



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 119th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 171

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2025

No. 39

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 27, 2025.

I hereby appoint the Honorable TOM MCCLINTOCK to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

MIKE JOHNSON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

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

Be thou our vision, O Lord of our hearts. Illuminate our paths. Guide us to see what You would have us see and enable us to live this day as You would have us do.

In Your light do we see the light of hope and peace. Heal our eyes, for when they are healthy, they reflect Your light. But in these times, when darkness overcomes our souls, how much greater that darkness is when Your light does not shine forth through them.

Yours is the light that shines in our darkness. Nothing else matters, naught is all else to us, except Your companionship leading us on Your path of righteousness. Show forth Your presence in our lives and on our journey of faith.

For Your presence is our light, in work or play, in waking or sleeping. On this day, be our best thought in all the things that invade our minds, and our only consideration when night fails to put our worries to rest.

In the certainty that You abide with us in the darkness and in the light,

may we find the joy You desire for us to experience in You this day.

God our light, we offer our prayers in Your loving name.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. CAREY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

HONORING BLAINE KELLY

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

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, almost 4 years ago, a determined handful of friends decided that we could help change the world. One would be the candidate, the other the wise problem-solver, and the other would bring clarity to the new forms of campaigning.

Through it all, we all agreed that one man would keep us together and make

sure that we could one day be here in our Nation's Capital, and that was our campaign manager, Blaine Kelly.

After we won, Blaine took on the monumental task of being the communications director for someone who had never served in elected office. He quickly showed how we could inform our constituents of Ohio's 15th Congressional District of the work that we were doing on their behalf.

Shortly thereafter, Blaine took on the most important role for any Member who prides themselves on being in touch with all the issues back home, the role of district director.

After working in and around each other for nearly a decade, and every day for the last 4 years, Blaine will now move to a new position. I wish him and Mollie and their three children all the best.

Blaine has given me that singular honor of being able to call him my friend, and I hope that that friendship will last for many years.

RECOGNIZING XAVIER WORTHAM

(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, I rise to recognize the extraordinary Oxford community and one of its most outstanding leaders, Mr. Xavier Wortham.

I had the honor of spending a day in Oxford, engaging with local nonprofits, educators, clergy, elected officials, and residents. We also visited the Masonic Home for Children and held a listening session.

Among the many remarkable people we met, Mr. Wortham's impact stands out. For 40 years, he has served as executive director of the Oxford Housing Authority, providing families with crucial education, job training, and opportunities like college tours at Duke University.

□ 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.

H883

Mr. Wortham's tireless commitment and love for those he serves in the community is indeed a beacon of hope. He embodies what makes Oxford and the First Congressional District exceptional.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. Wortham for his example and unwavering dedication and passion.

RECOGNIZING LYNCHBURG FIRE DEPARTMENT

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

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, southwest Virginia, in Congressman Morgan Griffith's district, has been hit hard by storms over and over again in the past few months, including Hurricane Helene. I visited Damascus in October, where I cooked and served food for first responders with my team for the victims of Hurricane Helene.

My thoughts and prayers have been with southwest Virginia since then and certainly remain today as they deal with the consequences of continued flooding.

I rise today to recognize and commend the nine members of the Lynchburg Fire Department's Urban Search and Rescue Team who recently deployed to southwest Virginia in anticipation of further flooding.

The Lynchburg search and rescue team represents what it means to be a proud Virginian. No matter where you are in the Commonwealth, when you are in need, a fellow Virginian gives you a hand.

Our first responders are critical to our safety, not just in disasters but every day. To all of those on the front lines, I thank them. May God and their training keep them safe.

RECOGNIZING JOANN WILLIAMS

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

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate Black History Month, I rise to recognize Joann Williams, a dedicated leader in Illinois' Fourth Congressional District and a pillar of the LeClaire-Hearst community on Chicago's southwest side.

Joann is a U.S. Army disabled veteran who has dedicated her life to service both in uniform and in her neighborhood. She has spent decades being a driving force of opportunity, making sure to uplift her community and ensure that other veterans receive the respect that they deserve.

As the founder of the Hearst Community Organization, she has fought for jobs and public spaces and to secure critical resources to help people lead better lives. Her dedication reflects the resilience we honor this month.

Mr. Speaker, Joann's unwavering service has left a lasting impact and

touched countless families. I thank her for her sacrifice to our country and her service to community.

PROVIDING SECURITY AND PATH TO CITIZENSHIP FOR DREAMERS

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

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today for Dreamers, young people brought to this country as children through no fault of their own.

Dreamers grew up in our schools, played with our children, pledged allegiance to our flag, and made our country, every single day, strengthened in every way. They are doctors, teachers, lawyers, essential workers, and businessowners. They pay taxes.

They keep the American Dream alive, but they still live a life in limbo.

Imagine building a life here only to be told to leave for a country you don't even remember, much less sometimes even speak the language. Even the President agrees that it is not fair.

Congress must act. More than 70 percent of Americans agree Dreamers deserve citizenship.

That is why, yesterday, I reintroduced the bipartisan American Dream and Promise Act to give Dreamers the security they deserve and a real path to citizenship.

Over 200 Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle joined me in doing that, along with over 100 organizations from across America representing all sectors of our economy.

Our message is clear to Dreamers: Their home is here. We will fight for them.

"Sí, se puede"; "Yes, we can."

AMERICAN FAMILIES WILL PAY FOR REPUBLICAN TAX CUT

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because, just 2 days ago, my Republican colleagues jammed through a budget plan that puts the 0.1 percent above hardworking Americans.

The Republican budget would give \$4.5 trillion to CEOs and big corporations.

Who pays for the tax cuts? American families just trying to make ends meet.

The Republican budget cuts at least \$880 billion from Medicaid. It doesn't matter whether someone is a Democrat, a Republican, an Independent, or a nonvoter. Americans across the country will either lose healthcare or see their premiums increase.

All the Federal workers that Elon Musk and DOGE decided to fire for no justifiable reason will also lose their healthcare.

Republicans represent millions and millions of Americans who rely on Medicaid and CHIP, and none of them, not a single one, voted with these constituents in mind.

MEDICAID CUTS MEAN HOSPITAL CLOSURES

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

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Speaker, the Republican budget calls for a trillion dollars in Medicaid cuts to pay for tax breaks for the very wealthy.

Mr. Speaker, 83 percent of the tax breaks go to 1 percent of Americans. What do these Medicaid cuts mean? It means the closure of hospitals and seniors denied coverage in long-term care.

Elon Musk talks about reducing deficits, but this bill would add \$2.8 trillion to the deficit, taking it to \$24.9 trillion.

Here is what is going on in the Republican family: While Musk and DOGE scrounge around for change under the couch, Speaker Johnson is running the credit card, bankrupting our Nation.

They are taking away your Medicaid to line the pockets of the wealthiest Americans who are controlling our government.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY RELATING TO "ENERGY CONSERVATION PROGRAM: ENERGY CONSERVATION STANDARDS FOR CONSUMER GAS-FIRED INSTANTANEOUS WATER HEATERS"

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 161, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 20) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Energy relating to "Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Consumer Gas-fired Instantaneous Water Heaters", and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 161, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 20

Resolved e Senate and House of representatives of the ited ates America in Congress sembled, That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the Department of Energy relating to "Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Consumer Gas-fired Instantaneous Water Heaters" (89 Fed. Reg. 105188 (December 26, 2024)), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

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

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA).

□ 0915

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the legislation and to insert extraneous material on H.J. Res. 20.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, on December 26, while American families were enjoying the holidays, the Biden administration's Department of Energy issued a final rule once again, setting cost prohibitive energy conservation standards for gas-fired instantaneous water heaters.

Today, the House will consider the gentleman from Alabama's Sixth District's legislation, H.J. Res. 20, to overturn this egregious standard.

Under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act, EPCA, in order to promulgate new or amended energy efficiency standards, the DOE must find that the standard be cost-effective, technologically feasible, and result in a significant conservation of energy. This amended standard does not meet those criteria and should be repealed.

In this final rule, the DOE fails to adequately estimate the cost difference between condensing and noncondensing water heaters. This difference will result in a significant cost increase for consumers, especially low-income households and seniors, by removing more affordable options from the market.

In fact, the DOE itself estimated that the amended standard would increase the cost of new water heater models by \$231. However, the DOE failed to adequately estimate the cost difference between condensing and noncondensing models in this assessment.

On top of expensive installation costs, industry stakeholders estimate the actual cost increase for American consumers will range between \$450 to \$665 per unit. This staggering increase is not cost-effective, as stipulated by EPCA, and is unattainable for many families.

The Biden-Harris administration consistently ignored this stipulation in a number of rulemakings, and the gas heater rule is no different.

This amended standard will ban approximately 40 percent of the tankless gas water heaters currently available, forcing consumers to purchase significantly more expensive or less efficient models.

Not only do bans on gas appliances infringe on consumer choice, but it also increases strains on our Nation's grid, which cannot sustain such massive and rapid amounts of forced electrification without new, baseload generation coming online.

President Trump, understanding the serious concerns unjustified energy efficiency standards pose for consumers, issued an executive order on day one to unleash American energy. This EO stated that it is the policy of the United States to safeguard the American people's freedom to choose from a variety of goods and appliances.

Additionally, this administration has paused implementation of this final rule and issued a Statement of Administration Policy supporting H.J. Res. 20. Congress should pass H.J. Res. 20 to right the wrongs of the previous administration, execute President Trump's agenda, and protect our consumers.

I thank the gentleman from Alabama's Sixth District for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes," and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 20, the second Republican resolution in just 2 days that will raise energy prices on Americans. This harmful resolution guts a Department of Energy efficiency rule on gas instantaneous, or tankless, water heaters.

Energy efficiency standards, like the one Republicans are going after today, are a popular, commonsense tool to save Americans money on their energy bills. President Trump ran on a promise to cut energy costs in half his first year, but now Republicans and their billionaire friends are only making themselves richer while sending Americans' utility bills through the roof.

Unfortunately, I guess it should not come as a surprise considering that earlier this week Republicans moved forward with a budget that includes devastating cuts to Medicaid and food assistance for our kids, our seniors, and our veterans, all so Republicans can give tax breaks to their millionaire buddies.

Let me start off by dispelling a few myths about the water heater standards targeted by this resolution.

First, these standards do not ban water heaters. Regardless of what the rightwing media and fossil fuel groups say, DOE cannot ban appliances based on their fuel type.

Second, these standards do not remove consumer choice. American families can still walk into a store, pick out a gas tankless water heater, and have it installed in their homes. In fact, these standards preserve consumer choice. They ensure that all products on the market meet a certain level of energy efficiency so consumers can shop with confidence.

The standards impact less than 10 percent of the gas water heater market, and right now, 60 percent of all models on the market already meet these standards. This isn't an effort to pull products from shelves. Instead, it is an effort to raise the quality of the products on the shelves. That is what we are trying to do with the standards.

Third, and most importantly, these standards do not increase costs for consumers. They reduce total costs over the life of a water heater and save \$3.31 billion for consumers over 30 years. They are also projected to reduce carbon dioxide emissions by 32 million metric tons over 30 years.

To summarize, these standards allow gas tankless water heaters to stay on the market, they preserve consumer choice, they lower costs for Americans, and they reduce emissions. So it is no wonder that these efficiency standards are supported by consumer advocates and American manufacturers—I stress American manufacturers—who want to preserve the standards.

The Republican resolution before us today completely nullifies these energy efficiency standards. It steals, essentially, \$3.1 billion in savings from Americans. Because it is a Congressional Review Act resolution, it goes one step further and prevents DOE from issuing substantially similar standards in the future.

Now, why are Republicans pursuing something that is bad for consumers?

It is because it is good for the gas industry. The American Gas Association and foreign manufacturers are on the side of this Republican resolution that will terminate the standards.

Why?

It is because inefficient appliances mean that gas companies sell more gas.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if you look at where the manufacturers stand on this, three out of four major water heater manufacturers are in favor of the standards and are opposed to this resolution. All three of the manufacturers that support the efficiency standards are American manufacturers, and they have factories in many Republican districts across the country.

Foreign manufacturers, however, are lobbying against these standards because they don't want to spend a comparatively small amount of money to retool their factories to produce more efficient water heaters.

I understand that companies are reluctant to spend money, but what I don't understand is why Republicans are willing to rob Americans of \$3.1 billion in savings, all to help multibillion dollar foreign companies save a few million dollars.

Republicans have made their choice. They have basically sided—and I guess that is not surprising—with their oil and gas friends, and they have sided also in this case with foreign manufacturers.

So, Mr. Speaker, for the sake of American families, American manufacturers, and our climate, I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER), who is the vice-chair of the Committee on Energy and Commerce's Energy Subcommittee.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to hear made-up stories

on the other side of the aisle, the once upon a time stories, if you will.

Nonetheless, in the eleventh hour, Joe Biden, or more accurately, his handlers, pushed through yet another overreaching regulation that forces the Federal Government into Americans' homes, dictating what appliances Americans can use or cannot use.

News flash: This is America. The government has absolutely no business making these decisions for hardworking families. Consumers, not Washington bureaucrats, should decide what works best for their homes and for their families.

Yet, thanks to Biden's mandate on his way out the door, I might add, American families are now looking at a whopping \$235 million in additional costs every single year. That is real money coming out of real pockets of real Americans, all to appease the radical Green New Deal agenda.

Today that ends. House Republicans are taking action to stop this Federal overreach. H.J. Res. 20, introduced by my colleague, GARY PALMER, sends a clear message: We reject the Biden administration's radical energy mandates.

This resolution expresses congressional disapproval of the Department of Energy's rule that effectively bans certain natural gas water heaters which burdens families with higher costs while stripping them of consumer choice.

House Republicans will continue fighting to protect American families from Washington's overregulation and ensure that those same hardworking Americans, not government bureaucrats, decide what appliances belong in their homes.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.J. Res. 20 and stand for consumer choice, affordability, and freedom.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) who is the ranking member of our subcommittee.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, here we are at the end of February, 2 months into the new congressional session, and House Republicans haven't offered one bill to lower the cost of living for our neighbors back home. Instead, they bring this silly bill to the floor, a bill to force to working families to spend more money, to use more energy, and to sell out American manufacturers.

Meanwhile, Republicans in Congress have stood idly by while there has been an illegal shutdown of grants and loans to our local communities and non-profits that help people save money and help families.

Plus, House Republicans didn't raise any concern when the new President illegally fired Inspectors General and prosecutors who are charged with rooting out waste, fraud, and abuse, and

that includes in the Department of Energy.

It gets worse because Republicans now are barreling toward a massive tax giveaway to billionaires paid for on the backs of American families, children, our neighbors with disabilities, our older neighbors, and grandparents in nursing homes.

This is not business as usual. I know Republicans bring a bill here and they say: Okay. This is just like what we have always done.

This is not business as usual.

Where is the House Republicans' outrage that everything they have worked on congressionally mandated through appropriations is just illegally frozen?

It is not business as usual.

This resolution is the latest of a whole lot of nonsense. It is hard to explain, except when we realize that oil and gas companies often have their way here in Washington, D.C.

We wasted hours and hours over the past couple of years trying to demonize energy efficient appliances. These kinds of appliances are popular. There has been a law in place for decades that says that every few years we update these appliance standards. Manufacturers work on it, advocates work on it, and they come together and update it.

This actual residential water heater standard hasn't been updated since 2010. Here we are in 2025, and the standard we are discussing today effects less than 10 percent of all water heater sales and most, over 100, of these models already meet this standard.

Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, if you want to talk about cost savings, it was Democrats who put in place tax credits and rebates to help everyday Americans lower the cost of their energy bill on appliances.

This is one of the reasons why we are so angry.

Part of the illegal freeze on government initiatives also impacts the money that should be going into the pockets of our neighbors back home. This includes the home energy rebates. Those are the rebates that help consumers save money on select home improvement projects that can lower energy bills by providing up to \$14,000 a year for homeowners as they update their homes.

Mr. Speaker, you had better believe this is important to my neighbors in Florida recovering from hurricanes Helene and Milton. They would love to be able to get these funds to help them repair their homes. Right now, frozen in Florida is \$346 million that could be helping everyday Floridians recover from the storms as they repair their homes.

That is not the only one. Weatherization assistance, very smart, has often been bipartisan in the past. Elon Musk and this new administration have frozen it. They have frozen billions of dollars that go to working-class households to improve the energy efficiency of their homes. In Florida alone, \$94 million that should be flowing to my

neighbors to help them weatherize their homes and save money is frozen.

So what Republicans are doing by freezing this and by trying to roll back energy appliance standards is contributing to the rising cost of energy for families and businesses. It is a dereliction of duty. They are turning a blind eye to the peoples' pocketbook. Democrats are going to fight for the peoples' pocketbook.

Meanwhile, an unelected billionaire who has made his vast fortune on government contracts should not be able to unilaterally stop and take money out of the pockets of American families, of the Americans who need it most.

Here is the warning, because this major tax giveaway that House Republicans are hammering out says to our committee: Find \$880 billion.

Republicans say: Oh, okay. Maybe there is enough waste, fraud, and abuse—even though they have taken the Inspectors General off the playing field to root out waste, fraud, and abuse. There is no way that you can say improper payments total up to \$880 billion.

□ 0930

Republicans shouldn't gaslight us and Americans if the majority is concerned about a major tax giveaway so that billionaires can have more money and Americans are going to have less healthcare for their grandparents and their children. It is not right, and we are not going to stand for it.

Mr. Speaker, who really benefits here on these tankless gas water heaters? Let me pull the curtain back. As they build homes, big corporate housing developers often install a slightly cheaper, less-efficient model, and they pass on the costs of higher energy bills to that new homeowner for the next 20 years.

Foreign manufacturers are going to benefit here. The American manufacturers who have participated in these energy efficiency standards aren't going to benefit. It is the foreign manufacturers who will get to sell their inferior, less-efficient appliances and take away sales from U.S. manufacturers.

It is the American Gas Association who will get to sell more polluting fossil gas to power inefficient appliances and pass the costs on to working families.

Once my colleagues take a closer look, Members will see this resolution really doesn't hold water. It does nothing to lower costs for working families. It does nothing to support American companies. It does nothing to address the real challenges facing our families back home.

It is a warning. It is a warning shot across the bow that this is not business as usual. It is a hold-on-to-your-wallet moment because the unelected billionaires who are calling the shots, who are reaching into citizens' wallets, and who are going to take away our healthcare want to rule the day.

House Democrats are not going to stand for it. We are going to continue to hold Republicans accountable. We are going to hold this administration accountable. We are going to fight for our constituents' wallets and pocketbooks, and we are going to make sure that Republicans are not going to be able to say that this kind of ridiculous stuff is business as usual here in the House of Representatives.

It is not. We believe in checks and balances. We believe in the hardworking Americans. We do not countenance unfairness and trying to steal from our kids, loading them up with massive debt and saying that their health doesn't matter in this country. It does.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to vote "no" on this resolution. It is not business as usual, and people need to know it.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from the Sixth District of Alabama (Mr. PALMER), the sponsor of the resolution.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, it is amazing to me to listen to my Democratic colleagues talk about the cost of living going up.

Mr. Speaker, during the first week of the Biden administration, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle shut down the Keystone XL Pipeline. My Democratic colleagues implemented energy policies that have immediately caused energy prices to go up, causing massive suffering and massive inflation. The inflation hit 9 percent.

It is amazing to me that the minority came in here and made these statements, and the American people figured it out. That is why my Democratic colleagues are in the minority. The American people were tired of being told what to do, what they could buy, what they could wear, and what they could use. Here we are, and my colleagues are hearing the same cold rhetoric that leads to cold homes and cold water.

I introduced this resolution because we are determined to restore a quality of life in this country that we enjoyed before the Democratic Party took over the White House and the House and the Senate.

We believe that we can help the American people be able to afford their groceries, afford an automobile, and afford education. That is why we are doing what we are doing.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 20. The Congressional Review Act is in response to the Biden-Harris administration's last-minute, overreaching attempt to ban natural gas water heaters.

If this rule is not stopped, a substantial number of Americans would be forced to purchase more expensive and less-efficient models of water heaters. In fact, 40 percent of consumers who will be directly impacted by this rule would face a significant cost increase. It will be particularly hard on senior citizens and low-income families.

Additionally, this rule mandate of fuel switching would set a dangerous precedent for natural gas appliances. We know my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have already tried to ban natural gas stovetops.

This would allow future Democratic administrations to restart their party's regulatory attack on our home appliances. I know that when the government steps in to pick winners and losers there are manufacturers of competing products that would profit.

It is amazing to me that my Democratic colleagues claim that a United States-based company based in Georgia is foreign manufacturing. What do Democratic Members say about Toyota, Honda, Mercedes, Kia, and the other foreign-owned companies that are based in this country, creating American jobs and providing incomes for American families?

We should let consumers decide what products succeed in the marketplace, not a bureaucrat implementing a regulation pushed out in the final hours of the Biden-Harris Presidency.

Earlier this week, the Trump administration issued a statement of administration policy agreeing that this egregious rule implemented by the previous administration must be repealed. While making a speech last week, the Secretary of Energy, Chris Wright, even mentioned how absurd this rule is.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, H.J. Res. 20 is essential for prioritizing consumer choice, protecting natural gas appliances, keeping prices affordable, and undoing the damage inflicted on the American people by the Biden-Harris administration for the past 4 years.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

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

Mr. Speaker, I listened to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER), who I greatly respect. When he talks about prices, since President Trump was inaugurated, prices have gone through the roof. Grocery prices, egg prices, meat prices, fish prices, and poultry prices are all up even more than ever. Electricity costs are way up, along with housing prices.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman mentions American jobs. As I mentioned earlier, I think it needs to be reiterated that American manufacturers support these water heater standards. Three out of four major water heater manufacturers are against today's resolution, and all three are American companies.

The manufacturers that are in favor of this resolution and against the standards are foreign manufacturers.

If this resolution is successful, Republicans are giving foreign manufacturers an advantage over domestic manufacturers. Foreign manufacturers are against the standards because they don't want to spend a bit of money on retrofits to their factories in order to switch their production over to products that meet the standards.

Republicans have decided that it is more important to save foreign manufacturers some money than it is to save \$3.1 billion for American families. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have decided to listen to the lobbying efforts of foreign companies over domestic companies, many of whom have factories in Republican districts.

Madam Speaker, it just doesn't make any sense to me. The Trump administration is all about America first, but the words are meaningless when it comes down to it. Republicans aren't here to stand up for American families and American companies. It is very much the opposite. My colleagues are here to attack regulations and help out their Big Oil and Gas friends.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to stand with American companies and families and to vote against this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LATTA. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from the Third District of Georgia (Mr. JACK).

Mr. JACK. Madam Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER) for his leadership on this resolution, and I rise today in strong support of H.J. Res. 20.

Madam Speaker, H.J. Res. 20 is a resolution authorized by the Congressional Review Act that will enable our Congress to repeal a job-killing regulation that would ban and eliminate noncondensing tankless water heaters, an American product made by blue-collar American workers in the heart of my congressional district in Georgia.

This regulation was imposed on December 26, 2024, in the midnight hour of the Biden administration and the day after Christmas, putting in peril the livelihoods of hundreds of my constituents during the holiday season.

Madam Speaker, I should also note that the timing of this regulation was 7 weeks after Americans overwhelmingly rejected the Biden-Harris regulatory regime.

To my colleagues who support the free market, this job-killing regulation eliminates consumer choice by effectively enabling nameless and faceless bureaucrats to choose which companies may operate and which companies may not operate in the marketplace for household appliances.

Ultimately, under this regulation, the American consumer would suffer, and hundreds of hardworking Georgians in my congressional district would be without a job. That is why I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this critical legislation.

To put everything that we have heard today into perspective, noncondensing tankless water heaters account for 40 percent of our country's tankless water heater market. A majority of those water heaters are manufactured in my congressional district, in the heart of Georgia, by an incredible company called Rinnai America Corporation.

These appliances are the most advanced and efficient noncondensing

tankless water heaters on the market. Perhaps most importantly, which I would encourage the other side to research, Rinnai America is the only company that builds noncondensing tankless water heaters on American soil.

Rinnai America is headquartered in my hometown of Peachtree City, Georgia, and it opened a state-of-the-art manufacturing facility 3 years ago in Griffin, Georgia, two cities I proudly represent in this Congress.

Over 500 of my constituents are working to manufacture and market these water heaters the Biden administration attempted to outlaw. The job-killing regulation we seek to repeal today is another painful example of the radical left's never-ending war on hydrocarbons and American energy production.

The sinister purpose of this regulation was to try to single out and eliminate an American manufacturer of water heaters to benefit their competitors.

Madam Speaker, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have spent an enormous amount of time in the past few weeks arguing that my Democratic colleagues are the party of blue-collar American workers. In the spirit of bipartisanship, I encourage my Democratic colleagues to join me in support of this resolution to protect and champion hundreds of blue-collar American jobs in the heart of our country.

To my Republican colleagues, let's join together as a team and end this war on American energy production now.

As the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER) noted, President Trump's White House has explicitly endorsed this resolution. I urge all of my Republican colleagues to join me and vote for this critical legislation to empower consumer choice, champion American manufacturing, and save blue-collar jobs in the heart of our country.

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

Madam Speaker, I respect the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JACK) for looking out for his district, but this plant that he is talking about in his district is the Japanese company. This is the one non-American manufacturing company.

All of the other companies that manufacture these products are American, and they are the ones that support these energy efficiencies because they have made the investments and created more jobs when they retrofitted their companies for this product.

Madam Speaker, this company is a multibillion-dollar Japanese company in Georgia. It is estimated that it would cost them about \$10 million to retrofit their plant so that they could produce more efficient tanks, and they don't want to do it. They don't want to make that investment, which would create more jobs.

Madam Speaker, I understand where my friend, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JACK), is coming from, but we have to look at this as the total picture.

Most of these tanks are manufactured in the United States by American companies, and they are in a lot of the red States. They are in Tennessee, for example. They are saying: This is fine. We want the more efficient standards. We want to save Americans money. We are the good actors, not the bad actors.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. MCCLELLAN), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Ms. MCCLELLAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) for yielding me time.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 20, which will undo a commonsense energy conservation standard and raise costs for consumers, all to benefit the gas industry.

My friends on the other side of the aisle talk a lot about how we need to lower costs, we need to lower costs, we need to lower costs.

The best way, the fastest way, and the most efficient way to lower energy costs and to lower utility bill costs that every American pays is to reduce energy demand.

□ 0945

We have seen that time and time again. This standard is a way to help lower energy demand needed for water heaters. Energy efficiency standards are popular, and it is a commonsense tool and, again, the fastest way to save taxpayers and American people money on their energy bills.

This resolution targets these standards, not realizing that these standards will save consumers \$3.1 billion and are good for the environment because they cut 32 million metric tons of carbon dioxide emissions over 30 years.

All major manufacturers already sell models that meet these standards, which is why they widely support the standards. Consumer groups, efficiency advocates, and consumers widely support the standards.

Again, the only manufacturers that oppose them are the foreign manufacturers and industry CEOs who make more money when water heaters are less efficient and use more gas.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this resolution and live up to the promise of lowering costs for the American people by lowering their energy bills.

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

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

Madam Speaker, I will call out some of the problems that I see on the Republican side in terms of their arguments that we have heard this morning.

Over the last 2 years, Republicans have claimed that they care about energy costs. On the campaign trail, they repeatedly promised to lower costs and lower inflation, but, again, none of their actions line up with their promises.

If you are paying attention to energy load growth in this country, you know that, in addition to increasing generation, we have to incorporate ways of reducing energy demand. Energy conservation standards are one of the tools that help lower costs and help reduce demand.

The previous administration's efficiency standards are estimated to save consumers \$1 trillion over 30 years. That is a trillion dollars. The water heater standards alone would save \$3.1 billion—that is, if Republicans don't kill the standards right here today, which is what they are doing.

Republicans don't want Americans to realize those savings. They want Americans to be stuck with older, energy-guzzling appliances that cost more money every time you turn them on. I think that is ridiculous and so should everyone else in this Chamber.

Republicans claim they are concerned about the higher upfront costs of these appliances, but 2½ years ago, when we voted on the Inflation Reduction Act, which contained \$9 billion in rebates and other investments in lowering the costs of energy-efficient appliances, Republicans all voted no.

Madam Speaker, let's review. They don't want to make positive economic investments because they are concerned about the upfront costs, but then they also refuse to take action to lower those costs. If you brought that mentality to the private sector, you would be fired in a heartbeat, but that is the orthodoxy in today's Trump-Musk Republican Party.

Lowering energy costs for consumers via efficiency gains used to be a bipartisan issue. We made real progress on this in 1992 and again in 2005, but somewhere along the way, Republicans decided to become the party of higher energy costs rather than the ones fighting for the American homeowner. That is a real shame.

For that reason, Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, we have heard from various speakers today, but I think it is really important to point out that, once again, because of the Biden-Harris administration's gas heater rule, we are going to ban approximately 40 percent of the tankless gas water heaters currently available, forcing consumers to have to pay more and get less efficient models.

This doesn't make sense. Not only does this rule go on to ban these gas appliances and infringe on consumer choice, but it also increases strains on the Nation's grid, which cannot sustain

such massive and rapid amounts of forced electrification without new baseload generation coming online.

When we talk about this loss of consumer choice, the DOE underestimated the cost by \$231 because when you look at the actual costs out there, industry stakeholders are estimating it is going to bring the cost up between \$450 to \$665 per unit.

I think it is also important to note that, in the last Congress, in the Energy and Commerce Committee's Energy Subcommittee, I asked everybody who came before us the same question when we had these testimonies: Do we have to have more energy in this country or less? Everybody said the exact same thing. We have to produce more energy in this country, but we also have to make sure we are producing the energy to make that energy in this country.

Republicans have led that way starting back in 2008 with our all-of-the-above energy policy, which said we weren't going to pick winners and losers. We were going to let the consumer decide and let the market decide, and that is important.

If we are going to make sure we become energy independent in this country, we have to start thinking about those things. It is important.

Madam Speaker, I urge the passage of H.J. Res. 20, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 161, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 198, answered “present” 2, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 53]

YEAS—221

Aderholt	Biggs (AZ)	Ciscomani
Allen	Biggs (SC)	Cline
Amodei (NV)	Bilirakis	Cloud
Arrington	Boebert	Clyde
Babin	Bost	Cole
Bacon	Brecheen	Collins
Baird	Bresnahan	Comer
Balderson	Buchanan	Crane
Barr	Burchett	Crank
Barrett	Burlison	Crawford
Baumgartner	Bynum	Crenshaw
Bean (FL)	Calvert	Cuellar
Begich	Cammack	Davidson
Bentz	Carey	Davis (NC)
Bergman	Carter (GA)	De La Cruz
Bice	Carter (TX)	DesJarlais

Diaz-Balart	James	Obernolte
Downing	Johnson (LA)	Ogles
Dunn (FL)	Johnson (SD)	Onder
Edwards	Jordan	Owens
Ellzey	Joyce (OH)	Palmer
Emmer	Joyce (PA)	Perez
Estes	Kean	Perry
Evans (CO)	Kelly (MS)	Pfluger
Ezell	Kelly (PA)	Reschenthaler
Fallon	Kennedy (UT)	Rogers (AL)
Fedorchak	Kiggans (VA)	Rogers (KY)
Feenstra	Kiley (CA)	Rose
Finstad	Kim	Rouzer
Fischbach	Knott	Roy
Fitzgerald	Kustoff	Rulli
Fitzpatrick	LaHood	Rutherford
Fleischmann	LaLota	Salazar
Flood	LaMalfa	Scalise
Fong	Langworthy	Schmidt
Fox	Latta	Schweikert
Franklin, Scott	Lawler	Self
Fulcher	Lee (FL)	Sessions
Garbarino	Letlow	Shreve
Gill (TX)	Loudermilk	Simpson
Gillen	Lucas	Smith (MO)
Gimenez	Luna	Smith (NE)
Golden (ME)	Luttrell	Smith (NJ)
Goldman (TX)	Mace	Smucker
Gonzales, Tony	Mackenzie	Spartz
Gonzalez, V.	Malliotakis	Staubert
Gooden	Maloy	Steil
Gosar	Mann	Steube
Graves	Massie	Strong
Gray	Mast	Stutzman
Green (TN)	McCaull	Suozzi
Greene (GA)	McClain	Taylor
Griffith	McClintock	Tenney
Grothman	McCormick	Thompson (PA)
Guest	McDowell	Tiffany
Guthrie	McGuire	Timmons
Hageman	Messmer	Turner (OH)
Hamadeh (AZ)	Meuser	Valadao
Haridopolos	Miller (IL)	Van Drew
Harrigan	Miller (OH)	Van Dune
Harris (MD)	Miller (WV)	Vindman
Harris (NC)	Miller-Meeks	Wagner
Harshbarger	Mills	Walberg
Hern (OK)	Moolenaar	Weber (TX)
Higgins (LA)	Moore (AL)	Webster (FL)
Hill (AR)	Moore (NC)	Westerman
Hinson	Moore (UT)	Wied
Houchin	Moore (WV)	Williams (TX)
Hudson	Moran	Wilson (SC)
Huizenga	Moskowitz	Wittman
Hurd (CO)	Murphy	Womack
Issa	Newhouse	Yakym
Jack	Norman	Zinke
Jackson (TX)	Nunn (IA)	

NAYS—198

Adams	Craig	Hoyle (OR)
Aguilar	Crockett	Huffman
Amo	Crow	Ivey
Ansari	Davids (KS)	Jackson (IL)
Auchincloss	Davis (IL)	Jacobs
Balint	Dean (PA)	Jayapal
Barragán	DeGette	Jeffries
Beatty	DeLauro	Johnson (GA)
Bell	DelBene	Johnson (TX)
Bera	Deluzio	Kamlager-Dove
Beyer	DeSaulnier	Kaptur
Bishop	Dexter	Keating
Bonamici	Dingell	Kelly (IL)
Boyle (PA)	Doggett	Kennedy (NY)
Brown	Elfireh	Khanna
Brownley	Escobar	Krishnamoorthi
Budzinski	Españal	Landsman
Carbajal	Evans (PA)	Larsen (WA)
Carson	Fields	Larson (CT)
Carter (LA)	Figures	Latimer
Casar	Fletcher	Lee (NV)
Case	Foster	Lee (PA)
Casten	Foushee	Leger Fernandez
Castor (FL)	Friedman	Levin
Castro (TX)	Frost	Liccardo
Cherfilus-	Garamendi	Lieu
McCormick	Garcia (CA)	Lofgren
Chu	Garcia (IL)	Lynch
Cisneros	Garcia (TX)	Magaziner
Clark (MA)	Goldman (NY)	Mannion
Clarke (NY)	Gomez	Matsui
Cleaver	Goodlander	McBath
Clyburn	Green, Al (TX)	McBride
Cohen	Harder (CA)	McClain Delaney
Conaway	Hayes	McClellan
Connolly	Himes	McCollum
Correa	Horsford	McDonald Rivet
Costa	Houlahan	McGarvey
Courtney	Hoyer	McGovern

McIver	Randall	Swalwell
Meeks	Raskin	Sykes
Menendez	Riley (NY)	Takano
Meng	Rivas	Thanedar
Mfume	Ross	Thompson (CA)
Min	Ruiz	Thompson (MS)
Moore (WI)	Ryan	Titus
Morelle	Salinas	Tlaib
Morrison	Sánchez	Tokuda
Moulton	Scanlon	Torres (CA)
Mrvan	Schakowsky	Torres (NY)
Nadler	Schneider	Trahan
Neal	Scholten	Tran
Neguse	Schrier	Turner (TX)
Norcross	Scott (VA)	Underwood
Ocasio-Cortez	Scott, David	Vargas
Olsweski	Sewell	Vasquez
Pallone	Sherman	Veasey
Panetta	Sherrill	Velázquez
Pappas	Simon	Wasserman
Pelosi	Smith (WA)	Schultz
Peters	Sorensen	Waters
Pingree	Soto	Watson Coleman
Pocan	Stansbury	Whitesides
Pou	Stanton	Williams (GA)
Pressley	Stevens	Wilson (FL)
Quigley	Strickland	
Ramirez	Subramanyam	

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—2

Fry Van Orden

NOT VOTING—12

Alford	Grijalva	Omar
Donalds	Hunt	Pettersen
Frankel, Lois	Mullin	Scott, Austin
Gottheimer	Nehls	Stefanik

□ 1026

Mr. LANDSMAN changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Ms. BYNUM, and GILLEN changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

Mr. CLEAVER changed his vote from “present” to “nay.”

Mr. VAN ORDEN changed his vote from “nay” to “present.”

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I'm not recorded because I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 53.

Stated against:

Ms. OMAR. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 53.

Ms. PETTERSEN. Madam Speaker, I missed votes due to recently giving birth. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 53.

□ 1030

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2025, TO MONDAY, MARCH 3, 2025

Mr. JACK. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. KIM). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia.

There was no objection.

RECOGNIZING EMILY TUTTLE-MILLARD

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

Mr. NUNN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Emily Tuttle-Millard, our deputy chief of staff.

Over the course of Emily's tenure, she has served in numerous roles, consistently demonstrating her professionalism and extraordinary work ethic, with a steadfast dedication to excellence.

Emily was not only a vital member of our team, but she was also an integral force behind our success for folks back home in Iowa.

As deputy chief of staff, Emily tackled strategic goals, including our passage of legislation to address veteran suicide with the Daniel J. Harvey, Jr. and Adam Lambert Improving Servicemember Transition to Reduce Veteran Suicide Act, helping support couples to start a family with the HOPE with Fertility Services Act, and delivering on U.S. national security priorities enshrined in the National Defense Authorization Act. As a fighter for folks in the heart of the heartland, she helped lead more amendments to the prestigious farm bill than nearly any other Member in Congress.

Further, Emily worked across the State and across the aisle to earn bipartisan support and helped our team be in the top 10 most bipartisan Members of Congress.

Throughout her tenure, Emily has been a true plankholder from day one. Whether she was operating in a role as communications director, scheduler, or, ultimately, deputy chief, she has continued to be a true mentor.

I thank Emily for all she has done for our team, especially her ability to foster collaboration and growth and to create a more united effort. Despite her University of Illinois pedigree, she will always be an Iowan and a Hawkeye at heart, from the corn dogs at the State fair to winning friends under the golden dome in Des Moines to right here at the marble steps of the U.S. Capitol.

Our country, our State, and our family are grateful for her service, and we wish her great success in her next adventure.

PROTECTING POSTAL WORKERS

(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, since before Christmas, I have heard from Louisvillians every day about mail delays.

I have heard from people who haven't received paychecks, prescriptions, or W-2s. One woman told me she received a bill so late that she owed more in late fees than she did on the bill.

What concerns me is if the Trump administration gets its way, things will get worse.

The USPS has operated independently since 1970, but now Donald Trump wants to take it over. Why? So Elon Musk can go in and fire letter carriers and sorters? These are hardworking people who go above and beyond.

This weekend, I heard about a Louisville letter carrier who wears a headlamp because she works well into the evening. She deserves support, not demonization.

Let's fix this. Let's get our letter carriers the resources they need. Let's get our sorters the machinery they need. Let's ensure Americans don't pay late fees if their mail is delayed. Let's get this done.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1301

Mr. FEENSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove the gentleman from New York (Mr. GOLDMAN) as a cosponsor to H.R. 1301.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KNOTT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

RECOGNIZING 41ST ANNIVERSARY OF CBYX EXCHANGE PROGRAM

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 41st anniversary of the CBYX exchange program and to thank David Byrne, a current participant and intern in my office.

The CBYX program is jointly funded by the U.S. Congress and the German Bundestag.

Every year, this unique program offers 75 young Germans and 75 young Americans the opportunity to study, work, and volunteer in Germany and the United States. The participants fully immerse themselves in the other culture, attending university, interning, and living with host families all over both countries.

CBYX is an excellent example of how cultural and political exchange amongst citizens can positively impact international relations in a different, more grassroots, and hands-on way.

As the co-chair of the bipartisan German-American Caucus and representing Pennsylvania, a State with a long history of German heritage, I am proud to support this program.

I thank David for his work and time in my office, and I wish him the best in his future endeavors.

HONORING BLACK HISTORY MONTH

(Mrs. FOUSHEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. FOUSHEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in celebration of Black History Month and to highlight the importance of our Nation's historically Black colleges and universities and diversity, equity, and inclusion initiatives.

This month is a time to reflect on and recognize the immense sacrifice and contributions that Black Americans have made throughout our Nation's history.

Today, we are witnessing blatant attempts to stifle DEI efforts, which were designed to promote fairness and provide resources to communities that have systemically been left behind.

These initiatives, in tandem with our Nation's rich web of HBCUs, have allowed for culturally relevant and supportive environments for Black Americans, making higher education more accessible to students of color, many of whom are first-generation college students and are producing top talent in a wide variety of fields.

These efforts are about supporting those in our community with the resources and education they need to thrive, and these policies help close the racial wealth gap and create more opportunities for upward mobility.

There is still much work to be done to properly support the Black community, and I am committed to eliminating discrimination in all forms and continuing to uplift the invaluable contributions of Black Americans to this country.

BEING TRUTHFUL ABOUT BUDGETS

(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, this week, we made an important step in passing the budget resolution in order to carry out the business of the House for the American people.

As we get into the budget reconciliation process, which is going to be a positive one for getting spending under control, we also need to have a lot more truth surrounding what is going to be happening in that process.

For more than I would like to have heard the last week, week and a half, 2 weeks, we keep hearing the same rhetoric that Republicans are going to cut Medicare, SNAP, Medicaid, Social Security, all of these things. Nowhere in that budget reconciliation document does it say that. In the resolution, nowhere does it say that.

We need not lie about what we are doing around here in order to gain political points. We actually should be sitting down at the table together and looking at how we can make these programs work better for longer.

Social Security is going to be in big trouble within 7 or 8 years. If we want to have solutions to that, why don't we sit at the table together and figure

these things out instead of lying about it?

We are trying to achieve better budgets and get closer to balancing the budget than what we have had the last 4 years. Why don't we be truthful in this process instead of the nonsense?

PROVIDING FAIRNESS IN SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. LANDSMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Social Security Fairness Act, which we passed a few months ago, is now in effect, and 3.2 million Americans will see a big increase in their monthly Social Security checks.

We are talking about retired public schoolteachers, retired police officers, retired firefighters, and retired letter carriers. They paid into Social Security for years but weren't getting their full benefits. They were missing out on hundreds, if not thousands, of dollars a month.

The bill was introduced in every Congress for the last 25 years. It had the most bipartisan support of any bill in the last Congress.

We had to force a vote on the bill with a discharge petition, and within 2 days, we got 218 signatures. We fought very hard to get this done, and now, our public retirees will finally start to see the benefits they were owed each month.

We could not have done this without the advocacy of thousands of public servants and retirees. I hope it can help restore some faith in our government that this institution does still get things done.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

HONORING CHARLES "CHUCK" HAEFLINGER

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

Mrs. KIM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Charles "Chuck" Haefflinger of Chino Hills, who passed away on February 3 at the age of 77.

Chuck had a distinguished 32-year career in the Army, serving as a helicopter pilot in the Vietnam war and retiring as a lieutenant colonel. He earned a Bronze Star and five Meritorious Service Medals.

Chuck's service to our Chino Hills community continued after his retirement. He helped fellow veterans transition back to civilian life, became a mentor emeritus for the Reaching New Heights Foundation, and was an active

member of the Chino Hills 55 Plus Club Veterans Group, playing a key role in raising funds for the military service monument at the community center. He was also a valued member of my Veterans Advisory Group.

I thank Chuck for his contributions to our community and extend my heartfelt condolences to his family and friends.

DISMANTLING SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, in January, a largely unknown midlevel career employee at the Social Security Administration, Leland Dudek, was caught sharing unauthorized data with Elon Musk's team at DOGE. Senior officials were so alarmed they put him on leave and launched an investigation. He may have violated privacy and tax laws.

Here is the stuff you can't make up. President Trump just promoted him to be the Acting Commissioner of Social Security.

DOGE, which I think stands for destruction of government by Elon, is reportedly demanding plans to gut the Social Security Administration, firing up to 50 percent of workers and closing field offices across the country, potentially including one in my district.

This isn't about efficiency. It is a back-door attack on Social Security itself. If they succeed, tens of millions of Americans will face delays, disruptions, and denials of benefits they have earned.

This is nothing more than an attempt to dismantle Social Security from the inside. We cannot allow it. We need answers. We need oversight. We need to stop this now.

□ 1045

RECOGNIZING HUNTER THOMAS

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the heroic actions of Deputy Hunter Thomas of the Ware County Sheriff's Office, who recently saved a life through his quick thinking and decisive actions.

On January 29, Deputy Thomas responded to a severe accident on U.S. 1/Georgia 4 near mile marker 8. A semitruck had collided with a Ford F-150, leaving several people injured.

Upon his arrival, Deputy Thomas found the semitruck driver severely wounded, suffering from a deep bleeding cut on his elbow. Without hesitation, he used his training and experience to apply a tourniquet, effectively stopping the excessive blood loss. His immediate response undoubtedly saved the driver's life.

Deputy Thomas' professionalism, dedication, and courage exemplify the

best of law enforcement. His actions not only protected a life that day but also set a standard of excellence for his department and colleagues.

He was rightfully honored with the lifesaving ribbon commendation bar by Sheriff Carl James. We are beyond grateful for his bravery and service to the Ware County community.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF RENE LICHTMAN

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

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life and legacy of my dear friend, Rene Lichtman, a Holocaust survivor and activist in our community who was deeply committed to justice in southeastern Michigan and around the world. He was my adopted "amo," "uncle."

Rene, who passed away at 87 years old, dedicated his life to teaching others about the Holocaust, ensuring that stories of survivors would never be forgotten. He worked so hard to live by the mission of Never Again to anyone.

Through his art, film, and photography, he captured the resilience of the human spirit, and through his activism, he fought for social justice and an end to human suffering.

At the age of 63, Rene got his Ph.D. in instructional technology and spent two decades working at a hospital in our community.

Even in the end of his life, Rene was painting, organizing with Jewish forces for peace in Detroit, and standing up for Palestinian human rights.

Rene's impact and legacy will live through his work and the countless lives he touched. May his memory and work live forever.

I will miss you, Rene. I love you.

HONORING GREGORY E. WALZ

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

Mr. LAWLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and service of Sergeant Gregory E. Walz of the Town of Pound Ridge Police Department.

Greg dedicated his life to serving others. Before his career in law enforcement, he worked as an EMT and paramedic, providing lifesaving care across Westchester County.

In 2008, he joined the Pound Ridge Police Department, where his skill, dedication, and leadership left a lasting impact.

Throughout his career, Greg was a mentor, protector, and friend to so many. His expertise saved lives, and his commitment to public safety earned him the respect of his fellow officers and the community he served.

As a police officer, Greg was honored with the Top Cop award by Westchester County for his outstanding efforts in

traffic safety through DWI enforcement.

In 2016, he was promoted to detective, where he took on investigative work and played a key role in training new officers. Just this month, Greg was promoted to sergeant, a testament to his unwavering commitment to Pound Ridge.

His passing is a tremendous loss to the Pound Ridge community, and my thoughts are with his wife, Lisa, his family, and his loved ones.

Today, we honor his service, his sacrifice, and his legacy. May he rest in peace.

DACA RECIPIENTS NEED PATHWAY TO CITIZENSHIP

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

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share an incredible story of one of my constituents, a proud DACA recipient, Martha Delgado.

Raised by a single mother who worked in the fields and cleaned houses, Martha was determined to earn the American Dream. She graduated with high honors from Godinez Fundamental High School in Santa Ana and then went on to earn a bachelor's degree in public health from UC Merced in 2019.

Martha's passion for innovation led her to University Lab Partners, where she helps startup companies develop groundbreaking medical devices and diagnostic devices. She helps bridge the gap between research and real-world problems.

Martha's journey is a testament to the impact our youth can have when they have the opportunity to earn the American Dream. I will not stop fighting until she and other DACA recipients have a shot to earn American citizenship.

CONGRATULATING NORTHERN MARIANA SPORTS ASSOCIATION

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

Ms. KING-HINDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer my heartfelt congratulations to the Northern Mariana Sports Association and all of our athletes in the Northern Mariana Islands who are celebrating the 40th anniversary of this great community organization today, February 27.

Being an athlete has given me so much, and it is not just about sports. It is about building self-confidence, understanding teamwork, and finding value in ourselves and our abilities, lessons essential both on the field and in life.

I have seen firsthand how critical the support of governing organizations like NMSA is to smaller sports groups in our islands and to giving our athletes moments of triumph and lessons for life that become a part of who they are.

For all NMSA does in our community and for the lives they have shaped, they have my sincere gratitude and congratulations. To all CNMI athletes, especially those who are being recognized this week, they make the Northern Marianas proud. I am honored to share their stories and amplify their voices here in Congress.

HONORING PROJECT ROOTS

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

Ms. ANSARI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark Black History Month and recognize the contributions of Black-led organizations in Arizona's Third District doing the work on the ground to uplift their communities.

Today, I want to honor Project Roots. Project Roots is a nonprofit community garden founded by two incredible women, Dionne Washington and Bridget Pettis, who recognized an unmet need in their community and stepped up to address it.

Their goal is to empower community members to grow their own crops so that their neighbors have access to fresh produce while also providing food to anyone who needs it.

Project Roots is a pillar in our community and an inspiring example of what can be when we envision a future where every single person has reliable access to fresh, nutritious food.

This Black History Month and every month, I hope we can follow Dionne and Bridget's example by centering those with the most need and working together to build a more connected, healthy, and equitable community for all.

PUTTING YOUR MONEY WHERE YOUR MOUTH IS

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

Mr. BEAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, if families across the Nation pay their debts and live within their means, shouldn't we in Congress reevaluate how money is being spent in Washington and across the Nation? Of course we should.

For far too long, our government has put the cost of not just emergencies but everyday expenses on our Nation's credit card. Now, as a result, our national debt is a staggering \$36 trillion and growing every day.

Mr. Speaker, I am willing to put my money where my mouth is, and that is why I have introduced the Put Your Money Where Your Mouth Is Act to reduce congressional office budgets by \$100,000, just a paltry 5.2 percent.

The American credit card has reached its limit. We must tighten our belts. We have bills to pay and emergencies to cover. We need to be in this together.

Mr. Speaker, I have one question for you and this body: Are we willing to put our money where our mouths are?

I encourage all of my colleagues to join in this effort. Let's go get them.

HONORING MINISTER DWAYNE ROBERTS

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

Mr. MIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Minister Dwayne Roberts of Second Baptist Church for his incredible 50 years of service to our community.

Second Baptist Church is the oldest Black church in Orange County, and it has become a home for faith, music, and fellowship.

Minister Roberts' 50 years of leadership are unprecedented. He served longer than any minister in the church's history. Through his gift for music ministry, he has touched and transformed countless lives.

Minister Roberts' talents are numerous. He is a singer, musician, songwriter, and compelling speaker. For 50 years, he has used these gifts to help others.

Last weekend, I had the honor of joining his congregation to celebrate Minister Roberts' 50th anniversary. I was moved by the love and respect for the minister in that room.

This Black History Month, I am proud to recognize Minister Roberts and his tremendous legacy in Orange County.

HONORING ANTHONY W. YOUNG

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

Mr. HARIDOPOLOS. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege today to honor Colonel Anthony W. Young, a distinguished veteran and dedicated public servant in our community.

Colonel Young is a retired United States Army officer who has devoted his life to serving both our Nation and our local community.

Tony is a native of Vero Beach. He has served as mayor, councilman, and vice mayor, and he has been a key leader in the Florida League of Cities.

Tony's military career spanned over 30 years, serving with the 24th Infantry Division, the 1st Armored Division, and the 30th Medical Brigade. His dedication and leadership have left an indelible mark on our military, city, and Nation.

Most recently, under his leadership as the president of the Indian River Chapter of the Military Officers Association of America, Tony spearheaded the creation of a permanent memorial for local World War II veterans, ensuring that their sacrifice will never be forgotten.

Colonel Tony Young is a true patriot and an embodiment of service. We are

grateful for his unwavering commitment to our community and country.

SENSELESS BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION WORKFORCE CUTS

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

Ms. SCHRIER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of millions of people in Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and Montana, I rise to express outrage and bewilderment at the senseless workforce cuts by Elon Musk and President Trump to Bonneville Power Administration, an agency that is not even funded by taxpayer dollars but by our utility bills.

Bonneville system operators keep the lights on. They match supply to demand, whether in a heat wave or a cold snap. They maintain the majority of our transmission lines so when we have a wind storm like our recent ones, their linemen go out and fix those lines in the worst weather. These specialized employees, frankly, are irreplaceable.

The decision by Elon Musk and by the President to fire nearly 20 percent of Bonneville workers in the name of efficiency and saving taxpayer dollars is not just wrongheaded. It is reckless and outrageous. It will make power less reliable and more expensive for our four States. In other words, it is all downside, no upside.

We have now seen weeks of taking a chain saw to our Federal programs and damage to our grid, national forests, national security, and, frankly, personal security. It is time for Congress to take our power back and protect our constituents.

MAKING CORRUPTION CRIMINAL AGAIN

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

Mr. LICCARDO. Mr. Speaker, let's make corruption criminal again.

Three days before his inauguration, President-elect Trump launched the Trump meme coin. Trump's partners and some investors based in China pumped up the price, making hundreds of millions of dollars with early selling while the price was high.

As they sold, though, the price plummeted. They duped more than 800,000 Americans, who collectively lost \$2 billion. Welcome to what experts refer to as a "rug pull."

When I was a criminal prosecutor, we had a different name for this. It was "corruption."

Foreign interests got the best Presidency money can buy. Donald Trump got richer, and Americans got screwed.

Today, I introduced the MEME Act, which prohibits top Federal officials from issuing, sponsoring, or promoting financial assets, with criminal and civil penalties.

Mr. Speaker, our public offices do not belong to us. They belong to the American people, and they are not for sale.

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

□ 1100

FUNDING MEDICAID IS NOT NEGOTIABLE

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

Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government runs out of money in 2 weeks.

Republicans, who lead both Chambers and the White House, have yet to produce an actual funding plan. Instead, House Republicans passed a blueprint to slash up to \$2.5 trillion from Medicaid.

In my State of Pennsylvania alone, that jeopardizes care for nearly 3 million people, including 100,000 people struggling with addiction.

In my district, that means risking medical care for more than 45,000 people under the age of 21 and more than 15,000 people over the age of 60.

These are children and seniors, vulnerable people who rely upon Medicaid for their health and for their very lives.

Negotiations are always part of the process, yet our duty remains to safeguard our children, our seniors, the working poor, people with disabilities, and people struggling with addiction. That is not negotiable.

Our budget reflects our values. Protecting life, liberty, and happiness are our values. We must live up to that.

HONORING VIRGIN ISLANDS TEACHERS

(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, I rise today to celebrate three teachers from the Virgin Islands, Ms. Cherise Davis, Mr. Cornell Hanley, and Mr. Andre Douglas, for their outstanding contributions and exceptional dedication to their students and our community.

Ms. Davis, an elementary teacher at Juanita Gardine Elementary School, is a committed community leader and an 11-year veteran of teaching.

Mr. Hanley, a special education teacher at Yvonne E. Milliner Bowsky Elementary School, has dedicated more than 20 years to teaching and is known for his leadership and devotion to his students.

Mr. Andre Douglas, a mathematics teacher at Ivanna Eudora Kean High School, was awarded the Presidential Award for Excellence in Mathematics and Science Teaching, one of the highest honors in the field.

Each of them has elevated the standard of education in our territory and secured a brighter future for generations of Virgin Islanders to come.

I thank them for their service.

RECOGNIZING REVEREND DR. CURTIS THEODORE WALKER, SR.

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

Mrs. SYKES. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Reverend Dr. Curtis Theodore Walker, Sr. as Ohio's 13th Congressional District Champion of the Week for his 50-year career in ministry.

Reverend Walker has served as a minister and pastor at multiple African Methodist Episcopal Zion Churches in New York, Connecticut, North Carolina, and Alabama. In 1992 he became the senior pastor at the Wesley Temple Church in Akron, which is Akron's oldest Black congregation.

Reverend Dr. Walker has been a faithful servant of God, the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church, and the Beth-El AME Zion Church where he currently serves as pastor.

Not only is he serving his ministry, he serves the countless individuals and families he has pastored throughout his 50 years of service.

The understanding and compassion that he demonstrates has served to benefit not only his congregation but also society as a whole as his congregation is made up of dedicated members of our community who work to spread the Lord's message of good deeds.

Throughout his 50 years of Christian ministry, Reverend Dr. Walker has displayed a solemn commitment to the Lord which encourages all who have known him to have faith and do all things for the glory of God.

Congratulations again to Reverend Dr. Curtis Theodore Walker, Sr., on this remarkable milestone. I thank him for all he does for our community. I wish him many more years of continued success and dedication to the ministry and to our entire community.

CUTS TO SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

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

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. Mr. Speaker, there is new reporting that the Social Security Administration has been told to cut its workforce in half.

Unfortunately, I heard from a constituent who works there who was just put on a 30-day leave with no promise to keep their job.

This agency helps keep 364,000 of Virginia's seniors out of poverty, supports over 181,000 disabled Virginians, and upholds the American promise that if you spend your life paying into a system, the next generation will have your back.

This agency is already understaffed, only reaching 20 percent of their hiring goals.

So why would DOGE do this?

They want to gut Social Security.

My constituents sent me here to protect their benefits.

It is clear to me that my colleagues across the aisle and this DOGE program will never stand up against this administration.

The Democrats will.

As the President and DOGE delay payments, disrupt services, and deny these hard-earned benefits, I will push back and protect Social Security.

SOCIAL SECURITY CUTS

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

Mr. LATIMER. Mr. Speaker, there were reports last night that the Social Security Administration may reduce their staff by more than 50 percent. This will affect whether seniors receive all the benefits that they are entitled to.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, 10,000 baby boomers every day become eligible for Social Security. How could they possibly keep up with that demand with a 50 percent reduction in staff?

In my district, we have been told that the Social Security Administration is closing the White Plains hearing office. That will mean that people in Westchester and the greater Hudson Valley will have to drive longer distances at greater expense to fight for their benefits, and this is happening nationwide.

This all comes in the same week as House Republicans passed their budget plan that would cut Medicaid by \$880 billion.

We were told this President would lower costs. Nothing I just mentioned lowers costs, and it actually throws people's livelihoods into chaos.

I am committed to making Westchester and Bronx lives less expensive.

Mr. Speaker, I urge this body to reverse course and do the same.

HONORING CONGRESSWOMAN BEVERLY BYRON

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

Mrs. MCCLAIN DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, I had the honor of standing with community leaders, friends and family to remember an amazing woman, former Congresswoman Beverly Byron. Ms. Byron was the last woman to hold my seat in the Sixth District of Maryland and honorably served from 1978 to 1992.

"Bev," as she was known, was sharp, funny, and wise. She was a true public servant who always put her country first. She stepped into her seat in 1978 after the sudden death of her husband, Goodloe, and she went on to serve for 14 years with distinction on matters that mattered most to Maryland families.

To me she was more than just a role model. At 92 years old, she was a friend

and a strong support system. Even in her last months, she was by my side on the campaign trail as she was for John when he held the seat.

As she often reminded me, she would say: April, remember our rural America. Remember western Maryland is important. We need our voices to be heard, and remember our armed services and our national parks.

Bev set the standard for public service and left a legacy we are all inspired to follow. She will be very much missed, but we will honor her memory by continuing the work she cared about so much.

Rest in peace, Bev. We have a special place in our hearts for you.

STAFFING CUTS AT THE VA

(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, 2 weeks ago we saw more than 1,000 staff being fired at the VA. Then, this week, 1,400 more staffers were fired at the VA.

Who are these folks?

They support the veterans' crisis hotline. They take care of medical research, studying cancer, mental health, you name it, and burn pit exposure.

Mr. Speaker, remember that the Federal Government is the largest veteran employer in the United States. Around one-third of all VA employees are veterans themselves.

Yesterday, we learned the Trump administration is canceling more than 800 VA contracts.

Do you know what these things fund, Mr. Speaker?

Getting toxic exposed veterans access to their records to prove their claims, cancer care for veterans, and calibrating radiation detection equipment. I could go on and on.

It is a betrayal to attack veterans' care. We do not send young Americans off to fight wars and then when they come back to this country, we betray them by attacking the VA.

Mr. Speaker, do you want to talk about fiscal responsibility?

Then go look at the fraud, waste, and abuse at the Pentagon. Go tax billionaires and offshoring corporations. We don't do it on the backs of veterans.

This is unacceptable, and we are going to fight this every way we can.

RECOGNIZING STEVE MARTIN OF NORTHWEST OHIO

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, there is always good news in America. It is contained in the hearts of its people.

I rise today in recognition of an extraordinary citizen of northwest Ohio, Mr. Steve Martin, for his selfless dedication to our community. Steve creates community.

Since April of last year, Steve has volunteered with I Want to Mow Your Lawn, a nonprofit providing free lawn care to elderly individuals, veterans, people with disabilities, and families in need.

Through his hard work and generosity, Steve has completed 30 visits to care for the homes of Nancy Kinkaid and Bill Orzechowski, two neighbors facing serious health challenges.

His service not only maintains their yards, he has given them peace of mind, dignity, and the knowledge that their community cares.

Steve's contributions exemplify the very best of the northwest Ohio spirit, neighbors helping neighbors and lifting each other up in times of need. His work reminds us all that small acts of kindness can have a profound impact.

I am honored to recognize Steve Martin today. Let's thank him for his unwavering commitment to making our communities a better place for all.

SOVEREIGN TRIBAL NATIONS

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

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Speaker, as you know, there are hundreds of sovereign Tribal nations across the United States. Since this great Nation's founding, the United States has signed hundreds of treaties with Tribal nations and passed hundreds of laws reaffirming Tribal sovereignty, self-determination, and U.S. commitments to indigenous communities.

However, over the last month, we have seen and heard from Tribes all over the country whose Federal funds have been frozen and their programs impacted by mass firings, including at Indian Health Service, BIA and BIE, including in my district at SIPI and at Haskell's College where faculty and students have been devastated by mass firings.

That is why yesterday myself, the New Mexico delegation, and 111 Members of Congress sent a letter to the administration calling on them to halt and reverse these harmful cuts to Tribal programs.

These programs are vital to Indian Country and part of the United States' solemn Tribal trust and treaty responsibilities. Our sovereign Tribal nations depend on these programs, and we must protect them.

HONORING GLYN RAMAGE ON HIS RETIREMENT

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

Ms. BUDZINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the incredible career of Glyn Ramage and to congratulate him on his retirement.

A resident of Millstadt, Illinois, and a lifelong labor champion, Glyn has inspired so many, including myself.

For 25 years, Glyn served as business manager for the Downstate Illinois Laborers' District Council. During that time he fought to secure better benefits and higher wages for more than 10,000 union families.

As a member of the Illinois Capital Development Board, Glyn brought workers' voices to the table that oversees State construction projects.

He also chairs the Illinois Laborers' and Contractors' Joint Apprenticeship and Training Program to help build the next generation of construction workers.

I thank Glyn for all he has done for Illinois' workers, the labor movement and our community.

I congratulate Glyn on his retirement.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO VENEZUELA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 119-21)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13692 of March 8, 2015, with respect to the situation in Venezuela is to continue in effect beyond March 8, 2025.

The situation in Venezuela continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13692 with respect to the situation in Venezuela.

DONALD J. TRUMP.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 27, 2025.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO UKRAINE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 119-22)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13660 of March 6, 2014, which was expanded in scope in Executive Order 13661, Executive Order 13662, and Executive Order 14065, and under which additional steps were taken in Executive Order 13685 and Executive Order 13849, is to continue in effect beyond March 6, 2025.

The actions and policies of persons that undermine democratic processes and institutions in Ukraine; threaten its peace, security, stability, sovereignty, and territorial integrity; and contribute to the misappropriation of its assets, as well as the actions and policies of the Government of the Russian Federation, including its purported annexation of Crimea and its use of force in Ukraine, continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13660 with respect to Ukraine.

DONALD J. TRUMP.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 27, 2025.

□ 1115

RETURN THE UNITED STATES TO A BALANCED BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time and effort to make this time available so that we can communicate directly with the American public about what is going on in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that I sometimes hear a lot of misinformation going out, including several presentations just a few minutes ago on the distortion of what the intentions are under the budget resolution and ultimately budget reconciliation and how we are going to return the United States back in the direction of a balanced budget, which has ballooned to be so unbalanced in the last few years. At least let's get back to the pre-COVID numbers instead of \$2 trillion annually.

We will resolve that, and we will talk about that. We will talk about it publicly in the upcoming weeks, and the people can tune right into the com-

mittee hearings and see for themselves rather than having to believe lies made by politicians and by the media.

Mr. Speaker, I also will share this time and this hour here with colleagues, including my new colleague here from Indiana (Mr. SHREVE), who would like to give his comments and thoughts here.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SHREVE).

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Speaker, during our district workweek this past week, I had the opportunity to visit with Hoosiers across Indiana's Sixth District. I applied my first in-district workweek traveling from Indianapolis to Columbus and points in between. It was great to hear directly from Hoosiers about their priorities and listening to the issues that are important to them.

Above all else, in this role, our job as Representatives is to listen to our constituents. I was honored to attend the Indiana National Guard change of command ceremony, at which Brigadier General Lawrence Muennich assumed command from Major General Dale Lyles, making General Muennich the 60th Adjutant General of Indiana's National Guard.

I met with constituents from the Indiana Railroad Association and the Indiana Trucking Association. The district that I represent literally lies at the crossroads of America, and industries such as these represent key parts of the lifeblood of our economy.

Indiana's Sixth continues to be home to safe and prosperous communities in which to raise families. It was highlighted by my visit with the leadership of Franklin College and a number of state of the city addresses that occur in the month of January, including Greenwood's, where I attended Mayor Mark Myers' 14th state of the city address.

I visited with the leadership of Cummins Engine Company, headquartered in the district. I toured their cutting-edge engineering facility at their Cummins Engine plant.

I toured Rolls Royce and their massive aircraft engine design and manufacturing facility, where they are at the leading edge of military aircraft production for our national defense.

I also visited with SABIC, a company in Bartholomew County that is part of a global plastics industry.

At each of these companies in my district, I witnessed the best of Indiana: highly-skilled, hardworking Hoosiers who are contributing to the success and the defense of our country.

Above all, I heard a common theme as I traveled my district: Let's bring more Hoosier common sense to Washington.

Mr. Speaker, that is the commitment I made, and that is what I will continue to do.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for participating and letting us know what is going on in the gentleman's district. I wish the gentleman the best in his first term and new term as a Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, just in quick review once again here, in passing the budget resolution this week, H. Con. Res. 14, it is a 60-page document, I invite people to look it up for themselves and reconcile for themselves between what they are hearing and what my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are trying to scare the public with on things that are going to be cut because of it. They are not in there.

Again, Medicaid, no cuts. Medicare, no cuts. Social Security, no cuts. SNAP, none. We even heard a bit ago about veterans. No. We want to make these things better for them. We want to make them more effective.

Our veterans deserve to have the best possible care and the best possible services for them. It isn't going to come from the type of rhetoric of what we are hearing here.

As I mentioned before, Social Security. No one is going to reduce Social Security, but looking forward in the long term, it is going to be in big trouble in 7 or 8 years. Shouldn't we be working together in a bipartisan way to make sure that that program can sustain itself beyond that when the trust fund runs out, at such a point when more money will have to be paid in by workers or having less benefits or things like that because it just flat runs out?

That is not good. Let's have an honest debate on that and how Medicaid is going to go forward, as well. All of these programs need to be looked at in order to keep them on a solid fiscal course. That doesn't happen when lies get told about what we are trying to do here in sight of running \$2 trillion budget deficits.

Mr. Speaker, with so many different issues for us to be looking at in Congress, we also have to revitalize our economy. A growing economy will help a lot in solving our deficit problem.

Two big drivers of inflation are overspending by Federal Government and the cost of energy, which is integral to so much of our economy, to every aspect of production and transportation and delivery and what we do in our daily lives. The cost of energy, from electricity in our homes and businesses, manufacturing, and fuel for vehicles, trains, and aircraft. Those are the two main drivers.

As we have seen in the last several years, when the Federal Government has basically put a giant vacuum on the available money supply, prices go up on everything. The energy to produce those things causes higher prices.

I am a farmer in my real life at home. A couple of years ago, I saw the tripling of the cost of fertilizer as an input for our crops and the doubling of the cost of fuel. Where is that going to be made up? It is in the price of food. Everybody is kind of mad about the price of eggs right now. I get it. I understand that.

A couple of points that factor into that is that we have California regula-

tions, especially on how eggs are to be produced and the chickens are to be raised. We have seen all those things that drive inflation affect the egg growers and the poultry folks.

Also, I believe there is an over-reaction on the bird flu. The last number I saw was 160 million chickens have been exterminated because of the idea or perception on that. Yes, there is a real deal out there, but I think the Biden administration took it way too far. When you have these things going on, that is going to affect the price of eggs.

The Trump administration is working diligently on that. I spoke with the Secretary of Agriculture just yesterday, and they are looking at remedies for that. We will be soon getting a handle on that and other things that are inflationary if we are allowed to have our economy thrive and be open enough to take care of these things.

I am encouraged by this direction. There is a lot of talk about DOGE and what it is doing. It is, indeed, flipping over rocks and finding a lot of cockroaches scurrying away on some things that the American public cares zero about on what is being spent in foreign areas. At USAID, at the beginning, there were some good aspects of USAID, but it sure turned into something that the public doesn't care about or want. There are effects from these costs and of these actions of government.

Mr. Speaker, we should then look at the regulatory side. We have had so much being expended on climate change, in my home State of California especially. What actually is climate change, and let's look at long-term trends.

There is a lot of science behind that being ignored, I believe. What are the trends on temperatures? What are the trends on CO₂? There are so many different aspects that are a lot more scientific than politicians, me included, who are trying to expound upon that.

We have seen very difficult regulations come down the pike on the regulations especially of CO₂. My colleagues have probably seen this poster of mine in the past, where I have pointed out the makeup of CO₂ in our atmosphere, one of the greenhouse gases that are the main concern by several administrations now.

The main gas is nitrogen, oxygen, and these trace gases. We put right over here, especially carbon dioxide. Look at that very narrow strip which that represents.

When I actually show them this stuff, people are astounded at how little CO₂ is in the atmosphere because they have been scared and had so much fear instilled in them by media, by politicians, and by regulatory agencies who say that CO₂ is going to be the end of mankind. It is an existential threat. It is the biggest threat we have according to John Kerry and others. It is not the actions of China and others in the promoting of war and terrorism around the world.

Let me show my updated chart here. This one points out the same one I just showed here. This is currently in 2025. This is what it looked like back in 1970, back when I was a kid in school and they were instilling fear in us that we were going to have an ice age. Those are the days of the ice age. Those are the days of global cooling.

Look at the two charts. They are a bit smaller than the first poster here, but they are the same ratios. There is CO₂ once again, that little, skinny, purple piece of pie in that chart here. There it is right here. It is the same ratios. Yes, CO₂ is bumped up a little bit over that time, but that can be defined by so many things besides human activity.

Mr. Speaker, the credit that we would get as a nation isn't very often forthcoming that we have actually already done a lot of good things in this timeline. There is the Paris climate accord. Only the U.S. and one other country have actually seen their CO₂ numbers go down in that period of time and leading up to it. Everyone else's is going up.

When efforts are being made to so dramatically regulate carbon dioxide, it is killing our economy. It is killing people's choices.

Look at my home State of California, where they want to ban vehicles that are gas or diesel powered by 2035. They are coming after locomotives. More and more, they have forced aircraft into using different types of fuels.

That is fine. If you can develop the fuel and it is a better fuel, let's look at it, but is it really going to produce? Instead of where the rubber meets the road, I guess where the wing meets the air, are we going to see dramatic savings in the different pollutants that are being focused on, or is it going to be offset by such tremendously high costs that it is never worth doing it?

□ 1130

When you look at the CO₂, so many things are being done to try and avoid CO₂, such as, again, vehicles. They want to take away gas stoves and gas water heaters. We have had legislation recently to address that, no, this isn't something that should just be done by whim, by the stroke of a pen in executive orders by EPA or others.

We have had CRAs, referring to the Congressional Review Act, to say, no, we are going to let people keep what they have because it really hasn't been shown that there is going to be a dramatic positive effect by taking away people's appliances, their gas stoves, vehicles, what have you.

Let's go back a little bit. I want to talk about greenhouse gas and the efforts by the EPA in different administrations.

In 2003, under the Bush administration, there was a petition submitted to the EPA for the agency to regulate greenhouse gases and CO₂ under the Clean Air Act. It led to litigation that went all the way up to the Supreme

Court, which ruled, in 2007, that the Clean Air Act was written broadly enough, at least in that Court's decision, for EPA to regulate greenhouse gases, which include CO₂ supposedly as a greenhouse gas—you can debate that if you want—and that EPA must decide if emissions from new motor vehicles endangered public health or welfare.

Once the Supreme Court made that ruling in 2007, 2 years later, the Obama administration, under their EPA, jumped to issue a 2009 finding that CO₂ greenhouse gas endangered public health and that these emissions from new motor vehicles contribute to that endangerment. That is the endangerment clause that we talked about.

With these actions, the EPA is now required to establish CO₂ standards for new motor vehicles for upcoming years. Up until that 2007 ruling, EPA generally did not regulate CO₂ and greenhouse gas emissions from vehicles. We saw that, in '09, as I mentioned, the Obama administration moved in that direction, and we have been hearing about CO₂ as a pollutant ever since.

Let's go back to basic school chemistry and science on that. CO₂ is an important element in the atmosphere, even though it is only this tiny fraction at 0.04 percent. It is enough to sustain plant life. It is an important element, a key element.

We breathe oxygen, basically. We breathe all this, but oxygen is what we carry in our bloodstreams. CO₂ is basically the same oxygen for plant life, tree life, all of it.

Interestingly, if we are too successful at reducing CO₂ below the 0.02 percent level, you will see plant life starting to die off. You will see, with certain agricultural and horticultural operations, some will put up greenhouses in order to get the new developed plants to grow faster. Maybe for retail sales, so you can buy your tomatoes at the market to plant in your garden, they will inject extra CO₂ into that to boost the speed of the plants. That shows right there firsthand that CO₂ is essential to plant life and tree life.

If we are making that an existential threat, then we are really missing an important key to the science. Even though back in '09, in that area, everybody wanted to say that the science was settled. This is a catastrophe waiting to happen, that has been happening ever since, especially in my home State of California, where they are hell-bent on taking away people's choices on their vehicles, gas stoves, gas leaf blowers, and whatever you can think of, even—catch this—generators.

Think of what a generator does during an emergency. Generally, they are pretty portable and are needed when there is no electricity available in an area. A lot of times, this might be up in the hills or in the woods where there is no electricity anyway or in a remote area, maybe out on a farm. Maybe you need to weld something on your farm

equipment, so there is a generator on the truck that can hook to the welder. A lot of people have home generators that are fuel powered, frequently gas powered, some diesel powered.

Let's say they get their way and ban fuel-powered generators of all types. Hospitals have backup generators when the power goes out there. Lord knows, in my part of the State here, we have seen plenty of power outages where we have what is called public safety power shutoffs in northern California because we have so many forest fires. Some of them have been started by the interaction of trees and tree branches and such with power lines. You get two bad results when that happens. A tree falling into a power line or a large branch, et cetera, sparks and causes fire.

The two bad outcomes frequently will cause a blackout. The power will be knocked out, but the things that are more dramatic and more noticeable in the long term are the fires that could come from that and then torch tens of thousands, even hundreds of thousands and, in one case, a million acres. In my district, a perfectly healthy-looking tree that had been inspected and deemed to be okay fell into a power line. That is how the Dixie fire started and burned 1 million acres.

What are the effects of that fire on CO₂, air quality, and all that? It is really bad.

The Dixie fire, for example, was, as I mentioned, 1 million acres of such concentrated smoke that that smoke plume got up into the atmosphere in such density that it made it up into the jet stream that comes across west to east in this country and affected the East Coast.

People in New York, Philadelphia, and even here in D.C. were advised for a several-day period to not go out and do physical athletic activities outside because the smoke was seen as above healthy levels.

This isn't just in my backyard, where it happens so often that people are almost used to having brown skies because of burning forests. Our fire is affecting the East Coast.

You noticed it a year or two ago with the Canadian fires, where it was coming down from either Ontario or Quebec, much more close by, and suffering those effects, too. That came all the way from back there. That is a result of regulations not allowing us to manage the forest in such a way that you can put fire out much more simply and sooner.

You are always going to have fires. You are always going to have burning forests. The last 50 years or so, because of the way they have not been managed, the forests are now so dense, so full of burnable material, burnable fuels, that it is extremely difficult to put a fire out.

We need what is called shaded fuel breaks, which in plain English means thinning areas of the forest. We should prioritize around towns and cities, of course, but any area that you can do

that means that you are going to have a lower density of trees per acre. A lot of the brush and other material that gathers on the bottom of the forest, that biomaterial can actually be used for positive things.

There are folks talking to us even more about expanding the use of that for pellets to export, positive export, positive for our economy and our trade deficit, but also for cleaning up our forests and putting jobs back in our forests.

For some reason, we are the number one importer of wood products of the Western countries. Let's get some wins on that. Let's get some wins for everybody on the management of the forest and the negative environmental effects you have on air quality as well as water quality. You have all the ash that is left behind on these catastrophic fires that basically leave you a moonscape that is washed into the streams, brooks, and rivers, and eventually the lakes, such as lakes in northern California that store mass amounts of water—4.5 million acre-feet in Lake Shasta, 3.5 million acre-feet in Lake Oroville, when they are allowed to be full. That is the water supply for most of the rest of California. It is the drinking water for L.A. It is important.

What do you do with that water quality with all that stuff flowing in there because we are not managing the forest lands? When we harm ourselves with CO₂ information that really isn't accurate or proportional, we hamper our ability to do much of anything.

I am excited to see that our new EPA Administrator, Lee Zeldin, is taking a look at this again. We are not just accepting that, back in 2009, the Obama administration was able to just say that the science is settled.

What do you know about science? Science is never settled. Science is constantly evolving at some level or another as new information is found. I don't know how many things you can really decide are the final word in the area of science, biology, or what have you. We are always learning more, so how you can have the whole equation on whether it is mankind's involvement or what nature does with forests and trees—in the rain forest, for example, as plant life grows and dies, as it absorbs oxygen doing so, it releases CO₂ when it dies off.

What is happening in the ocean? There are a lot of sources where CO₂ could be happening. That is under the assumption that we think CO₂ is bad, but ask a tree. CO₂ is good. Pretty much everything is carbon-based anyway in our world and our lives.

If we are going to eliminate CO₂, which I don't know that we can eliminate that much, down to 0.02 percent, that would be really dangerous to do so.

I am pleased that under the executive order that President Trump put out, the EPA Administrator is going to look at recommendations on the 2009 endangerment finding as it was called

at the EPA under the Obama administration. It has been the basis for many climate-related regulations. This executive order will determine whether this really aligns with what the energy policies, legal interpretations, and, more importantly, the needs of Americans are for energy and all the things that come from energy.

Remember, I talked about the main cost drivers of inflation and why everything is so expensive now, including eggs and fuel. Our fuel in California is about \$1.25 or \$1.50 a gallon higher than the national average. That is another thing we get to enjoy under the regime in California.

Taking a look at this endangerment finding and saying the science isn't settled is going to be extremely important. We can actually get some more science involved back in how we are going to look at CO₂.

The other greenhouse gases, I think we need to continue to look at methane and NO_x, nitrogen oxide. Those are still issues we need to look at, and I think certainly that Mr. Zeldin over there at EPA is going to be responsible in that area.

I also am very glad that we are asking the question once again, because if you watch this floor very much, you might see me pretty often talking about this chart because so many people have been scared into believing that CO₂ is this giant existential danger.

I ask people frequently when we have gatherings or meetings and sway into this topic a little bit. Most people on the street believe the atmosphere is somewhere between, typically, 20 to 50 percent of CO₂. Again, they are dumbfounded when they find out that it is 0.04 percent.

We are exporting our jobs to the Pacific Rim, Mexico, or other places because we don't want to do it here. Part of the findings is that when you look at the whole equation, we are not helping overall global emissions. The finding itself states that even if the U.S. cut its emissions to zero, global emissions would keep increasing because of countries like China, India, and others in that neighborhood. They would keep going up.

Remember the Olympics that were held in China just a few years ago? The air is so nasty there in those large cities that they actually shut down their industries for about a couple of weeks leading up to the Olympics and during the Olympics so they could try to have blue skies and cleaner air for the athletes participating back then.

We don't have to do that stuff here, except when we have forest fires. Of course, no one wants to go outside if the forest fire is affecting them. That gets down to a forest management thing I will talk about on a different day.

We have achieved so much, and we have achieved good things with regulations in this Nation here going back to '66 and '68. A lot of those rules came in

on car emissions, devices, and such that have helped.

The L.A. Basin is a lot cleaner than it was in the late sixties and earlier seventies and probably before that, as well. We have done so much. The technology with engines these days, with the internal combustion engines, called ICE, is so tremendously much cleaner-burning now than it used to be. Credit doesn't seem to be given to industry for doing that. Truck engines and tractor engines are up to Tier 4 now. They burn pretty darn clean.

We can still do more to improve, but if industry is allowed to improve on its own as technology is done organically instead of being forced by a regulation that is taking it in the wrong direction, away from improving what we have, we are not going to get there.

We are going to have these electric vehicles that nobody can afford and nobody really wants, other than the elitists and what have you. They are being forced upon people, and they are forced upon the industry that is trying to develop a way to make it better.

□ 1145

Battery technology, I am sorry, has not caught up to the desire to have battery-powered vehicles. Storage batteries, it takes so much area, so many resources to build the batteries, so many metals, metals that we are not allowed to mine in this country due to EPA and other regulations.

In one case, a copper mine took 29 years to permit. Copper is going to be dramatically needed as more and more AI technology; AI centers are built. The amount of electricity to run them is going to be tremendous as well.

Where are we going to get the energy to do all this? Well, we have these clean forms of energy that have been shunned for a long time. One form is hydroelectric power. In my own district, just recently, they took four hydroelectric dams down that generated CO₂-free power. Hydroelectric creates zero CO₂ in making that electricity. Nuclear power creates zero CO₂.

The type of power they make is 24-hour, 7-day a week availability of power. You don't have to wait for the Sun to come up, the rain and clouds to go away, or for the wind to blow, as is necessary for a windmill or solar plant to become effective. I am not against those forms of power, but I am just looking at what is the efficiency of them versus what we know has worked for a long time.

The country has moved away from coal. Coal is still a very important component. Coal could still be a win if we would redesign the power plants and allow them to be retrofitted. Maybe it is a good backup plan. I am not sure. That is a tougher debate.

Natural gas plants are very, very clean running plants. We need more of them, as we have so much natural gas available after the miracle of hydraulic fracturing was invented and is being perfected more each day. There is so

much potential there. It is important that we up the production of natural gas and the export of it, as well.

Look at Europe, where Russia built the giant pipeline to bring gas into Germany, and other areas I suppose. When you look at the history of that area of the world there, I am astounded that Europe would want to be dependent upon Russia for natural gas. They could take that 90-degree valve and shut it off anytime if they didn't like what Germany or others were doing politically or what have you.

We have a much stronger relationship with Europe. We are in NATO together, which we need to maintain that relationship. I am glad to see President Trump is also requiring stronger participation by NATO folks to pay for more of their own way. Why should that be on the American taxpayer? They seem to be getting it. Germany was talking more recently about participating at a stronger level. That is all good. We are still their friends. We are still allies together. There is nothing wrong with that.

Why would they want to be dependent on the Russian bear for their natural gas?

What if there was actually not a political crisis but just some kind of hiccup anyway?

The U.S. has tremendous ability to develop more natural gas and export it via those big ships to Europe. We should be doing a lot more of that as a good ally and a good trading partner. It will help with trade.

We were talking about trade in agriculture a little bit earlier today. We are not having a lot of great results on that trade. Dairy, for example, is really suffering in this country as there is a tremendous amount of imports coming in, kind of undercutting our dairies. Why is that?

Why are we seeing so much Canadian lumber and wheat coming down? I see it as I sit at the railroad crossings in northern California when a train goes by. Why are we importing all that, especially the lumber? We burn hundreds of thousands, millions of acres each year that are not being managed by the Forest Service or by allowing those contracts to be let out for the lumber, the timber that needs to be taken from those areas.

The first thing you will hear from the environmental groups: Oh, you want to clear-cut. You are just in it for big lumber, big timber companies.

That is not what it is at all. We are managing these lands. We will be much more successful. The forests will be healthier, and it is better for the wildlife. Nothing is good for the wildlife when you burn a million acres. The habitats of the spotted owl, cougar, and raccoon, and everything else goes up with them, and the water quality, on and on and on.

It comes back to these choking regulations that don't allow us to do what we need to do. I am getting back to the CO₂ and the work the EPA will be looking at.

As I mentioned, the U.S. has cut emissions in absolute terms as a share of global emissions since really the 1990s. Despite our increasing population, larger economy, we have been able to accomplish that.

An important thing to note about the ruling by the 2009 Obama EPA is that Congress has not directly given the EPA the authority to regulate these emissions. It was by the sweep of a pen in the Supreme Court.

Well, isn't Congress the most responsive, the closest to the people, especially this House, as each of us represents about 750,000 people?

We have the most opportunity to interact most directly with our constituents and hear from them. That is the model that was set up by the Founders. The U.S. House is the one most directly responsive to the people and has 2-year election cycles so that if they get tired of us they can throw the bums out.

There has to be a responsiveness. It has a responsibility in that it really should be leading the way on how regulations are going to affect those same people that send us here.

That is why we have, thankfully, for the EPA and others, the Congressional Review Act where if a regulation is put in and it seems to be overreaching, overbearing, we have the opportunity in the House to hear those. We have passed a couple lately that say, no, we are going to put you back in your more reasonable role as a regulatory agency.

What we are hearing from the people is they don't want their light bulbs taken away. They don't want their cars taken away. They don't want all these things to happen to them when the science is unsettled about if it is really helping anything. They know it is driving costs up. They know they have fewer choices.

The Supreme Court has already had another recent ruling where the EPA has tried to move even more aggressively to regulate emissions and they have found that some of these rulings were illegal in their overreach, so it comes back to us to legislate on it.

Let's take credit for what we have done. Let industry take credit for having done the research and development to make cleaner running vehicles, more efficient vehicles, cleaner power plants, more efficient appliances than ever. Just over time, by attrition, when more and more of these are replaced with the newer stuff, you are going to see improvements in that, even with the increased population and more things going on with the economy.

As I mentioned AI a minute ago, the amount of need for electricity is going to grow dramatically just for that. If we did have all these electrify-everything mandates, electricity needs to be grown as well.

How are we going to do that if we are not building more power plants, like nuclear power, natural gas, hydroelectric?

They are after more hydroelectric plants in northern California, Washington, and Oregon. It is all about tearing dams out right now. We are seeing some of the negative effects.

Let's talk about the Klamath River. As soon as they tore the dams out, millions of cubic yards of silt flushed right down the Klamath River. I have the pictures in the other room—I have shown them to you enough times probably—of dead fish, dead wildlife, and the muck that has been moving down the Klamath River. That is a pretty negative effect from all the hype of what it was going to do to help that.

With all this happening, we still have a pretty amazing, strong economy in this country. I am very, very pleased that President Trump is trying to restore that after the 4 dark years of the Biden administration not really paying attention to much of what we need, especially in the rural sector with the economies we used to have in timber, mining and agriculture as well.

Due to the timber industry being devastated for most of the last 50 years, we have to resort to something called the Secure Rural Schools Act that myself and Mr. NEGUSE from Colorado are putting forward. It is a fund that comes from the U.S. Treasury to make sure that the schools and roads in local areas have some of the money they need that they used to get from timber receipts.

When you cut timber in those areas, they had this fee upon that timber that went to the local roads, local schools and counties, et cetera. With the sweeping away of the timber industry and so many mills that we have lost in the West, the negative effect it has had on those local funds has been required to be replaced by the Secure Rural Schools Act that we are again putting forward.

We have enjoyed pretty good bipartisan support in the past on that, but it does have a budget effect, so we have to fight for it every year. Wouldn't we rather fight for the timber receipts and not have to come hat in hand to Congress, to the American people and say, yeah, we need this fund for something that got taken away by a regulatory act?

It is something we need anyway. It would be better for these wood and paper products to come from American forests instead of us being the number one importer of wood products, as I mentioned.

Why are we doing that? We are not forced to take these products by any type of trade agreement.

Certainly, President Trump is looking at how we are going to even the score with other countries via tariffs. Tariffs are controversial, I get it. I have long believed, just personally—this is as a nonpolitician, when I was much younger—you know, our policy with other countries ought to just be a mirror. You treat us how we will treat you or vice versa. That is what our trade policy is going to be. If you are

going to tariff us, then I guess we should tariff you back until we get to the point where we can just get rid of the tariffs and whoever can build the best product or compete the best is going to be able to trade with each other. India has been pretty bad on that. Even some of our best trading partners we have these tariffs. I hope that ultimately, if that has to be a stick until we can get to the carrot—and I hope we get to the carrot soon—then that is something we have to look at.

I am encouraged that under this administration we are looking at things in a different way, maybe more scientifically than we have in a long time, but the greenhouse gas thing is going to be very detrimental long term to our economy and the things that we do well unnecessarily.

I mean, in California, they are still pushing forward on this high-speed rail project. You have heard me talk about this maybe a few times. What started as an idea back in 2008 and put before the California voters was a \$33 billion fast train from S.F. to L.A.

Well, this is 2025. That is 17 years, and not a single mile of track has been laid yet. There have been kids born and graduated high school during the amount of time that this hasn't been done.

This fast train from S.F. to L.A. was projected to be finished by 2020. That is what the voters were told when they approved the bonds by a narrow 52 to 48 percent. Okay. We will put forth \$9 billion of bonds to kick-start the investment.

I love that word “investment” around here, meaning we are going to spend your dollars, we are going to invest.

That said, they narrowly agreed to that because private investment was going to come along as well. They would be attracted to it. This will be a great project, a money maker. It will be a great thing. Private investment has stayed away in droves. Nobody wants to come in on this unless they can have guarantees that they will make money.

However, in that bond initiative specifically, in order to pass it, because people would be warning against that, it specifically outlined that no subsidies of train tickets, what have you, are allowed. Now they are going to try to find ways around that, which is another lie told to the voters on that proposition. Still, they forge ahead. Many years later, not a single mile of track has been laid.

They have these bridges and causeways built, which one day will be monuments to the idiocy of this project. Still, they forge ahead.

You can only identify between that \$9 billion—and then right back in 2009 there are kids in junior high school that saw that happen—or still in high school, I mean, that saw during that timeline when the Obama administration had the ARRA funds, which was

known as the stimulus package then for shovel-ready projects.

How many years can you do a project and have it still be deemed shovel-ready when we are 17 years in on high-speed rail?

Shovel-ready projects, they had a component for high-speed rail around the country. Three other States wanted a piece of that. After a while, looking at the cost, they gave it back, so it all went into one pile. California said: We will take that \$3.5 billion. Here we are 17 years later without having a mile of track even laid.

We are having an investigation into that, too. I appreciate that Secretary of Transportation Sean Duffy came out to L.A. a little over a week ago and announced that they are going to be auditing that, reviewing that, and seeing if the American taxpayers are getting a bang for the buck for the money that had been, not really asked for, but had put in there, that original \$3.5 billion in 2009, and then right at the end of the Biden era another approximately \$4 billion.

As I started to mention, you can only identify between all this money, the \$9 billion, the two chunks from Federal, and then California has implemented a cap-and-trade act to tax people's ability to make CO₂, as in manufacturing. If you are a certain size or larger manufacturer, you have to go buy the right to do what you have always done if that produces CO₂, you know, 0.04 percent of the atmosphere in that.

□ 1200

Mr. Speaker, they have created their own phony currency. They just had the auction for it. They have an auction where people have to go bid for this. They had it sometime in February and raised some money for the State government to spend. About a billion of that is dedicated each year since then to the high-speed rail.

If all of these numbers are added up and if they are somehow allowed to keep the \$3.5 to \$4 billion that Secretary Duffy is looking at—that I hope to claw back—adding all that up, it is about \$18 billion or \$19 billion. The price of that rail project has quadrupled since its inception in 2008 from the \$33 billion to now about \$130 billion.

Let's look at these numbers for a bit. The \$130 billion, after all this trouble, after all this battle to get Federal money—two chunks of a little over \$3 billion, the \$9 billion from the voters, and this \$1 billion at a time for the CO₂ cap-and-trade money generated in California with that fake currency they are taxing people that produce—\$18 billion to \$19 billion, they are about \$110 billion to \$112 billion short of the \$130 billion that is commonly accepted to be the total price.

They have extracted maybe seven or eight out of the Federal Government. They want another \$110 billion, and the private sector is not coming forward to finance this thing because they know it is a loser. They can recognize that.

Are they going to hit the people of California with another bond? Instead of just \$9 billion, it is a bond of \$110 billion which takes 30 years to pay back once they have doubled the price of that. Where are they going to get the \$110 billion?

Secretary Duffy of the Department of Transportation is right. He is smart to look at the \$4 billion still hanging right now just recently given by the Biden administration. Let's claw that back now and let them figure it out in California, my home State. Let them figure it out. Why should the other 49 States pay for something that isn't working at all and that is so late?

They promised—back when this came along in 2008, 2009, 2010—it will probably provide a million jobs for California. Are we kidding ourselves? People up there on that dais were promising that number.

It turns out, after review a couple of years later in a State senate hearing, they said we meant a million job years. Job years is a different terminology than what they had been telling people.

Currently, they claim there are 14,000 jobs involved in building whatever the portions of high-speed rail they are doing. When we do the math on that, 14,000 divided into that million job years, that means that at about 70 years of 14,000 people at a million job years, it will take about 70 years to make that math work, which they are right on track. It is going to take about 70 years to build this rail if they actually got the financing. I don't know that anybody wants to come forward with \$110 billion to continue this.

I thank Secretary Sean Duffy for looking at this. I thank EPA Director Lee Zeldin for looking at the CO₂ side of it here because most of the premise of the high-speed rail in California is that it will be a CO₂ saver. We have this electric train. Where does electricity come from? How many trains can they actually run on that track from northern California to southern California to displace Southwest Airlines and all the other airlines that have a heck of a lot of traffic?

How much is the ticket going to cost to ride this since it is not allowed to be subsidized? It will probably be in the rage of \$300. They say it will be cheaper than airlines. How will it be cheaper with these rates? It can't be. It can't possibly be. People will ride it for the novelty.

Even at one point they said, in order technically for it to be the high-speed rail going from San Francisco to L.A. in 2½ hours, they only have to run one train as an express each day to do that. Other trains can stop in little burbs along the way, which means it won't be a high-speed rail anymore except in between the cities.

It will probably end up being a 4-hour train anyway by the time they do that. What have they gained? What have they gained for all that money? What have they gained for all that pain—from the ag land, the farmland, a rendering plant that is in the way of it?

Rendering plants are very essential, where they take discarded farm animals that have died: dairy, horses, whatever. To resite a rendering plant isn't popular. No one wants to be next to one of those, especially in this day and age where people don't understand rural issues and rural needs. They ask: What is all this dust? What is all this noise? What are all these tractors going slowly down the road? It is making our food is what it is doing, but we will worry about all that later. Maybe we can import all that.

It brings back this old poster I always use here. We are not growing the food in California if we are not growing these crops. Somewhere between 90 and 100 percent of these crops listed here are grown in California. If we don't grow them, then we have to import them or do without them. We have to pay higher prices.

We won't have the stability of where they come from, all because it is being regulated out of business. The water is being taken away for these growers. The land is being taken away in some cases like this debacle going on at the Point Reyes National Seashore Park where farmers for dairy and beef ranches are being kicked off right now because the national parks have muscled them off, along with environmental organizations. They are muscling them off because of phony NEPA stuff that they have made up to move them out of the way.

They say the Tule elk will now thrive there because of that. Cattle and Tule elk get along just fine on these lands. Cattle are very essential for helping maintain the landscape, grazing at a level that helps with keeping it healthy. In areas where it is dry, it keeps it safe from fire.

That is more government regulation muscling people out there. That is what we see. That is why we have the Congressional Review Act. That is why we have what we are looking at here with DOGE flipping things over, finding these phony-baloney contracts, and giving it even to some of the media here, to buy subscriptions to the media to keep them pumped up.

We see how many people are getting laid off from some of the higher levels of media and some of the programs that are closing because maybe they are not getting these hidden subsidies anymore from things like USAID.

It is disgusting when a lot of people see what is going on and what this Federal Government has been getting away with behind the scenes. It is exciting to see the rocks flipped over and watch the cockroaches run away on this.

There is criticism about how some of it is coming about, and I think that is being looked at and refined. To throw away the process of making government accountable is a giant mistake if that is allowed to happen. The rhetoric flying out of here on that is just amazing. People are defending basically this massive government waste and these

scandalous issues that are being funded by our tax dollars.

I understand. Tax dollars aren't contributions. People don't have the option of making these contributions for these investments. These are mandatory. If people don't pay their taxes, bad stuff happens to them. Wages are garnished. Stuff is taken away and auctioned. A person might even find himself in handcuffs and prosecuted if they think it is a high enough level.

I think the American people need to be optimistic about the direction things are going and not fall for all the scary stories. Again, we have been hearing it all week long. They are going to cut Social Security. They are going to cut billions and billions from Medicaid. Nope. We need to look at how these programs can be made better, but there is nothing in the budget resolution this week that said we are going to do that.

Ongoing, the President has pledged that. We, in Congress, should look at it. How can we make them better? It is by not taking a single benefit away from anybody. Don't buy the lies. Read H. Con. Res. 14 on the budget resolution. It is not even listed in there. Don't buy the lies flying out of this place and that the media keeps pushing.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time and the ability to get some of these ideas across to the American public and our colleagues here.

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

REMEMBERING HISTORY AND WHY IT IS IMPORTANT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. MFUME) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARIDOPOLOS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about two things, one particularly of import and interest, because we are exiting what we have come to know in this country as Black History Month and the other more pertinent in terms of the current news and what is going on, particularly what has been going on over the last month and a half.

I begin my remarks today by talking about this whole notion of history, why it is important, why nobody owns it, why it affects all of us as Americans, and why it is important to remember. In remembering, we tend not to make the same mistake again.

As we officially end the month tomorrow, I wanted to take some time today to bring to the attention of the American public something that is not highlighted and very seldom ever talked about but very important because it was a grave injustice and a mark on our Nation's history. It is referred to as the Tulsa Race Massacre which occurred in the summer of 1921 in Tulsa, Oklahoma.

I want to walk us back to that summer and those three nights when the affluent Greenwood neighborhood in Tulsa, often referred to then and now as Black Wall Street, was burned to the ground. It was totally burned to the ground, and 300 African-American people—men, women, and children—were murdered.

It is hard to imagine that that happened in this country in just the last century, just a little over 100 years ago. It did, and the fact that it did, I think, speaks volumes about why it is so very important that we understand the deep hurt that took place and why we understand also it is really our responsibility to remember that and to make sure that we don't allow this Nation to creep down that dark kind of road again.

That Tulsa Race Massacre, again, 300 people were murdered. It started with a man being falsely accused of sexual assault, a 19-year-old kid. On May 30, 1921, Sarah Page, a young White woman operating an elevator in the Drexel Building in Tulsa, Oklahoma, encountered him. He encountered her.

Dick Rowland was the name of the 19-year-old Black kid. He was a shoeshine, a delivery boy, and worked in the Drexel Building. He was in that building at that time because they had a public "colored" restroom facility. He came there to relieve himself, as he normally did.

While there, both Rowland and Page were both in an elevator. A clerk, ironically a White clerk, claimed to have heard a scream and called the police, telling them that this kid, this 19-year-old kid, Rowland, had sexually assaulted the young lady.

The police chief, whose name was John Gustafson, reported that the young lady bore no scratches, no bruises, no disarranged dress. The young woman said: No, he never made a bad remark to me of any kind. This is public record.

That should be enough to negate this false claim that someone just yelled out of the clear blue. Despite that, charges were brought against the 19-year-old kid, Mr. Roland. He was arrested and then taken to the Tulsa courthouse.

Later that afternoon, newspapers ran inflammatory articles hot off the press that suggested that the 19-year-old kid, Rowland, had sexually assaulted the young lady, and they ran with a story that stirred emotions at that time.

□ 1215

The story was: Headline. Headline. Read all about it. Young Negro nabbed for attacking girl in elevator.

Even though the girl's testimony was: He never touched me. We never spoke. He got on the elevator. He got off.

Even though there was no physical evidence to the contrary, that is what the newspaper ran at the time.

Worried, as most of the residents were, that this kid was going to be lynched, approximately 300 men met at the courthouse, and an estimated 25 Black men also arrived at the scene to back up the sheriff who had sent out a plea for help. The sheriff wanted somebody there to protect the courthouse to ensure justice and to make sure that this kid he had had to take into custody was, in fact, safe.

However, when the crowd of White men swelled to roughly 3,000 and the group of Black men swelled to about 75, a confrontation did not take place. There was a standoff at the courthouse, and the National Guard Armory in Tulsa opened its doors and allowed people to come in, citizens, to arm themselves. They just took whatever weapons they wanted. Then they dispersed.

Now, if this sounds a little strange, it really, really is. This was 104 or so years ago. It is the sort of thing that in this month where we talk about Black history and American history, which are both intertwined, it is important to say to a lot of people that this really happened. I am not making it up. We have got court records. There are newspaper records. There are reports of all sorts by those who reported the news. This is an American fact. It is chilling. I mean, it is sad. It is very, very sad.

I don't raise it today to make anybody feel bad. I just raise it to say that you can't simply close the books and act like things did not happen, call it DEI if somebody wants to talk about it, and pretend that something that did happen, that was gross and so antihuman—it is still repulsive to pretend that it did not happen.

For someone just tuning in right now, these are the statistics from that day. Again, this community, Greenwood, was known as the Black Wall Street at the time. It was thriving with businesses and entrepreneurship and commerce.

Eighty-five of the businesses in that town owned by the Black population were burned to the ground. One thousand of their homes were set on fire and burned to the ground. As I indicated in my opening remarks, 300 African Americans were killed that day and the next day, and there were 700 people injured, overflowing the hospitals, which in that day and time were challenged anyway.

The total damage was estimated to be \$1.5 million, but in today's dollars it is \$32 million plus.

What was left of the town? Just smoldering ashes.

Again, it is important to talk about this, because this actually happened. For anybody thinking that Black History Month is just a celebration of all the great things that Africans Americans did or invented or their role in the

arts or in sports or anything like that, it is. It is also about the shame of massacres in this country, the home of the free and the land of the brave, and how somehow we are just supposed to cover it over and never believe that it happened. There is importance in remembering. The importance is to remember so that it never happens again.

As I indicated, there is this standoff. The sheriff has called for help. He believes that this mob of 300 White men are going to storm the small jail, take the 19-year-old kid, and lynch him.

The National Guard, for some reason, opened its doors so citizens can run in and get weapons and arm themselves.

We don't know who fired the first shot or what happened, but we do know that what was to happen would be the worst race massacre in American history.

Gunfire broke out between the Greenwood men and the White mob, and at least 20 persons fell dead right there at that first volley.

During the shoot-out—this is from published reports. This is not hearsay.

During the shoot-out, White mobs prevented the ambulances from treating Black men and let them lay there and die. Around the city, racial violence ensued, including an unarmed Black man being chased into the Royal Theater and then murdered viciously on the stage.

Greenwood men fled from the courthouse because they were outnumbered and because they were pursued by this crazy mob of enraged men.

Most of the Black men made it back to their side of town, preparing to defend their community, their wives, their children, and their property, which caused rumors to circulate again, rumors that ginned up a response that was completely out of touch with reality. It was being said that there was a Negro uprising and, therefore, get ready to protect yourself and get ready at the same time to defend your property, even though the property was not under assault. It was the property of the Black citizens there.

Throughout the night, they were engaged in gun battles at the Frisco tracks. Those were the tracks that separated Black Greenwood from the White sections of Tulsa.

Interestingly, many of the Black men—and you will see some of them in some of these photographs—donned their World War I uniforms, their military uniforms, the uniforms that they had worn to protect the Nation in segregated troops in our armed services. Those uniforms had hung in their closets. They put them back on to remind the mob that they were Americans, that they were patriots, that they had offered to give their lives, and so many never returned home.

I thought that was kind of fascinating that you are being besieged; you are watching scores of your neighbors be murdered, lynched, burned; you are watching businesses being de-

stroyed; and you still love your country so much that you go and get your uniform, your military uniform, and put it on and stand in your doorway to protect your house.

On that same night, the police chief, the sheriff, and a judge requested that Governor JBA Robertson send the National Guard in so that they would have troops to restore order.

Around this time, however, fires began to erupt in the town of Greenwood. Remember, this was called then, and it is now, the Black Wall Street of America. It was great commerce, great independence, great businesses, and great people developing a community that they could be proud of, that Oklahoma could be proud of, and that the Nation could be proud of.

Around this time, fires began to erupt, and firefighters were actually threatened by the White mobs as they tried to extinguish the flames. They could not protect all of the homes. That is why 1,000 homes burned down.

They started rounding up Black civilians for them to be interred, to be locked up, put in jail.

From 2 a.m. that morning until 5 a.m., members of the Tulsa Police Department, the National Guard, and American Legion formed mobs of White men into companies and made a plan to invade Greenwood at daybreak. They were going to end it once and for all, even though they had started it.

Unlike the gun battles of the night before, this violence was more one sided during this invasion as it was carried out. Despite pockets of resistance from Black residents, they were overwhelmed, the women, the children, and the elderly.

We have this crazy, crazy situation where this is happening in Tulsa, Oklahoma, and yet there is not a sound from the White House. Knowing that the National Guard has been called up, knowing by this time that 200 Black citizens had been murdered, there is this eerie, eerie silence.

The mobs carried out their terrorizing campaign. They did it with the old-style, early automobiles, the few that were around at the time. They did it with machine guns mounted on grain elevators. They did it as mobs, with tiki torches and knives and shotguns. They were organized and began methodically burning Greenwood down block by block, while women and children stood there watching people being set ablaze.

It is horrific. It is the sort of thing that I really don't want to have to come here and talk about, but unless we tell the story of how we became who we are, every aspect of that story, I think we do a disservice to history. It is something, as I have said before, that is just absolutely shameful.

Dr. A.C. Jackson, who at the time was a Black doctor and one of America's more prominent surgeons, a Black man, was murdered surrendering with his hands in the air on the steps of his porch. His home was then looted and burned.

An elderly, paralyzed Black man was gunned down when he refused, when ordered, to stand. He couldn't stand. He was paralyzed. He was shot down and killed.

These are the reports that are still in the newspapers of the time, those that talked about and wrote about what was happening.

A Black double amputee was tied to the bumper of a car and dragged through the streets until he died and could not say anything else.

While there was resistance, including a group of Black men fighting the invaders at the Mount Zion Baptist Church there in Greenwood, the resistance was ultimately scattered by overwhelming machine gun fire.

As I have said before, this scene, and scenes like this, are part of the history that we have to pledge to ourselves that we will never, ever revisit.

You can see these persons who were the last ones that did not get murdered. What does the headline say? "Captured Negroes on way to convention hall . . . June 1, 1921."

It was a community of law-abiding, hardworking, successful people that caused Black communities around the Nation to look at Tulsa as the epitome of what could happen in terms of commerce and what could happen in terms of education and what could happen in terms of just being able to raise families the right way in America. That picture never returned to the way it was.

People envied what was going on there until what they knew had happened and what we all know did happen. Again, practically every building in that Black community, dozens of churches, five hotels, three restaurants, four drug stores, eight doctor's offices, two dozen grocery stores, a public library, and over 1,000 homes burned to the ground.

□ 1230

As I said before, this is really not something that anybody wants to talk about or regurgitate. It is very painful, quite frankly, when you read through the books of history and see this.

My role here on the floor is not to make anybody feel bad or to shame anybody. I just want us to remember that this took place, to know it, and to not assume that things like this will never happen again. If you live long enough, you might see everything twice. We must pledge ourselves as a nation that we would never ever permit something like this to take place again.

There was silence from the White House when this was happening. The Governor there finally got involved on the third day. Martial law was declared on June 1. The massacre had largely ceased by then, and the fires continued to smolder and burn throughout the day. That martial law was lifted on June 3. The National Guard left Tulsa on June 4.

The primary role of the National Guard during the massacre was to arbitrarily take any and all Black men

into custody, which prevented them from trying to fight the blazes that were burning down their own homes.

This may also be hard to believe, but internment camps were set up at the Convention Hall, McNulty Park, and Tulsa County Fairgrounds. We didn't see internment camps again until the 1950s when Americans of Japanese ancestry were huddled up and locked behind bars out of a strange and twisted paranoid fear that they somehow would forget their loyalty to their new homes and their loyalty to the country that they loved. These were the first internment camps set up in Tulsa, and armed guards were placed there to oversee the 4,000 to 6,000 people who were detained in those camps, which were reported at the time to have terrible sanitary conditions and inadequate food.

For at least a month after the massacre, African Americans needed to be sponsored by a White Tulsan in order to get a special ID card in order to leave the internment camp for 24 hours. You really just can't make this up.

Without their card, those without employment were forced to work, to clean the city, to bury more bodies that had not been buried, and to live in that internment camp for almost a year, 4,000 to 6,000 people.

It is difficult to fully confirm the number of casualties. I have said before the best estimates by reporters at the time and the newspaper were that there were 300 people killed, that many of them were just thrown into mass graves. It was difficult to count because you were not allowed out on the streets. Reports from the Red Cross at that time documented at least 700 injuries, people who lost their eyes, lost their limbs, had their fingers cut off.

These sights, these sounds, and these horrors that I have just described bear a resemblance to an apocalyptic war zone, quite frankly, but it wasn't a war zone. It was the country that we love. "My country, tis of thee, sweet land of liberty." It was devilish destruction that took place.

I want to put up these numbers again for somebody just tuning in and asking what I am talking about. I am using the end of Black History Month, again, not to sing flowery songs or to talk about great achievements within the African-American community because we do that throughout the year, but to talk about a pain that continues to burn in the hearts of people who had to go through that, and to remind all of us that this really did happen.

In 1921, Oklahoma impaneled a grand jury that subpoenaed 200 witnesses and returned 70 indictments, interestingly enough, mostly against Black people in the community who were the victims of the riot and victims of the massacre. Appallingly, the only people ever accused and the only people to go to prison were the Black people of that community.

The grand jury deemed that the massacre was a riot and blamed it on Black

men who went to the courthouse that night at the request of the sheriff to help protect the courthouse and to help keep mobs from lynching the young 19-year-old kid who was there and had been falsely accused.

Tulsa's Public Welfare Board was formed to handle the rebuilding—remember, this was 1921—which was replaced by Tulsa's then-mayor, T.D. Evans, with a reconstruction committee. In his speech announcing the committee, Mayor Evans again blamed the riot on the Black people of Greenwood and suggested that the land should be redeveloped for industrial purposes.

Remember, this was Black Wall Street at the time, the envy of communities around the country, the model of self-initiatives, discipline, and citizenship, but the mayor said it ought to be redeveloped for industrial purposes.

Seated on the committee that granted his wish were individuals that included the likes of Tate Brady, who was a wealthy White landowner who was also later identified in several reports as a leading Klansman.

The city tried to force survivors out of Greenwood by passing a new fire ordinance that made rebuilding extremely expensive. Even though your house had been burned down, you would think the government would try to help you, but they made it more expensive since so many homes of the 1,000 that had been burned never got rebuilt.

A year later, in September 1921, an African-American attorney named Buck Colbert Franklin secured a permanent injunction against that ordinance, even though many had already been arrested for simply trying to rebuild their homes.

The FBI got involved, and a gentleman by the name of T.F. Weiss, a special agent, was leading up this effort. The FBI's predecessor agency was also sent at that time to investigate whether crimes had taken place during the riot—whether crimes had taken place.

We have a complete onslaught of violence that carries over for 3 days where 300 people are murdered while living in the community that they helped to build, where all of their businesses are burned to the ground, where 1,000 homes are totally destroyed, where the cost and the estimate was more than the State of Oklahoma even wanted to think about. Yet, in Agent Weiss' own report, he makes mention that, on the night of May 31, a police officer had recruited men from nearby towns to join in the raid that would take place the next morning, which should have been evidence itself of preplanning, but the report was never turned in. Agent Weiss took less than a week to complete his interviews and write a report, which may have never been reviewed by an individual at the Justice Department.

In the halls of our judicial system, victims and descendants desperately

continued to seek some form of redress, and they were all met with similar blockades.

In September 1926, the Oklahoma Supreme Court ruled that insurance companies could not be sued for the damages that took place as a result of the massacre. You pay your insurance year after year. After you have built your own house and lived there with your family and somebody burns it down, you go to whatever the insurance company was at the time to try to seek some relief, but the Supreme Court in Oklahoma ruled that those insurance companies didn't have to do a damn thing, nothing.

Residents tried to sue Mayor Evans. They tried to sue the Tulsa police and others throughout the decade of the 1920s. All of those lawsuits, all of them, were dismissed.

In 2003, survivors and descendants of Tulsa alleging civil rights violations and a denial of equal protection in the case of *Alexander v. Oklahoma* began a process that gets us closer to where we are today. There were descendants.

In fact, there were two women who both, I believe, are 105 or 106 years of age who fought this. They never stopped trying. They never gave up. They were the last group of survivors. They brought their case all the way to the Supreme Court. These are the witnesses who saw 300 people murdered, 1,000 homes destroyed, 85 businesses destroyed. They held on some sort of way because they believed, as they said, that they had to tell the story before they died because no one else wanted to tell the story. It is unbelievable.

In June of last year, the Oklahoma Supreme Court dismissed the case, finding that the plaintiffs did not have legitimate grievances or that their grievances did not fall within the scope of the law that they sought to utilize.

This is just absolutely amazing. I don't know what it would have been like to hold on all those many years with a nightmare of a story in your gut and in your belly, with the crying and the pain and the violence that you witnessed as a young person, but they held on. They held on.

In 2010, just a decade before the Supreme Court of Oklahoma's decision, the John Hope Franklin Center for Reconciliation was opened in Tulsa. That center was established to foster dialogue about historical and racial violence and the lingering effects that it has on people and how they find that pain and promote healing.

That is why this story is so interesting. Mrs. Viola Ford Fletcher and Ms. Lessie Benningfield Randle never stopped believing that their country would, in fact, correct a wrong that had gone on so long.

God only knows that when they leave this planet for their eternal rest, we have to carry on with their belief that there will be a reckoning, that there will be reconciliation, and that there will be a need to tell the story, not to make anybody feel bad but to make everybody more committed to the fact

that we have to be one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty for all.

□ 1245

I don't want to belabor the point, so I won't. I can just tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I have lived long enough to know that difficulties between groups in our society are not novel nor are they new but that our approach to those differences must be both.

For more than 200 years we have joined together different colors, different creeds, and different nationalities, all under that one flag, and while this assembled diversity has produced the most successful experience of democracy in the world's history, we have by no means clearly achieved perfect harmony.

Slavery was allowed to exist legally for almost 200 years. Crosses were burned to terrorize people in an ugly desecration of the symbol of love. Just a century ago, Protestants and Catholics battled in the streets of New York City, and on that day 44 Catholics were killed. At the end of the decade of the 1930s, a ship by the name of the *St. Louis* with a human cargo of Jewish men and Jewish women was denied safe harbor in this, the land of the free and the home of the brave and sent back to a madman named Hitler.

At the beginning of World War II, as I mentioned earlier, Japanese Americans were huddled up and placed behind bars in internment camps out of the fear that they somehow would forget their loyalty to their new home.

After the attacks of 9/11, Arab and Muslim Americans were set upon and beaten in the streets of America—lest we ever forget, by angry men who formed mobs of their own—because their religion and because their ethnicity were deemed to be a threat to the land that they professed to love.

There have been times that we have sought as a Nation to ban the teaching of foreign language and to slam shut the doors of elementary schools simply because they were sponsored by religious groups. There have been occasions and there have been periods where our differences of race, our differences of religion, and our differences of nationality have produced an ugly alienation instead of producing harmony.

Nevertheless, as I prepare to conclude this portion of my remarks, let me remind all of us that there are still yet other differences: The difference between the people who have and the people who have not.

The difference between the people in this room, Members of the United States Congress, you and I, and the millions of people in this country who at this hour are out of work or working at jobs that provide them with a scant living and no real dignity.

The difference between us, you and I, on one hand, living as we do in relative comfort and the millions of people in the streets across America torn by the terrible pain of drug addiction.

The difference between us and the illiterates.

The difference between us and the homeless.

The difference between our child parents and the 15-year-olds in towns and communities across this Nation, who at this hour are about to have children of their own, creating a situation where they are lost, unprepared, and doomed to raising another generation of disadvantaged children.

Those differences produce frustration, and they produce anger. America at her best has always treated those differences with a blend of common sense and compassion. America at her worst has treated such differences with the empty evenhandedness of Marie Antoinette: Just let them eat cake. We can't be bothered.

Yet we know that this is not a perfect nation and we are not perfect people, but God calls all of us to a perfect mission. Whether we are Christian, Jew, Muslim or something else, it is still a mission to feed the hungry, clothe the naked, house the homeless, teach the illiterate, provide guidance to our young, and security to our seniors.

Part of that guidance means remembering the stony road that we charred to get to where we are here in 2025, by remembering something as painful even as the Tulsa race massacre, which I have tried to talk about now over and over again, and to remember committing ourselves and promising those who have gone before us and those who will come after us that we will never allow something like that to happen again.

I have not given up on the American Dream or the American possibility, and I have come to the floor tonight to ask people around this country not to give up also. I am convinced that this Nation still stands before the world as perhaps the last expression of a possibility of mankind, devising a social order where justice is the supreme ruler and law is but its instrument, where freedom is the dominant creed and order is but its principle, where equity—equity—is the common practice and fraternity the true human condition.

It is also my conviction that we may be the last generation of Americans who has the opportunity to help our Nation totally fulfill that promise and to realize that still-yet-to-achieve possibility.

So, Mr. Speaker, again, I call our attention to the matter of the Tulsa race massacre as we conclude Black History Month tomorrow, but this could be December. It doesn't matter. It is something we have to not hide in books and say: Those books are banned; and tell a generation of young people: You can't read this, you don't need to know that.

Again, we have to use it in an instructive way to talk about how far we have come since then and why we must do more and why something like that can't take place.

I am going to talk a bit just briefly about this whole situation that we are

facing, regrettably, with people being laid off and fired and being asked: What did you do last week?

I do want to make sure that my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, has an opportunity to come forward and make another very important point.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. FIGURES).

Mr. FIGURES. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative MFUME for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a question similar to many of the questions we just heard the distinguished gentleman from Maryland raise as it relates to historical events that happened across the country, particularly in Tulsa, but it is a question that gets to the core of what he is saying, and that is: Who are we as Americans?

Who are we as a nation?

Who are we as a people?

In the flurry of activity that comes out of this administration and that comes out of the White House it is easy to overlook certain things that the administration is doing that are impacting people whom we may not see every day that we may not even know. One of those unfortunate occurrences happened late last week when the administration decided to revoke the temporary protected status of half a million people who are in the Nation legally from the nation of Haiti.

Now, the TPS program, the temporary protected status program, is specifically designed to provide temporary status, legal status—not permanent status, not citizenship, but temporary status—to people who are from nations who find themselves in situations similar to what is going on in Haiti right now, where they are wrapped in a situation of a destabilized government, a not-too-long-ago assassinated President, a situation where gangs are literally controlling large swaths of the country, over 85 percent of the capital city. It is not safe for people to be pushed back into those environments.

This is one that is personal to me because I have had the privilege in life to have met a man named Gerald Dessources who came to this country from the nation of Haiti. He worked his way through college, refined his English by listening to Sesame Street and by listening to Martin Luther King's speeches. He went on to become an engineer at a Fortune 500 company here in the United States in New York.

I have had the privilege to get to know a woman from Haiti by the name of Katlyn Dessources, who immigrated here as a young child following her mother who was pursuing that American Dream of making life better for her children. She too worked her way through to her American Dream. She has been a healthcare worker for decades.

The two of them, Gerald and Katlyn, it didn't stop with them. Those same values they brought with them, that same dream that they brought with

them from the country of Haiti, they instilled that in their children, their four daughters, one of whom is a schoolteacher, one of whom is a speech pathologist, one of whom is an Ivy-League-educated gynecological oncologist in North Carolina, and the fourth of whom holds four different degrees from three different Ivy League schools, and I have the privilege of calling her my wife and the mother of our children.

They come from Haiti. They are evidence of what Haitians have produced for this country and contributed to this country.

For us as America to ignore the current conditions of what is happening in Haiti, to turn our backs on people who need us most, this is a Nation that prides itself on being that beacon of hope. This is a Nation where when you look at one of our most famous landmarks, the Statue of Liberty, it says: "Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free."

However, by ignoring the conditions that are currently present in Haiti, we are not living up to that model. We are not living up to that creed. What we are doing is sending people back to an environment where they are certain to meet ends that we would not wish on anybody.

We see the reports of gang violence in the streets. We see the reports of women being raped. We see the reports of children being forced to partake in armed conflict. We see the reports of food insecurity. We see the reports of people who no longer own the homes that they left because they are now under the control of armed gangs. We see the reports that Haiti doesn't have a police force that can protect its people. They don't have a military force that can protect its people.

Yet, we are sending people back to that environment. It is not safe, and it is not the right thing to do. There are ways to lead with strength but decency. There are ways to enforce the law in a manner that recognizes reality and exudes compassion.

This is not that. This is not who we are as Americans. We can do so much better than this. We can be that place of refuge. We can be that place that America and the world still look up to as standing up for people who need us most.

Again, TPS is not about permanent citizenship. This is about a temporary place for people to be safe from gun violence and armed conflicts, from being kidnapped and held for ransom. That is what will surely happen to some of the people who are returned back to Haiti.

These are people who are a proud people and who are a hardworking people. My wife's family is just one example of that. They are just one example. There are millions of Haitian Americans who make vital contributions to this country every single day. For us to turn our backs on them now is simply not right. It is indecent. It is inhu-

mane. Quite frankly, it is un-American.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge, I plead, and I beg of the White House to reconsider its restriction on TPS and extend the protection for the Haitians who are in America.

□ 1300

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, I associate myself with the remarks from the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. FIGURES) and to also urge the White House to move forthwith on that request and other similar requests.

I will say a couple of words before I conclude. The matter of the Tulsa Race Massacre was very important. I hope that, to the extent that anybody paid attention, that it makes a difference in terms of trying to remember how far we have come and why we can't, in fact, go back.

I simply also indicate that it is my intention to come back onto the floor next week to spend time again on the matter of the mass layoffs and firings that have been taking place that are affecting Federal workers throughout this country, 80 percent of whom are outside of Washington, D.C., and many of whom are in my State of Maryland and the city of Baltimore.

I will again urge some sort of prudence. I think most people will agree that we all want to do away with waste, fraud, and abuse.

I am the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Government Operations and the Federal Workforce, which has been doing just that for the last 2 or 3 years. The committee has been identifying it and trying to make sure that we, in fact, come to grips with it.

I think the thing that concerns most Americans has been the speed and the surgical way that people have been cut out of employment, oftentimes without any kind of review. It is wrong. I have said it over and over again, and I think most people now are starting to recognize that "due process" is more than just 2 words. It is a way that we have to move forward.

It doesn't mean stopping anything, but it does mean affording people the courtesy of a process, and I would strongly urge Members of this body to keep that in mind as we go forward.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. FIGURES) for his comments, and I yield back the balance of my time.

DESTRUCTION OF THE NUCLEAR FAMILY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARIDOPOLIS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, we just got done with a very interesting week in which this House passed a budget bill, and now we proceed actually to the more difficult process in which, sometime over the next 4 months, we plan on passing both the reconciliation bill and appropriations bills.

Between the two, we deal with all of government spending. As a result, we have an opportunity to look at programs and examine programs the way we haven't before, particularly because we have someone as President who is somewhat of a person who promises change. Clearly, his election meant that they want fundamental changes in government.

Mr. Speaker, different programs have different goals. Just so the public understands, the appropriations bills are for what we call discretionary spending. The reconciliation bills are what are referred to as mandatory spending. Between the two bills that must eventually pass or several separate appropriations bills, we will be looking at virtually all of the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, different programs have different goals, and obviously one of our goals has to be to reduce spending given that we have over \$35 trillion in debt.

Some of these programs also have goals that are perhaps intentional and perhaps unintentional. These are the goals that I am going to address today.

By the way, this is relevant whether we are running a \$1 trillion or over a \$1 trillion increase in debt every year, or whether we were, in fact, in a surplus situation.

I am going to look at some programs, which, again, maybe intentionally, maybe unintentionally, penalize people who are raising children while they are married.

We had a hearing a couple of weeks ago in a subcommittee which I have been fortunate enough to chair. In that hearing, Robert Rector, who works for the Heritage Foundation, found approximately 90 programs in which eligibility depended upon having a small income.

In other words, you would lose eligibility for these programs if you either worked and, depending on the program, made more than \$12,000, made more than \$25,000, made more than \$50,000, or had somebody else in the household making more than this amount of money.

This would include if, say, a single parent had a husband or a wife and the single parent was not working or making very little. If they married someone with an income of \$30,000, \$40,000, or \$50,000, they would lose the benefits from that program.

We are all familiar with some of these larger programs. I think most people wouldn't be able to name all 90, but there are things like FoodShare. There is the earned income tax credit, which requires a little bit of work, but

as you work your way up and get a higher income in the company where you work, you would lose that.

Low-income housing, which I think is maybe the worst program of the bunch because you are given housing if you are a young person, allowing you to get out from having to live with your parents as a benefit for having a low income.

Medicaid; TANF, a cash benefit; childcare; Pell grants; payments for children with some disabilities, all of these programs are conditioned upon not making too much money and, of our primary concern today, not marrying somebody who makes too much money.

Frequently, these programs are, in certain ways, more generous than the middle class normally receives. A perfect example would be section 42, low-income tax credits. I have known people who have looked for housing, and the housing they get is not as lavish as the housing available in low-income housing.

The programs are set up in a way that the owners of the low-income housing are encouraged to build very modern, very upscale apartments that maybe some of the average people cannot afford. As a matter of fact, a lot of the average people may still be living with their parents for a while even after they get married.

We have our Medicaid program, which is a fine program, providing healthcare for the poor. Again, there are a lot of people out there working who may have a \$10,000 or \$15,000 or \$20,000 deductible on their medical payments, and of course the government program has, in most cases, no deductible.

We have the FoodShare. All you have to do is talk to people who work in the food stores, and they will say that frequently people on the FoodShare program can afford types of food that the people who are working at the grocery store feel they cannot afford. Not only do we have these programs which are conditioned upon not marrying somebody with an income, but they even have benefits that are sometimes superior to people who are not taking advantage of these programs.

I mentioned Robert Rector and what he said at the relevant hearing. The penalty for getting married obviously varies from person to person, but, in his example, a young person who married a father or mother of their children would be penalized by \$28,000.

It is, therefore, not surprising that, if my colleagues ask around, they will find examples of people who are living together but not getting married because they want the benefits. Inevitably, they will find the percentage of people getting married when they have children falls because the generosity of the programs is such that there is a feeling of: Why would I get married at all?

These programs also cause cheating or breaking the law because, of course,

they frequently don't catch it if you are getting cash off the books. All of these programs encourage working for cash. They also encourage, I think, earning money by doing things illegally because that is another thing that is not reportable.

We were in a different hearing the other day, and there was a feeling of one of our witnesses who, I think, I would have to say leans toward supporting the Democratic Party. They didn't like the fact that sometimes people are stuck in the muck and are not making as much money as other Americans.

This woman did not seem to realize that one of the reasons that people sometimes make less money is because they shouldn't try to improve their lot in their employer's company because, if they improved their lot, they would lose some of these 90 benefits.

Mr. Speaker, a question is: Is this a penalty for getting married? It has had a huge impact on society. I point out that in the 1950s, 4 percent of the children in this country were born out of wedlock. That number is now over 40 percent. America has fundamentally changed because of these programs.

The question is: Was this on purpose, or was it an inadvertent problem caused by these programs? I think most people would say that people didn't realize what they were doing. The fact that we have had the number of children born out of wedlock skyrocket from 4 percent to over 40 percent was an oversight.

One thing I think America should realize is there were always radicals out there who were trying to get rid of the American family.

Karl Marx, back in the 1800s, made it clear, I think, because he wanted the government to have the absolute power, that he felt that, to have his socialist paradise, we had to get rid of the family.

In the 1960s, the leading feminists, who were celebrated by the left at that time, made it clear that a goal of theirs was to get rid of the nuclear family.

Here is Kate Millett, who has been described as the mother of women's studies classes which dot our universities around the country: "The complete destruction of traditional marriage and the nuclear family is the 'revolutionary or utopian' goal of feminism."

Linda Gordon, another prominent feminist: "The nuclear family must be destroyed. . . . Whatever its ultimate meaning, the break-up of families now is an objectively revolutionary process."

Michelle Barrett, in the book "The Anti-Social Family," wrote: "The family sucks the juice out of everything around it, leaving other institutions stunted and distorted."

There is no shortage of radical feminists. I could quote Angela Davis, who some on the left view as a hero, as another person who was antifamily.

More recently, Black Lives Matter, during their ascendancy a few years ago, in documents written by their founders, wanted to get rid of the Western-prescribed, so-called nuclear family.

Even after that was out there on the internet, before they took it down, a significant number of people in this institution, I think, showed up at rallies, or whatever one would call them, sponsored by Black Lives Matter, a group that at least initially said they were against the traditional family.

It is entirely possible that one of the reasons we have all of these programs is because some of the powerful feminists and Marxists that influence what goes on in this body were in favor of destroying the nuclear family.

Mr. Speaker, people can say that there is nobody in this conference who would yield to these radical feminists. I remind the public that the radical feminists are for abortions at 8½ months.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues would say that nobody here would be for an abortion like that—oh, my goodness—but there are individual States that have that law right now, and that is what the radical feminists wanted.

My colleagues would say that nobody would allow transgender women in women's sports, but, again, that is what the radical feminists want. They want to blur the distinctions between men and women, and almost all Democrats in this institution follow along and vote to allow transgender women in women's sports.

There is the same thing about transgender women in women's bathrooms. My colleagues would say that nobody in Congress would be for transgender women in women's bathrooms, but, in fact, the Democratic Party is overwhelmingly for that.

□ 1315

Now, ask yourself, if the Democratic Party is for these things, all of which would have been considered absurd 40 years ago—8½ month abortions, transgender in sports, transgender in women's bathrooms—is it too much to conclude that one of the reasons our government's programs are designed to destroy marriage is because the power of the radical feminists and the power of the Marxists in the Democratic Party. It has to be in there for some reason. It is something that we should look out for.

I will point out one more time that I think this is the most critical debate that we are going to have over the next 4 or 5 months as we debate our appropriation bills and as we debate our reconciliation bills. This is a debate we should have regardless of whether we are in a difficult financial plight or not.

I want to emphasize that I don't care if we are running trillion-dollar surpluses around here, the idea of putting out programs, substantially generous programs whose effect is to destroy the family, is wrong.

While I certainly know many single parents who are doing a tremendous job and have done a tremendous job, when I talk to people in different fields, they say the explosion in families without a mother and father at home is causing other problems for society. When I talk to law enforcement, they feel one of the root causes of crime is the breakdown of the American family.

I am sure, like everybody around here who has been in politics for a while, you sit in these committee hearings and hear the problems of high crime and murders and such, and people have suggestions as to how to deal with them, but we don't spend enough time pointing out that one way that would certainly reduce the crime rate, maybe back down to where it was in the 1950s, is to do what we can to build up the traditional family rather than what we do now, which is trying to have as few people as possible in the family.

The second thing that I am told is that families of all backgrounds can have problems with drug abuse. Right now, we have over 100,000 people a year dying of drug abuse. It can happen everywhere, but again, when I talk to the professionals who deal with this, disproportionately, the 100,000 people who die every year are from difficult family backgrounds. This drug culture, I think, would be less strong in America if we did more to promote the traditional family rather than doing all we can to make sure the traditional family is weakened.

The third institution I will point out that is harmed by this government's policy of penalizing traditional families is education. I know my friends on the other side of the aisle like to claim they care about education. When I have talked to school superintendents, when I have talked to teachers about the additional money that has to be spent on children with certain problems, again, those kids are disproportionately from families in which you don't have both a mom and dad there.

Again, I know a lot of families like that who do a fantastic job, but I am pointing out that if you really cared about education, you would look at these programs that have caused the children who are born into a family with only one parent there to have skyrocketed from 4 percent to over 40 percent.

I ask the chairman of the relevant committees that are going to have to deal with the appropriation bills and deal with their designated spending limits on the reconciliation bill to pay particular attention to the programs that are designed to penalize the nuclear family, which is so despised by Karl Marx and some of the radicals who were around in the 1960s and 1970s.

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

IMPACT OF PRESIDENT ON PEACE PROCESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, and still I rise.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to first announce two pieces of legislation. Thereafter, I will go into my message, which will be the impact of President Trump's engagement in the peace process between Israel and the Palestinians.

First, let's look at the two resolutions. The first resolution is our Black History Month resolution.

I am proud to say that this resolution will be filed tomorrow, and this is the original Black History Month resolution for 2025. We have many persons who have signed up to cosponsor, but it is still not too late for additional persons to sign up.

The theme is African Americans and labor. It deals with African Americans and labor in America. It will trace the history of labor from enslavement through current times.

The second resolution is one that I am very proud to present. This is a resolution for slavery remembrance month. As you know, August 1619 was the month and year that enslaved persons from Africa were introduced into the Colonies. Since that time, we have had an adverse impact on African Americans in the United States of America.

We need to retrace some of the history of what actually happened, but not just on one day. We have a slavery remembrance day that we proposed. Now, we are proposing a slavery remembrance month. There is still time to sign on to this resolution, as well.

We will file it tomorrow, so if Members desire to be original cosponsors of either of these two, they have until the close of business tomorrow or until we have our last opportunity to file tomorrow any type of legislation. I suggest by noon tomorrow for Members who want to file.

Now, let me get to my message: the impact of the President on the peace process. I say again: the impact of the President on the peace process.

The President, as it relates to this process, is not an honest broker. He is not an honest broker because an honest broker has to be impartial. The President has made it perspicuously clear that he is not impartial.

He has already sided with Israel, and the President has every right to do that, to side with one side as opposed to another, but let's be clear about the role that he is playing. He is not playing the role of an honest broker.

The President is not playing the role of a negotiator because the President does not seek to get input from the Palestinians. The President will get input from one side, that would be the Israelis, and he will make his decisions with the Israelis.

It appears that there will be an all-or-nothing offer made. The President has gone so far as to say that certain things must be done, or certain conditions will manifest themselves.

The President doesn't want peace. It appears to me that the President wants to stop the killing, and there is a difference between stopping the killing and peace.

Peace requires more than the absence of tension, the absence of violence, the absence of killing. Peace requires justice. It requires justice. Stopping killing is not going to end the process because you won't have justice for all parties involved, and there must be justice for all parties involved if we are to have genuine peace between Palestinians and Israelis.

The President appears to currently be engaging in a process of ethnic cleansing. This is where his thoughts are. He seems to believe that we can take Gaza from the Palestinians. He seems to believe that the Gazans can be relocated. Just place them someplace else. Give them nice homes in some other place. Let us, meaning the United States or Israel, have Gaza.

Mr. Speaker, that won't happen because the Palestinians have made it very clear that they don't intend to leave their homeland, but there is more to it than simply replacing them, putting them someplace else. We have to think about what the President is saying.

The President is making it clear that we are an existential threat to the creation of a Palestinian state because if you remove the Palestinians from the land that was once Palestine, they won't have a Palestinian state there, then we, indeed, are an existential threat to Palestine. In fact, if the language that the President is using as it relates to the Palestinians, if it were used as it relates to the Israelis, the President would have some serious problems.

You cannot say with any degree of credibility that we ought to remove the Israelis from Israel, which is now in land that was once labeled "Palestine." You can't say that. If you say "from the river to the sea," you are saying that you are proclaiming an existential threat to exist as it relates to the State of Israel, the mere statement, whereas Israel's Knesset has already, by way of resolution, indicated that there will not be a Palestinian state in the land of what we now call Gaza, in the land of what we now call the West Bank, that there won't be a Palestinian state. If there is not going to be a Palestinian state, then Israel is declaring that it is an existential threat to the creation of a Palestinian state.

The President doesn't want a Palestinian state. He is with the Israelis. The President wants Gaza. He wants the West Bank to be controlled and possibly become a part of Israel. This is not the way to achieve justice.

Remember, you cannot have peace without having justice. You have heard

the phrase, "No justice, no peace." Well, there has to be justice for us to have peace, and the President is willing to sacrifice the Palestinians. He seems to be willing to sacrifice them because he has indicated as much, that if a certain thing doesn't happen, if hostages aren't returned by a certain time that he has chosen, that all hell will break loose.

Well, that seems to indicate that he is willing to see an infiltration unlike we have not seen so far, something more than we have seen so far because, quite frankly, Gaza has been decimated. The roads have been destroyed. The bridges have been destroyed. The schools have been destroyed. The hospitals have been destroyed. The homes have been destroyed. People have been killed. Until we decide that we want peace, we are not going to have the kind of place that people should have as a homeland for Palestinians.

There has to be peace. To have peace, there must be justice. To have justice, we have to at least decide that there are certain things that we are willing to do. Justice is going to require equal respect for the lives of all babies—equal respect for the lives of all babies.

I will tell you that I, just as early as this morning, had tears well in my eyes when there was a story about the Israeli babies who were returned after they had been held hostage by Hamas.

Hamas did a dastardly thing in taking babies as hostage. Israel has done nothing that would warrant Hamas to take babies as hostages. Then, for those babies to be returned in caskets, it is heartbreaking.

Those parents had to suffer immeasurable heartache as a result of what happened to their children. Those babies were young babies, infants.

Hamas is not—is not—an organization that seeks peace. If you are going to do these kinds of things, you are not seeking peace because what you did was not just. It was an injustice to take those babies.

□ 1330

It was an injustice to keep those babies, and now you are returning them lifeless to their parents, and they have to suffer for the rest of their lives knowing what happened to their babies.

You can't stop there. All babies have to be treated equally. The lives of all babies have to be treated equally. You cannot say that it is shameful and sinful for Hamas to do what they did to those Israeli babies and not condemn what Israel has done to the Palestinian babies.

Babies have been bombed; body parts scattered all over. One parent just had the baby born and was about to register the baby. The parents come back, and the baby is no longer alive. All babies have to be treated equally. Their lives have to be respected in the same way, regardless as to where they are, where they are from, and what their ethnicity is. We cannot continue to be-

lieve that some babies have lives that are more valuable than others.

Nothing Israel has done merits what Hamas did to the babies that they took hostage or other babies that may have been killed as well. Nothing that the Palestinians have done merits the killing of—nothing that the Israelis have done merits the killing of Palestinian babies to the extent that they have been killed.

Palestinian babies, Palestinians cannot have done anything that would merit Israelis killing their babies to the same extent that they have. Israelis have to understand that Palestinian babies have lives that have to be respected to the same extent as they want Israeli babies' lives to be respected. By the same token, Palestinians have to respect Israeli babies' lives to the same extent that they want Palestinian lives to be respected. All babies have to be respected equally. All babies.

Today, I want to say to the Israelis and the Palestinians: There will be no peace until you respect the babies equally. But you have got to do more than this and we have to do more because we have to rebuild Palestine.

I say "we." I believe the United States has to make a contribution, just as we contributed to the rebuilding of Japan after we dropped bombs on Japan, just as we have contributed to the rebuilding of other places when we have been involved in the destruction.

We helped to destroy Palestine. Yes, I know that what Hamas did was dastardly. I understand that. It shouldn't have been done, but that did not give Israel the right to kill babies and innocent people to the extent that Israel has killed these babies and innocent people. We have to respect their lives.

Now we have to respect their property. There has to be a home for Palestinians, and that home has to have some help from the United States because we sent our weaponry over there. We have to pay for weapons that were used to bomb the Palestinians. The bombs, many of them, were actually munitions that came from us.

We have a duty to respect their lives and their property, and we have a duty to help to rebuild. This is something that we can't push off on others, and we can't just decide, Mr. President, that the Palestinians should not have a state and that we can just simply take their land. This land belongs to them. It was theirs in 1948.

The majority of the people in Palestine in 1948 were not people who were there to have a State of Israel. People came into the place called Palestine and helped to build and construct the State of Israel. I have said that a two-state solution is a solution, but you can't have a two-state solution without respecting the babies that are Palestinian and the land that was once Palestine.

We have got to give Palestinians a homeland, more specifically a state. Palestinians have the right to live

there with sovereignty, not to be told what to do by others, not to have the flow of their electricity controlled by others, not to have others determine whether they can have ingress and egress. They have got to have a state.

That means there has to be some negotiation. It can't just be dictation. The President wants to dictate what the policies will be and expect everybody to live happily thereafter. If we want true peace, then, Mr. President, you have got to cease to be a dictator and become a negotiator. You have to talk to the Palestinians and get their opinions about what they want, and you have got to decide that you cannot side with one side and conclude that that is going to give you the necessary strength to bring peace about.

You may have calm, but you won't have peace, and you won't have the kind of peace that will be lasting if you just decide you are going to stop the killing. Stopping killing does not bring about peace. It just brings about an absence of a certain amount of tension.

Dr. King reminded us that if you want peace, you have to have more than the absence of tension. You have got to have the presence of justice. The presence of justice must be accorded not only to the Israelis, they deserve justice. But to the Palestinians, they also deserve justice. Justice for both sides, peace for both sides. One country, one place; Palestinians on one side of that place, the Israelis on the other side. Two people, two homes, two sovereignties living side by side in peace.

Finally, on this whole question, Dr. King also reminded us that we have to learn to live together as brothers—this is how he put it—or we will perish together as fools. Living together as brothers—and I would add and sisters—is an imperative. We no longer have, as Dr. King put it, a choice between violence or nonviolence. He said: We have a choice between nonviolence or nonexistence, and we are marching toward nonexistence.

As we decide who is going to have certain pieces of land and how land is going to be divided, many countries who are viewing this are concluding that to protect themselves, they are going to have to have the ultimate weapon. Just as North Korea made that decision, others are making that decision. I don't support any of those decisions. I don't support any nuclear weapons. I would like to see the absence of nuclear weapons across the globe, but I also understand that they exist. I understand that others are going to want them to protect themselves from us, from the United States, from Israel. They are going to want them to protect themselves from other countries that have them.

Friends, it is no longer the choice between nonviolence or violence. The choice is going to be between nonviolence or nonexistence, and we have to learn to live together as brothers and sisters or we will perish together

as fools. Those were the words of Dr. Martin Luther King.

I stand for peace, peace between Israelis and Palestinians. I stand for loving all babies the same. The lives of all babies should be treated equally. Hamas shouldn't hide behind babies, but that doesn't give you the right to just kill babies indiscriminately. Thousands of babies have been killed. You can't do that. That is antithetical to having a just society where peace presides.

I present to you my belief that if we are to have true peace, there has to be justice; and if there is to be justice, all babies have to be treated equally. All babies have to be respected equally. All babies' lives are equally as important. It doesn't matter where they are or who they are.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President and to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to a perceived viewing audience.

PROBLEMS CAUSED BY DOGE CUTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) for 30 minutes.

(Mr. SHERMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, he got his start on a TV show called, "The Apprentice." We saw how entertaining it can be to fire people, but that is entertainment. That is not how you run an organization.

We have seen a performative effort to try to convince us that they are saving money. They are doing this in order to justify their plan for a \$3.5 trillion tax cut for hedge fund managers, multinational corporations and billionaires, but they are really not saving anything.

Then, yesterday, we passed a budget resolution, and all my Republican colleagues are on Twitter, X, whatever they want to call it, saying that that resolution contains statutory language to say no tax on tips, no tax on overtime, no tax on Social Security.

Well, what did Elon Musk have to say about that or what did his organization have to say?

They organized the readers content comments to correct falsehoods that people put in their tweets, and every single time a Republican went up and said that that resolution had eliminated taxes on tips, overtime, and Social Security, the Musk organization said: Readers added context. None of the policies mentioned in this post were included in the House budget resolution. It does nothing to exempt tips, Social Security, or overtime. We know they are not ultimately going to do

that because they need the \$4.5 trillion to provide tax breaks for hedge fund managers, multinational corporations, and billionaires.

Now, government is frustrating. It frustrates me often. It needs to be improved. You know what is also frustrating sometimes? My computer is on the blink a little bit, and I just want to take a hammer and hit it up the side. That makes me feel good, but it doesn't actually make the device work any better.

There are several techniques being used by the Federal Government that may make us feel good but don't make it work any better. You see, you can fire people—and they are firing just about everybody in the government with less than 2 years of government service, the probationary employees. That destroys our future. The people hired in 2024 are those that we are going to need in 2034.

The Dodgers are a pretty well-run organization. I think better run than government. Imagine if the Dodgers were going to fire all the players who had joined in the last 2 years, just eliminate everybody in single A and double A ball, I would say they would be worse than the White Sox. You can fire people.

You can also do the buyouts. They offered everybody in government a buyout. Who took the buyout? The people who could easily get another job elsewhere because they have very high capacity and the people who are going to retire in the next year or two anyway, so why not get 8 months free vacation.

Then they have the hiring freeze. Imagine if the Dodgers stopped signing new talent, where would they be in the 2030s?

You can also stop all research, and I will get to an example of that, and then you argue, well, hey—in 2026, they can say: Hey, we saved all this money, and the research wouldn't have benefited you by 2026. However, who is going to be dying from cancer and other diseases in the 2030s because of the research they are stopping now?

Then they can do an oopsy-daisy and say: Oh, we stopped the research, and we started it again. No, no, no, no, you stopped the research. All those little white rats are dead. You can't start again. You have to start the research over.

You can stop maintenance, and I will get to an example of that. It saves you money unless you actually want things to work well.

Again and again, we are told that there is just a government mulligan, let's just do it over.

Oopsy-daisy is not the way to run a multitricillion-dollar organization.

We are told that there is \$50 million for condoms and \$100 million for condoms in Gaza, and then they said, never mind, we got it wrong. We made a mistake. Oopsy-daisy.

They decided to offer all of the air traffic controllers 8 months free pay

for quitting, and then they say, oopsy-daisy. Then today Elon Musk tweets: There is a shortage of top-notch air traffic controllers. If you have retired but are open to returning to work, please consider doing so. He just gave them 8 months' pay to stay home. Now he hopes they are going to come back. No, the fishing is good, the 8 months' pay is guaranteed.

However, it is even worse. You see, not only did they give buyouts to the air traffic controllers, but they have fired the navigational aid maintenance personnel. Those air traffic controllers are going to be looking at empty screens, and those folks remain fired. What could go wrong?

□ 1345

They also stopped our efforts against Ebola. Some of the charities were barely getting by. They have gone bankrupt. They pulled their people out of Africa. Then he says: Oopsy-daisy, we are going to start that again.

What a way to run a government. There are people who are going to get Ebola as a result of this oopsy-daisy mistake, and that is another opportunity for Ebola inside a human being to mutate a little bit and then be a more pathogenic Ebola when it comes here.

Finally, they fired 300 people who were in charge of security of our nuclear weapons. Oopsy-daisy, what could have gone wrong? Keep in mind, if somebody is fired and then hired back or told they are going to be fired but then not fired—if you say, oh, no harm, no foul, oopsy-daisy—once that happens to a person, their resume is on LinkedIn. They are looking for a new job.

Nobody wants to stay with an employer, if they have other opportunities, if that employer is teasing them about firing them or, worse yet, actually fired them and got them back. Some of our best people will be leaving in the weeks to come, even if they hire them back.

There is real waste, fraud, and abuse in government. This is an example. Mr. Speaker, \$200 million of our taxpayer money is being spent on advertisements praising Donald Trump. How do they justify this? They aim these at their own base, to tell their own base: Hey, Donald Trump is great. Here is a commercial to tell us that.

They claim that these ads are aimed at undocumented immigrants and that somehow, by watching a 30-second ad, the immigrants are going to say: Oopsy-daisy, I made a mistake. Venezuela really is better than California.

I don't think so. There is nothing that can be put in a 30-second ad that is going to cause somebody who is here to decide they want to be back there. These are people who walked here from Venezuela. They went through the Darien Gap. They dealt with the forest. They dealt with the snakes. They dealt with the predators. They dealt with the drug dealers.

They came into our country at great personal risk. They are going to see a 30-second ad praising Donald Trump and decide to walk back or even fly back? What a stupid excuse that is for the obvious election interference of spending \$200 million of taxpayer money on ads praising Donald Trump.

Let's look at what is happening at the VA. They fired 2,000 people there. They are still hiring, but they have fired 2,000 people there. They have a nursing shortage in this country. The nurses they have fired are going to find jobs elsewhere very quickly, and they are not going to get them back.

The VA has stopped its clinical trials on cancer. Even people who are not veterans may be dying next decade because of the research that is not being done this decade. They are canceling operations. They are increasing the wait times at the VA. They have fired the suicide crisis line counselors.

There is veterans' blood on the hands of a man who never served his country. That is right. Elon Musk never served in the South African Army.

My district includes the Pacific Palisades. I thank so many of my colleagues for their expressions of sympathy. I have had a chance to work, as I always do, with my constituents dealing with government. It is sometimes frustrating. There are short deadlines imposed on people who have fled their homes and form letters that are confusing as hell and make people think they are not eligible.

How do we make it all worse? Fly to my district, as the President did, and announce the elimination of FEMA entirely, while I have FEMA workers working 12 hours a day with my constituents, trying to solve problems. Offer the FEMA workers, including the temporary workers, a buyout. In any disaster we go in, we have to hire temporary workers. They may only have a 3-month or 4-month job, but they are offered 8 months of pay to stay home. What a way to deal with a disaster.

Then the President says he wants to impose conditions on the aid. They want to abolish the California Coastal Commission which takes steps to prevent billionaires with beachfront property to not wall off the beach and prevent anybody else from getting in the sand. I can see why Donald Trump would identify with those billionaires. That is the condition he wants to impose?

I voted for aid for hurricane victims in Louisiana, and it never occurred to me to turn to a victim after a hurricane in Louisiana and tell them to stay on their cousin's couch and no Federal aid until their State changes its abortion laws.

Now is not the time to take hostage fire victims or hurricane victims in an effort to try to force a State government to take an action that this or that Member of Congress or this or that President wants them to take.

I want to assure the country we are going to build back better. We are

going to make sure that the Palisades does not burn again. We have a very strict fire building code that is applicable to all new construction in the Palisades and other fire-prone areas.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 17 minutes remaining.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, my party has put confidence in me and made me the chief Democrat dealing with the Subcommittee on Capital Markets. Our SEC oversees our capital markets which are the nerve center of global capitalism. Virtually all the most powerful companies in America and really the world focus on one goal, and that is to increase the value of their companies' stock on our capital markets.

Our capital markets are the envy of the world. The securities traded there are worth over \$100 trillion. It is fragile. It is delicate. It is the nerve center of global capitalism. Why don't we just let big balls take a whack at it? What could go wrong?

Whether it is crime in the streets or crime in the suites, we should not defund the police. We don't defund the men and women in blue, and we don't defund the Securities and Exchange Commission that oversees the stock and bond markets.

The SEC has a budget of \$2 billion. It secured over \$3.2 billion in fines, in effect, to those on Wall Street that did the wrong thing. It more than paid for itself and—no, that was \$3.2 billion that went back to investors, \$8.2 billion in fines. The Federal Government made four times its money on the SEC.

There are those at DOGE that want to, in effect, abolish the SEC and get the same kind of securities regulation on Wall Street that they have in Botswana or Kazakhstan—that is to say, no regulations at all—and see what happens.

Two years from now we will have to see. Did the SEC under the Trump administration secure \$8.2 billion paid to the Federal Government or \$3.2 billion returned to investors? If not, it will not be because there is no crime in the suites, that there is no crooks on Wall Street. It will not be because the wolves of Wall Street have become lambs. It will be because they defunded the police of Wall Street.

OUR RELATIONSHIP WITH CHINA

Mr. Speaker, a lot of attention is being spent here in Congress on China. With 28 years of experience on the Foreign Affairs Committee, I would like to address that issue. The big part of the problem started when this Congress voted to give most favored nation status to China. That was at the beginning of this century. We were told it would only increase our trade deficit by a billion dollars a year. That prediction was off by 4,000 percent.

The vast majority of Democrats voted "no" on that bill, which was the action which made China a worldwide

economic superpower. It got China into the international trading organizations and opened up access to our markets. We voted "no" when a Democratic President was twisting our arms to vote "yes." It was our proudest moment. I hope my Republican colleagues will have a proud moment when they stand up to a President of their own party.

Unfortunately, Republican votes and a few Democratic votes passed that. We now have our markets wide open to China. Their markets aren't particularly open to us, and we have huge trade deficits. Those trade deficits with China were \$150 billion higher under the Trump administration than they were under the Biden administration. They were particularly high in the partial Trump administration before COVID. It wasn't a COVID thing. Trump's policy is to yell loudly and accomplish nothing when it comes to dealing with our trade deficits with China.

Trump talks about other countries eating our lunch. Under his first administration, China ate our lunch, our dinner, our dessert, and our snacks. Americans are investing in Chinese stocks, and the question I would ask at hearing after hearing is: Can anybody give me a reason why we should use our tax system and lose our tax dollars to incentivize Americans buying Chinese stocks? And not a single member can give a reason. Not a single witness can give a reason why we should do that.

We forgo hundreds of millions or billions of dollars in taxes on the gains people earn on investing in Chinese stocks. We encourage them to invest in the Chinese economy with our tax dollars. Only one Republican has stepped forward and cosponsored my legislation to eliminate the capital gains allowance, the tax incentive for investing in Chinese stocks.

Why is that? The billionaire class wants subsidies for every investment they make, even when they are building the Chinese economy or the Russian economy or the Iranian economy. It is time to stand up to the billionaire class. China cannot be confronted if people are not willing to do so.

We also need to take steps so that Chinese stocks are not included in index funds and so that every company that reports to the SEC informs its shareholders of what risk they have due to their dependence on China and what they are doing about it so that every private company is derisking from China and doing everything they can. Then, God forbid, if China wants to end the trade relationship or, God forbid, China invades Taiwan, these companies have minimized the risk that our economy faces.

One area where we need to be particularly strong is in those islands in the Pacific between the United States and China. My father fought in the Pacific. He landed the boats on island shores. We need to maintain our influence in places like the Solomon Islands

and the Cook Islands. Solomon Islands are a place where thousands and thousands of American Marines died and many in the Navy, as well.

What have we done? We have eliminated our aid program. These countries are very small. These islands are small. The aid programs are small. Yet, they have a tremendous impact on influence in these strategic islands. We eliminated \$21 million for the Solomon Islands. We eliminated \$95,000 for the Cook Islands.

□ 1400

Is this how we confront China, or is this how we have performative savings?

Now, we need to confront China. One way we also need to confront China is in international lending and the credit rating agencies, the bond rating agencies that rate the creditworthiness of countries. We need to tell those who rate the other countries' creditworthiness that if they don't repay a phony debt to China, a debt trap debt to China, that should not be counted against them.

What do I mean? When China makes a loan to Sri Lanka, that they know Sri Lanka is not going to be able to pay for that project. They put in there: Oh, if you don't pay, we get to control your port. Sri Lanka should be encouraged: Don't give your port to China. Give your middle finger to China, and you will be able to borrow from American banks and European banks and international lending associations.

We should never allow a credit rating agency under our control to ding a country that is subject to this kind of blackmail from China.

FOREIGN AID IS A GOOD THING

Mr. Speaker. This brings up the issue of foreign aid in general.

If you poll Americans, they will say we are spending too much on foreign aid. Then you ask them how much of our budget is going to foreign aid. They say 25 percent of our American budget is going to foreign aid, and it ought to be less. Then you ask them what percentage should we be spending on foreign aid, and they say 10 percent.

Well, guess what. We are spending way less than 1 percent of our budget on foreign aid. We are spending way less than the American people think we are spending. We are spending less than they want to spend, but they want it cut because they think it is over 30 times what it actually is. That is why Ronald Reagan recognized the importance of our foreign aid program.

Now, I have been in Congress for a long time, and I remember when Congress confronted the executive branch. It wasn't just Democrats against Republicans. It was all of us against the executive branch. There are times when both sides of the aisle are going to need to do that.

There are some criticisms that are valid against our foreign aid and State Department budget. The State Department is doing something that is too woke for me but is supported by Elon

Musk. That is when they have in their budget spending \$400 million to replace the perfectly good armored cars that the State Department has now, armored vehicles designed to make sure that our diplomats are safe in dangerous places. We have perfectly good armored cars, but there is a proposal that the State Department spend \$400 million on new zero-greenhouse-gas-emitting armored cars. That is pretty damn woke. You would expect DOGE to have crossed that out, but they won't because the explicit statement is that this is \$400 million for Tesla Cybertruck armored cars. You know Elon ain't cutting that.

You know what they did to fool us because they think we are stupid? They changed the document a little bit. They took out the word "Tesla." Now, the State Department is going to spend \$400 million on armored, U.S.-made Cybertrucks. Do they really think those aren't going to be Tesla? Is there somebody else who makes armored Cybertrucks in the United States? That money is going to reduce the greenhouse gases of our armored vehicles, and it is going to Elon Musk.

There are a lot of things that are said about our foreign aid budget that are completely false. Elon Musk already has admitted that his statement that \$50 million was going to condoms for Gaza was just a total mistake. Oopsy-daisy. He apologized. It is okay, he thinks, for DOGE to make a mistake, but if he can find even a single dollar of misspent money in any other agency, he says that is a reason to abolish the whole agency and fire all the employees.

Well, that \$50 million was going for anti-AIDS programs in Africa, and some of it was going for condoms. That is one of the ways you try to prevent the transmission of AIDS.

Now, why are these foreign aid programs in the interest of America? First, you might think that we have a moral responsibility as the richest country in the world to do something for the poorest countries, but let's put that aside. If we don't provide foreign aid, China steps in, our influence is declined, and China's influence increases.

If we don't provide aid to the very poorest people there, that gives them a strong incentive to try to come here. You can try to stop them with a wall, but he had 4 years to build a wall and didn't build a wall.

The best way to reduce irregular migration to America is to eliminate the reason that people are so desperate to come here.

Finally, and most importantly, our aid deals with diseases. Musk already said oopsy-daisy, he didn't mean to cut the program to fight Ebola in Africa. He tries to restore it. Of course, he has already done so much damage to it, wasted so much money, who knows what. That is more people getting Ebola in Africa, more chances for the disease to mutate and then come here.

He is fine with cutting our actions against HIV/AIDS. Same issue. That

disease mutates in every human it infects. One out of a thousand, one out of a million of those mutations make the disease more capable of surviving the drugs that we have, make it more communicable, and make it more powerful when it comes back here. A lot of Americans will be dying of AIDS next decade because of what we are not doing in Africa this decade.

Then they try to point to some other programs that are wasting money, like \$6 million to help Egypt encourage tourism. I have Republican colleagues who think that USAID is aid that must be food for people who are hungry right now and about to die of starvation. They don't know that USAID stands for U.S. Agency for International Development. The goal is not just to feed people who are hungry now, not just give a man a fish, not just give a woman a fish, but to teach them how to fish.

That is why an Agency for International Development would help Egypt develop its economy. You know what Egypt has? They have got a lot of sand. That doesn't help them too much. They have got pyramids. If they can develop their tourist industry, which is a big chunk of their economy, they won't need our food aid because they will have money of their own. It is a good program, \$6 million to help them get more tourists.

You know who started that program? Donald Trump in his first term. Yes, they made a big deal of cutting a wasteful program that Donald Trump started.

Then we are told that there is a circumcision program. There is a circumcision program, voluntary, providing this very inexpensive operation. Why? Because you reduce by 60 percent of risk of female-to-male transmission of AIDS. It is the single cheapest thing you can do to reduce AIDS. Then you make a joke out of it. Yes, you can make a joke, but it is not a joke when more people die of AIDS in Africa and more AIDS mutates in Africa because you had a funny joke.

The Ebola cut was a mistake. Musk admits it. Oopsy-daisy. The cutting efforts to deal with HIV/AIDS in Africa, also a mistake.

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

IN MEMORY OF PE KHA LAU

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is one other cut they made, and that is they cut oxygen in a clinic for people who have fled the terrible deaths in Burma/Myanmar. As a result, a 71-year-old woman, Pe Kha Lau, died without her oxygen.

I ask that this House not only reflect on the other 10,000 people in that refugee camp who are without medical care, but I ask that we adjourn in silence in the memory of Pe Kha Lau

who died at the hands of Elon Musk and DOGE.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 3, 2025, at noon for morning-hour debate.

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. MASSIE (for himself, Ms. BOEBERT, Mr. CLYDE, Mr. COLLINS, Ms. GREENE of Georgia, Ms. HAGEMAN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. PERRY, Mr. ROY, Mrs. SPARTZ, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. GILL of Texas):

H.R. 1643. A bill to reduce, from 21 years of age to 18 years of age, the minimum age at which a person may obtain a handgun from a Federal firearms licensee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. UNDERWOOD (for herself, Mr. MOULTON, Mrs. HAYES, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 1644. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to eliminate copayments by the Department of Veterans Affairs for medicines relating to preventive health services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. UNDERWOOD (for herself, Ms. MCCLELLAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. MULLIN, Ms. STANSBURY, Ms. JACOBS, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BROWN, Ms. MORRISON, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 1645. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the continued implementation of the Climate and Health program by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. UNDERWOOD:

H.R. 1646. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require a lactation space in each medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. UNDERWOOD (for herself, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. NORTON, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, and Ms. ANSARI):

H.R. 1647. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, to implement the Climate Ready Tribes Initiative; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ALFORD (for himself, Mr. PANNETTA, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. GRAVES, Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. VASQUEZ, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Mr. FEENSTRA, Mr. FINSTAD, and Mr. MOORE of Alabama):

H.R. 1648. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to amend certain regulations to clarify that livestock auction owners may have an interest in small meatpacking businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ALLEN:

H.R. 1649. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to im-

prove mental health services for students, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Mr. ARRINGTON (for himself, Ms. LEE of Nevada, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. SCHNEIDER, and Mr. PANNETTA):

H.R. 1650. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the exemption for telehealth services from certain high deductible health plan rules; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BALDERSON (for himself, Mr. PALMER, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. LATTA, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. RULLI, Mr. LANGWORTHY, and Mr. ZINKE):

H.R. 1651. A bill to nullify the final rule issued by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "New Source Performance Standards for Greenhouse Gas Emissions From New, Modified, and Reconstructed Fossil Fuel-Fired Electric Generating Units; Emission Guidelines for Greenhouse Gas Emissions From Existing Fossil Fuel-Fired Electric Generating Units; and Repeal of the Affordable Clean Energy Rule"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 1652. A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to clarify standards for UDAAP enforcement actions brought by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BARR (for himself, Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, and Mr. MOSKOWITZ):

H.R. 1653. A bill to reform the civil investigative demand process of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BEAN of Florida:

H.R. 1654. A bill to rescind unobligated COVID-19 relief funds and certain infrastructure funds to offset the cost of the supplemental foreign assistance made available for fiscal year 2024, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Appropriations, and Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. BENTZ:

H.R. 1655. A bill to provide that construction, rebuilding, or hardening of communications facilities following a major disaster or an emergency related to a wildfire is not subject to requirements to prepare certain environmental or historical preservation reviews; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. BERGMAN (for himself, Mr. CORREA, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. McDOWELL, Mr. HARRIGAN, and Mr. ALFORD):

H.R. 1656. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to permit certain fee agreements between claimants and agents or attorneys for the preparations, presentation, or prosecution of initial claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BEYER (for himself, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. TONKO, Mr. CALVERT,

Ms. BARRAGAN, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. TITUS, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. SUBRAMANYAM, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. STANTON, Ms. SCHOLTEN, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. STANSBURY, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. CASTEN, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. MULLIN, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. MRVAN, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. GARCIA of California, Mr. CORREA, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Ms. CHU, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. AMO, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. BYNUM, Ms. SALINAS, Ms. ROSS, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Ms. MENG, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Ms. SCHRIER):

H.R. 1657. A bill to substantially restrict the use of animal testing for cosmetics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. BONAMICI (for herself, Ms. JAYAPAL, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 1658. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to address certain issues relating to the extension of consumer credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BOST (for himself, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. MRVAN, Mrs. KIM, Mr. STEEL, Mr. NEHLS, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. MEUSER, Ms. SCHOLTEN, Mr. SWALWELL, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. MANN, Mr. GUEST, Ms. TITUS, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Mr. YAKYM, Mr. VAN ORDEN, Mr. FINSTAD, Mr. MAGAZINER, Mr. HURD of Colorado, Mrs. HOUCHIN, Ms. ROSS, and Mr. CUELLAR):

H.R. 1659. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to establish a competitive grant program for projects for commercial motor vehicle parking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. BROWNLEY (for herself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MULLIN, Ms. CHU, Ms. STANSBURY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PANNETTA, Ms. ROSS, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. THANEDAR, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. SANCHEZ, Ms. BARRAGAN, and Mr. CARBAJAL):

H.R. 1660. A bill to award grants to States to establish or improve, and carry out, Seal of Biliteracy programs to recognize high-level student proficiency in speaking, reading, and writing in both English and a second language, and early language programs; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Mr. BUCHANAN (for himself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. NEHLS, Mr. BEYER, Mr. CISCOMANI, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. KIM, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. STEUBE, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. BARR, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. CAREY, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. THANEDAR, Mr. LALOTA, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Ms. MENG, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. POCAN, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. MCGARVEY, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. STANSBURY, Ms. BUDZINSKI, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. STANTON, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. MRVAN, Ms. CHU, Ms. SALINAS, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. COHEN, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. CARSON, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. PEREZ, Ms. OMAR, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. MULLIN,

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. GARCIA of California, Mr. SORENSON, Mr. CORREA, Mr. LIEU, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mr. FROST, Ms. TITUS, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. PETERS, Ms. HOYLE of Oregon, Mr. LAWLER, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. TONKO, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mrs. SYKES, Mr. NEAL, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. HARIDOPOLOS, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. TLAIB, Mrs. FOUSHEE, Mr. AMO, Mr. LATIMER, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. SCHOLTEN, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. CROW, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Mr. MAGAZINER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. ROSS, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. KEAN):

H.R. 1661. A bill to amend the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018 to prohibit the slaughter of equines for human consumption; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. BUDZINSKI (for herself, Mr. CAREY, Ms. HOYLE of Oregon, and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY):

H.R. 1662. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow employers a credit against income tax for employees who participate in qualified apprenticeship programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 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. CALVERT (for himself, Mr. BOST, Mr. COLE, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. LAWLER, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. CISCOMANI):

H.R. 1663. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish in the Department of Veterans Affairs a Veterans Scam and Fraud Evasion Officer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. CAMMACK (for herself and Mr. SOTO):

H.R. 1664. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to take actions necessary and appropriate to promote the competitiveness of the United States related to the deployment, use, application, and competitiveness of blockchain technology or other distributed ledger technology, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. CAMMACK (for herself and Ms. MATSUI):

H.R. 1665. A bill to require the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture to establish online portals to accept, process, and dispose of certain Form 299s, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Agriculture, 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. CASTEN (for himself, Ms. LEE of Nevada, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MCGARVEY, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. TITUS, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. SCHRIER, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. BERA, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. KEATING, Mr. TRAN, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. WHITESIDES, Mr. THANEDAR, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia):

H.R. 1666. A bill to index the maximum value of Federal Pell Grants to inflation; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Ms. CHU (for herself and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 1667. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage for acupuncturist services 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. CLOUD (for himself, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. HARIDOPOLOS, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. ROSE, Ms. BOEBERT, and Mr. HARRIS of Maryland):

H.R. 1668. A bill to terminate the Shelter and Services Program of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. COHEN:

H.R. 1669. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the Stop, Observe, Ask, and Respond to Health and Wellness Training Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CONNOLLY (for himself, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ):

H.R. 1670. A bill to require Federal employee health benefit plans to include assisted reproductive treatment benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. DAVIDSON (for himself, Mr. NEHLS, Mr. MASSIE, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. FALLON):

H.R. 1671. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for a presumption of service-connection under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for certain diseases associated with the COVID-19 vaccine that become manifest during the one-year period following the receipt of the vaccine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. YAKYM, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. BEAN of Florida, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. ALLEN, Ms. VAN DUYN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. MOORE of Utah, and Mr. CRENSHAW):

H.R. 1672. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to protect access to genetically targeted technologies; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania (for herself, Mr. EVANS of Pennsylvania, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Mr. DELUZIO, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. MEUSER, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BRESNAHAN):

H.R. 1673. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 28 East Airy Street in Norristown, Pennsylvania, as the "Charles L. Blockson Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself, Ms. TITUS, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. MCGARVEY, Ms. NORTON, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mr. PAL-LONE, Ms. JACOBS, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. PINGREE, Mrs. MCIVER, Mr. NEAL, Mr. MRVAN, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. PETERSEN, Mr. MAGAZINER, Mr. POCAN, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. CARSON, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Ms. CHU, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. TONKO, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CASAR, Ms. MORRISON, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. FOUSHEE, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Mr. BERA, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. CASTEN, Ms. BROWN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCBRIDE, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. FIGURES, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. AMO, Mr. GARCIA of California, Ms. ROSS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. SUBRAMANYAM, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. DEXTER, Ms. SALINAS, Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. STANSBURY, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. BEYER, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. EVANS of Pennsylvania, Ms. SCHOLTEN, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. MENG, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. SOTO, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. THANEDAR, Ms. ANSARI, Mr. DELUZIO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. KEATING, Mr. IVEY, Mr. MOSKOWITZ, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. SCHRIER, and Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois):

H.R. 1674. A bill to regulate large capacity ammunition feeding devices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DESJARLAIS (for himself and Mr. ROSE):

H.R. 1675. A bill to amend the Horse Protection Act to provide increased protection for horses participating in shows, exhibitions, sales, and auctions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DONALDS (for himself and Mr. MOSKOWITZ):

H.R. 1676. A bill to amend the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act to require the Secretary of the Interior to approve the wildlife conservation and restoration program of a State within a certain period of time; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. DOWNING (for himself and Mr. ZINKE):

H.R. 1677. A bill to prohibit the importation of certain minerals from the Russian Federation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. ESCOBAR:

H.R. 1678. A bill to increase transparency, accountability, and community engagement within the Department of Homeland Security, to provide independent oversight of border security activities, to improve training for agents and officers of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. EVANS of Colorado (for himself and Ms. KELLY of Illinois):

H.R. 1679. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce, in coordination with the heads of other relevant Federal departments and agencies, to conduct an interagency review of and report to Congress on ways to increase the global competitiveness of the United States in attracting foreign direct investment; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. EVANS of Colorado (for himself, Mr. CRANK, Ms. BOEBERT, and Mr. HURD of Colorado):

H.R. 1680. A bill to amend the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 to expand the prohibition on State noncompliance with enforcement of the immigration laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVANS of Colorado (for himself and Ms. CRAIG):

H.R. 1681. A bill to require the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information to establish an interagency strike force to ensure that certain Federal land management agencies, including the organizational units of such agencies, prioritize the review of requests for communications use authorizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, and Agriculture, 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. EVANS of Colorado (for himself and Mr. PANETTA):

H.R. 1682. A bill to amend the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act to provide for lifetime National Parks and Federal Recreational Lands Passes for family members of members of the Armed Forces who lost their lives while serving their country; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. FISCHBACH:

H.R. 1683. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Health and Human Services from implementing, enforcing, or otherwise giving effect to a final rule regarding minimum staffing for nursing facilities, and to establish an advisory panel on the nursing home workforce; 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. FITZPATRICK (for himself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. BUCHANAN, Ms. SCHKOWSKY, Mr. CISCOMANI, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. FULCHER, Mrs. KIM, Mr. LAWLER,

Mr. NEAL, Mr. MAGAZINER, Mr. LALOTA, Ms. SALAZAR, Ms. STRICKLAND, Ms. NORTON, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. CAREY, Mr. BEYER, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mrs. MCBATH, Mrs. TRAHAN, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. BUDZINSKI, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCGARVEY, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. TITUS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. TONKO, Mr. MRVAN, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. CHU, Ms. PEREZ, Mr. BISHOP, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mr. STANTON, Mr. GARCIA of California, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Ms. MENG, Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. SCANLON, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. THANEDAR, Ms. BROWNLEY, Ms. MCCLELLAN, Mrs. SYKES, Ms. BROWN, Mr. CARSON, Mr. MOSKOWITZ, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. SALINAS, Ms. ROSS, Ms. OMAR, Mr. RYAN, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. CASE, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. STANSBURY, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. HOYLE of Oregon, Ms. MACE, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. POCAN, Ms. ELFRETH, Mr. GIMENEZ, Mr. HIMES, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Ms. JACOBS, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SORENSSEN, Mrs. FOUSHEE, Ms. SCHOLTEN, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. LIEU, Mr. SOTO, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. NADLER, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Mr. EVANS of Pennsylvania, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. NEHLS, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. TENNEY, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. PETTERSEN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. FRIEDMAN, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. CROW, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. GOODEN, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Ms. BALINT, Ms. ANSARI, Ms. DEXTER, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. BERA, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CASTEN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Mr. SWALWELL, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. VINDMAN, Mr. IVEY, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. LATIMER, Mr. DELUZIO, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. SMUCKER, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. SUBRAMANYAM, Mr. AMO, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. KEATING, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. HOYER, Mr. KEAN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Ms. PLASKETT):

H.R. 1684. A bill to amend the Horse Protection Act to designate additional unlawful acts under the Act, strengthen penalties for violations of the Act, improve Department of Agriculture enforcement of the Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself and Mr. PAPPAS):

H.R. 1685. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend increased dependency and indemnity compensation paid to surviving spouses of veterans who die from amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, regardless of how long the veterans had such disease prior to death; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FLOOD (for himself and Mr. TIMMONS):

H.R. 1686. A bill to prohibit the continuing availability of any portion of a Federal payment to the District of Columbia for a program of District of Columbia resident tuition support for a fiscal year which remains unobligated as of the end of the fiscal year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. FULCHER (for himself, Ms. MALOY, and Ms. BOEBERT):

H.R. 1687. A bill to amend the Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 to increase the frequency of lease sales, to require replacement sales, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GARCIA of California:

H.R. 1688. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to increase the accountability of the Office of Special Counsel in enforcing certain provisions of that title vigorously, consistently, and without regard to the political affiliation, career status, or personal characteristics of individuals subject to those provisions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. GILLEN (for herself, Mr. LAWLER, and Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK):

H.R. 1689. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to designate Haiti for temporary protected status; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. MOYLAN, and Ms. SALAZAR):

H.R. 1690. A bill to limit the use of funds for the production of films using assets of the Department of State under certain circumstances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 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. GROTHMAN (for himself and Mr. HARRIS of Maryland):

H.R. 1691. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow unreimbursed employee expenses to be taken into account as miscellaneous itemized deductions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUEST (for himself and Mr. THANEDAR):

H.R. 1692. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to enable secure and trustworthy technology through other transaction contracting authority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. HAGEMAN:

H.R. 1693. A bill to redesignate the National Historic Trails Interpretive Center in Casper, Wyoming, as the "Barbara L. Cubin National Historic Trails Interpretive Center"; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HARDER of California (for himself and Ms. KELLY of Illinois):

H.R. 1694. A bill to direct the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information to conduct a study and hold public meetings with respect to artificial intelligence systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HARRIGAN (for himself, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina):

H.R. 1695. A bill to provide for the crediting of funds received by the National Guard Bureau as reimbursement from States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HERNÁNDEZ (for himself and Mr. TORRES of New York):

H.R. 1696. A bill to amend the definition of extremely low-income families under the United States Housing Act of 1937; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HERNÁNDEZ:

H.R. 1697. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide equitable treatment for residents of Puerto Rico with respect to the refundable portion of the child tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana (for himself, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BABIN, Mr. SCHMIDT, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. GILL of Texas, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. HARRIS of Maryland, and Mr. MESSMER):

H.R. 1698. A bill to provide accountability for unlawful disclosures of firearm trace data in the Firearms Trace System database, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 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. HORSFORD (for himself, Ms. HOULAHAN, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. STRICKLAND, Ms. JACOBS, Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. TURNER of Ohio, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. GOODLANDER, and Ms. MCBRIDE):

H.R. 1699. 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. HOYLE of Oregon (for herself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. CASAR, Ms. CHU, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DELUZZO, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Ms. SALINAS, Ms. TLAIB, and Ms. TOKUDA):

H.R. 1700. A bill to enhance Social Security benefits and ensure the long-term solvency of the Social Security program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Workforce, and Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. HUIZENGA (for himself, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, and Mr. OLSZEWSKI):

H.R. 1701. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State to monitor efforts by the People's Republic of China to build or buy strategic foreign ports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself, Ms. LEE of Florida, Mr. NEHLS, and Mr. KILEY of California):

H.R. 1702. A bill to authorize additional district judges for the district courts and convert temporary judgeships; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. BUCHANAN):

H.R. 1703. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to clarify payment rules for manual wheelchairs under part B of 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 Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE (for herself, Mr. SOTO, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mrs. MCIVER, Mrs. BEATTY, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Ms. BROWN):

H.R. 1704. A bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to establish within the National Park Service the National Freedom Settlements Preservation Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. RILEY of New York, Mr. LAMALFA, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. BYNUM, Mr. MORAN, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. HARDER of California):

H.R. 1705. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a credit for investments in innovative agricultural technology; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KENNEDY of New York (for himself, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mr. LATIMER, Mr. LAWLER, Mr. MANNION, Mr. RILEY of New York, Ms. TENNEY, and Mr. TONKO):

H.R. 1706. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1200 William Street, Room 200, in Buffalo, New York, as the "William J. Donovan Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. KUSTOFF (for himself, Mr. COSTA, Mr. ALFORD, Mr. ROUZER, and Mr. CAREY):

H.R. 1707. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a tax credit to incentivize the purchase of American agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAHOOD (for himself, Ms. CRAIG, and Mrs. FISCHBACH):

H.R. 1708. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to adjust allowable direct and indirect costs for nursing and allied health education programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANDSMAN (for himself and Mrs. CAMMACK):

H.R. 1709. A bill to direct the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information to submit to Congress a report examining the cybersecurity of mobile service networks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LAWLER (for himself, Mr. MOSKOWITZ, Ms. TENNEY, and Mr. GOTTHEIMER):

H.R. 1710. A bill to impose sanctions with respect to the system of compensation of the Palestine Liberation Organization and the Palestinian Authority that supports acts of terrorism; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LEE of Florida (for herself, Mr. EVANS of Colorado, and Mr. PFLUGER):

H.R. 1711. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to direct the Under Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of Homeland Security to conduct an annual audit of the information sys-

tems and bulk data of the Office of Intelligence and Analysis of the Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. LICCARDO (for himself, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. THANEDAR, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. CARSON, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SOTO, Ms. ELFRETH, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. OLSZEWSKI, Mr. LIEU, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. TURNER of Texas):

H.R. 1712. A bill to amend chapter 131 of title 5, United States Code, with respect to prohibited financial transactions; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LUCAS:

H.R. 1713. 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; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and 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. LUTTRELL:

H.R. 1714. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to submit a report to Congress on crimes committed by individuals granted parole under the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. TONKO, Ms. MCCLELLAN, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. COHEN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CISNEROS, Ms. TITUS, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. ELFRETH, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. THANEDAR, Mr. GARCIA of California, Mr. KHANNA, and Ms. TOKUDA):

H.R. 1715. A bill to fully fund the Prevention and Public Health Fund and reaffirm the importance of prevention in the United States healthcare system; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MCCLAIN (for herself and Mr. SHERMAN):

H.R. 1716. A bill to deter Chinese aggression towards Taiwan by requiring the Secretary of the Treasury to publish a report on financial institutions and accounts connected to senior officials of the People's Republic of China, to restrict financial services for certain immediate family of such officials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, 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. MENENDEZ:

H.R. 1717. A bill to direct the Federal Communications Commission to establish a council to make recommendations on ways to increase the security, reliability, and interoperability of communications networks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MFUME (for himself, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HARRIS of Maryland, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. IVEY, Mr. OLSZEWSKI, Ms.

ELFRETH, Mrs. MCCLAIN DELANEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. CARSON, Ms. TLAI, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mrs. MCIVER, and Mr. FIELDS):

H.R. 1718. A bill to establish the Justice Thurgood Marshall National Historic Site in the State of Maryland and provide for its administration as an affiliated area of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MILLER of Ohio (for himself, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. FINSTAD, Ms. BUDZINSKI, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. MANN, Mr. BOST, Mr. BACON, Mr. FEENSTRA, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. ALFORD, Mr. SORENSON, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, and Mrs. FISCHBACH):

H.R. 1719. A bill to amend the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 with respect to the definition of biofuels and sustainable aviation fuel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia (for herself, Mr. GOLDEN of Maine, Ms. VAN DUYN, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Mr. BEAN of Florida, and Mr. MORELLE):

H.R. 1720. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend certain telehealth flexibilities with respect to hospice care under the Medicare program, and to establish a modifier for recertifications of hospice care eligibility conducted through telehealth; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS (for herself and Ms. SCHRIER):

H.R. 1721. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to conduct a study on the feasibility of manufacturing in the United States products for critical infrastructure sectors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS:

H.R. 1722. A bill to require an annual report of taxpayer-funded projects that are over budget and behind schedule; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MOOLENAAR (for himself, Mr. COLE, Mr. FULCHER, and Mr. LAMALFA):

H.R. 1723. A bill to clarify the rights of Indians and Indian Tribes on Indian lands under the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Mr. MORAN:

H.R. 1724. A bill to prohibit the use of funds supporting any activities within the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region of the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOULTON (for himself and Mr. CLYBURN):

H.R. 1725. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend to Black veterans of World War II, and surviving spouses and certain direct descendants of such veterans, eligibility for certain housing loans and educational assistance administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. NEGUSE (for himself, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. CORREA, Mr. BACON, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. FRY, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Ms. LEE of Florida, Mr. IVEY, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 1726. A bill to reauthorize the Project Safe Neighborhoods Grant Program Authorization Act of 2018, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEGUSE (for himself, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. FULCHER):

H.R. 1727. A bill to authorize additional district judgeships for the districts of Colorado and Idaho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEGUSE (for himself, Ms. PETERSEN, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. CROW):

H.R. 1728. A bill to provide for the designation of certain wilderness areas, recreation management areas, and conservation areas in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. NEGUSE:

H.R. 1729. A bill to amend the John D. Dingell, Jr. Conservation, Management, and Recreation Act to allow for additional entities to be eligible to complete the maintenance work on Bolts Ditch and the Bolts Ditch Headgate within the Holy Cross Wilderness, Colorado; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. OGLES:

H.R. 1730. A bill to prohibit any transactions using Alipay in the United States; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. PALMER (for himself and Mr. RYAN):

H.R. 1731. A bill to amend the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 to establish a uniform fee schedule applicable to the processing of forms for the consideration of applications for the placement of communications facilities on certain buildings and other property owned by the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PAPPAS (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Mr. GOLDEN of Maine, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. BACON, Mr. MCGARVEY, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. SYKES, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. CASAR, Mr. KEATING, Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK, Mr. PETERS, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. HOYLE of Oregon, Ms. TOKUDA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MCCLELLAN, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. SORENSON, Mr. MAGAZINER, Ms. SHERRILL, Ms. SALINAS, Mr. KUSTOFF, Ms. OMAR, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. DELUZIO, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. AMO, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. ROSS, Mr. GARCIA of California, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. COHEN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. STANTON, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. STRONG, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. TITUS, Ms. TENNEY, and Mr. GRIMALVA):

H.R. 1732. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to reinstate penalties for persons charging veterans unauthorized fees relating to claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. PEREZ (for herself, Mr. CISCOMANI, Mr. VASQUEZ, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio,

Mr. GOLDEN of Maine, and Ms. PETERSEN):

H.R. 1733. A bill to expand and modify the grant program of the Department of Veterans Affairs to provide innovative transportation options to veterans in highly rural areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. PETERSEN (for herself, Mr. FLOOD, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, and Mr. HARDER of California):

H.R. 1734. A bill to establish the Task Force on Artificial Intelligence in the Financial Services Sector to report to Congress on issues related to artificial intelligence in the financial services sector, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. PFLUGER (for himself, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, and Ms. SCHRIER):

H.R. 1735. A bill to amend title XIX of the Public Health Service Act to provide for prevention and early intervention services under the Block Grants for Community Mental Health Services program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PFLUGER (for himself, Mr. GUEST, and Mr. EVANS of Colorado):

H.R. 1736. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to conduct annual assessments on terrorism threats to the United States posed by terrorist organizations utilizing generative artificial intelligence applications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. PLASKETT (for herself and Mr. FULCHER):

H.R. 1737. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to submit to Congress a report containing an assessment of the value, cost, and feasibility of a trans-Atlantic submarine fiber optic cable connecting the contiguous United States, the United States Virgin Islands, Ghana, and Nigeria; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. QUIGLEY (for himself and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 1738. A bill to designate the area of Sumner Row between 16th Street Northwest and L Street Northwest in Washington, District of Columbia, as "Alexei Navalny Way"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ROY:

H.R. 1739. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for fiscal accountability, to require institutions of higher education to publish information regarding student success, to provide for school accountability for student loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER (for himself, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. PANETTA):

H.R. 1740. A bill to improve the procedures of the national instant criminal background check system in the case of firearm transfers by federally licensed firearms importers, manufacturers, and dealers before the completion of the related criminal background check, and to provide for annual reports on default firearm transfers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SELF:

H.R. 1741. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the online publication of the docket of the Board of Veterans' Appeals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. SHERRILL (for herself, Ms. HOULAHAN, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. CROW, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK, Ms. MCCLELLAN, Ms. TOKUDA, Ms. NORTON, Ms.

McCOLLUM, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. RYAN, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CARSON, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. SCANLON, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. BROWNLEY, Ms. ELFRETH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NADLER, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. GARCIA of California, Ms. SALINAS, Mr. SOTO, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. ANSARI, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. TRAN, Mr. SORENSON, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. TITUS, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Ms. MCBRIDE, Mr. DELUZIO, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. CROCKETT, Ms. BUDZINSKI, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. JACOBS, Ms. STRICKLAND, and Mr. PETERS):

H.R. 1742. A bill to establish leave policies of the Armed Forces for a member to seek an abortion; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska (for himself, Mr. HIMES, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. ARRINGTON):

H.R. 1743. A bill to provide the President with authority to enter into a comprehensive trade agreement with the United Kingdom, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. CUELLAR):

H.R. 1744. A bill to extend and authorize annual appropriations for the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom through fiscal year 2026; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington (for himself and Ms. SANCHEZ):

H.R. 1745. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose an excise tax on the failure of certain hedge funds owning excess single-family residences to dispose of such residences, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STANTON (for himself and Mr. HAMADEH of Arizona):

H.R. 1746. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements to the laws relating to the recognition of agents, attorneys, organizations and their representatives, and other individuals for the purposes of assisting in the preparation, presentation, and prosecution of claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 1747. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify the provisions that relate to family-sponsored immigrants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEUBE (for himself, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Ms. BOEBERT):

H.R. 1748. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to provide that aliens who are not qualified aliens are ineligible for certain assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 1749. A bill to permit employees of the House of Representatives who are authorized to possess certain weapons in the District of Columbia to bring such weapons into House Office Buildings for secure storage, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. STRICKLAND:

H.R. 1750. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for greater investments in research on rare diseases and conditions disproportionately affecting minority populations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. SYKES (for herself and Mr. CAREY):

H.R. 1751. A bill to criminalize stalking using an unauthorized geotracking device; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. TENNEY (for herself, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. CAREY, and Mr. PANETTA):

H.R. 1752. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the energy credit for qualified fuel cell property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. TENNEY (for herself and Ms. DELBENE):

H.R. 1753. A bill to provide tax incentives that support local media; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIFFANY (for himself, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. CLINE, and Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas):

H.R. 1754. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the energy credit shall not apply to certain types of energy production on agricultural land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIMMONS (for himself, Ms. GREENE of Georgia, and Mr. FALLON):

H.R. 1755. A bill to require an income verification platform for certain Federal benefit funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. TLAIB (for herself, Ms. NORTON, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. OMAR, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. TONKO):

H.R. 1756. A bill to prohibit certain defense industry stock trading and ownership by Members of Congress and spouses of Members of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, Ways and Means, and Agriculture, 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. VALADAO (for himself and Ms. LEE of Nevada):

H.R. 1757. A bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to provide that the supplemental security income benefits of adults with intellectual or developmental disabilities shall not be reduced by reason of marriage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN DREW (for himself and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H.R. 1758. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income certain federally subsidized loan repayments for dental school faculty; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. WATERS (for herself, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. BYNUM, Mr. CARSON, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. MCCLELLAN, Mrs. MCIVER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OLSZEWSKI, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SEWELL, Ms. STANSBURY, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. THANEDAR, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Ms. TLAIB):

H.R. 1759. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to allow borrowers of Parent PLUS loans or loans under section 428B made on behalf of a dependent student to repay such loans pursuant to an income-contingent repayment plan or income-based repayment plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Mr. WEBER of Texas:

H.R. 1760. A bill to require the Comptroller General of the United States to submit reports to Congress on theft of mail and United States Postal Service property and other civil or criminal violations relating to the Postal Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mr. NORMAN, and Mr. ISSA):

H.R. 1761. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to require the Secretary of the Treasury to print \$250 Federal reserve notes featuring a portrait of Donald J. Trump, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ZINKE (for himself, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Ms. LETLOW, Mr. CRANE, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. GOODEN, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. HURD of Colorado, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. MOYLAN, Mr. PFLUGER, and Mr. BAUMGARTNER):

H.R. 1762. A bill to amend the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 to provide that the President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, the Chief of the Forest Service; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BEYER (for himself, Ms. MCCLELLAN, Mr. SUBRAMANYAM, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. VINDMAN, and Ms. NORTON):

H.J. Res. 63. A joint resolution redesignating the Robert E. Lee Memorial as the "Arlington House National Historic Site"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FLOOD (for himself, Mr. MEUSER, Mrs. KIM, Mr. DOWNING, and Mr. STEIL):

H.J. Res. 64. A joint resolution disapproving the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to "Defining Larger Participants of a Market for General-Use Digital Consumer Payment Applications"; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GROTHMAN (for himself, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. STEUBE):

H.J. Res. 65. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Internal Revenue Service relating to Rules for Supervisory Approval of Penalties; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. EVANS of Pennsylvania, Ms. SALAZAR, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Mr. DELUZIO, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. HOULAHAN, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Mr. MACKENZIE, and Mr. SMUCKER):

H. Con. Res. 16. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of the Congress in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, on Thursday, July 2, 2026, in honor of the semiquincentennial of the Declaration of Independence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas (for himself, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. CASAR, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. OMAR, Ms. TITUS, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. CARSON, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JACOBS, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. TLAIB):

H. Res. 168. A resolution reaffirming the United States commitment to respecting the sovereignty of Mexico and condemning calls for military action in Mexico without Mexico's consent and congressional authorization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ESPAILLAT:

H. Res. 169. A resolution recognizing the Dominican community's presence and contributions to Washington Heights and Inwood; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. EVANS of Pennsylvania (for himself, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. IVEY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Ms. BYNUM, and Mr. CARSON):

H. Res. 170. A resolution expressing support for Americas Black workers and affirming the need to pass legislation to reduce inequalities and discrimination in the workforce; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Mr. GOLDMAN of New York:

H. Res. 171. A resolution reaffirming the Twenty-second Amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Ms. NORTON):

H. Res. 172. A resolution raising awareness for the sarcoma cancer chordoma; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE (for herself, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mrs. MCIVER, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN):

H. Res. 173. A resolution restoring the promise of freedom: honoring, preserving, and investing in Freedmen's Settlements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OGLES (for himself and Mr. GILL of Texas):

H. Res. 174. A resolution impeaching Amir Hatem Mahdy Ali, a judge of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, for high crimes and misdemeanors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BACON, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Ms. CHU, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr.

CONNOLLY, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. FOSTER, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. MCBRIDE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. MCIVER, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MULLIN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. POCAN, Ms. STANSBURY, Ms. SEWELL, Ms. TITUS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. TONKO):

H. Res. 175. A resolution recognizing the seriousness of polycystic ovary syndrome (PCOS) and expressing support for the designation of the month of September as "PCOS Awareness Month"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. TENNEY (for herself, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SALAZAR, Ms. TITUS, Mr. LAWLER, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. COSTA, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. YAKYM, Mr. LIEU, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Ms. ROSS, Mr. KEAN, Mr. STEUBE, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H. Res. 176. A resolution urging the European Union to expeditiously designate the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps as a terrorist organization under Common Position 931, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. HERNÁNDEZ introduced a bill (H.R. 1763) for the relief of Diego Montoya Bedoya; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on 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.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. MASSIE:

H.R. 1643.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 and the 2nd Amendment

By Ms. UNDERWOOD:

H.R. 1644.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. UNDERWOOD:

H.R. 1645.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of congress to make rules for the common defense and general welfare of the United States as enumerated in Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. UNDERWOOD:

H.R. 1646.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. UNDERWOOD:

H.R. 1647.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. ALFORD:

H.R. 1648.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. ALLEN:

H.R. 1649.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18, Section 8, Article 1 of the Constitution

By Mr. ARRINGTON:

H.R. 1650.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. BALDERSON:

H.R. 1651.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 1652.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 1653.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BEAN of Florida:

H.R. 1654.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Necessary and Proper Clause of Article 1 Section 8

The Congress shall have the power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution . . .

By Mr. BENTZ:

H.R. 1655.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. BERGMAN:

H.R. 1656.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BEYER:

H.R. 1657.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

article 1 section 8

By Ms. BONAMICI:

H.R. 1658.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. BOST:

H.R. 1659.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. BROWNLEY:

H.R. 1660.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 1661.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. BUDZINSKI:

H.R. 1662.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 1663.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Mrs. CAMMACK:

H.R. 1664.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mrs. CAMMACK:

H.R. 1665.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution

By Mr. CASTEN:

H.R. 1666.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution

By Ms. CHU:

H.R. 1667.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. CLOUD:

H.R. 1668.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 Clause 18

"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."

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 1669.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 1670.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H.R. 1671.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

"Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have 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."

By Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina:

H.R. 1672.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 1673.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 1674.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 allows Congress to make all laws "which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution" any "other" powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States.

By Mr. DESJARLAIS:

H.R. 1675.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. DONALDS:

H.R. 1676.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, Sec. 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 1677.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. ESCOBAR:

H.R. 1678.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

THE U.S. CONSTITUTION

ARTICLE I, SECTION 8: POWERS OF CONGRESS

CLAUSE 18

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.

By Mr. EVANS of Colorado:

H.R. 1679.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 3

By Mr. EVANS of Colorado:

H.R. 1680.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. EVANS of Colorado:

H.R. 1681.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17

By Mr. EVANS of Colorado:

H.R. 1682.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mrs. FISCHBACH:

H.R. 1683.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art I, Sec 8

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 1684.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 1685.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 1686.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. FULCHER:

H.R. 1687.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 allows Congress to make all laws "which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution" any of Congress' enumerated powers, including Congress's power over appropriations.

By Mr. GARCIA of California:

H.R. 1688.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. GILLEN:

H.R. 1689.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. GREEN of Tennessee:

H.R. 1690.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. GROTHMAN:

H.R. 1691.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

By Mr. GUEST:

H.R. 1692.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. HAGEMAN:

H.R. 1693.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 7

By Mr. HARDER of California:

H.R. 1694.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. HARRIGAN:

H.R. 1695.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. HERNÁNDEZ:

H.R. 1696.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. HERNÁNDEZ:

H.R. 1697.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana:

H.R. 1698.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: 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.

By Mr. HORSFORD:

H.R. 1699.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the Constitution

By Ms. HOYLE of Oregon:

H.R. 1700.

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 of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. HUIZENGA:

H.R. 1701.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, the Necessary and Proper Clause

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 1702.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18 allows Congress to make all laws "which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution" any "other" powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States.

*Note: According to the Supreme Court, the Necessary and Proper Clause gives Congress the "power to make laws for carrying into execution all the Judgments which the judicial department has power to pronounce" (Wayman v. Southard, 10 Wheat 1, 22 (1825)), and, thereby, Congress has "undoubted power to regulate the practice and procedure of federal courts." See Sibbach v. Wilson & Co., 312 U.S. 1, 9 (1941).

By Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 1703.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE:

H.R. 1704.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is introduced pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under the General Welfare Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 1), the Commerce Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 3), and the Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 18). Further, this statement of constitutional authority is made for the sole purpose of compliance with clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives and shall have no bearing on judicial review of the accompanying bill.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 1705.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. KENNEDY of New York:

H.R. 1706.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3, Section 8, Article 1 of the Constitution

By Mr. KUSTOFF:

H.R. 1707.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, the Necessary and Proper Clause. Congress shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing powers and all Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereof.

By Mr. LAHOOD:

H.R. 1708.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: Congress has the power "to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any Department of Officer thereof."

By Mr. LANDSMAN:

H.R. 1709.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. LAWLER:

H.R. 1710.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. LEE of Florida:

H.R. 1711.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. LICCARDI:

H.R. 1712.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of section 8 of article I and clause 8 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. LUCAS:

H.R. 1713.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. LUTTRELL:

H.R. 1714.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8. To make 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.

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 1715.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mrs. MCCLAIN:

H.R. 1716.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. MENENDEZ:

H.R. 1717.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3

By Mr. MFUME:

H.R. 1718.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 3 of Article IV of the Constitution, which states that "Congress shall have the Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States."

By Mr. MILLER of Ohio:

H.R. 1719.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

"The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution."

By Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia:

H.R. 1720.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS:

H.R. 1721.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS:

H.R. 1722.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. MOOLENAAR:

H.R. 1723.

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;

By Mr. MORAN:

H.R. 1724.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. MOULTON:

H.R. 1725.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 12, 13, 14, and 18 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution. To raise and support Armies . . . To provide and maintain a Navy; To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces; 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.

By Mr. NEGUSE:

H.R. 1726.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. NEGUSE:

H.R. 1727.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. NEGUSE:

H.R. 1728.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. NEGUSE:

H.R. 1729.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. OGLES:

H.R. 1730.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII of the United States Constitution

By Mr. PALMER:

H.R. 1731.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. PAPPAS:

H.R. 1732.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution states that "Congress shall have the authority to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Ms. PEREZ:

H.R. 1733.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. PETTERSEN:

H.R. 1734.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. PFLUGER:

H.R. 1735.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. PFLUGER:

H.R. 1736.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Ms. PLASKETT:

H.R. 1737.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H.R. 1738.

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.

By Mr. ROY:

H.R. 1739.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. SCHNEIDER:

H.R. 1740.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. SELF:

H.R. 1741.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8
By Ms. SHERRILL:
H.R. 1742.
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.

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska:
H.R. 1743.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, clause 1, and Article I, Section 8, clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:
H.R. 1744.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
Mr. SMITH of Washington:
H.R. 1745.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. STANTON:
H.R. 1746.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. STEUBE:
H.R. 1747.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Mr. STEUBE:
H.R. 1748.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1 Section 8
By Mr. STEUBE:
H.R. 1749.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Ms. STRICKLAND:
H.R. 1750.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Mrs. SYKES:
H.R. 1751.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution
By Ms. TENNEY:
H.R. 1752.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1
By Ms. TENNEY:
H.R. 1753.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Mr. TIFFANY:
H.R. 1754.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TIMMONS:
H.R. 1755.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article One, Section 8, United States Constitution

By Ms. TLAIB:
H.R. 1756.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. VALADAO:
H.R. 1757.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. VAN DREW:
H.R. 1758.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1 Section 8
By Ms. WATERS:
H.R. 1759.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1 of the U.S. Constitution.
By Mr. WEBER of Texas:
H.R. 1760.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section VIII, Clause 7
By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:
H.R. 1761.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 5
By Mr. ZINKE:
H.R. 1762.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Mr. HERNÁNDEZ:
H.R. 1763.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Mr. BEYER:
H.J. Res. 63.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1 Section 8
By Mr. FLOOD:
H.J. Res. 64.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1 Section 8
By Mr. GROTHMAN:
H.J. Res. 65.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1 Section 8

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 7: Mr. MOORE of North Carolina.
H.R. 32: Mr. HARRIGAN.
H.R. 34: Mr. HARRIS of Maryland.
H.R. 210: Ms. STRICKLAND.
H.R. 211: Mr. LEVIN, Ms. SCHOLTEN, Ms. FRIEDMAN, and Ms. DEXTER.
H.R. 220: Mr. GRIJALVA and Ms. FRIEDMAN.
H.R. 251: Mr. GILL of Texas.
H.R. 309: Mr. CRENSHAW and Mr. DONALDS.
H.R. 347: Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia and Ms. ELFRETH.
H.R. 409: Mr. LATIMER.
H.R. 425: Mr. WIED.
H.R. 433: Ms. ELFRETH and Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.
H.R. 452: Mr. AMO, Ms. JACOBS, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 475: Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 490: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 515: Mrs. FOUSHEE, Mr. BEYER, Mr. SOTO, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, and Ms. JAYAPAL.
H.R. 516: Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 530: Mr. LUTTRELL.
H.R. 539: Mr. SMUCKER.
H.R. 628: Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 646: Mr. LATIMER.
H.R. 768: Mr. LEVIN and Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 783: Ms. BROWNLEY, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. BOST, and Ms. SCHRIER.
H.R. 816: Mr. MCGUIRE.
H.R. 847: Mr. HARRIS of North Carolina.
H.R. 880: Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 897: Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 909: Mr. CAREY and Mrs. RAMIREZ.

H.R. 914: Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Mr. STEIL.

H.R. 923: Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 945: Mr. BISHOP.
H.R. 956: Mr. BENTZ.
H.R. 973: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHIL.
H.R. 979: Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. CARTER of Louisiana.

H.R. 987: Mr. HARRIS of Maryland.
H.R. 992: Mr. HARRIS of Maryland.
H.R. 1005: Mr. CAREY.
H.R. 1008: Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ.
H.R. 1009: Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ.
H.R. 1015: Mr. HARRIS of Maryland.
H.R. 1041: Mr. STEUBE.

H.R. 1081: Mr. JACKSON of Texas and Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana.
H.R. 1099: Mr. BERA.
H.R. 1130: Ms. TENNEY.
H.R. 1140: Mr. HARRIS of Maryland.
H.R. 1151: Mr. MORAN and Mr. HARRIS of Maryland.

H.R. 1159: Mr. LATIMER, Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK, and Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 1163: Mr. CAREY.
H.R. 1181: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. HARRIS of Maryland, and Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 1195: Mr. MESSMER.
H.R. 1200: Mrs. HINSON.
H.R. 1229: Mr. SORENSEN, Mr. JACK, Mr. RYAN, Mr. VAN DREW, and Mr. EZELL.
H.R. 1242: Mrs. MILLER of Illinois and Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 1251: Ms. JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 1262: Mrs. HAYES, Mr. GARCIA of California, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. CAREY.

H.R. 1267: Mr. GOLDEN of Maine.
H.R. 1271: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 1277: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 1284: Mr. STRONG.
H.R. 1288: Ms. HOULAHAN and Ms. HAGEMAN.
H.R. 1300: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. McCOLLUM, Mr. CAREY, and Mr. EZELL.

H.R. 1317: Mr. GROTHMAN.
H.R. 1321: Mr. KHANNA, Ms. FRIEDMAN, Mrs. HAYES, and Mr. MRVAN.
H.R. 1360: Mr. SELF.

H.R. 1369: Mr. COSTA and Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 1378: Mr. CARTER of Texas.
H.R. 1383: Mr. CARBAJAL.
H.R. 1404: Ms. DELBENE, Ms. OMAR, Ms. Barragán, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. BISHOP, Ms. TITUS, Ms. TLAIB, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 1408: Mr. SORENSEN.
H.R. 1410: Ms. Pou.
H.R. 1418: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.
H.R. 1422: Mr. EZELL, Mr. OWENS, Mr. JACK, Mr. RYAN, Mr. VAN DREW, and Mr. MOORE of Alabama.

H.R. 1432: Mr. HARRIS of Maryland.
H.R. 1437: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia and Ms. SHERRILL.

H.R. 1448: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 1452: Mr. SELF.
H.R. 1458: Mr. MCDOWELL.
H.R. 1463: Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H.R. 1484: Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 1485: Mr. HARRIS of Maryland.
H.R. 1497: Mr. HARRIS of Maryland.
H.R. 1505: Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H.R. 1509: Mr. McCAUL, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. BACON, Mr. TONKO, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas.

H.R. 1514: Mr. BOST.
H.R. 1520: Ms. NORTON, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. TONKO, Mr. STAUBER, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, and Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.

H.R. 1522: Ms. SALINAS.
H.R. 1524: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Ms. GARCIA of Texas.

H.R. 1564: Mr. AGUILAR.
H.R. 1589: Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas and Ms. GOODLANDER.
H.R. 1607: Mr. CARTER of Louisiana.

H.R. 1611: Mr. GARCIA of California, Ms. McBRIDE, Mr. McGOVERN, Ms. FRIEDMAN, and Mr. GARCIA of Illinois.

H.R. 1623: Mr. OGLES, Mr. SELF, and Mr. HARRIS of Maryland.

H.R. 1625: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 1632: Mr. HARRIS of Maryland.

H.R. 1637: Mr. PANETTA, Mr. RYAN, Mrs. HAYES, and Ms. FRIEDMAN.

H.R. 1638: Ms. CROCKETT and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.J. Res. 25: Mr. DOWNING.

H.J. Res. 61: Mrs. BICE.

H. Res. 23: Mr. BEYER, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. LICCARDO, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. OLSZEWSKI, Ms. ELFRETH, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. MCCLELLAN, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. TAKANO.

H. Res. 70: Mrs. MCIVER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, and Mr. MOYLAN.

H. Res. 76: Mr. MANN.

H. Res. 115: Mr. MOORE of North Carolina.

H. Res. 145: Mr. GILL of Texas.

H. Res. 155: Mr. COSTA and Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE.

H. Res. 159: Mrs. McCLAIN DELANEY.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. GUTHRIE

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Rules in on H.J. Res. 42, "Providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Energy relating to "Energy Conservation Program for Appliance Standards: Certification Requirements, Labeling Requirements, and Enforcement Provisions for Certain Consumer Products and Commercial Equipment" do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or lim-

ited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. GUTHRIE

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Rules in on H.J. Res. 61, "Providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Rubber Tire Manufacturing" do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 1301: Mr. GOLDMAN of New York.