



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. McCLELLAN).

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 McCLELLAN 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.

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.

“Si, 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 presentatives of the United States America in Congress assembled, 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 hard-working 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 nonprofits 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?

This 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 hard-working 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 non-condensing 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. LATTA. 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	McIver	Randall
Downing	Johnson (LA)	Ogles	Meeks	Swalwell
Dunn (FL)	Johnson (SD)	Onder	Menendez	Sykes
Edwards	Jordan	Owens	Meng	Takano
Ellzey	Joyce (OH)	Palmer	Mfume	Thanedar
Emmer	Joyce (PA)	Perez	Min	Thompson (CA)
Estes	Kean	Perry	Moore (WI)	Thompson (MS)
Evans (CO)	Kelly (MS)	Pfluger	Morelle	Titus
Ezell	Kelly (PA)	Reschenthaler	Morrison	Tlaib
Fallon	Kennedy (UT)	Rogers (AL)	Moulton	Sánchez
Fedorchak	Kiggans (VA)	Rogers (KY)	Mrvan	Tonko
Feenstra	Kiley (CA)	Rose	Nadler	Schneider
Finstad	Kim	Rouzer	Neal	Scholten
Fischbach	Knott	Roy	Neguse	Trahan
Fitzgerald	Kustoff	Rulli	Norcross	Tran
Fitzpatrick	LaHood	Rutherford	Ocasio-Cortez	Scott (VA)
Fleischmann	LaLota	Salazar	Olszewski	Scott, David
Flood	LaMalfa	Scalise	Pallone	Underwood
Fong	Langworthy	Schmidt	Panetta	Sherman
Fox	Latta	Schweikert	Pappas	Vargas
Franklin, Scott	Lawler	Self	Pelosi	Velázquez
Fulcher	Lee (FL)	Sessions	Peters	Wasserman
Garbarino	Letlow	Shreve	Pingree	Schultz
Gill (TX)	Loudermilk	Simpson	Pocan	Stansbury
Gillen	Lucas	Smith (MO)	Pou	Waterson
Gimenez	Luna	Smith (NE)	Pressley	Whitesides
Golden (ME)	Luttrell	Smith (NJ)	Quigley	Strickland
Goldman (TX)	Mace	Smucker	Ramirez	Williams (GA)
Gonzales, Tony	Mackenzie	Spartz		Wilson (FL)
Gonzalez, V.	Malliotakis	Stauber		
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 Duyn		
Harris (MD)	Miller (WV)	Vindman		
Harris (NC)	Miller-Meeks	Mills		
Harshbarger	Mills	Moolenaar		
Hern (OK)	Moore (AL)	Moore (TX)		
Higgins (LA)	Moore (NC)	Webster (FL)		
Hill (AR)	Moore (UT)	Westerman		
Hinson	Moore (WV)	Wied		
Houchin	Moran	Williams (TX)		
Hudson	Moskowitz	Wilson (SC)		
Huizenga	Murphy	Wittman		
Hurd (CO)	Newhouse	Womack		
Issa	Norman	Yakym		
Jack	Nunn (IA)	Zinke		

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	DeBene	Johnson (TX)
Bera	Deluzio	Kamilarov-Dove
Beyer	DeSaulnier	Kaptur
Bishop	Dexter	Keating
Bonamici	Dingell	Kelly (IL)
Boyle (PA)	Doggett	Kennedy (NY)
Brown	Elfreth	Khanna
Brownley	Escobar	Krishnamoorthi
Budzinski	Esparillat	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
	Friedman	Levin
	Frost	Liccardo
	Garamendi	Lieu
	Garcia (CA)	Lofgren
	Garcia (IL)	Lynch
	Garcia (TX)	Magaziner
	Goldman (NY)	Mannion
	Gomez	Matsui
	Goodlander	McBath
	Green, Al (TX)	McBride
	Harder (CA)	McClain Delaney
	Hayes	McClellan
	Himes	McCollum
	Horsford	McDonald Rivet
	Houlihan	McGarvey
	Hoyer	McGovern

Diaz-Balart	James	Obernolte	McIver	Randall
Downing	Johnson (LA)	Ogles	Meeks	Swalwell
Dunn (FL)	Johnson (SD)	Onder	Menendez	Sykes
Edwards	Jordan	Owens	Meng	Takano
Ellzey	Joyce (OH)	Palmer	Mfume	Thanedar
Emmer	Joyce (PA)	Perez	Min	Thompson (CA)
Estes	Kean	Perry	Moore (WI)	Thompson (MS)
Evans (CO)	Kelly (MS)	Pfluger	Morelle	Titus
Ezell	Kelly (PA)	Reschenthaler	Morrison	Tlaib
Fallon	Kennedy (UT)	Rogers (AL)	Moulton	Sánchez
Fedorchak	Kiggans (VA)	Rogers (KY)	Mrvan	Tonko
Feenstra	Kiley (CA)	Rose	Nadler	Schneider
Finstad	Kim	Rouzer	Neal	Scholten
Fischbach	Knott	Roy	Neguse	Trahan
Fitzgerald	Kustoff	Rulli	Norcross	Tran
Fitzpatrick	LaHood	Rutherford	Ocasio-Cortez	Scott (VA)
Fleischmann	LaLota	Salazar	Olszewski	Scott, David
Flood	LaMalfa	Scalise	Pallone	Sewell
Fong	Langworthy	Schmidt	Panetta	Sherman
Fox	Latta	Schweikert	Pappas	Vargas
Franklin, Scott	Lawler	Self	Pelosi	Velázquez
Fulcher	Lee (FL)	Sessions	Peters	Wasserman
Garbarino	Letlow	Shreve	Pingree	Schultz
Gill (TX)	Loudermilk	Simpson	Pocan	Stansbury
Gillen	Loudermilk	Smith (MO)	Pou	Watson Coleman
Gimenez	Luna	Smith (NE)	Pressley	Whitesides
Golden (ME)	Luttrell	Smith (NJ)	Quigley	Williams (GA)
Goldman (TX)	Mace	Smucker	Ramirez	Wilson (FL)
Gonzales, Tony	Mackenzie	Spartz		
Gonzalez, V.	Malliotakis	Stauber		
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 Duyne		
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)			

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—2

Fry Van Orden

NOT VOTING—12

Alford	Grijalva	Omar
Donalds	Hunt	Petterson
Frankel, Lois	Mullin	Scott, Austin
Gottheimer	Neils	Stefanik

□ 1026

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

Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Mses. 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 Service-member 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. FOUSHÉE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. FOUSHÉE. 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" Haeflinger 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 range 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. HARIDOPOLOS). 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 multitrillion-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. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. MULLIN, Ms. STANSBURY, Ms. JACOBS, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. 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. BARRAGÁN, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. TITUS, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. SUBRAMANYAM, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. STANTON, Ms. SCHOLTE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. STANSBURY, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. DOGETT, Mr. CASTEN, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. MULLIN, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. MRVAN, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. GARCIA of California, Mr. CORREA, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Ms. CHU, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. AMO, Mrs. MCBAATH, 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. STEIL, Mr. NEHLS, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. MEUSER, Ms. SCHOLTE, 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. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. BARRAGÁN, and Mr. CARBAJAL):

H.R. 1660. A bill to award grants to States to establish or improve, and carry out, Seal of Bilingual 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. MCBAATH, 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. DOGETT, Mr. CARSON, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. PEREZ, Ms. OMAR, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. MULLIN,

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. GARCIA of California, Mr. SORENSEN, 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. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. JAYALPAL, Mrs. SYKES, Mr. NEAL, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. HARIDOPOLOS, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. TLAIB, Mrs. FOUSHEE, Mr. AMO, Mr. LATIMER, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. SCHOLTON, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. CROW, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCORMICK, 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. KRISHNAMOORTHI):

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. MATSUD):

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. KRISHNAMOORTHI, 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 DUYNE, 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. PALLOINE, 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. PETTERSEN, Mr. MAGAZINER, Mr. POCAN, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, 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. JAYALPAL, Mr. FIGURES, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. AMO, Mr. GARCIA of California, Ms. ROSS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. DELAUBO, 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-MCORMICK, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. BEYER, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. EVANS of Pennsylvania, Ms. SCHOLTON, 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 and 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. SCHAKOWSKY, 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. QUIGLE, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MC CORMICK, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCGARVEY, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. CONNOLY, 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. KRISHNAMOORTHI, 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. SORENSEN, 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. DELAUBO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. GOODEN, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Ms. BALINT, Ms. ANSARI, Ms. DEXTER, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, 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-MC CORMICK):

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, Ms. 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. DELUZIO, 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. BARRAGÁN, 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. BARRAGÁN, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCOR- MICK, 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. KRISHNAMOORTHI, 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. TLAIB, 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. SORENSEN, 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 DUYNE, 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. MCBAH, 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. PETTERSEN, 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. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. HOYLE of Oregon, Ms. TOKUDA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. McCLELLAN, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. SORENSEN, 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. GRIJALVA):

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. PETTERSEN):

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. PETTERSEN (for herself, Mr. FLOOD, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, and Mr. HARDEE 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. DIN-GESELL, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. BROWNLEY, Ms. ELFRETH, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. NADLER, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. NOR-CROSS, Mr. GARCIA of California, Ms. SALINAS, Mr. SOTO, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. ANSARI, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. TRAN, Mr. SORENSEN, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. TITUS, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Ms. MCBRIDE, Mr. DELUZIO, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. CROCKETT, Ms. BUDZINSKI, Mr. JACK-SON 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. SÁNCHEZ):

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. JAYPAL, 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. McCLELLAN, 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 America's 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. VELAZQUEZ, 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. MCOLLUM, 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 93/1, 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, Clasue 18

By Mr. BERGMAN:

H.R. 1656.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 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: 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. LICCARDO:
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 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. HERNANDEZ:
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
By Mr. LATIMER, Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK, and Mr. TONKO:
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. GARCÍA 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.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 119th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 171

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2025

No. 39

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable TIM SHEEHY, a Senator from the State of Montana.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, empower our Senators to make consistency a top priority. Lead them over life's mountains and through life's valleys with the spirit of faithfulness and trust in You. Help them to live their lives on an even keel, refusing to give in to despair. Whether in life's sunshine or shadows, may they be aware that You will walk beside them, making the crooked places straight. Keep them from making critical decisions without consulting You or succumbing to the temptation of taking the easy way out. Lord, infuse them with the spirit of gratitude for Your involvement in our Nation and world.

We pray in Your wonderful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer 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.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, February 27, 2025.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby

appoint the Honorable TIM SHEEHY, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair.

CHUCK GRASSLEY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. SHEEHY thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY RELATING TO "WASTE EMISSIONS CHARGE FOR PETROLEUM AND NATURAL GAS SYSTEMS: PROCEDURES FOR FACILITATING COMPLIANCE, INCLUDING NETTING AND EXEMPTIONS"—Resumed

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the following joint resolution, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 12) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "Waste Emissions Charge for Petroleum and Natural Gas Systems: Procedures for Facilitating Compliance, Including Netting and Exemptions".

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER
The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader is recognized.

DEPARTMENT OF GOVERNMENT EFFICIENCY

MR. SCHUMER. Mr. President, when Donald Trump and DOGE began their work, they kept saying the same thing. Donald Trump, Elon Musk, and DOGE said: This is about cutting waste; it is about efficiency; it is about meritocracy. Unfortunately, the truth has not been as advertised. It has been utter chaos.

Yesterday, the Department of Veterans Affairs said they were reversing course on canceling billions of dollars in contract work because, as it turns out, slashing billions in funding that helps veterans is extremely harmful for veterans. These VA cuts were lauded by DOGE as an example of eliminating waste. The VA Secretary claimed these contracts were for consultants "to make PowerPoint slides and write meeting minutes." That is not even close to the truth.

Let me read some examples of what DOGE was actually prepared to cut: Funding for chemotherapy and imaging services, those were going to be cut—hardly make-work, hardly writing meeting minutes. Funding for veterans with disabilities—cut—even funding to help veterans suffering from toxic exposure in burn pits. One contract would help over 20,000 veterans track down their military service records from DOD in order to prove their toxic exposure, as is required. Without these records, getting affordable treatment would not likely be possible, and DOGE said: Let's cut that, too.

Even if the VA reverses course, canceling these contracts and firing VA staff is still immediately damaging—very damaging. There is the risk that you can't rehire workers back in time because they have moved on to other jobs or contracts aren't available because they took their business elsewhere, and, by then, the damage is

- This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

done. Vital services and operations that serve veterans can't continue as before. It could take months—maybe even years—to build this back, which had been built up carefully to help veterans over the years, and many of us in Congress worked for those things; so to cut these services and then say “never mind” still ends up being very destructive. Sadly, this is only one example.

Yesterday, Elon Musk led his first Cabinet meeting of this administration. He admitted that DOGE's approach has led to many erroneous cuts to staff and programs that are not wasteful but, on the contrary, vital.

For example, he said:

With USAID, one of the things we accidentally cancelled very briefly was Ebola prevention.

Those are his words.

Are you kidding me? Cutting funds to stop one of the deadliest diseases in the world is reckless, especially when there is an Ebola outbreak in Uganda as we speak, and flights leave Kampala every day and go all over the world. When epidemics hit America, they oftentimes begin abroad, and U.S. funding is essential to prevent those diseases from reaching us here at all.

I should also note that the claims that Ebola funding is back online are false. Reports are out from last night that 95 percent of all USAID funding is now being cut. So we are not sure where it all is.

What DOGE is doing is not what efficiency looks like. If DOGE actually cares about efficiency and meritocracy, then it is failing, in many ways, its own test. It would be better to look at these programs, see which might be wasteful, see which are needed, and then make the cuts to the wasteful programs, not take a meat-ax or a blowtorch—call it what you will—cut everything, and then say we will restore some of the things that we shouldn't have cut, because once you make those cuts, it is very hard to put the pieces back together.

TAXES

Mr. President, on Republican taxes, last month, consumer confidence took its biggest nosedive in 4 years—the biggest nosedive in 4 years. This is how confident consumers, average Americans, feel about the economy. Inflation is trending back up. The price of eggs is sky high. The threat of a trade war looms over our country, and Americans are fearful that things are not going to get any better anytime soon. And what are Republicans doing about all of this? They are trying to cut taxes for billionaires—trying to cut taxes for billionaires—and make the American people pay for it.

The Republican agenda is quickly taking shape. Under Donald Trump's Republican Party, billionaires win; American families lose.

It doesn't matter if Republicans go with 1 bill or 2 bills or 50 bills. That is what they are debating right now. Their endgame—House and Senate Republicans—has always been cutting

taxes for billionaires and forcing American families to pick up the tab.

Of course, Senate Republicans know that cutting Medicaid by over \$800 billion to lower taxes for billionaires is wildly unpopular. They know that increasing the deficit by up to \$5 trillion to help the ultrarich contradicts everything the so-called party of fiscal responsibility stands for. They say they have to cut all this stuff to reduce the deficit, and then, with their tax breaks for billionaires, they increase the deficit, no matter what sleight-of-hand accounting method they use.

What are Republicans doing about fiscal responsibility? Are they admitting that their plans would be a disaster for the deficit? No. Instead, Senate Republicans are engaged in budgetary hocus-pocus to hide the true cost of their tax cuts for the ultrarich, and there may be signs that House Republicans are going along.

Instead of admitting the truth about the consequences of their plans, they are pursuing a gimmick called “current policy baseline”—a gimmick, if there ever was one—which is essentially an attempt to magically turn \$5 trillion of deficit spending into zero dollars of deficit spending. Well, that can't happen and doesn't happen, and the economy will realize it doesn't happen. Any junior high school math student could tell you this is a bunch of bunk. You can't pass \$5 trillion to cut taxes for the rich and pretend like it doesn't affect the deficit.

The issue isn't complicated. Republicans are trying to hide the true cost of their billionaire tax cuts from the American people. Meanwhile, they are getting ready to eviscerate funding for healthcare that serves over 80 million Americans—kids, seniors, rural communities. These cuts to Medicaid will dramatically hurt rural America, people with disabilities, and more.

The only people who seem to be opposing this is the hard-right Freedom Caucus, because they seem to really care about the deficit. Let's hope they stay strong for the sake of the economy and this country.

Of course, the American people are not going to take these Medicaid cuts lying down.

Last night, I got on a Zoom. Over 3,000 New Yorkers, worried about the attacks from Republicans on healthcare, got on the Zoom, many more than we expected. These were rank-and-file folks, healthcare advocates, union members, and concerned citizens from all walks of life. They were all upset about the cuts to Medicaid and putting those cuts in place in order to give tax breaks for billionaires.

It was a great call. It was an energizing call. I urge my colleagues to do the same, as many of them are. It is a stark reminder of what is at stake but also a reminder that the American people don't like these cuts.

We heard from New Yorkers who are in danger of having their Medicaid cov-

erage taken away if Republicans proceed with their actions, on this Zoom of over 3,000 people. But we also talked about taking action.

I urged participants to call their Members of Congress. I urged them to mobilize online and to organize in their communities. We urged everyone to make their voices heard, like we are seeing in the townhall meetings.

I reminded folks that organizing is not easy, but it works. It changes things, and it is going to make a difference in making sure Medicaid is protected.

NOMINATION OF LINDA MCMAHON

Mr. President, on our Education Secretary nominee, today, the Senate will vote on whether to advance the nomination of Linda McMahon as Secretary of Education.

Mrs. McMahon's nomination comes as President Trump has been clear about cutting funding for education and abolishing the Department of Education entirely.

Is Mrs. McMahon going to go along? I hope not.

Cutting education is not what the American people want. The American people don't want a radical, out-of-touch billionaire slashing funding for public schools. When you slash Federal funding for education, guess what happens. Since so many of our school districts—urban, suburban, rural—depend on this Federal money, it leads to higher property taxes for people back home.

If you eliminate the Department of Education as a whole, that means local communities are forced to pick up the tab to fund the schools. It means that families in these communities will pay in the form of higher property taxes to make up the loss of Federal funding. But communities will also be forced to slash other programs to make room for funding for schools.

Again, this is not what the American people want. This is not what they voted for.

Mrs. McMahon, in my judgment, is not qualified to lead America's public education. She seems not to care very much about it. But that is precisely why President Trump nominated her. She is the perfect choice to bring our public education system burning to the ground.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The majority leader is recognized.

ENERGY

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, this week, the Senate is focused on unleashing American energy. As I have

said before, our country is facing some serious energy challenges. We need more power, or we face the possibility of a future defined by unreliable and unaffordable energy, which is why President Trump declared an energy emergency on his first day in office—to produce more energy, build more infrastructure, and ultimately bring energy prices down.

But our Democrat colleagues made it clear, yesterday, they don't believe such an emergency exists. The Senator from Virginia called it a "sham." Our colleague from New Hampshire said it was "an emergency declaration in search of an emergency."

Every Senate Democrat voted to deny the emergency that our country faces. I guess they haven't seen the reports of the precarious state of American energy.

Last year, a Washington Post headline read:

Amid explosive demand, America is running out of power.

A recent report from the North American Electric Reliability Corporation warns of "mounting resource adequacy challenges" in the next decade.

Whether Democrats want to acknowledge it or not, the signs of a rapidly approaching energy crisis are clear. There is a threat of blackouts, not enough power to meet demand, heightened prices for gas and utilities. Apparently, Democrats don't think these are cause for alarm. But whether they are willing to acknowledge it or not—and yesterday's vote, I think, made clear that they are not—we have a serious problem, and if we don't do something about it, we face a future with an unreliable and unaffordable energy supply.

Republicans are taking action. This week, the Senate is working to prevent two of the Biden administration's anti-energy policies from going into effect.

On Tuesday, the Senate passed Senator KENNEDY's resolution to stop the Biden administration's marine archeology rule. Offshore oil and gas producers have long been required to submit an archeological report before drilling if their project area was thought to include things like shipwrecks, settlements, or other archeological sites. But last year, the Biden administration decided to require archeological reports for all offshore projects, even when there is nothing to suggest the project will be near an archeological site. It is just another way to slow down production and heap more costs on producers—costs that consumers eventually pay. And it is another part of the Biden administration's efforts to close off America's waters to conventional energy production.

Under President Biden, offshore permits dropped to a two-decade low. The administration's offshore leasing plan included only 3 possible leases, down from 47 in an earlier draft from the first Trump administration.

And, of course, there was President Biden's last-minute ban on oil and gas

production in 625 million acres of America's waters. Why we would so severely limit the use of our natural resources is beyond me. Under Republican leadership, we will be leveraging assets to restore American energy dominance.

Later today, the Senate will also vote on a resolution to block the \$6 billion natural gas tax that was included in the Democrats' so-called Inflation Reduction Act. This tax would increase costs for energy producers and limit energy production, leading to higher utility bills for many Americans.

Under the Biden administration's implementation of this tax, it would hit smaller operations the hardest. On top of that, the tax puts tens of thousands of jobs at risk, including in natural gas-rich States like Pennsylvania, New Mexico, Texas, and North Dakota.

The Senate will vote later today to stop implementation of this tax on energy producers. I appreciate Senator HOEVEN's leadership on this issue. Thanks in substantial part to his efforts, energy producers will not have to worry about this unnecessary natural gas tax, and the American people won't have to worry about it driving up their utility bills.

It would be nice if Democrats would join us in our efforts, if not to avoid our rapidly approaching energy crisis, at least to promote more affordable prices for Americans. I have recently been hearing our Democrat colleagues express newfound interest fighting inflation. If they are serious about that, they should be joining us in blocking these anti-energy policies that are driving prices up.

But with Democrats or without, Republicans will keep working to build a more secure and more affordable energy future.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ELECTRIC VEHICLES

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, before coming to the floor each day, I try to make sure I go through the morning newspapers, and today I found in the Washington Post an interesting column: "Multi-car pileup as electric vehicles collide with reality."

"Multi-car pileup as electric vehicles collide with reality."

And the reality is the Democrat electric vehicle mandate is a failure. It failed the American people, failed the taxpayers, and just plain failed.

For years, President Biden and Democrats tried to force Americans to buy electric vehicles. They tried to do it by banning gas-powered cars. They tried to do it by bribing people with taxpayer subsidies.

President Trump has, rightly, promised to pull the plug on Joe Biden's unpopular electric vehicle mandate. People are delighted. President Trump fulfilled that promise on day one in office. He ended the Biden ban on gas-powered vehicles. In my home State of Wyoming and the Presiding Officer's home State of Montana, that is welcome relief.

The next step is for Congress, for this body, to end the subsidies on electric vehicles, and I have introduced legislation to do just that. My bill ends the \$7,500 subsidy for EVs. It also closes the Biden loophole that funnels taxpayer moneys, believe it or not, to communist China. Finally, it ends the subsidies for the EV charging stations.

The EV subsidies were, in essence, a Biden giveaway. He wanted to give money away to the coastal elites who drive electric vehicles, and it was connected to Biden's unpopular climate dreams.

The aggressive push for EVs began with Democrats' reckless tax-and-spending bill. It included a \$7,500 handout for anyone who bought an electric vehicle, while not a single Republican in the House or Senate voted for that reckless tax-and-spending bill.

The Joint Committee on Taxation looked at the cost of these EV subsidies because there was going to be a mandate attached; you were going to have to buy an electric vehicle at some point or other. So originally they said it might cost \$14 billion. That is a lot of money. When they redid the math a year later, they said the cost estimated would be \$100 billion. Outside analysts estimated the cost even higher. Goldman Sachs said that the EV subsidies could cost taxpayers as much as \$394 billion, which is 28 times as much as the original thought that it would be when the Joint Committee on Taxation looked at it.

These subsidies—this is for a vehicle that most Americans can't afford, don't want, and doesn't work for them. It doesn't work in my home State of Wyoming. It doesn't work in the Presiding Officer's home State of Montana. Most Americans know that EVs are luxury items with severe limitations. They certainly can't be the primary source of transportation for most Americans.

The average cost of an EV: \$62,000. Well, that is \$16,000 more than the cost of most gas-powered vehicles. The dealers I have talked to in my home State of Wyoming tell me that it takes significantly longer to sell an EV than a gas-powered vehicle. And the EVs that they are able to sell, they end up selling for a loss. The nationwide sales of EVs is also stalling. They actually lost market share in 2024.

Despite endless subsidies, EVs account for less than 10 percent of all car sales in America. Most of these are sold to wealthier Americans, people who don't need a subsidy from the government to begin with. This is social engineering to benefit the liberal elite. It is

a transfer of money from hard-working American families to the wealthy.

Every time a wealthy liberal in San Francisco gets a government subsidy when they go and buy an electric car, a working-class family in Sheridan, WY, ends up paying in their taxes.

My legislation ends all of that. EVs are a bad investment for American people and for American automakers. This month, Ford projected that, in 2025, it would lose over \$5.5 billion on its electric vehicles. In 2024, Ford sold only 21,000 EVs. It lost \$5 billion. That is a loss of \$60,000 for each and every electric vehicle that they were able to sell. Now, Ford isn't alone. Major car companies—General Motors and others—are also losing money on EVs.

The transition to EVs is also estimated to kill hundreds of thousands of jobs, including in the Midwest, manufacturing jobs of gas-powered vehicles. It is already sending thousands of American workers from the assembly line to the unemployment line.

Ending subsidies for EVs is about saving taxpayer money, protecting American jobs, but it is also about protecting our national security. Initially, only EVs made in America were supposed to be eligible for this \$7,500 subsidy. But before leaving office, Joe Biden made it easier for those tax credits on EVs to go for those made with parts from China. It wasn't supposed to happen that way, but Biden and the Democrats, so desperate to force EVs onto the American public, they created a leasing loophole specifically designed to help China.

This is how it works. It allows customers who lease EVs instead of buying them—but who lease EVs—made with Chinese parts, they could still fully receive the subsidy. Well, since 80 percent of the EV batteries come from China, they had noted a major problem because they weren't going to be able to get the subsidies. That is why they came up with this leasing loophole.

Because in 2022, before they had the loophole, only 7 percent of new EVs were leased. Because of this Biden gimmick, that number jumped to 45 percent—almost half of all the EVs in America then being leased rather than bought.

The American taxpayers are subsidizing technologies controlled by communist China. It is wrong. My bill ends that.

Republicans are focused on what matters: lowering prices, unleashing American energy, creating American jobs, and putting Americans back in the driver's seat.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MULLIN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

H.J. RES. 35

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am here today in opposition to the measure that we are about to vote on, which would undo a rule that regulates the release of methane into the atmosphere.

Let's just start with the most basic simple proposition that methane is dangerous, it is poisonous, it is explosive. And for those reasons alone, it is something that the fossil fuel industry should not be leaking. The fossil fuel industry should be responsible about taking care of its leaks of a gas that is dangerous, poisonous, and explosive.

But in addition to that immediate danger, methane is also a really, really potent greenhouse gas. If you look at the effect over a 20-year period, methane in the atmosphere is 80 times—80—times more dangerous than carbon dioxide. So we talk all the time about carbon emissions, carbon limits, carbon pollution. Methane is actually 80 times more dangerous.

So there are two reasons why the fossil fuel industry should not be leaking large amounts of methane. First, it is dangerous, poisonous, and explosive. And, second, it is an 80 times worse greenhouse gas than carbon dioxide over a 20-year period.

So how much methane is industry leaking, and why did we do this measure in the first place?

Well, industry told the EPA for years that it was leaking about 8 million tons—8 million tons—of methane, which all by itself is a pretty big number, but it turned out that the industry was not telling the EPA the truth.

It turns out that once independent sources got a chance to spot methane leaks using, for instance, satellites—this is a satellite image of a methane plume that is being released from a leak site—when they could find that—and satellites can now do that so we are beginning to know how much methane is actually being leaked and particularly when you backstop the satellite information with information from aircraft where the readings can be more sensitive than from a satellite—it turns out that what they were actually leaking was more like 32 million tons. They were only disclosing a quarter of what they were leaking, and even that 8 million that they disclosed was a pretty bad number. When you go to 32 million tons, that is a great deal of leakage of a gas that is dangerous, poisonous, explosive, and 80 times more powerful a greenhouse gas over a 20-year period than carbon dioxide.

Now, you would think that, as an attribute of basic human decency, these companies that are leaking methane would go and clean it up. It is the decent thing to do, but they didn't, obviously. They didn't even disclose truthfully and accurately what they were leaking. So, when we were confronted with a 32-million-ton annual leak of poisonous, dangerous, explosive methane, and its greenhouse effects on top of that, we tried to do something about it.

So what did we do?

Well, we did two things: a little bit of carrot, a little bit of stick.

The carrot was \$1.5 billion—1.5 billion taxpayer dollars—in flatout corporate welfare to the leaking oil and gas companies so that they could use taxpayer money to clean up the mess they were making to deal with the pipes and the valves and the wells that they weren't properly maintaining and that were leaking, it turned out, 32 million tons of methane.

Now, one could argue that that was a pretty poor use of taxpayer money; that a basic tenet of corporate responsibility should be: You clean up your own mess. You take care of your own equipment. That is a basic tenet of human responsibility. I don't know why it shouldn't be a basic tenet of corporate responsibility, but the measurement of 32 million tons of leakage shows that, obviously, those companies were not meeting that basic corporate tenet of responsibility.

So along comes the \$1.5 billion of free taxpayer money—corporate welfare—to polluters and leakers for taxpayers to pay them to clean up the problem that they were causing. I didn't love that, to tell you the truth, but it came with an incentive as well, and the incentive was, if you are still leaking methane after a certain period and if you are still leaking methane above a certain level—you had to be a big leaker yourself. It had to be a big leak, like 300 tons per leak, and you had to be in the worst sector of the oil and gas industry. If those things were true—if you had big leaks and you were a big leaker and you were in the worst performing sector of your industry—then you would be assessed a fee for the leakage, which would be an incentive, in addition to the free \$1.5 billion the industry got to go out there and fix the darned pipes and valves and wells and stop the leaking.

What we are doing today is saying to this industry: You can keep the \$1.5 billion. We gave you that whether you used it to clean up or not. I don't know that. I don't think the jury is back on that, but they did get the \$1.5 billion. But the part where you have to pay if you are still polluting, after all of this, beyond industry standards—that is what we are stripping out today. This Congressional Review Act measure specifically helps the segment of the oil and gas industry that is not even meeting oil and gas industry standards for controlling leaks.

I think it is a pretty reasonable test to impose on industry leakers that they at least meet their own industry standard for leaking. This isn't some arbitrary standard that government has imposed. This isn't something that came out of the Green New Deal. This is the industry's own standard for responsibility about leaks, and you pay this fee if you don't meet your own industry standard for taking care of your equipment properly and avoiding leaks of a dangerous, explosive, poisonous

greenhouse gas 80 times more dangerous than carbon dioxide.

So that is where we are, and that is where we are at today. Today's vote only protects those worst industry performers who have not cleaned up their act and met their own industry standards. If there were ever an undeserving group for Congress's solicitude, that is the group. They are not even meeting their own industry standards. They are comfortable with dangerous levels of leakage beyond what even their own industry recommends as a standard, and on they go.

This is just a little bit of a piece with the recent designation by the Trump administration of what "energy" is. The Trump administration just put out a definition of "energy" that doesn't include solar or wind. Most of what came online and is slated to come online in 2025 has been solar and wind. It is the booming part of our energy economy. It is where the growth is and the jobs are and the innovation is. It is also a leading energy source in red States. If you look at who is best on solar and who is best on wind, you see States like Texas; you see Iowa; you see Wyoming. They have considerable investments in solar and wind, but the Trump administration won't even call solar and wind energy.

So we are in this bizarre circumstance in which the fossil fuel industry, which drives so much behavior in this body after \$100 million spent on the Trump campaign that we know of—probably hundreds of millions more secretly—has gained two big things: one, a completely false definition of "solar energy" and "wind energy" as not being energy despite the fact that it is fully operational, producing electrons, and was the largest source of new additions to the grid for 2025, and they just decree: This is not energy.

Why the fossil fuel industry would want that is a pretty strong signal of how low that industry will go in using its power over Congress. They will basically press the Trump administration to claim that solar energy and wind energy aren't even energy. It is a spectacularly foolish and false proposition, but bending the knee to the wishes of the fossil fuel industry appears to have no limits.

This vote is the second expression of that subservience to fossil fuel because of all the things that you could do, of all the things that would help grow America's energy markets, of all the things you could do to help take care of people who live near energy facilities or people who are being subjected to harm from climate change—of all the things you could do, probably the worst one would be to take the worst performers at leaking, which shouldn't happen in the first place, who leak so badly they don't even meet their own industry standards, who for years have been falsely saying that they leaked only a quarter of what they have actually been leaking, and they are the people whom we are going to come to the rescue of.

They had two choices here so that they didn't have to pay the fee for being among the worst leakers and not meeting their own industry standards. One is, clean up your darned equipment. Fix your pipes. Fix your valves. Fix your wells. Stop the leaking or at least reduce it to your own industry standard. If you do that, you don't pay this fee—or come to Congress. Use your power, the force of your dark money, of your influence, of your super PACs, of your political control, and get that requirement removed so that you can continue to leak, continue to leak methane—a dangerous, explosive, and poisonous substance—into your communities, continue to add this far more dangerous greenhouse gas to the atmosphere, and continue to meet no reasonable standard of corporate responsibility for taking care of your own gear and quitting the leaking.

And you know what they chose; they chose to come here and get a free pass—a hall pass from Republicans in Congress, a hall pass from the Trump administration—so that they can continue to leak to their hearts content, never mind their culpability of not meeting their own industry standards, never mind the harm that it causes.

This is an industry that lives off a pollute-for-free business model. If this industry were not allowed to pollute for free—if it had to compete, head-to-head, with hydro, geothermal, solar, wind, without the free right to pollute—we would have a very different energy mix, and they know that. So they insist on protecting their right to pollute for free, but of all the little quadrants of the industry whose pollution-for-free we should be coming to the floor to defend, those worst leakers who aren't taking care of their own equipment even to industry standards are at the bottom of any reasonable person's priority list, and yet they are the ones we are here to serve today.

The backdrop to this is, of course, "climate change," a term that the fossil fuel industry has so ingratiated itself with the Trump administration that it is able to excise the term—a language attack—excise the term from official documents, a little bit like saying that "energy" is everything except solar and wind. That is obviously false—provable false, in fact, and a preposterous assertion—but when serving the fossil fuel industry, that is the stuff they make you do, and here you go with saying that climate change isn't real when Exxon scientists talked about its being real 30 years ago. We are driving down a path of polluter-funded falsehood that ends in very dangerous places.

We have a pretty good idea of where it ends because scientists have been telling us where this goes for decades now, scientists in our major universities. I do not believe that there is a single State university, a State university with the name of the State in its name—University of Rhode Island, for instance. I don't think there is a single

State university in this country that does not teach climate change. That is how well-established climate change is as a factual proposition, and what it is going to do has been known for a long, long time.

The predictions are astonishingly accurate. Here in the Senate, we heard all those predictions. The first hearing on those warnings was actually by Republican Senator John Chafee of Rhode Island in his role then as chairman of the Environmental Public Works Committee. He had a senior scientist from NASA, John Hanson, come over and describe what the science was, what we knew about what was going on.

So there is a long, clear, indisputable scientific record warning us of what is coming—preview of coming attractions.

But then it came here, and, here, the fossil fuel industry butted in with enormous political force, turbocharged after the Citizens United decision allowed that industry to spend unlimited amounts of money. And in the enforcement—or nonenforcement—of that decision, allowed that industry to spend those unlimited amounts of money secretly from behind front groups and through Super PACs and from other devices where the public was denied the knowledge of who was trying to influence them. The basic right of citizenship is to know who is doing what to whom on the field of politics American citizens are supposed to police with their votes. That knowledge was denied them, and that flood of industry pressure came into this Chamber. And before you knew it, climate change was suddenly a partisan issue. If you wanted to be a Republican, you had to deny climate change. It was pretty much as simple as that.

Ask Bob Inglis from the House of Representatives what happened if you tried to break that grip of the fossil fuel industry on the House leadership, the fossil fuel industry grip on the House leadership on the Republican side.

So the science was right all along. We failed at the politics because of improper fossil fuel industry influence, probably the most maligned and large-scale political influence campaign in American history. We yielded to it. We allowed ourselves to not heed the warnings and take the steps that would have put us on a pathway to safety.

Now, having heard the scientific warnings, having failed at taking appropriate safety steps, we are now entering the third era, the era of consequences, when the stuff starts to hit the fan. And the warnings are coming from all over.

Just about 2 weeks ago, the chair of the Federal Reserve testified to the Senate Banking Committee that in 10 to 15 years, it will be impossible to get a mortgage in entire regions of the country. How does that relate to climate change? That relates to climate change because climate change is creating changes in weather patterns that

make it impossible for the insurance industry to predict risk. That is why insurance rates are quadruple the national average in Florida, which is first and worst into this insurance crisis because of its storm and flooding risk, because it is on the path of so many hurricanes, because the Gulf of Mexico is warming so fast that it is powering worse storms, more heavily laden storms, with rain onto Florida's coasts. And when you can't get insurance on your home, and you go to sell it, you have got a problem because the buyer can't get a mortgage if your home is uninsurable.

What the chief economists of Freddie Mac warned, the mortgage giant, is that the climate risk creates an insurance crisis, which rolls over into a mortgage crisis, which drives down property values so badly that it creates a 2008-style national economic crisis.

Those aren't the only warnings. Reinsurers look at this climate mess as a business proposition. The insurance industry has to get the future right in order to do its business, and it knows that what the fossil fuel industry is saying about what is going to happen in the future is a whole pack of lies. So they are raising their rates. The reinsurance companies are looking and saying, wow, this is getting way more dangerous. We are not going to reinsurance without getting a lot more money.

Reinsurance rates have more than doubled since 2017. They were up as much as 40 percent in 2023 alone in some markets.

So it is not just the voice of the Fed; it is not just the voice of the chief economists of Freddie Mac; it is the reinsurance industry.

Go below the reinsurance industry to the insurance industry and look at the first and worst place, Florida. All the major insurers are out—pulled the plug. Gone. Done. Pop-up insurers have come to fill the gap. Twelve to fifteen of them have gone bankrupt already. And when they go bankrupt, they don't pay claims, and Floridians are left stuck behind an insurer that was not solvent.

Florida has had to stand up its own homeowners insurance company, which now has a huge share of the market and an even bigger share of the risk because they have allowed the other insurers to come in and cherry-pick out the lowest risk properties. So Florida is carrying a liability right now on homeowner's insurance that is greater than its entire State debt.

If you want to look at the solvency of a State, look at what Florida's risk is for its property insurance companies, citizens' property insurance, and its backup fund that comes in when the pop-up insurance companies go bust and somebody else has to come in and pay the claims.

The insurance industry, which has to look accurately at the future is also telling us this is deadly, deadly serious.

There is an international Financial Stability Board whose job is to look at

the world banking industry, the world banking sector, and warn of risks to the banking sector. They just put out a comprehensive report on the danger that climate change poses to the banking sector.

It comes in a couple of ways. One is the one I just described. When banks can't issue mortgages, they lose a huge revenue proposition. So they get hurt in the "insurance to mortgage to market value to economic crash" cascade.

But, also, as those values fall—let's say you went from carrying a \$4,000 carrying cost for your property insurance to a \$20,000 carrying cost. The present value of \$20,000 every year into the future as long as you are going to own that home, diminishes the value of that home. It doesn't just diminish it for you and for the next buyer, it diminishes it for the bank that holds your mortgage. It is really important to banks that they have enough collateral to back their loan. Their loan-to-value ratio is what helps determine their solvency. So the International Financial Stability Board is warning banks around the world: Look out. The climate crisis is coming at you and for your solvency.

This was, perhaps, said best by The Economist magazine in April, which led with a cover article warning of the next housing disaster and saying that "the severe weather brought about by greenhouse-gas emissions is shaking the foundations of the world's most important asset class"—real estate.

The number that they put to that risk that is shaking the foundations of the world's largest asset class is \$25 trillion. A \$25 trillion hit to the world's largest asset class.

In the United States, a new report by First Street, which is a technical firm that looks at flooding risk for a whole variety of corporate clients but also publishes as well—they just published a report that climate change could erase \$1.4 trillion in real estate value by 2055—i.e., in the 30-year mortgage period—a \$1.4 trillion hit to real estate values here in the United States. While \$25 trillion dollars was The Economist's global number; First Street's is \$1.4 trillion here in the United States.

Trillions are big, big numbers. And when it is hitting people in their most prized and valuable family asset—their homes—it is a very, very dangerous proposition.

Here is what The Economist said:

The impending bill—

For climate harms—

is so huge, in fact, it will have grim implications not just for personal prosperity—

i.e., the homeowner—

but also for the financial system.

Hence the report from the International Financial Stability Board about the need to shore up the international financial system.

Here is how it goes down, they say:

If the size of the risk suddenly sinks in, and borrowers and lenders alike realize the collateral underpinning so many trans-

actions is not worth as much as they thought, a wave of repricing will reverberate through financial markets.

Punch line:

Climate change, in short, could prompt the next global property crash.

Instead of dealing with this—even as Americans are already seeing their property insurance prices rise and double, are getting more and more non-renewal notices to get them off the company—what are we doing? We are helping out the absolutely worst offenders at climate leakage.

Here is Deloitte. I will close with this. Deloitte is a corporate consultancy. This is not Green New Deal. This is a corporate consultancy:

If we allow climate change to go unchecked, it will ravage our global economy. For the United States, the damages to 2070—

Which was their prediction date—

are projected to reach \$14.5 trillion, a lifetime loss of nearly \$70,000 for each working American.

And we are not even talking about that seriously. We are here, instead, to let off the hook that segment of the oil and gas industry that is the worst polluters, that doesn't even meet their own industry standards, and that can get away from the fee that we will be voting down now by simply meeting industry standards. This is a shameful moment for the Senate.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAGERTY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for a little more than a minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

H.J. RES. 35

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, every American should be paying close attention to what is about to happen on the floor. In just a few moments, the Senate will vote on a Republican resolution that is straight from the wish list of Big Oil and Big Gas.

Instead of spending floor time pushing legislation that will lower costs for American families, Republicans are bowing to Big Oil and Gas billionaires by trying to reverse the methane waste emissions charge which Democrats passed in the Inflation Reduction Act. Donald Trump and DOGE claim to care about efficiency, but Republicans are undoing a measure to reduce oil and gas waste and are making prices for the consumer go up—prices going up—when they are saying they want prices to go down. The rule we passed has been one of our most important tools to lower energy prices, to hold Big Oil and Big Gas accountable, to keep excessive and harmful levels of methane

out of our atmosphere, which my friend Mr. WHITEHOUSE, who has done such a good job on this issue, tells me is 80 times as poisonous as CO₂. Without this safeguard, Big Oil and Gas can waste as much natural gas as they like and then pass the cost on to consumers.

Why are Republicans doing this? Well, it is simple. They are putting the needs of Big Oil and Gas companies over the needs of the American people, over the health of the American people and the health of our environment, our climate, our globe. And the consequences for the American people, for their health and their energy bills, are going to be very harmful.

I urge my colleagues to think carefully, one last time, before voting to overturn it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all time has expired.

The clerk will read the title of the joint resolution for the third time.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY RELATING TO “WASTE EMISSIONS CHARGE FOR PETROLEUM AND NATURAL GAS SYSTEMS: PROCEDURES FOR FACILITATING COMPLIANCE, INCLUDING NETTING AND EXEMPTIONS”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the Congressional Review Act, the clerk will report H.J. Res. 35 by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 35) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to “Waste Emissions Charge for Petroleum and Natural Gas Systems: Procedures for Facilitating Compliance, Including Netting and Exemptions”.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the title of the joint resolution for the third time.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

VOTE ON H.J. RES. 35

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Mr. TILLIS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER).

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 97 Leg.]

YEAS—52

Banks	Grassley	Mullin
Barrasso	Hagerty	Murkowski
Blackburn	Hawley	Paul
Boozman	Hoeven	Ricketts
Britt	Husted	Risch
Budd	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Capito	Johnson	Schmitt
Cassidy	Justice	Scott (FL)
Collins	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Lankford	Sheehy
Cotton	Lee	Sullivan
Crapo	Lummis	Thune
Cruz	Marshall	Tillis
Curtis	McConnell	Tuberville
Daines	McCormick	Wicker
Ernst	Moody	
Fischer	Moran	Young
Graham	Moreno	

NAYS—47

Alsobrooks	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Baldwin	Hirono	Sanders
Bennet	Kaine	Schatz
Blumenthal	Kelly	Schiff
Blunt Rochester	Kim	Schumer
Booker	King	Shaheen
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Slotkin
Coons	Luján	Smith
Cortez Masto	Markey	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warnock
Fetterman	Murray	Warren
Gallego	Ossoff	
Gillibrand	Padilla	Welch
Hassan	Peters	Whitehouse
Heinrich	Reed	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Cramer

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 35) was passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Linda McMahon, of Connecticut, to be Secretary of Education.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 770

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I speak with senior citizens all over Vermont and, in fact, in many parts of the country. Just last night, we held a telephone townhall in Vermont, and in our small State, 34,000 people were on the line. I think the reason for that is there is a great deal of anxiety among people in general and seniors in particular regarding the Republican budget proposal that was passed the other day in the House. Seniors and Americans all over this country have reason to be concerned.

At a time of massive income and wealth inequality, the Republican budget would give over \$1 trillion in tax breaks to the top 1 percent—that is billionaires and the wealthiest people in our country. In Vermont and all over this country, seniors are asking: Well, how are they going to pay for

that trillion-dollar gift to the 1 percent? The answer is not complicated. They have made it clear. Republicans will be making massive cuts in healthcare, nutrition assistance, affordable housing, and education. These are precisely the programs that working families and kids and the elderly and the sick and the poor most depend upon. The Republican budget would cut Medicaid by \$880 billion. The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities has estimated that if these cuts are implemented, up to 36 million Americans, including millions of children, would have their health insurance taken away from them.

Let's be clear. When we have Republicans in the House passing a budget to make massive cuts to Medicaid, we are not just talking about throwing millions of kids off of the healthcare they need; we are also talking about massive cuts to community health centers, where some 32 million Americans receive the primary healthcare they need and where community health centers receive 43 percent of their funding from Medicaid. So a massive cut to Medicaid is a cut to community health centers and is a cut to the services that 32 million Americans receive, including many, many seniors.

At a time when we have a major crisis in nursing home availability in Vermont and all over this country, let us understand that Medicaid provides for two out of every three seniors who live in nursing homes. A massive cut to Medicaid is a massive cut to nursing homes and the people who utilize those homes. How many seniors would be thrown out of nursing homes if the Republicans cut Medicaid by \$880 billion? Nobody knows, but it would be a disaster for working families and their parents. That is for sure.

But it is not just Medicaid cuts that seniors are worried about. Today, nearly 22 percent of people over 65 years of age are trying to survive on an income of less than \$15,000 a year. That is an unbelievable and horrific reality. Imagine anyone in America, in any part of this country—let alone a senior citizen—trying to survive on \$15,000 a year or less. I don't know how anybody can possibly do that, especially seniors who have healthcare needs and need prescription drugs and who need to heat their homes more than the general public. And it is not just seniors trying to get by on \$15,000; half of our Nation's seniors are trying to get by on less than \$30,000 a year.

The bottom line is that in the richest country in the history of the world, you have millions and millions of seniors today—people who helped build this country, people who raised us—who are barely getting by in the year 2025.

According to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, the OECD, the United States now has the dubious distinction of not only having one of the highest rates of childhood poverty in the industrialized

world, we also have one of the highest rates of senior poverty—senior poverty—compared to other wealthy nations.

In America today, according to the latest OECD estimates, 23 percent of seniors are living in poverty compared to just 4.1 percent in Norway, 6.1 percent in France, 9.5 percent in Ireland, and 14.9 percent in the United Kingdom. That is a dubious distinction. That is something we should not be proud of. That is a crisis we should be addressing.

In addition to the poverty that millions of seniors in America are experiencing today, about half of older workers—these are people in the workforce right now, people between the ages of 55 and 64—have no retirement savings at all. You are 60 years old. You have worked your entire life. Half of the people in that situation—from 55 to 64—have no retirement savings at all.

As bad as all of that is, many of my Republican colleagues have proposed making a bad situation—a tragic situation—even worse by cutting Social Security. Some want to cut benefits. Others want to raise the retirement age. Then there are some who simply want to privatize Social Security and give it over to Wall Street.

Well, I strongly disagree. At a time when millions of seniors are struggling to keep their heads above water, I don't believe that now is the time—in fact, never is the time—to cut Social Security benefits. Instead of cutting Social Security and giving tax breaks to billionaires, Congress must expand Social Security so that every senior in America can retire with the dignity and the respect that he or she deserves. Further and importantly to the younger generation, we must also make Social Security solvent for generations to come.

So that is the goal. The goal is to say to seniors all over this country, in the richest country on Earth: We are going to address the fact that many of you can't quite figure out how to buy the food you need, heat your homes, get the prescription drugs you need. You are struggling. You helped build this country. You are our parents and our grandparents. We stand with you.

That is why I have introduced legislation today with 10 of my colleagues—Senators WARREN, MERKLEY, WELCH, PADILLA, SMITH, VAN HOLLEN, MARKEY, BOOKER, GILLIBRAND, and WHITEHOUSE—to accomplish both of those goals. This legislation would make Social Security solvent for the next 75 years. It would lift millions of seniors out of poverty, and it would expand benefits for seniors and people with disabilities by \$2,400 a year.

Now, I know that in the world here in Washington where the government is now run by billionaires, \$2,400 doesn't seem like a whole lot of money, but if you are trying to get by on \$15,000 a year and can't afford to heat your house and can't afford to buy a prescription drug that you need, \$2,400 is something that will help.

How do we do this? What does this legislation do? Well, at a time of massive income and wealth inequality, when billionaires pay an effective tax rate lower than the average worker, this legislation demands that the wealthiest people in America, the billionaires and others, start paying their fair share of taxes.

Today, absurdly and unfairly, a billionaire pays the same amount of money into Social Security as someone who makes \$176,000 a year. A billionaire pays the same amount into Social Security as somebody who makes \$176,000 a year. That is because there is a cap on the Social Security payroll tax.

What does that mean? It means, if you make up to \$176,000 a year, you pay 6.2 percent of your income in Social Security taxes, but if you make 10 times more—\$1.7 million a year—you pay just 0.62 percent of your income in Social Security taxes. If you make \$1 billion a year, you pay nothing more into the Social Security fund than someone making \$176,000.

Now, that may make sense to somebody—probably to the billionaire class—but it does not make sense to me. This legislation applies the Social Security payroll tax to all income—including capital gains and dividends—for those who make over \$250,000 a year. Under this bill, 91 percent of households in our country would not see their taxes go up by one single penny—not one penny for the bottom 91 percent.

Not only is this legislation good public policy, it also happens to be precisely what the American people want. According to a Data for Progress poll, 81 percent of the American people, including 79 percent of Independents and 75 percent of Republicans, support expanding Social Security benefits. So in passing this legislation, it is not only good policy, it is precisely what Democrats, Republicans, and Independents want.

Therefore, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 770, which was introduced earlier today; that the bill be considered read three times and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I rise today to discuss Senator SANDERS' request for unanimous consent for the Senate to pass his Social Security Expansion Act. Before I do so, I want to respond to a couple of points that were made.

The accusation was once again made that Republicans are trying to cut taxes for billionaires. The reality is, Republicans are trying to stop a tax increase on all Americans. The TCJA, or 2017 tax bill, is going to expire at the end of this year, and if it is not stopped from expiring, every American will get

a tax increase, and those in the lower income categories and middle-income categories will share \$2.6 trillion of that tax increase. That is what the tax fight is about.

Then, continuing what I call the politics of fear in the face of the reforms that we are bringing, the attack was, well, we are going to cut Medicaid, we are going to stop financing for community health centers, and we are going to do all of these terrible things. I have not seen such a bill in this Congress, in the House or the Senate. We are debating how to get rid of fraud, waste, and abuse. We are not looking at how to cut benefits in Medicaid. I believe that is very clear. Today was the first time on the floor that I heard we were looking at community health centers. I wasn't aware of that either.

The bottom line here is we are trying to pay attention to our \$37 trillion national debt by weeding out waste, fraud, and abuse. We will have disagreements about how to do that, but it is definitely not going to be all the things that are being brought up, that have been accused in order to stir people up and scare them and tell them that we should not pay attention to our national debt.

With regard to Social Security, we can all agree on the importance of Social Security, which provides monthly benefits to millions of seniors, individuals with disabilities, and their families.

I also agree with my colleagues on the other side that Congress must act to preserve and strengthen Social Security to ensure that it is there for current beneficiaries and future beneficiaries.

According to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, if no action is taken, the combined Social Security trust funds will be exhausted within the next 10 years, meaning the program will not be able to pay the full amount of benefits currently promised.

However, I disagree with my colleagues' approach here today, and they have disagreed with our approaches. We have competing ideas about how we should address this issue.

Addressing Social Security's solvency will require thoughtful discussion about a variety of policy options that culminates in a bipartisan solution, not a cramdown of a different solution that we haven't even had the opportunity to have a discussion in the Finance Committee about.

Instead, my Democrat colleagues are pursuing a live UC of a bill that has not received consideration before the full committee and has never had a Republican cosponsor in the House or the Senate.

This bill would also raise taxes on certain workers making less than \$400,000—something my Democratic colleagues have previously promised not to do.

For these reasons, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Michigan.

NOMINATION OF LINDA MCMAHON

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I rise today in opposition to Linda McMahon's nomination to serve as the Secretary of the Department of Education.

All across America, from small towns like Grand Marais to cities like Grand Rapids, public schools serve as the bedrock of our communities.

As a product of Michigan public schools, the son of a public school teacher, and having watched my own three children attend public schools, I know firsthand the importance of public education.

Education is the cornerstone of academic achievement, career development, and lifelong learning in our society. A strong public education system is critical to not only our Nation's economy but community safety, social mobility, and the health of our democracy.

We need a Secretary of Education who values and respects public education and the millions of teachers and faculty who support the system.

We need a Secretary of Education who will support critical funding streams like Head Start for early education, IDEA for students with disabilities, and the school meal program that ensures that no student—no student—goes to class hungry.

That is why we cannot allow Mrs. McMahon to run our Department of Education. Instead of working to protect funding for the programs that support our students, improve classrooms, and help recruit the hard-working teachers that we so desperately need today, Mrs. McMahon has made it clear that she has, well, other priorities.

During her committee hearing, she blatantly supported efforts to dismantle our education system, including taking funding away from our public schools and using it to make investments in private schools. Mrs. McMahon and others have tried to sell this as "school choice," but we know—we know—that it is basically a voucher program that will ultimately give private schools the ability to hand pick students and close their doors to everyone else. Private schools have no requirement to serve students with disabilities, students with mental health needs, or homeless students.

We have already seen private school voucher programs fail in States that have actually implemented them, like Louisiana—Louisiana, where students who accepted vouchers experienced significant declines in their academic performance, worse than the learning loss caused by the COVID-19 pandemic and Hurricane Katrina.

So-called school choice does not meet the needs of our students, and American voters overwhelmingly agree. A 2024 poll found that less than a quarter of Americans support increasing funding for school vouchers. Meanwhile, 68 percent of Americans want to boost public school funding to better support

teachers and give our opportunities and children the education and career opportunities that they certainly deserve.

Under Mrs. McMahon's plan, we would be letting private schools decide who is educated and who is not. But, unfortunately, we know that these private institutions will always prioritize their bottom line, and the needs of students and families will be second.

If confirmed as Secretary of Education, the quality of our American education will certainly decline, and our children will ultimately suffer the consequences.

I would urge my colleagues to vote no on Mrs. McMahon's nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, over the last few months, there has literally been more than 10,000 Californians who have made it a point to reach out to me by phone calls, by letters, by emails to say one thing loud and clear: Stand up for public education.

There are students throughout California, teachers throughout California, parents throughout California, and I am sure beyond in all of our States who are afraid that Donald Trump is going to decimate Federal funding for public schools. And from what we have seen, they have every right to be concerned.

You see, only 1 month into office, the richest President in our history has teamed up with the richest man in the world to slash public funding across the board, including in education.

They have already terminated nearly \$1 billion in contracts with the Education Department alone. They have fired or placed on leave Education Department staff. These are hard-working Americans dedicated to everything from protecting the civil rights of students to special education, to student aid. And they are making it clear that this is just the beginning.

President Trump has bragged that he actually wants to eliminate the Department of Education, threatening the quality of education of 80 percent of students who go to public schools.

Colleagues, that is the situation. That is the context in which we find ourselves today as we consider the nomination of Linda McMahon to serve as Education Secretary.

We could talk about Linda McMahon's qualifications, or, frankly, lack thereof, but I am not shocked because President Trump isn't looking for someone with the background or the commitment to strengthen education in America. He is looking for someone to destroy it. President Trump has said publicly that he wishes that Mrs. McMahon would "put herself out of a job." And it is clear that she is ready to do it. And to justify it, I know I have heard of her countless accusations of Department of Education overreach or that the Department is just too big. Now, if we are saying this because of the budget cuts Republicans

are starving for to underwrite the tax rate for the wealthy, let me remind us all that the Department of Education is the smallest Agency in the Cabinet by a lot.

The Department is responsible, though, for promoting equal access to education; ensuring protections and support for students with special needs; defending the civil rights of tens of millions of students; and, yes, managing the student loans and Pell grants that students need to afford an education, just like I did when I was graduating from San Fernando High School, trying to figure out how I was going to be able to pay for college.

Yet Linda McMahon and Republicans in Congress will try to sell us on the idea that education should be left to States and to local communities.

Tell that to the young student who is struggling to read by the fourth grade but whose school doesn't have the resources they need to help them catch up. Tell that to the parents of an eighth grader who is behind in math who fear that their child will never be able to make up the time that they lost during the pandemic.

While it is true that State and local communities play the primary role in education, it is actually the Federal Government that helps close the gaps. That is part of what makes our country strong—the idea that no matter where you live, no matter who your parents are, or what tax bracket your family is in, you have the right to a good education because, after all, it is the surest path to achieve your American dream.

And, yes, it is personal for me. As I mentioned, I am a proud product of public education, a graduate of San Fernando High School—go Tigers. Upon completion of my high school education, I was accepted and had the blessed opportunity to attend the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, where I earned my degree in mechanical engineering. That led to a better life and more opportunities—exactly what my parents worked so hard and sacrificed for. That is the American dream. And I know that, by far, I am not alone.

That is why I find it outrageous that Mrs. McMahon and Republicans can so callously plan to take a chain saw to the American dreams of so many current and future students.

But, today, we are here to say that tens of millions of public school students are not line items on your chopping block. They deserve better. Our country is better than this.

I urge all of my colleagues to reject President Trump's attempts to abolish the Department of Education and to reject Linda McMahon's nomination or any nominee who is willing to carry out his wishes.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I rise today deeply concerned about the state of public education in our country.

Public education is foundational. It allows people to get ahead. As simple as that, it is foundational.

I have spoken before on the floor about the power of public education in my own life. As an immigrant from Japan, I arrived in this country speaking no English.

I started off by trying to learn how to count from 1 to 10—very humble beginnings. But it was the public education I received at schools like Koko Head Elementary and Kaimuki High School that enabled me, an immigrant from very humble beginnings, to learn English and to go on to college, law school, and, ultimately, the U.S. Senate.

We should all agree on the importance of a strong public education system for every student in our country. An educated citizenry helps grow the middle class and drive economic success in red and blue States alike.

Support for public schools should not be a partisan issue. There are millions of kids who are attending public schools in every single State in our country, so it shouldn't be a partisan issue. But just weeks into the Trump administration, public education is under attack. Already, chain saw-wielding Elon Musk—it is really hard to get rid of that image because he takes such delight in wielding that chain saw and willy-nilly cutting all kinds of government programs that we rely on. But Elon Musk and his minions have started unilaterally canceling contracts at the Department of Education without any transparency or accountability whatsoever, and Donald Trump has made no secret of his desire to eliminate the Department of Education entirely, as part of his quest to cut government services we rely on to give trillions in handouts to his billionaire buddies.

While only Congress has the power to eliminate the Department of Education in its entirety, that is not stopping Trump from using every means available to weaken Federal support for education. And as you heard from my colleague just previously, there is a lot of support for public education in our country. Why? Because most of the people in our country have to go to public schools.

The person who will help him do this, meaning totally weaken our public school system and eliminate the Department of Education, is billionaire Linda McMahon. As Trump's Secretary of Education, she will dismantle the Department of Education from the inside out.

President Trump told her that he wants her to “put herself out of a job” by eliminating this Department. Since President Trump only nominates people who are 100 percent loyal to him, we can expect Linda McMahon will comply with putting herself out of a job, which leads us to wonder why we are even giving her this job in the first place.

A nominee tasked to end the very Department that she is supposed to be

leading does not need to have much by way of experience in leading or running such a Department, which is the case with Linda McMahon. In her confirmation hearing, Mrs. McMahon could not name a single requirement of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the main Federal law that supports K through 12 education.

She couldn't say whether teaching African-American history courses violated Trump's Executive order on radical indoctrination. Teaching the history of our country is considered radical indoctrination by this President. Think about that for a minute.

She couldn't even answer a simple yes-or-no question about whether schools receiving taxpayer dollars should be allowed to discriminate against children with disabilities.

Mrs. McMahon is totally unqualified to oversee the education of our Nation's children, but Donald Trump doesn't care about that. Linda McMahon will carry out President Trump's dangerous agenda to dismantle the Department of Education, privatize the Nation's public schools, and strip educational opportunities from millions of students across the country.

In doing so, she will be 100-percent loyal to Donald Trump above all else. She will execute the plans laid out in Project 2025 to eliminate funding for title I schools, which support low-income students. We are talking about funding for 49,000 title I schools throughout the country, including 170 schools in my State of Hawaii, 2,091 title I schools in Florida, 7,500 title I schools in Texas, and so many more. Every single State has title I schools. There are 49,000 title I schools throughout our country.

Project 2025, Trump's blueprint, will have the Secretary of Education dismantle civil rights protections for students and weaponize the Office of Civil Rights to advance Trump's hateful, far-right political agenda. Then the Secretary will come after funding for programs that help provide childcare, afterschool care, school meals, and more. Think about it: school meals. For many children, that would mean taking away access to the only meal a day they can count on.

Why? Not because she thinks these decisions will improve outcomes or benefit students. No. These attacks on the Department of Education are about one thing and one thing only: finding money to pay for massive giveaways to billionaires like McMahon, Elon Musk, obviously the President, and their ilk.

Republicans are robbing our children's futures to line the pockets of their billionaire buddies, and they are robbing our country of future doctors, innovators, leaders, and more.

A strong public education system is the foundation of a strong democracy, a strong economy, and a strong middle class. That is why Democrats are committed to strengthening our schools and ensuring every child has the opportunity to get ahead, regardless of dis-

ability, income, or background. That starts with our rejecting Linda McMahon's troubling nomination to lead the Department of Education, a Department that she is going to start dismantling and, indeed, working herself out of a job.

On behalf of students, teachers, and families in Hawaii and all across our country, I urge my colleagues to think about it and to oppose this nomination.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on the importance of the Department of Education and my grave concerns about the nomination of Linda McMahon to be the Secretary of Education.

President Trump has made it clear what his directive is for Linda McMahon. It is to dismantle the Department of Education. And despite President Trump's stating that he has never read Project 2025 and Mrs. McMahon repeatedly stating that she is not familiar with Project 2025's proposals on higher education, it is abundantly clear that this administration is following Project 2025 to a tee.

Project 2025 lays out a blueprint for ending the Federal Government's role in public education, starting with dismantling the Department of Education, so that they can find the money they need to provide tax breaks for their billionaire friends. You heard me right: cutting public education dollars so that the richest can get richer.

Eliminating the Department of Education would be absolutely devastating for students, for teachers, and parents in Wisconsin and across America. Wisconsin stands to have \$235 million in title I funding ripped away. Wisconsin stands to have over \$270 million in IDEA funding, which is critical for special education, ripped away.

What this means is Wisconsin teachers stand to have needed resources for their classrooms ripped away. Parents stand to have in- and out-of-classroom support for their children ripped away. And of course, our children—our children—stand to lose out on the public education and opportunity to learn that they deserve, regardless of their ZIP code.

Look, we know we are facing a challenging time in the American education system. We know that, as a nation, we must turn the tide and ensure that America is a global leader in educating our children, and I am committed to working with parents, teachers, principals, and school districts to do just that. But we also know what won't help our children get a good education, and that is slashing the education budget. And we know what will help turn the tide: critical, data-driven investment in our public education system to support our children, our teachers, our schools, and our communities.

It is clear that Mrs. McMahon is being nominated for this role not to help children but to do Mr. Trump's

bidding. She comes to this role with very little experience in education, but she has a wealth of experience in Trump world. She has never been a teacher, but she did donate over \$20 million to Trump's campaign and organizations that are backing him. She has never been a school administrator, but she does sit on the board of directors for Trump Media & Technology Group.

In this critical time, we need to be providing our students and schools with more support, not less, and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting no on her nomination.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. RES. 103

MR. GALLEGRO. Mr. President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 103, which was submitted earlier today; further, that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

MR. RISCH. Mr. President, I object.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Arizona.

MR. GALLEGRO. Mr. President, 3 years ago, when Russia launched its invasion of Ukraine, many people, including experts, believed Putin would crush Ukraine's democracy in days. They were wrong.

About 1 month before the war broke out, I traveled to Ukraine with a bipartisan coalition of House Representatives to meet with Ukrainian soldiers. Those soldiers we met there knew they were up against one of the strongest militaries in the world, but they refused to back down when it came to fighting for their families, their freedom, and their future. These soldiers are the reason why—against all odds—Ukraine still stands strong.

Over 3 years, the scrappy little country of Ukraine has grinded down the second most powerful military in the world. Ukraine is holding the line for democracy, and they are doing it with our support. But Monday's vote at the U.N. undermined that and was a betrayal of Ukraine, America's allies, democracy, and everything we have stood for as a country.

Let's be clear on this: This is a war that Russia started. Ukraine did not ask for it. They did not ask to go to war with a nuclear superpower, and they did not ask for their cities to be reduced to rubble. They didn't ask for their children to be displaced and families to be torn apart. If Ukraine had its way, this war would have ended years ago.

What happened at the U.N. puts us on the same side as Russia and North Korea. That is not just embarrassing; it is dangerous. It sent a message to

our allies and every other country that relies on the U.S. to stand up to bullies and defend freedom that America cannot be relied on to rightfully call out unprovoked aggression. It told them that they are on their own; that America's words mean nothing.

If we can't stand up against these criminals, if we can't stand up against pariah states like Russia, how can we expect the world to take us seriously as leaders of democracy?

This is why I am introducing this resolution. I urge my colleagues to correct the mistake we made at the U.N. this week. Stand with our allies, and condemn Russia's invasion of Ukraine. America does not stand with dictators, and we never will, and we shall never.

With that, I ask for consent and vote on my resolution.

MR. PAUL. Mr. President, was there a unanimous consent request?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. No, there wasn't.

MR. GALLEGRO. I ask unanimous consent—

MR. PAUL. Mr. President, what was the consent request?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Can the Senator repeat the request, please.

MR. GALLEGRO. I withhold my request.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

MR. SCHIFF. Mr. President, "I urge you to beware the temptation of . . . label[ing] both sides equally at fault—

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Time has expired, Senator.

MR. SCHIFF. May I have consent to speak for 2 minutes?

MS. ERNST. I object.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Objection is heard.

MR. PAUL. Two minutes? If it is going to take longer.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion to invoke cloture—

MR. PAUL. If we can be done in 2 minutes.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Senator ERNST, you objected.

MS. ERNST. Withdrawn.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Withdrawn.

The Senator from California is recognized for two minutes.

MR. SCHIFF. I thank my colleagues for their courtesy to speak on this resolution.

I urge you to beware the temptation of . . . label[ing] both sides equally at fault, [the temptation] to ignore the facts of history and the aggressive impulses of an evil empire.

My colleagues, these are not my words; they are, of course, the words of Ronald Reagan almost 42 years ago to the day.

Imagine if he could see his party now turning its back on our ally and fellow democracy, Ukraine; sponsoring a U.N. resolution that would whitewash the start of the war; engaging in the most immoral equivalence and failing to assign responsibility to Russia for its in-

vasion and ruthless aggression; voting with Russia and North Korea against our longtime friends and allies in Europe and around the world; and abandoning and insulting our allies as Putin seeks to remake the map of Europe.

What is this resolution in the United Nations about that we helped defeat? The United States has used its influence and its vetoes in the Security Council many times, but this resolution was offered by dozens of our close allies on the third anniversary of Russia's invasion of Ukraine. What was in it that was so objectionable to split the United States from its friends?

The resolution made clear that Russia started this war. It reaffirmed the sovereignty and independence of Ukraine. It deplored Russian aggression on women and children. It raised concerns with North Korean troops fighting alongside Russian forces. It noted the threat to nuclear safety. It called for an end to the war and a just and lasting peace and the withdrawal of Russian forces from Ukrainian lands.

None of this is in dispute—none. This was the resolution that the United States, the leader of the free world, blocked at the United Nations. Can any Member of this body point to a single problematic word in that resolution? Of course not.

The Senate should stand by that resolution, even as we must stand by Ukraine.

Today, the White House and Kremlin seek to rewrite the history of this war with falsehood and slander, calling Zelenskyy the dictator, Ukraine the instigator, and Putin the hero. We need to do more than say something; we need to do something.

"Slava Ukraini."

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORENO). The majority whip.

WAIVING MANDATORY QUORUM CALL

MR. BARRASSO. I ask unanimous consent to waive the mandatory quorum call with respect to the McMahon nomination.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 24, Linda McMahon, of Connecticut, to be Secretary of Education.

John Thune, Cindy Hyde-Smith, James E. Risch, Katie Britt, Tommy Tuberville, James Lankford, Markwayne Mullin, Marsha Blackburn, Tom Cotton, John R. Curtis, Bernie Moreno, Tim Sheehy, Mike Rounds, Joni Ernst, Roger F. Wicker, David McCormick, Rick Scott of Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Linda McMahon, of Connecticut, to be Secretary of Education, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG).

Further, if present and voting: the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) would have voted “yea.”

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 51, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 98 Ex.]

YEAS—51

Banks	Graham	Moran
Barrasso	Grassley	Moreno
Blackburn	Hagerty	Mullin
Boozman	Hawley	Murkowski
Britt	Hoeven	Paul
Budd	Husted	Ricketts
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Risch
Cassidy	Johnson	Rounds
Collins	Justice	Schmitt
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Cotton	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Crapo	Lee	Sheehy
Cruz	Lummis	Sullivan
Curtis	Marshall	Thune
Daines	McConnell	Tillis
Ernst	McCormick	Tuberville
Fischer	Moody	Wicker

NAYS—47

Alsobrooks	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Baldwin	Hirono	Sanders
Bennet	Kaine	Schatz
Blumenthal	Kelly	Schiff
Blunt Rochester	Kim	Schumer
Booker	King	Shaheen
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Slotkin
Coons	Lujan	Smith
Cortez Masto	Markey	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warnock
Fetterman	Murray	Warren
Gallego	Ossoff	Welch
Gillibrand	Padilla	Whitehouse
Hassan	Peters	Wyden
Heinrich	Reed	

NOT VOTING—2

Cramer	Young
--------	-------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 51, the nays are 47.

The motion is agreed to.

The majority leader.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all postcloture time on the McMahon nomination be expired; further, that the Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination at 5:30 p.m. on Monday, March 3; finally, if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate re-

sume legislative session and be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNIZING THE JOLIET EMS FIRE DEPARTMENT PROGRAM

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, earlier this month, I had the pleasure of meeting with leaders from Joliet, IL—including Mayor Terry D'Arcy, city manager Beth Beatty, fire chief Jeff Carey, deputy chief of health services Aaron Kozlowski, emergency management coordinator Dr. John Lukancic, and Sister Mary Francis Seely.

I take dozens of meetings every week in my office here in Washington, but I was struck by the remarkable work underway in Joliet. Joliet is the third-largest city in Illinois, and like all communities, it faces its share of challenges. But over the past few years, Joliet has launched an incredible program to address mental health and addiction among its residents.

Starting in 2020, Joliet noticed that mental and behavioral health calls accounted for a growing percentage of the 9-1-1 calls. The fire department was spending less time putting out fires—and more time responding to people in mental health crisis. Some residents were dialing 9-1-1 regularly—several times a week—because they were facing underlying mental health needs. This cost the city money. It strained resources. But most of all, it meant residents of Joliet were suffering. So they decided to do something about it.

Joliet began by training 200 firefighters and paramedics in “crisis first aid,” to be able to respond appropriately to callers in mental health distress. You see, after experiencing trauma—like witnessing a shooting or seeing their home destroyed by a fire—people can suffer. Exposure to trauma can harm the brain, changing the way people see and interact with the world.

We know that young people who experience trauma have a shorter life expectancy, are more likely to misuse drugs, attempt suicide, commit violence, or not graduate from high school. By providing Joliet firefighters with the tools to help individuals facing trauma, these first responders are able to recognize the signs of stress, and plant the seeds of a healthier tomorrow. It also helps the firefighters understand their own mental health needs from the strains of the job, so we can keep them healthy, too.

Additionally, after being dispatched to one of these serious calls, the Joliet Fire Department pays a follow-up visit within 48 hours. These visits help to show residents that someone cares and is looking out for them; it helps calm them down and can help provide referrals to additional services the residents may need.

In less than 3 years, the Joliet Fire Department has provided more than

2,000 Joliet residents with these mental health services. Think about this for a moment: Rather than just throwing up their hands and saying, “Sorry, we just fight fires,” Joliet is taking ownership of the community's needs and preventing future 9-1-1 calls.

But they are not stopping there. Of course, not every patient's mental health needs can be addressed by first responders; some individuals require specialized treatment from a professional. But in Joliet, like most places across the country, there is a shortage of counselors and psychologists, causing waitlists that can last for months until the next available appointment. And what Joliet had realized was that, if a patient couldn't see a mental health provider, they were resorting to calling 9-1-1 and taking an ambulance to the emergency room.

It is similar to a problem that the University of Illinois Hospital in Chicago was seeing: where 48 individuals accounted for more than 776 visits to the emergency room in a single year. The reason? They were homeless. That hospital realized they could save money and better treat these patients, by paying for supportive housing.

Joliet is applying a similar lesson. They have partnered with the local hospital and a mental health company to offer free mental health services with a clinician, usually within 24 hours. Whatever insurance won't cover, the city has set up a fund to pay the co-pays and other out-of-pocket expenses for the mental health care of its residents.

What has been the result of this effort? Well, in the year before the program launched, Joliet area high schools experienced 12 teenage suicides. But in the last 2 school years, there have been zero teen suicides. Across all ages, citywide suicides have decreased by 50 percent. That is life-saving work. It is being recognized, too. Joliet recently received the Congressional Fire Service Award for Excellence.

I hope to support this effort in any way I can. Illinois recently received Federal approval to use Medicaid to cover preventive mental health services in the community, which can reduce costs down the line. And with Senator CAPITO, I have worked on Federal legislation to increase funding for trauma-informed care in schools and with first responders, to help break the cycle of mental health challenges.

I applaud the city of Joliet's efforts, which are serving as a new national model for emergency medical services and using first responders to address the root causes of suffering in the community. I look forward to working with them to identify additional Federal resources and opportunities to grow this project.

But to do that, my Republican colleagues need to understand a few things: We must fund the Federal Government and the critical programs that pay our first responders—and not allow

Elon Musk to decide what he thinks is worthwhile spending; and Medicaid is the insurance program that pays the largest share of mental health services; we cannot slash the Medicaid program to pay for billionaire tax breaks.

These may sound like distant debates in Washington, but when it comes to preventing suicides in Joliet, IL, it is a critical investment. And I will work every day to defend these programs.

U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS RULES OF PROCEDURE

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, consistent with Standing Rule XXVI, I ask unanimous consent that the rules of procedure of the Committee on Appropriations for the 119th Congress be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE RULES—119TH CONGRESS

I. MEETINGS

The Committee will meet at the call of the Chairman.

II. QUORUMS

1. Reporting a bill. A majority of the members must be present for the reporting of a bill.

2. Other business. For the purpose of transacting business other than reporting a bill or taking testimony, one-third of the members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum.

3. Taking testimony. For the purpose of taking testimony, other than sworn testimony, by the Committee or any subcommittee, one member of the Committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum. For the purpose of taking sworn testimony by the Committee, three members shall constitute a quorum, and for the taking of sworn testimony by any subcommittee, one member shall constitute a quorum.

III. PROXIES

Except for the reporting of a bill, votes may be cast by proxy when any member so requests.

IV. ATTENDANCE OF STAFF MEMBERS AT CLOSED SESSIONS

Attendance of staff members at closed sessions of the Committee shall be limited to those members of the Committee staff who have a responsibility associated with the matter being considered at such meeting. This rule may be waived by unanimous consent.

V. BROADCASTING AND PHOTOGRAPHING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS

The Committee or any of its subcommittees may permit the photographing and broadcast of open hearings by television and/or radio. However, if any member of a subcommittee objects to the photographing or broadcasting of an open hearing, the question shall be referred to the full Committee for its decision.

VI. AVAILABILITY OF SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

To the extent possible, when the bill and report of any subcommittee are available, they shall be furnished to each member of the Committee thirty-six hours prior to the Committee's consideration of said bill and report.

VII. AMENDMENTS AND REPORT LANGUAGE

To the extent possible, amendments and report language intended to be proposed by

Senators at full Committee markups shall be provided in writing to the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member and the appropriate Subcommittee Chairman and Ranking Minority Member twenty-four hours prior to such markups.

VIII. POINTS OF ORDER

Any member of the Committee who is floor manager of an appropriations bill is hereby authorized to make points of order against any amendment offered in violation of the Senate Rules on the floor of the Senate to such appropriations bill.

IX. EX OFFICIO MEMBERSHIP

The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the full Committee are ex officio members of all subcommittees of which they are not regular members but shall have no vote in the subcommittee and shall not be counted for purposes of determining a quorum.

U.S. SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON BORDER MANAGEMENT, FEDERAL WORKFORCE, AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, Senate Standing Rule XXVI requires each committee to adopt rules to govern the procedure of the committee and to publish those rules in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD not later than March 1 of the first year of each Congress. On February 27, 2025, a majority of the members of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs' Subcommittee on Border Management, Federal Workforce, and Regulatory Affairs adopted subcommittee rules of procedure.

Consistent with Standing Rule XXVI, today I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the Rules of Procedure of the Subcommittee on Border Management, Federal Workforce, and Regulatory Affairs be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

119TH CONGRESS—RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON BORDER MANAGEMENT, FEDERAL WORKFORCE, AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS OF THE COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS AS ADOPTED

(February 27, 2025)

(1) SUBCOMMITTEE RULES. The Subcommittee shall be governed, where applicable, by the rules of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Standing Rules of the Senate.

(2) QUORUMS. For public or executive sessions, one Member of the Subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for the administering of oaths and the taking of testimony in any given case or subject matter. One-third of the Members of the Subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business other than the administering of oaths and the taking of testimony, provided that one Member of the minority is present. Proxies shall not be considered for the establishment of a quorum.

(3) TAKING TESTIMONY. In any hearings conducted by the Subcommittee, the Chair or the Chair's designee may swear in each witness prior to their testimony.

(4) SUBCOMMITTEE SUBPOENAS. Subpoenas for witnesses, as well as documents and records, may be authorized and issued by the Chair, or any other Member of the Sub-

committee designated by him or her, with the approval of the Ranking Minority Member of the Subcommittee, provided that the Chair may subpoena attendance or production without the approval of the Ranking Minority Member where the Chair or a staff officer designated by him or her has not received notification from the Ranking Minority Member or a staff officer designated by him or her of disapproval of the subpoena within two calendar days excluding Saturdays and Sundays, of being notified of the subpoena. If the subpoena is disapproved by the Ranking Minority Member as provided herein, the subpoena may be authorized by a vote of the Members of the Subcommittee.

A written notice of intent to issue a subpoena shall be provided to the Chair and Ranking Minority Member of the full Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, or staff officers designated by them, by the Subcommittee Chair, or a staff officer designated by him or her, immediately upon such authorization, and no subpoena shall be issued for at least two calendar days, excluding Saturdays and Sundays, from delivery to appropriate offices, unless the Chair and Ranking Minority Member of the full Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs waive the two-calendar day waiting period or unless the Subcommittee Chair certifies in writing to the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the full Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs that, in his or her opinion, it is necessary to issue the subpoena immediately.

U.S. SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON DISASTER MANAGEMENT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AND CENSUS RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, Senate Standing Rule XXVI requires each committee to adopt rules to govern the procedure of the committee and to publish those rules in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD not later than March 1 of the first year of each Congress. On February 27, 2025, a majority of the members of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs' Subcommittee on Disaster Management, District of Columbia, and Census adopted subcommittee rules of procedure.

Consistent with Standing Rule XXVI, today I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the Rules of Procedure of the Subcommittee on Disaster Management, District of Columbia, and Census be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

119TH CONGRESS—RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON DISASTER MANAGEMENT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AND CENSUS OF THE COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS AS ADOPTED

(February 27, 2025)

1. Subcommittee rules. The Subcommittee shall be governed, where applicable, by the rules of the full Committee on Homeland Security and Government Affairs and the Standing Rules of the Senate.

2. Quorums.

A. Transaction of routine business. One-third of the membership of the Subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of routine business, provided

that one Member of the Minority is present. For the purpose of this paragraph, the term “routine business” includes the convening of a meeting and the consideration of any business of the Subcommittee other than reporting to the full Committee on Homeland Security and Government Affairs any measures, matters, or recommendations.

B. Taking testimony. One Member of the Subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for taking sworn or unsworn testimony.

C. Proxies prohibited in establishment of quorum. Proxies shall not be considered for the establishment of a quorum.

3. Subcommittee subpoenas. The Chair of the Subcommittee, with the approval of the Ranking Minority Member of the Subcommittee, is authorized to subpoena the attendance of witnesses or the production of memoranda, documents, records, or any other materials at a hearing, provided that the Chair may subpoena attendance or production without the approval of the Ranking Minority Member where the Chair or a staff officer designated by the Chair has not received notification from the Ranking Minority Member or a staff officer designated by the Chair of disapproval of the subpoena within 2 calendar days, excluding Saturdays and Sundays and legal holidays in which the Senate is not in session, of being notified of the subpoena. If a subpoena is disapproved by the Ranking Minority Member as provided herein, the subpoena may be authorized by vote of the Members of the Subcommittee.

Immediately upon authorization of the issuance of a subpoena under these rules, a written notice of intent to issue the subpoena shall be provided to the Chair and Ranking Minority Member of the full Committee on Homeland Security and Government Affairs, or staff officers designated by the Chair and Ranking Minority Member for the full Committee, by the Subcommittee Chair or a staff officer designated by the Chair, and no subpoena shall be issued for at least 2 calendar days, excluding Saturdays and Sundays, from delivery to the appropriate offices, unless the Chair and Ranking Minority Member of the full Committee on Homeland Security and Government Affairs waive the 2-calendar day waiting period or unless the Subcommittee Chair certifies in writing to the Chair and Ranking Minority Member of the full Committee that, in the opinion of the Chair, it is necessary to issue a subpoena immediately.

When the Subcommittee or its Chair authorizes subpoenas, subpoenas may be issued upon the signature of the Chair or any other Member of the Subcommittee designated by the Chair.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO AMBER MORGAN

• Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I am honored to recognize Amber Morgan of Nashua as February's Granite Stater of the Month. Amber's flower shop Fortin Gage Flowers sells a special floral arrangement every month and donates the proceeds to a local community group.

Amber is an active member of the Nashua community. She sits on the city's citizen advisory committee and has built relationships with many local organizations. In the 2 years that she has owned Fortin Gage Flowers, Amber has often donated bouquets for charity events.

Amber's new Flowers for Good Campaign spotlights a different organiza-

tion every month with a unique bouquet. Amber donates proceeds from the sale of the arrangement to the organization and the recipient of the bouquet can learn about the group from an information card included with the flowers. Amber sees the campaign as a way to spread awareness of groups in the area that are helping Granite Staters in a fun and creative way.

Amber's passion for uplifting local organizations is a wonderful example of the Granite State spirit of going the extra mile to support your community. Her commitment to lifting up others is why I am proud to name her February's Granite Stater of the Month. •

TRIBUTE TO RICK BARNES

• Mr. SCHMITT. Mr. President. I rise today to honor Rick Barnes of Doolittle, MO, for his service to his neighbors and the State by a simple act of kindness.

On March 8, 2024, Stella Typaldos and her two young children were on the way to St. Louis to attend a family gathering. As Stella was driving east-bound on I-44, near Fort Leonard Wood, she hit a massive pothole that popped her tire and left her and her children stranded. Rick Barnes, a firefighter with the Doolittle Rural Fire Protection District, was driving west on I-44 when he saw Stella's car stranded on the other side of the highway. Barnes didn't hesitate to turn around and stop to help her. He drove Stella and her children to a nearby auto shop to purchase a new tire and help install it. Barnes began his firefighting career 7 years ago when he was 60 years old, and his desire to help his fellow Missourians when they are in need is inspirational.

Rick Barnes is truly a Champion of Missouri. He went above and beyond to support his fellow Missourians, and I am grateful for his commitment to helping our community. I wish him the best as he continues to serve at the Doolittle Rural Fire Protection District. •

TRIBUTE TO DEPUTY MARKUS BURNS

• Mr. SCHMITT. Mr. President. I rise today to honor Deputy Markus Burns of Benton County, MO, for his selfless act of bravery and continued service to the State.

As heavy storms came on April 29, 2024, Benton County Sheriff's Deputy Markus Burns responded to reports of a woman crying for help inside Deer Creek. Without knowledge of her whereabouts or regard for his own safety, Deputy Burns quickly shed his gear and entered the chest-deep water. Following the screams, Deputy Burns discovered a woman clinging to a tree for dear life. Deputy Burns quickly convinced the woman to let go of her anchor, allowing the current to safely bring the woman to his position. Thanks to Deputy Burns' quick think-

ing and rapid response, another Missourian made it home safe.

Deputy Burns is truly a Champion of Missouri. The selfless actions taken by Deputy Burns on that fateful day demonstrate not only a dedicated officer, but a true, American hero. For that, we are forever thankful. I wish him the best as he continues to grow in his career in the Benton County Sheriff's Office. •

TRIBUTE TO DANA BYERLEY

• Mr. SCHMITT. Mr. President, I rise today to honor Officer Dana Byerley of Sparta, MO, for her timely and heroic act of service to save the life of an infant.

The Short family welcomed their youngest daughter Bristol in July 2022. They soon discovered that she had cystic fibrosis (CF) and would need various medications every day to help her breathe and give her as normal a life as possible. The Short family is dedicated to creating as many life-giving memories as they can, so they attended the Persimmons Day Festival at the Roller Park in Sparta, MO, in October 2024. While at the festival, Bristol's mother Miranda noticed that her lips were turning blue and her body was going limp. They urgently searched for help among the crowd and reserve officer Dana Byerley quickly came to their aid. Officer Byerley performed mouth-to-mouth until Bristol was revived and the emergency medical services could arrive to bring her to the nearest hospital. The doctors and nurses at Mercy Hospital were able to attend to Bristol and treat her so she was well enough to travel to her CF hospital in Columbia, MO, where she remained and made a full recovery.

Dana Byerley is truly a Champion of Missouri. Her willingness to help and quick thinking kept little Bristol alive; now, she is a thriving and happy toddler. I commend Officer Byerley for her service to her fellow Missourians and wish her all the best with the Sparta Police Department. •

RECOGNIZING THE ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY TECHNOLOGY MANAGERS ANNIVERSARY

• Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Intellectual Property, I rise to celebrate the Association of University Technology Managers' 50th anniversary.

The Society of University Patent Administrators, known as SUPA, was first formed in 1975 to focus on how best to advance discoveries from university labs into the marketplace. In the decades since, SUPA was renamed the Association of University Technology Managers and now is known as AUTM. They championed the 1980 Bayh-Dole Act, which allowed universities and inventors to retain the intellectual property rights of discoveries made using Federal funding and helped technology transfer blossom.

Technology transfer has had a profound effect on the American economy and is estimated to have created more than 19,000 startup companies, up to 6.5 million jobs, and \$2 trillion in economic impact since 1996. Technology transfer, via AUTM and the many inventors that they assist, help ensure that the United States remains the world leader in innovation. Therefore, on behalf of myself and Senator CHRIS COONS—my longtime partner on the IP Subcommittee—I recognize AUTM's 50th anniversary and commend the many technology transfer professionals on their successes to make our Nation safer, more vibrant, and healthier.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Hanley, one of his secretaries.

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGES

REPORT OF THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY THAT WAS ORIGINALLY DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13692 OF MARCH 8, 2015, WITH RESPECT TO THE SITUATION IN VENEZUELA—PM 10

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with the accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

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.

REPORT OF THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY THAT WAS ORIGINALLY DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13660 OF MARCH 6, 2014, WITH RESPECT TO UKRAINE—PM 11

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

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* 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.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:04 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Alli, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following joint resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.J. Res. 35. Joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "Waste Emissions Charge for Petroleum and Natural Gas Systems: Procedures for Facilitating Compliance, Including Netting and Exemptions".

At 11:40 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Alli, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 250. An act to direct the Joint Committee on the Library to procure a statue of Benjamin Franklin for placement in the Capitol.

H.R. 469. An act to provide for the creation of a Congressional time capsule in commemoration of the semiquincentennial of the United States, and for other purposes.

H.R. 695. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the rate of the special pension payable to Medal of Honor recipients, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 250. An act to direct the Joint Committee on the Library to procure a statue of Benjamin Franklin for placement in the Capitol; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

H.R. 469. An act to provide for the creation of a Congressional time capsule in commemoration of the semiquincentennial of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

H.R. 695. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the rate of the special pension payable to Medal of Honor recipients, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-474. A communication from the Board Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Administration's Fiscal Year 2024 Federal Information Security Management Act (FISMA) and Privacy Management Report received in the Office of the President pro tempore; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-475. A communication from the Board Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Administration's Fiscal Year 2024 Federal Information Security Management Act (FISMA) and Privacy Management Report; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-476. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Notice: Guidance Related to Health Coverage Reporting Required by Sections 6055 and 6056" (Notice 2025-15) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 26, 2025; to the Committee on Finance.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CRUZ for the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

*Steven Bradbury, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of Transportation.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, for the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation I report favorably the following nomination list which was printed in the RECORD on the date indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of

reprinting on the Executive Calendar that this nomination lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

*Coast Guard nomination of Samuel B. Hafenstein, to be Lieutenant Commander.

By Mr. CASSIDY for the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

*Lori Chavez-DeRemer, of Oregon, to be Secretary of Labor.

By Mr. PAUL for the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

*James Bishop, of North Carolina, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

*Troy Edgar, of California, to be Deputy Secretary of Homeland Security.

By Mr. GRASSLEY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Todd Blanche, of Florida, to be Deputy Attorney General.

Abigail Slater, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself and Ms. ROSEN):

S. 762. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to deny immigration benefits to aliens who carried out, participated in, planned, financed, supported, or otherwise facilitated the October 2023 attacks against Israel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO):

S. 763. 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 Finance.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. HICKENLOOPER):

S. 764. 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 Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself, Mr. HUSTED, and Mr. RICKETTS):

S. 765. A bill to prohibit the use of DeepSeek by the executive agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. ERNST:

S. 766. A bill to require an annual report of taxpayer-funded projects that are over budget and behind schedule; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. KELLY (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 767. A bill to amend the Office of National Drug Control Prevention Act of 1998 to include new requirements for assessments and reports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. COONS, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. KELLY, Mr. YOUNG, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 768. A bill to establish a grant program to provide assistance to local law enforcement agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. PADILLA):

S. 769. A bill to amend the Research and Development, Competition, and Innovation Act to clarify the definition of foreign country for purposes of malign foreign talent recruitment restriction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WELCH, Mr. PADILLA, Ms. SMITH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 770. A bill to enhance Social Security benefits and ensure the long-term solvency of the Social Security program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DAINES, Ms. LUMMIS, and Mr. SHEEHY):

S. 771. A bill to terminate the Shelter and Services Program of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. THUNE):

S. 772. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make the exclusion for certain employer payments of student loans under educational assistance programs permanent; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. 773. A bill to amend section 324 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to incentivize States, Indian Tribes, and Territories to close disaster recovery projects by authorizing the use of excess funds for management costs for other disaster recovery projects; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 774. A bill to prohibit the use of funds to seek membership in the World Health Organization or to provide assessed or voluntary contributions to the World Health Organization until certain conditions have been met; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mr. LUJÁN):

S. 775. A bill to amend the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018 to prohibit the slaughter of equines for human consumption; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. MORAN):

S. 776. 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 Finance.

By Mr. BUDD (for himself, Mr. KELLY, and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. 777. 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 Relations.

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 778. 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 Mr. PADILLA (for himself, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. KAINE, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 779. 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 Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. SMITH, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BOOKER, and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 780. 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 Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. MURPHY):

S. 781. A bill to reauthorize Long Island Sound programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. LUJÁN (for himself and Ms. ERNST):

S. 782. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to amend regulations to allow for certain packers to have an interest in market agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 783. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to provide additional assistance to rural water, wastewater, and waste disposal systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. OSSOFF (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 784. 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 Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 785. A bill to extend the Alaska Native Vietnam era Veterans Land Allotment Program; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Ms. SMITH, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 786. 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 Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 787. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a commission to review operations at the Veterans Health Administration and submit to Congress reports with respect to that review, and for other programs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. KING, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. KELLY):

S. 788. 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 Finance.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and Mr. KING):

S. 789. A bill to require reports on critical mineral and rare earth element resources around the world and a strategy for the development of advanced mining, refining, separation, and processing technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. LUMMIS (for herself and Mr. BARRASSO):

S. 790. 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 Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself and Ms. ALSOBROOKS):

S. 791. A bill to establish the Justice Thurgood Marshall National Historic Site in the State of Maryland as an affiliated area of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. LEE:

S. 792. A bill to require the National Telecommunications Information Administration to estimate the value of electromagnetic spectrum assigned or otherwise allocated to Federal entities; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. 793. A bill to amend the Commander John Scott Hannon Veterans Mental Health Care Improvement Act of 2019 to modify and reauthorize the Staff Sergeant Parker Gordon Fox Suicide Prevention Grant Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LEE:

S. 794. A bill to require the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information to audit Federal spectrum; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. ROUNDS (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. THUNE, Mr. HOEVEN, and Mr. MARSHALL):

S. 795. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to exclude prior converted cropland from the definition of "navigable waters", and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. DAINES, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. RISCH, and Ms. LUMMIS):

S. 796. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the corporate alternative minimum tax; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WARREN, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. COONS, and Mr. KAIN):

S. 797. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to protect and expand access to fertility treatment under the health insurance program carried out under chapter 89 of that title, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 798. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the indexing of certain assets for purposes of determining gain or loss; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. KAIN):

S. 799. A bill to establish and implement a multi-year Legal Gold and Mining Partner-

ship Strategy to reduce the negative environmental and social impacts of illicit gold mining in the Western Hemisphere, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. KING):

S. 800. A bill to modify the Precision Medicine for Veterans Initiative of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LEE:

S. 801. 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 Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. WICKER, Ms. BALDWIN, and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER):

S. 802. A bill to amend title 14, United States Code, to make appropriations for Coast Guard pay in the event an appropriations Act expires before the enactment of a new appropriations Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. COONS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. KAIN, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. REED, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. SMITH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 803. A bill to regulate large capacity ammunition feeding devices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. SCHIFF):

S. 804. A bill to terminate authorizations for the use of military force and declarations of war no later than 10 years after the enactment of such authorizations or declarations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. KAIN, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. WARNOCK):

S. 805. A bill to establish in the Department of State the Office to Monitor and Combat Islamophobia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. LUJÁN (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 806. 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 Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. RISCH, Mr. JUSTICE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. MORAN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 807. 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. DAINES (for himself, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SHEEHY, and Ms. SLOTKIN):

S. 808. A bill to prohibit the importation of certain minerals from the Russian Federation; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LEE (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. 809. A bill to amend the Right to Financial Privacy Act of 1978 to preserve the confidentiality of certain records, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MARKEY:

S. 810. A bill to ensure that there are no reductions in funding for critical education programs for fiscal years 2025, 2026, and 2027, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. WELCH, Mr. BUDD, Mr. CURTIS, and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 811. A bill to express findings relating to the recreational trails program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. RICKETTS (for himself and Mr. BUDD):

S.J. Res. 28. 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 Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. FETTERMAN, and Mrs. BRITT):

S. Res. 101. A resolution affirming the threats to world stability from a nuclear weapons-capable Islamic Republic of Iran; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. HICKENLOOPER):

S. Res. 102. A resolution to recognize and celebrate the 30th anniversary of the Denver International Airport; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. GALLEGUO (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. BENNET, and Mr. SCHIFF):

S. Res. 103. A resolution condemning the rejection by the United States of a United Nations resolution condemning the illegal invasion of Ukraine by the Russian Federation; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. Res. 104. A resolution designating February 27, 2025, as "Rare Disease Day"; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 9

At the request of Mr. TUBERVILLE, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mrs. MOODY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 9, a bill to provide that for purposes of determining compliance with title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 in athletics, sex shall be recognized based solely on a person's reproductive biology and genetics at birth.

S. 121

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. HUSTED) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) were added as cosponsors of S. 121, a bill to extend the statute of limitations for violations relating to pandemic-era programs to be 10 years.

S. 292

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 292, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against tax for charitable donations to nonprofit organizations providing education scholarships to qualified elementary and secondary students.

S. 317

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 317, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify and extend the deduction for charitable contributions for individuals not itemizing deductions.

S. 345

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 345, a bill to provide that silencers be treated the same as firearms accessories.

S. 363

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 363, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to foreign governments that resist efforts to repatriate their citizens who have unlawfully entered the United States and foreign governments and foreign persons that knowingly facilitate unlawful immigration into the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 364

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 364, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to remove silencers from the definition of firearms, and for other purposes.

S. 435

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BANKS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 435, a bill to improve the missile defense capabilities of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 522

At the request of Mr. HAGERTY, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. TUBERVILLE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 522, a bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to modify the frequency of board of directors meetings, and for other purposes.

S. 525

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mrs. BRITT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 525, a bill to transfer the functions, duties, responsibilities, assets, liabilities, orders, determinations, rules, regulations, permits, grants, loans, contracts, agreements, certificates, licenses, and privileges of the United States Agency for International Development relating to implementing and administering the Food for Peace Act to the Department of Agriculture.

S. 556

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN), the Senator from Florida (Mrs. MOODY), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BANKS), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) were added as cosponsors of S. 556, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to persons engaged in logistical transactions and sanctions evasion relating to oil, gas, liquefied natural gas, and related petrochemical products from the Islamic Republic of Iran, and for other purposes.

S. 567

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 567, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the First Rhode Island Regiment, in recognition of their dedicated service during the Revolutionary War.

S. 583

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 583, a bill to amend chapter 9 of title 5, United States Code, to reauthorize the executive reorganization authority of the President and to ensure efficient executive reorganization, and for other purposes.

S. 599

At the request of Mr. WELCH, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. SLOTKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 599, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the mileage rate offered by the Department of Veterans Affairs through their Beneficiary Travel program for health related travel, and for other purposes.

S. 627

At the request of Mr. SCHMITT, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 627, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make certain provisions with respect to qualified ABLE programs permanent.

S. 679

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 679, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to improve the Law Enforcement Officers Safety Act of 2004 and provisions relating to the carrying of concealed weapons by law enforcement officers, and for other purposes.

S. 680

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 680, a bill to prohibit funding for the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change until China is no longer defined as a developing country.

S. 685

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SCHMITT) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. MORENO) were added as cosponsors of S. 685, a bill to ensure State and local law enforcement officers are permitted to cooperate with Federal officials to protect our communities from violent criminals and suspected terrorists who are illegally present in the United States.

S. 706

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 706, a bill to amend the Justice for United States Victims of State Sponsored Terrorism Act to clarify and supplement the funding sources for United States victims of state-sponsored terrorism to ensure consistent and meaningful distributions from the United States Victims of State Sponsored Terrorism Fund, and for other purposes.

S. 720

At the request of Mr. PADILLA, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 720, a bill to establish an Office of Environmental Justice within the Department of Justice, and for other purposes.

S. 761

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the names of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 761, a bill to establish the Truth and Healing Commission on Indian Boarding School Policies in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 86

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 86, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding United Nations General Assembly Resolution 2758 (XXVI) and the harmful conflation of China's "One China Principle" and the United States' "One China Policy".

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. PADILLA (for himself, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. Kaine, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 779. 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 Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the bipartisan Early Action and Responsiveness Lifts Youth Minds Act. This legislation would increase access to early intervention and prevention initiatives in children's mental health.

Our bipartisan bill would allow States to use up to 5 percent of their community mental health services block grant funding for prevention and early intervention activities. The community mental health services block grant, MHBG, administered by the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, is currently limited to funding services for those with severe, diagnosed mental illnesses.

The bill would also require the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, HHS, to provide reports to Congress detailing States' efforts to promote early intervention. HHS would report to Congress every 2 years regarding States' efforts to promote early intervention, including comprehensive information on activities undertaken and outcomes achieved.

Over 20 percent of youth have reported seriously considering suicide in the previous year, with 18 percent having developed a suicide plan, which is one of the most significant risk factors that precipitates an actual attempt. Over 40 percent of teens reported persistent feelings of sadness or hopelessness, with a shocking 57 percent of girls reporting this. These statistics regarding suicidality and hopelessness are considerably poorer than ten years ago. The evidence is clear: There is a youth mental health crisis, and it is getting worse. Yet many of these youth in distress do not yet have a diagnosed mental health condition, meaning that MHBG funds can't be used to help them and prevent their symptoms from worsening.

Research shows that intervening early with people who are experiencing mental health challenges can help prevent those challenges from turning more serious—and more costly to treat.

States should have the flexibility to use up to 5 percent of mental health block grant funds for prevention and early intervention activities if they so choose. Without this adjustment, the mental health block grant is missing a valuable opportunity to intervene early and save lives.

I would like to thank Senators TILLIS, Kaine, and MURKOWSKI for co-leading this legislation, and I look forward to working with my colleagues to enact this bill as soon as possible.

Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. CAS-
SIDY, Mr. DAINES, Mrs. BLACK-
BURN, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. RISCH,
and Ms. LUMMIS):

S. 796. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the corporate alternative minimum tax; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 796

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Book Minimum Tax Repeal Act".

SEC. 2. REPEAL OF CORPORATE ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM TAX.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 55 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking "There" and inserting "In the case of a taxpayer other than a corporation, there", and

(B) by striking "plus, in the case of an applicable corporation, the tax imposed by section 59A" in paragraph (2), and

(2) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) TENTATIVE MINIMUM TAX.—

“(1) AMOUNT OF TENTATIVE MINIMUM TAX.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The tentative minimum tax for the taxable year is the sum of—

“(i) 26 percent of so much of the taxable excess as does not exceed \$175,000, plus

“(ii) 28 percent of so much of the taxable excess as exceeds \$175,000.

The amount determined under the preceding sentence shall be reduced by the alternative minimum tax foreign tax credit for the taxable year.

“(B) TAXABLE EXCESS.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'taxable excess' means so much of the alternative minimum taxable income for the taxable year as exceeds the exemption amount.

“(C) MARRIED INDIVIDUAL FILING SEPARATE RETURN.—In the case of a married individual filing a separate return, subparagraph (A) shall be applied by substituting 50 percent of the dollar amount otherwise applicable under clause (i) and clause (ii) thereof. For purposes of the preceding sentence, marital status shall be determined under section 7703.

“(2) ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM TAXABLE INCOME.—The term 'alternative minimum taxable income' means the taxable income of the taxpayer for the taxable year—

“(A) determined with the adjustments provided in section 56 and section 58, and

“(B) increased by the amount of the items of tax preference described in section 57.

If a taxpayer is subject to the regular tax, such taxpayer shall be subject to the tax imposed by this section (and, if the regular tax is determined by reference to an amount other than taxable income, such amount shall be treated as the taxable income of such taxpayer for purposes of the preceding sentence).“

(b) APPLICATION TO GENERAL BUSINESS CREDIT.—Section 38(c)(6)(E) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

“(E) CORPORATIONS.—In the case of a corporation, this subsection shall be applied by treating the corporation as having a tentative minimum tax of zero.”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 11(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking "the taxes imposed by subsection (a) and section 55" and inserting "the tax imposed by subsection (a)".

(2) Section 12 of such Code is amended by striking paragraph (5).

(3) Section 53 of such Code is amended by striking subsection (e).

(4) Part VI of subchapter A of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by striking section 56A (and the item related to such section in the table of sections for such part).

(5) Section 59 of such Code is amended by striking subsections (k) and (l).

(6) Section 860E(a)(4) of such Code is amended by striking "section 55(b)(1)(D)" and inserting "section 55(b)(2)".

(7) Section 882(a)(1) of such Code is amended by "55".

(8) Section 897(a)(2)(A)(i) of such Code is amended by striking "section 55(b)(1)(D)" and inserting "section 55(b)(2)".

(9) Section 6425(c)(1)(A) of such Code is amended by striking clause (ii) and by redesignating clause (iii) as clause (ii).

(10) Section 6655(e)(2) of such Code is amended by striking ", adjusted financial statement income (as defined in section 56A)" each place it appears in subparagraphs (A)(i) and (B)(i).

(11) Section 6655(g)(1)(A) of such Code is amended by striking clause (ii) and by redesignating clauses (iii) and (iv) as clauses (ii) and (iii), respectively.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2024.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. WELCH and Mr. SCHIFF):

S. 804. To terminate authorizations for the use of military force and declarations of war no later than 10 years after the enactment of such authorizations or declarations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 804

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Accountability for Endless Wars Act of 2025".

SEC. 2. TERMINATION OF AUTHORIZATIONS FOR THE USE OF MILITARY FORCE AND DECLARATIONS OF WAR.

(a) FUTURE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR THE USE OF MILITARY FORCE AND DECLARATIONS OF WAR.—Any authorization for the use of military force or declaration of war enacted into law after the date of the enactment of this Act shall terminate on the date that is 10 years after the date of the enactment of such authorization or declaration.

(b) EXISTING AUTHORIZATIONS FOR THE USE OF MILITARY FORCE AND DECLARATIONS OF WAR.—Any authorization for the use of military force or declaration of war enacted before the date of the enactment of this Act shall terminate on the date that is 6 months after the date of such enactment.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 101—AFFIRMING THE THREATS TO WORLD STABILITY FROM A NUCLEAR WEAPONS-CAPABLE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN

Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. FETTERMAN, and Mrs. BRITT) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 101

Whereas numerous officials of the Islamic Republic of Iran have repeatedly made statements against the United States, Israel, and their allies and partners, including—

(1) the Supreme Leader of the Islamic Republic of Iran, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, who stated—

(A) “As long as America continues its wickedness, interference, and savagery, the Iranian nation will not abandon ‘Death to America.’”;

(B) “The Zionist regime is a deadly, cancerous growth and a detriment to this region. It will undoubtedly be uprooted and destroyed”;

(C) “We will definitely do everything necessary to prepare the Iranian nation for confronting the Arrogant Powers, whether militarily, in terms of armament, or politically. Our officials are already working on this”; and

(D) “The United States of America and the Zionist regime will definitely receive a crushing response for what they do against Iran and the Resistance Front”;

(2) an adviser to the Supreme Leader of the Islamic Republic of Iran, Kamal Kharrazi, who stated, “We have no decision to build a nuclear bomb but should Iran’s existence be threatened, there will be no choice but to change our military doctrine”; and

(3) former foreign ministry spokesperson of the Islamic Republic of Iran, Nasser Kanani, who stated, “This action of the three European countries [France, Germany and the United Kingdom] is the continuation of the hostile policy of the West and economic terrorism against the people of Iran, which will face the appropriate and proportionate action of the Islamic Republic of Iran”;

Whereas the Islamic Republic of Iran is directly responsible for the death and injury of United States servicemembers, including—

(1) between 2005 and 2011, when the Quds Force, a branch of Iran’s Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, provided explosively formed penetrators to Iranian-backed fighters in Iraq and killed 195 United States troops and wounded nearly another 900 United States troops;

(2) since the October 7, 2023, attack on Israel, where Iranian-backed proxies have attacked United States troops in the region more than 170 times; and

(3) on January 28, 2024, when an Iranian-backed proxy launched a drone that killed 3 United States troops and wounded nearly another 40 United States troops stationed at Tower 22 in Jordan;

Whereas the United States Government has reported—

(1) “Iran’s annual financial backing to Hizballah — which in recent years has been estimated at \$700 million — accounts for the overwhelming majority of [Hizballah’s] annual budget”;

(2) “Hamas has received funding, weapons, and training from Iran”; and

(3) “Iran also provides up to \$100 million annually in combined support to Palestinian terrorist groups, including Hamas”;

Whereas the Islamic Republic of Iran’s support to the Houthis, including through the provision of ballistic and cruise missiles and unmanned weapons systems, has allowed the Houthis to carry out attacks against United States partners;

Whereas, since the Iranian Revolution in 1979, the Islamic Republic of Iran has engaged in acts of international terrorism and continuously threatened the United States, Israel, and their partners and allies;

Whereas, on January 19, 1984, the United States designated the Islamic Republic of Iran as a state sponsor of terrorism for repeatedly providing support for acts of international terrorism;

Whereas, on April 11, 2006, the Islamic Republic of Iran announced that it had enriched uranium for the first time to a level close to 3.5 percent at the Pilot Fuel Enrichment Plant in Natanz, Iran;

Whereas, on December 23, 2006, the United Nations Security Council adopted Resolution 1737 (2006), which imposed sanctions with respect to the Islamic Republic of Iran for its failure to suspend enrichment activities;

Whereas the United Nations Security Council subsequently adopted Resolutions 1747 (2007), 1803 (2008), and 1929 (2010), all of which targeted the nuclear program of, and imposed additional sanctions with respect to, the Islamic Republic of Iran;

Whereas, on February 3, 2009, the Islamic Republic of Iran announced that it had launched its first satellite, which raised concern over the applicability of the satellite to the ballistic missile program;

Whereas, in September 2009, the United States, the United Kingdom, and France revealed the existence of the clandestine Fordow Fuel Enrichment Plant in the Islamic Republic of Iran, years after construction started on the plant;

Whereas, on January 28, 2017, the Islamic Republic of Iran conducted a test of a medium-range ballistic missile, which traveled an estimated 600 miles and provides the Islamic Republic of Iran the capability to threaten United States military installations in the Middle East;

Whereas, in 2018, Israel seized a significant portion of the nuclear archive of the Islamic Republic of Iran, which contained tens of thousands of files and compact discs relating to past efforts at nuclear weapon design, development, and manufacturing by the Islamic Republic of Iran;

Whereas, on September 27, 2018, Israel revealed the existence of a secret warehouse housing radioactive material in the Turquz Abad district in Tehran, and an inspection of the warehouse by the International Atomic Energy Agency (referred to in this preamble as the “IAEA”) detected radioactive particles, which the Government of Iran failed to adequately explain;

Whereas, on June 19, 2020, the IAEA adopted Resolution GOV/2020/34, which expressed “serious concern . . . that Iran has not provided access to the Agency under the Additional Protocol to two locations”;

Whereas, on April 17, 2021, the IAEA verified that the Islamic Republic of Iran had begun to enrich uranium to 60 percent purity;

Whereas, on August 14, 2021, the former President of the Islamic Republic of Iran, Hassan Rouhani, stated, “Iran’s Atomic Energy Organization can enrich uranium by 20 percent and 60 percent and if . . . our reactors need it, it can enrich uranium to 90 percent purity”;

Whereas, on April 17, 2022, the Islamic Republic of Iran confirmed the relocation of a production facility for advanced centrifuges from an aboveground facility at Karaj, Iran, to the fortified underground Natanz Enrichment Complex;

Whereas, on April 19, 2022, the Department of State released a report stating there are “serious concerns” about “possible undeclared nuclear material and activities in Iran”;

Whereas, on May 30, 2022, the IAEA reported that the Islamic Republic of Iran had achieved a stockpile of 43.3 kilograms (95.5 pounds) of 60 percent highly enriched uranium, roughly enough material for a nuclear weapon;

Whereas, on June 8, 2022, the Islamic Republic of Iran turned off surveillance cameras installed by the IAEA to monitor uranium enrichment activities at nuclear sites in the country;

Whereas, on July 14, 2022, in The Jerusalem U.S.-Israel Strategic Partnership Joint Declaration, which was signed between President Biden and Israel, the United States stressed its commitment “never to allow

Iran to acquire a nuclear weapon, and that [the United States] is prepared to use all elements of its national power to ensure that outcome”;

Whereas, on July 27, 2022, the head of the Atomic Energy Organization of Iran, Mohammad Eslami, announced that the Islamic Republic of Iran is building a new nuclear reactor at the Isfahan Nuclear Technology Center, which will be one of the largest nuclear facilities in Iran;

Whereas, on December 2, 2022, IAEA Director General Rafael Mariano Grossi stated, “Iran informed us they were tripling . . . their capacity to enrich uranium at 60 percent, which is very close to military level, which is 90 percent”;

Whereas, on January 25, 2023, Director General Grossi stated, “One thing is true: [the Islamic Republic of Iran has] amassed enough nuclear material for several nuclear weapons”;

Whereas, on February 27, 2023, the IAEA reported that the Islamic Republic of Iran had enriched uranium to 83.7 percent, which is just short of the 90 percent threshold for weapons-grade fissile material;

Whereas, on September 4, 2023, an IAEA report estimated the total uranium stockpile of the Islamic Republic of Iran to be 3795.5 kilograms (8367.65 pounds) and that the Islamic Republic of Iran has enough fissile material, that if further enriched, would be sufficient to produce several nuclear weapons;

Whereas, on October 18, 2023, United Nations Security Council Resolution 2231 (2015) lapsed and many proliferation-related penalties and restrictions were lifted, allowing the Islamic Republic of Iran to test or transfer ballistic missiles, which may contribute to the further development of a nuclear weapon delivery system;

Whereas, on December 28, 2023, the governments of the United States, France, Germany, and the United Kingdom jointly declared, “The production of high-enriched uranium by Iran has no credible civilian justification. These decisions demonstrate Iran’s lack of good will towards de-escalation and represent reckless behavior in a tense regional context . . . Iran must fully cooperate with the IAEA to enable it to provide assurances that its nuclear program is exclusively peaceful.”;

Whereas, on February 27, 2024, a spokesperson for the Department of State stated, “We remain seriously concerned about Iran’s continued expansion of its nuclear program in ways that have no credible civilian purpose, including its continued production of highly enriched uranium”;

Whereas, on June 3, 2024, Director General Grossi stated, “Many countries have said if Iran gets nuclear weapons, they will do the same. Adding nuclear weapons to the cauldron of the Middle East is a very bad idea.”;

Whereas, on June 5, 2024, by a vote of 20 to 2, the United States joined other nations in formally censuring the Islamic Republic of Iran for advances in their nuclear program and failure to cooperate with the IAEA;

Whereas, on June 18, 2024, it was reported that intelligence agencies of the United States and Israel were looking into information that the Islamic Republic of Iran may have developed a computer model that could be used for research and development of nuclear weapons;

Whereas, on July 23, 2024, the Office of the Director of National Intelligence published an assessment, in accordance with Iran Nuclear Weapons Capability and Terrorism Monitoring Act of 2022 (22 U.S.C. 8701 note; Public Law 117-263), which stated, “Iran continues to increase the size of its uranium stockpile, increase its enrichment capacity,

and develop, manufacture, and operate advanced centrifuges. Tehran has the infrastructure and experience to quickly produce weapons-grade uranium, at multiple facilities’;

Whereas, on November 28, 2024, the Islamic Republic of Iran informed the IAEA that it planned to start enriching uranium with thousands of advanced centrifuges at its Fordow and Natanz plants, while also installing more uranium-enriching centrifuges at those locations;

Whereas, on December 5, 2024, the Office of the Director of National Intelligence published another assessment, in accordance with Iran Nuclear Weapons Capability and Terrorism Monitoring Act of 2022 (22 U.S.C. 8701 note; Public Law 117-263), which stated—

(1) “Iran’s 20-percent and 60-percent enriched uranium stockpiles are far greater than needed for what it claims it will use the uranium for and Iran could produce more than a dozen nuclear weapons if its total uranium stockpile were further enriched”; and

(2) “Iran probably will consider installing or operating more advanced centrifuges, further increasing its enriched uranium stockpile, enriching uranium up to 90 percent, or threatening to withdraw from the Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons”;

Whereas, on December 9, 2024, France, Germany, and the United Kingdom released a joint statement that—

(1) condemns “Iran’s latest steps . . . to expand its nuclear programme to significantly increase the rate of production of uranium enriched up to 60 percent”;

(2) expresses extreme concern “to learn that Iran has increased the number of centrifuges in use and started preparations to install additional enrichment infrastructure”; and

(3) “strongly urge[s] Iran to reverse these steps, and to immediately halt its nuclear escalation”; and

Whereas, on February 26, 2025, the IAEA reported that the Islamic Republic of Iran had increased its total stockpile of 60 percent highly enriched uranium to 274.8 kilograms (605.83 pounds), which, if further enriched, would be sufficient to produce 6 nuclear weapons: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) affirms that the Islamic Republic of Iran’s continued pursuit of a nuclear weapons capability is—

(A) a credible threat to the United States; and

(B) an existential threat to Israel and other allies and partners in the Middle East;

(2) asserts all options should be considered to address the nuclear threat the Islamic Republic of Iran poses to the United States, Israel, and our allies and partners;

(3) demands the Islamic Republic of Iran to immediately cease engaging in any and all activities that threaten the national security interests of the United States, Israel, and our allies and partners, including—

(A) enriching uranium;

(B) developing or possessing delivery vehicles capable of carrying nuclear warheads; and

(C) developing or possessing a nuclear warhead.

SEC. 2. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this resolution may be construed to authorize the use of military force or the introduction of United States Armed Forces into hostilities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 102—TO RECOGNIZE AND CELEBRATE THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DENVER INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. HICKENLOOPER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

S. RES. 102

Resolved, That the Senate recognizes and celebrates February 28th, 2025, as the 30th anniversary of the Denver International Airport.

SENATE RESOLUTION 103—CONDAMNING THE REJECTION BY THE UNITED STATES OF A UNITED NATIONS RESOLUTION CONDEMNING THE ILLEGAL INVASION OF UKRAINE BY THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Mr. GALLEGOS (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. BENNET, and Mr. SCHIFF) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 103

Whereas the Russian Federation first invaded Ukraine illegally in 2014 and further expanded that illegal invasion in 2022: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate condemns the rejection by the United States of United Nations General Assembly Resolution A/ES-11/L.10 (2025), titled “Advancing a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in Ukraine”, condemning the illegal invasion of Ukraine by the Russian Federation.

SENATE RESOLUTION 104—DESIGNATING FEBRUARY 27, 2025, AS “RARE DISEASE DAY”

Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. BOOKER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 104

Whereas a rare disease or disorder is a disease or disorder that affects a small number of patients;

Whereas, in the United States, a rare disease or disorder is defined as affecting fewer than 200,000 individuals;

Whereas, as of the date of adoption of this resolution, more than 30,000,000 individuals in the United States are living with at least 1 of the more than 10,000 known rare diseases or disorders;

Whereas children with rare diseases or disorders account for a significant portion of the population affected by rare diseases or disorders in the United States;

Whereas many rare diseases and disorders are serious and life-threatening;

Whereas 2025 marks the 42nd anniversary of the enactment of the Orphan Drug Act (Public Law 97-414; 96 Stat. 2049), a landmark law enabling tremendous advances in the research and treatment of rare diseases and disorders;

Whereas programs such as the Accelerating Rare Disease Cures Program of the Food and Drug Administration (referred to in this preamble as the “FDA”) aim to drive scientific and regulatory innovation and en-

gagement to accelerate the availability of treatments for patients with rare diseases;

Whereas 26 of the 50 novel drugs approved by the Center for Drug Evaluation and Research of the FDA in 2024—

(1) were approved to prevent, diagnose, or treat a rare disease or condition; and

(2) received an orphan-drug designation;

Whereas, although the FDA has approved more than 882 drugs and biological products with 1,300 orphan indications as of the date of adoption of this resolution, approximately 95 percent of rare diseases still do not have a treatment approved by the FDA for their condition;

Whereas financing life-altering and life-saving treatments can be challenging for individuals with a rare disease or disorder and their families;

Whereas individuals with rare diseases or disorders can experience difficulty in obtaining accurate diagnoses and finding physicians or treatment centers with expertise in their rare disease or disorder;

Whereas the National Institutes of Health support innovative research on the treatment of rare diseases and disorders;

Whereas Rare Disease Day is observed each year on the last day of February; and

Whereas Rare Disease Day is a global event that was first observed in the United States on February 28, 2009: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates February 27, 2025, as “Rare Disease Day”; and

(2) recognizes the importance of, with respect to rare diseases and disorders—

(A) improving awareness;

(B) encouraging accurate and early diagnosis; and

(C) supporting national and global research efforts to develop effective treatments, diagnostics, and cures.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I have nine requests for committees to meet during today’s session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority Leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today’s session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, February 27, 2025, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing on a nomination.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, February 27, 2025, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, February 27, 2025, at 10 a.m., to conduct an executive session.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet in executive session during the session of the Senate on Thursday, February 27, 2025, at 9:30 a.m., to consider a nomination.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, February 27, 2025, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on a nomination.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, February 27, 2025, at 9 a.m., to conduct a business meeting.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, February 27, 2025, at 9 a.m., to conduct an executive business meeting.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES

The Subcommittee on Strategic Forces of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, February 27, 2025, at 11:45 a.m., to conduct a closed briefing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SURFACE TRANSPORTATION, FREIGHT, PIPELINES, AND SAFETY

The Subcommittee on Surface Transportation, Freight, Pipelines, and Safety of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, February 27, 2025, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for my intern Ellie White to have privileges of the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROTECTION OF WOMEN AND GIRLS IN SPORTS ACT OF 2025—Motion to Proceed

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 2, S. 9.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 9) to provide that for purposes of determining compliance with title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 in athletics, sex shall be recognized based solely on a person's reproductive biology and genetics at birth.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the

Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 2, S. 9, a bill to provide that for purposes of determining compliance with title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 in athletics, sex shall be recognized based solely on a person's reproductive biology and genetics at birth.

John Thune, Eric Schmitt, Marsha Blackburn, Joni Ernst, Ted Budd, Katie Britt, David McCormick, Bernie Moreno, Rick Scott of Florida, Tommy Tuberville, James Lankford, Markwayne Mullin, Jim Justice, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Cynthia M. Lummis, John Barrasso, Mike Rounds.

AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE FOR THE PERIODS MARCH 1, 2025, THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2025, OCTOBER 1, 2025, THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2026, AND OCTOBER 1, 2026, THROUGH FEBRUARY 28, 2027

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 16, S. Res. 94.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 94) authorizing expenditures by committees of the Senate for the periods March 1, 2025, through September 30, 2025, October 1, 2025, through September 30, 2026, and October 1, 2026, through February 28, 2027.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. THUNE. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 94) was agreed to.

(The resolution is printed in the RECORD of February 25, 2025, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

RARE DISEASE DAY

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 104, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 104) designating February 27, 2025, as "Rare Disease Day".

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to; the preamble be agreed to; and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 104) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S.J. Res. 12

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that S. Res. 12 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, MARCH 3, 2025

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 3 p.m. on Monday, March 3; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, morning business be closed, and the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of Executive Calendar No. 24, the McMahon nomination, under the previous order; finally, that following disposition of the McMahon nomination, the Senate proceed to legislative session and resume consideration of Calendar No. 2, S. 9; and that the Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned under the previous order following the remarks of my colleagues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S.J. RES. 12

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, let me just restate: I ask unanimous consent that S.J. Res. 12 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Duly noted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

NOMINATION OF LINDA McMAHON

Mr. REED. Mr. President, as we celebrate Public Schools Week, Senate Republicans are preparing to confirm Linda McMahon, another of President Trump's billionaire patrons, as Secretary of Education, and I oppose such nomination.

During her confirmation hearing, Mrs. McMahon demonstrated little knowledge of public education or the basic programs and functions of the Department of Education. Clearly, the choice of this nominee is not based on merit.

But that does not matter because Mrs. McMahon was selected to be a front, as the Agency she hopes to lead is being dismantled by Elon Musk and DOGE. Indeed, while Mrs. McMahon was at her confirmation hearing, claiming that she would work to improve the Department of Education, Elon Musk's DOGE minions were at work firing people, taking back grants, compromising sensitive data, and laying the groundwork to eliminate the entire Agency.

And on Valentine's Day, President Trump's Department of Education threatened to cut Federal funding from public schools, as well as colleges and universities, if they did not eliminate any program that the Trump administration deems as promoting diversity, equity, and inclusion.

During her confirmation hearing, Mrs. McMahon seemed unsure whether this edict meant that schools can't celebrate or teach classes on African-American history or host clubs like Special Olympics or Girls Who Code.

As a reminder, by law, the Secretary of Education may not interfere with the content that schools teach, nor the academic standards that they set. Mrs. McMahon doesn't seem to know that.

By the way, while Mr. Musk has been tearing the Department of Education apart from the inside, Republicans in Congress have passed punitive blueprints that will cut trillions from government services to the American people, including education, all to pay for tax cuts for the richest Americans and Big Business.

In the Senate, the Republicans are calling for an unspecified \$9 trillion in cuts. In the House, the Education and Workforce Committee must provide a minimum of \$330 billion in cuts from education and job training programs. It is no wonder that educators, students, and families from across the country feel under siege.

We know what this looks like because we see how teachers, students, and military families are reacting with dismay as our world-class Department of Defense schools are laboring under another Secretary intent on politicizing its Department and promoting an indoctrination agenda authorized by President Trump.

I would like to take a moment to first thank all educators, school staff, family volunteers, and all community members who tirelessly work to equip our students for the future. We owe you a debt of gratitude and so much more than that. We need to recommit to strengthening our public schools and to investing in them.

In the first part of the 20th century, it was the high school movement that broadly expanded educational attain-

ment, preparing young Americans for success in a changing world and evolving economy. This movement featured professional educators and engaged families and communities. It was about general knowledge and practical application.

This movement launched the United States as a world economic power. It was essential to our national defense, and it created the conditions for the success of the largest expansion of postsecondary education through the GI bill. The high school movement meant that soldiers returning from World War II already had high school diplomas and were ready for postsecondary education.

Head Start, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, and the Higher Education Act are some of our Federal laws that work to ensure that opportunities to learn and advance are not limited by income, race, ethnicity, or disability.

The expansion of public education is a great American story. Yet, today, it sometimes seems to have been forgotten. Some argue that we do not need public schools, that we can offer vouchers or education savings accounts or homeschooling instead. Today, instead of freedom of inquiry and inclusion, we see policing of what schools can teach, what students can read, what they can discuss, and how they should think. This is a recipe for stifling creativity and the development of the skills needed for an ever-changing knowledge economy.

We politicize and neglect public schools at our peril. They educate nearly 50 million students—our future. It is time that we treat public education as the priority it must be if we want a brighter future for our children and our grandchildren and our country.

We should embark on a new public school movement—one that will strengthen and support the education profession, one that will ensure that all communities can provide modern, state-of-the-art facilities, one that will ensure that all students have the right to read—with evidence-based reading instruction, school libraries, books at home, diverse materials, and the freedom to choose what to read.

Today, we are failing our public schools because we are not investing in them. For example, the average age of our public school facilities is 49 years. The GAO found that over half of our school districts in our country needed to replace or update major systems in more than half of their buildings.

As a nation, we should commit to modernizing our school facilities. That is why I will be reintroducing the Rebuild America's Schools Act to invest \$130 billion in our school facilities in the communities with the greatest need.

We know there is a crisis in the education profession. Too many school districts struggle to hire and retain teach-

ers. Too often, a career in teaching means financial struggles and little support to meet student needs.

Additionally, we need a national focus on literacy. In 2024, the percentage of eighth graders reading below the basic level on the National Assessment of Educational Progress was the largest in the assessment's history, and the percentage of fourth graders who scored below the basic level was the largest in 20 years.

Adults are not doing any better. Recent results of the Program for the International Assessment of Adult Competencies show that overall scores in literacy and numeracy have decreased for U.S. adults, with adults scoring at the lowest level of proficiency in literacy, increasing from 19 percent in 2017 to 28 percent in 2023.

This is a crisis. Eliminating the Department of Education does nothing to solve it. Instead of gutting educational funding and eliminating the Department of Education to pay for tax cuts for the wealthy, Congress should address the acute literacy crisis for both adults and children across the Nation.

We should be increasing funding for adult education—at least doubling it. We should increase resources for schools to provide evidence-based reading instruction by fully funding title I, increasing funding for the Comprehensive Literacy Development State Grant Program and for Innovative Approaches to Literacy grants.

We should double the Pell grant and restore its purchasing power so students do not have to rely mostly on loans to pay for college.

Sadly, none of this is on Mrs. McMahon's agenda.

I urge my colleagues to join me in ushering in a new public education movement—a movement to ensure that this generation, as well as future ones, has the foundation to achieve their full potential and build a prosperous future. This nominee is not the person to lead such an effort. All indications are that she will actively work against it. So I encourage my colleagues to vote no on her confirmation.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— S. 348

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I rise today to seek unanimous consent for my STABLE Trade Policy Act with Senator KAINE, an act that would prevent any President from imposing tariffs on a U.S. ally or a free-trade agreement partner without congressional consent.

I will make that motion in just a moment, but let me, first, just explain what this is and why I am doing it.

Next week, President Trump has announced plans to impose 25-percent tariffs on products coming into the United States from Mexico and Canada, our No. 1 and No. 2 trading partners.

These tariffs will be disastrous for our economy and our national security. These tariffs will cost the average American household about \$1,200 a year. They will raise costs for avocados, appliances, diesel fuel, dog toys, car parts, Christmas tree lights, tomatoes, and tequila. I could go on.

Our economies are so closely integrated—the United States, Canada, and Mexico—that it will increase the cost of a GM pickup truck about \$10,000.

Even if these tariffs, at the last minute, are delayed, businesses are hurt by the uncertainty, which continues to increase costs.

President Trump plans to follow those tariffs with reciprocal tariffs on the EU, which includes many of our critical NATO allies and closest partners.

Imposing tariffs on our allies and partners diminishes our standing in the world and makes our neighbors less likely to help us in the future.

It is no surprise that Americans think this is a terrible idea. Barely a quarter of Americans think imposing tariffs on Canada is a good idea. More than double that disapprove.

President Trump has already declared an economic emergency to justify imposing these tariffs on Mexico and Canada, but my bill with Senator KAINE would prevent him from abusing long-established national security authorities to follow through on further tariff threats against our allies and FTA partners.

The U.S. Constitution in the Commerce Clause, article I, section 8, gives Congress jurisdiction over trade policy. It is time that we take ownership back of controlling the ability to impose tariffs willy-nilly on our trusted partners and allies by passing this bill and reining in President Trump's costly and damaging ideas.

So I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be discharged from further consideration of S. 348 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that the bill be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I rise to discuss some issues with Senator COONS' request for unanimous consent for the Senate to pass S. 348, the STABLE Trade Policy Act.

Senator COONS is a good friend and a great ally, and, reluctantly, I stand to

oppose this motion on this particular procedure.

First, Senator COONS and I agree about much on trade policy, including the need for the United States to have more high-standard free-trade agreements, like the United States-Mexico-Canada trade agreement, or USMCA. We should ensure that the commitments in those agreements are respected.

The last administration not only refused to negotiate new trade agreements but undermined U.S. rights under them when it waived our intellectual property rights under the WTO TRIPS Agreement and without informing Congress, attempting to remove the rights of American investors under the USMCA.

Second, I also agree that we should not undertake tariff actions lightly on our allies or free-trade agreement partners.

We should, however, take care before we say that all options are completely off the table. In fact, all of our free-trade agreements provide exceptions for when parties can remove economic benefits, including on national security grounds.

I don't recall anyone suggesting that the Biden administration could not impose sanctions on Nicaragua last year because it was a CAFTA party. Instead, we recognized that legitimate national security grounds, including Nicaragua's human rights abuses, warranted the economic pressure.

Third, it was only yesterday that we confirmed Jamieson Greer as the U.S. Trade Representative to serve as the principal adviser on trade issues. He told the Finance Committee that he wants to work closely with Congress.

There are a lot of good things we can do together. For instance, we can negotiate new agreements and reinvigorate congressional executive partnerships on trade.

The STABLE Trade Policy Act is, accordingly, too blunt of an instrument when nuance is called for, including the option of tariffs in some instances.

With that, I object to Senator COONS' request.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUDD). The objection is heard.

The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I understand that Senator CRAPO, the chairman of the Finance Committee, a supporter of President Trump, has blocked this bill today. I hope to find ways to work with him on improving market access and on elevating the quality and the capabilities of U.S. trade engagement with our partners. But I really don't understand why President Trump seems so intent on harming one of his signature accomplishments, the USMCA.

I am disappointed because Congress gave the President authority to impose tariffs in the event of a national security crisis. Congress did not grant this power to pursue petty grudges against trusted neighbors.

Honestly, how can anyone be angry with Canadians? They are the nicest people in the world. Yet here they are, working with us, pleading with us to not impose ruinous tariffs that would harm their economy and ours.

I will briefly, then, just make, again, a few simple points. I am disappointed that President Trump isn't doing more to reduce costs. He was elected, in no small part, because of high inflation and promised it would come down on day one.

These tariffs, if imposed, will make inflation worse and hit the lowest income Americans the hardest. It will impact American business, American families, and American communities.

So I hope that working together with my friends and colleagues here in the Senate, we can find ways to lower costs on pharmaceuticals and automobiles and microchips. But imposing reciprocal tariffs on trusted friends and allies and sparking tariff wars in our region and around the world is not the way to do that.

Two-thirds of Americans already think that President Trump isn't doing enough to lower costs. Blocking this bill will only accelerate that if President Trump continues to act unwisely and bully and threaten our closest and most trusted partners.

We must find a better way forward together.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UKRAINE

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize a very painful milestone. This week marks the third anniversary of Russia's full-scale invasion of Ukraine.

Over the past 3 years, the world has witnessed the incredible bravery and resolve of the Ukrainian people as they have stood up to Russia's unspeakable brutality and destruction.

We have seen—and, indeed, the United States should take great pride in having led—an impressive coalition of nations coming together to support Ukraine in this fight to preserve its democracy.

At the same time, an alarming convergence of authoritarian states—Russia, China, Iran, Belarus, and North Korea—have banded together to enable Russia's illegal war of choice.

As we mark this milestone, we are faced with another frightening set of developments. President Trump has set his sights on negotiations with Vladimir Putin to win the war. But before reaching the negotiating table, Mr. Trump has appeared so eager to reach

a deal that he has been willing to acquiesce to Russian demands for essentially nothing in return. Even worse, he has deliberately excluded Ukraine and Europe from the discussion.

We have seen this playbook before, most recently in Afghanistan. In 2020, President Trump, eager to achieve a quick deal, negotiated directly with the Taliban and excluded the Afghan Government from the negotiating table. He capitulated to Taliban demands, including the release of over 5,000 Taliban fighters, and blindly agreed to a 1-year withdrawal timeline, even as evidence mounted that the Taliban was not holding up the meager demands in the agreement. I fear President Trump has not learned any new negotiating skills in the 5 years since.

The tenets of his approach to Ukraine and Europe appear to be the same: Exclude and criticize American allies, capitulate to our enemies, and withdraw support without any assurance of success.

Earlier this month, Munich was the scene of another capitulation, when Vice President Vance and Defense Secretary Hegseth kicked off Trump's giveaway campaign to President Putin.

The historical irony is unmistakable, since Munich is a place that has inauspiciously become a shorthand for the "appeasement" of tyrants.

In 1932, British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain left his meeting with Adolf Hitler in Munich. And after surrendering Czechoslovakia in exchange for a peace pledge, when he returned to England, Chamberlain waved about a piece of paper with Hitler's promise and declared, "Peace in our time." In reality, it was the beginning of the capitulation that would lead inextricably to the greatest war in history.

Hopefully, this administration's rush to appease Vladimir Putin will not lead to the carnage like that of World War II. But it well may cost Ukraine its sovereignty and independence while also undermining the international order—the very same order that America and her allies created from the ashes of World War II.

Let's review the bidding so far. To begin, Defense Secretary Hegseth's speech in Brussels at the Ukraine Defense Contact Group set a shameful tone for the American delegation in Europe.

Ukraine Defense Contact Group, or UDCG, was created by the United States under the Biden administration. It has organized and led the international efforts to support Ukraine, which has enabled Ukrainians to significantly repel the Russian invasion and continue the fight to protect their homeland.

The United States has led this effort throughout the war. I regret that Secretary Hegseth's first appearance marked the retreat of our role as leader of the UDCG.

In his remarks, he said:

[W]e must start by recognizing that returning to Ukraine's . . . 2014 borders is an unrealistic objective.

He further stated:

[T]he United States does not believe that NATO membership for Ukraine is a realistic outcome of a negotiated settlement.

In essence, Secretary Hegseth conceded away our most important leverage against Russia. His statements, echoed by President Trump and Vice President VANCE, have already badly weakened and undermined our negotiating position by gifting the Russians with several unilateral concessions. All of these forfeits were made without any apparent consultation with the Ukraine or our NATO allies.

Again, the shortsightedness of President Trump's, Hegseth's, and VANCE's statements are alarming.

NATO has been the bulwark against Russian aggression in Europe since 1949. The alliance has more than doubled its membership since its founding. Central to the enlargement is NATO's open-door policy, enshrined in article 10 of the North Atlantic Treaty, which affirms a core NATO tenet that any European nation that demonstrates a willingness to contribute to our collective security and the values and obligation of the NATO alliance may seek membership.

Vladimir Putin does not get to dictate who may or may not become a member of the NATO alliance, just as his Soviet predecessors could not stop the membership prospects of Poland or Hungary or Germany. To preemptively surrender admission to NATO is national security malpractice and only benefits Vladimir Putin.

Finally, Secretary Hegseth declared that Europe and NATO are no longer priorities of the Trump administration.

In his words:

We're . . . here today to directly and unambiguously express that stark strategic realities prevent the United States . . . from being primarily focused on the security of Europe.

Further:

The United States faces consequential threats to our homeland. We must—and we are—focusing on security of our own borders.

I agree that the security of America's homeland is our No. 1 national security mission, but I reject Secretary Hegseth's myopic view that the American national security establishment is so fragile and so constrained that it must shift the entirety of its focus to the border security mission, at the expense of other national security imperatives.

Moreover, border protection is a civilian law enforcement mission. Deploying large numbers of military forces to support the Border Patrol is a gross misallocation of forces and raises numerous legal issues.

The administration's shameful claims have been a shock to Ukraine, NATO, Europe, and the democratic world at large. They have provided great comfort to Putin and autocrats everywhere.

In addition to Secretary Hegseth's speech, Vice President VANCE took the stage in Munich and further eroded our

status in the world. He castigated European allies for his perceived grievances with their domestic politics and alleged movements away from "democratic values," while at the same time remaining silent on the brutal dictators in Russia and Belarus who have never had a free or fair election in the course of their tenure.

President Trump gave his tip of the hat to autocracy last week when he attempted to revise history by alleging that Ukraine, not Russia, started the war and that President Zelenskyy was the "dictator" in this situation. These categorically false statements are either a product of deliberate deceit or historical delusion.

President Trump even directed the Acting U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations to vote against a U.N. resolution condemning Russia's war against Ukraine. The United States instead voted in a bloc with Russia, Iran, North Korea, and other authoritarian nations, which is a stunning reversal of decades of American foreign policy.

This toxic revisionist history has now pervaded his political nominees as well. Throughout the week, his political appointees have contorted themselves in order to avoid acknowledging the fact that Russia was responsible for starting the war in Ukraine. This is something straight out of North Korea, where "facts" are the sole purview of the Dear Leader.

We must also note the deafening silence from many of my Republican colleagues. Many Republicans claimed for years to be unapologetic supporters of Ukraine who were outraged by the perception that President Biden was not sending enough U.S. support to Ukraine. But now they appear to be standing by silently as facts are erased, as the pipeline of aid to Ukraine peters to a halt, as the Trump administration disbands Federal task forces established to seize the assets of Russian oligarchs and guard against foreign election interference and disinformation campaigns.

Silence is complicity. We cannot allow this to continue. If we are going down the path of negotiation with Russia, we must act to strengthen our hand in these negotiations.

Ironically, Russia is in a very weak negotiating position. Let us briefly review Putin's situation.

Over the course of 3 years, Ukraine has inflicted a staggering cost on Russia. Putin has lost 200,000 soldiers, and many hundreds of thousands more were wounded. He has lost hundreds of billions of dollars of military equipment and weapons. Indeed, Russia's weapons and logistical stocks are perilously diminished. Their closest ally in the war—Iran—is weaker than it has been in decades due to Israeli and U.S. actions. North Korean soldiers, sent to reinforce flagging Russian forces, are suffering severe casualty rates. Russia has been ousted from Syria, and its Wagner mercenaries in Africa are struggling to reorganize. The Russian economy is afloat but stagnant.

Any shrewd negotiator should recognize that Russia is on the ropes. Now is not the time to appease Putin. This is a time to exert maximum pressure to bring him to the negotiating table hat in hand.

There are three things we must do now.

First, we must continue to pressure Russia economically. This means strengthening existing sanctions, identifying secondary sanctions, and bolstering sanctions enforcement and anti-evasion efforts. At the top of the effort to control the evasion of sanctions, we should be working with allies to combat the illicit oil trade, including efforts to go on the offensive against the so-called ghost fleet of aging tankers Russia employs to facilitate the export of oil and other sanctioned goods.

Second, we must work with our European partners to impound and leverage Russia's frozen assets.

Finally, we must ensure in both word and deed that Ukraine has our support and commitment to working with them to establish a just and lasting peace.

However, instead of taking action to strengthen the negotiating hand on any of these fronts, the administration has shifted focus to the signing of a deal to exploit Ukraine's natural resources. Much remains to be seen about the shape of this agreement, but we do know it will take years, if not decades, to see substantial returns.

A large number of Ukraine's rare earth deposits are actually located in Ukrainian territory that is currently contested or occupied by Russia. I am not sure how one is to square this agreement with Secretary Hegseth's comments about the forfeiture of Ukraine's sovereign territory.

Furthermore, the deal includes no security guarantees from the United States, which the Ukrainians have—rightly, I believe—insisted upon. Security guarantees are essential to assure Ukraine that the United States is not simply interested in an enrichment scheme but is committed to the pursuit of a just and lasting peace.

Indeed, a just and lasting peace must be the final outcome. That is a United States national security imperative, one that has—at least until recently—enjoyed robust and vocal bipartisan support.

We support Ukraine because we know that the war in Ukraine is not just a regional war; it is the most visible demonstration of the larger existential threat Russia poses to our national security.

We support Ukraine to ensure that Vladimir Putin cannot achieve his goals, which are counter to our own national interests. We must be clear-eyed about this. If Putin succeeds in Ukraine, it will be the first piece in his long-stated promise to recreate the Soviet empire. If that happens, if we fail to learn from history and to see brutal and craven authoritarians for what they are and the threat they represent,

we may again find America's sons and daughters sent overseas to fight on foreign shores.

I urge my Republican colleagues and my Democratic colleagues—all my colleagues—to speak up and stand with Ukraine as they have done for so many years. Let us continue.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise today with my colleagues in strong opposition to the firings of scientists, medical researchers, and more at the Department of Health and Human Services.

HHS is in charge of everything from preventing disease outbreaks to making sure that our kids are healthy to ensuring that seniors can live with dignity.

It directly touches more lives than any other Cabinet Agency. That is why the administration's mass firings of thousands of HHS employees are deeply troubling.

When a new CEO comes in and wants to see a new direction for a company, they look at it, they look at all the divisions, they figure out their direction. They maybe cut a division; they maybe make changes to it. They look at the merits of certain employees; they move some employees to different divisions. And they figure out, thoughtfully, what is the right way and what is the best way for their company.

This is the entire government, but that is not what is happening here. They are firing people across the board, without regard to merit, without regard for function. They are firing some of the newest employees who are eager and excited to have their jobs. They are firing some people who are simply up for promotion which puts them in a probationary status.

They are not looking at what these people are doing or the value they bring to the workforce and to the American people. They are just doing it and getting on TV with a chain saw.

These are people who went into public service for a reason. They are people, in the case of Health and Human Services, who keep us healthy and save lives, who work every day to keep America at the forefront of medical breakthroughs and innovation.

It has been our secret sauce. It has given the world the most incredible, credible, lifesaving drugs and medical devices—like the pacemaker in my State.

That didn't just come out of one company. That came out of a lot of ideas, and that came out a lot of universities, and that came out of people doing clinical trials, and that came out of a devotion by our country to moving forward. That is how we have gotten these lifesaving cures.

That is how we mapped the human genome, so that we are now starting to

offer personalized medicine, drugs that fit people, things that work, things that cure diseases we never thought were possible to cure. That is how our economy has been so strengthened, and we have led across the world.

You know, I have worked for years to cut redtape, and I know there is more to do. I know there is more we can do to make our government effective. But we can do that together and take the ideas from the administration. We can work on it in the next budget. We can make some changes. I support permitting reform—all kinds of things that we could do.

But these mass firings in the area of medical research? This makes no sense.

The Department of Health and Human Services is also tasked with implementing Medicare drug price negotiation, which I fought for years to pass into law, along with my colleague Senator WELCH from Vermont, when he was in the House, and Senator SANDERS here in the Senate.

This is expected—we finally passed it. It was part of the Inflation Reduction Act, and it actually says: Hey, this sweetheart deal that pharma had with Medicare, in which they can't negotiate at all and that the prices are locked in and so our country—people are paying twice as much as they do in places like Canada, for the drug. Yet it is our taxpayers that put in the money for the research or the VA, which works so well for our veterans. They are able to negotiate and get better prices, but not 50 million seniors?

So what did we do? We finally ended the sweetheart deal, and we passed a law. I would have been more aggressive about how many drugs we could negotiate because I understand they start with a group of drugs, and pretty soon that is going to help people who aren't seniors, as we did with the insulin cap. That insulin cap, at 35 bucks a month, was only for seniors, but Merck and other companies offered it to nonseniors, as well, because we got it going with the biggest prescription drug buying group in the country, and that would be our seniors.

So this Medicare negotiation has ramifications for everyone in this country. However, even though we only did 10 drugs at first, the Biden administration picked blockbuster drugs—big drugs that so many people take, like Januvia and Jardiance and Xarelto and Eliquis. Combined, in 1 year—just 1 year, when this starts next year; no one has refuted these statistics—9 million seniors will save \$1.5 billion in out-of-pocket costs in the first year alone and save taxpayers over \$100 billion in the next decade. That is just 10 drugs.

They have now come up with 15 more drugs, including Ozempic and those weight-loss drugs, and they have passed that torch now—or the voters have—onto the next administration. So now, it is on them to negotiate these 15 and then pick 15 more and 15 more. Imagine how much money we can save, not just for the seniors—that is obvious—but also for the taxpayers because

we are footing part of this bill. And then, ultimately, it will bring down drug prices, like they have in other countries.

But firing the men and women who carry out these price negotiations put those savings totally at risk. You cannot take on some of the world's biggest companies—the pharmaceutical companies—with bandaids and a skeleton crew. That is not going to work. I think we all know that. We all know this is really hard work.

On top of this, the firings threaten healthcare for the 170 million Americans who get coverage through Medicare, Medicaid—which is so many of our seniors when they are in assisted living with their long-term care, and people's parents and grandparents—as well as coverage under the Affordable Care Act, including over 2 million Minnesotans. In fact, Medicaid actually provides healthcare for 20 percent of my rural residents in my State. You will see similar numbers all across the country. And more than half of all nursing home residents in our State are on Medicaid.

I remember when my dad was in assisted living. He got late-onset Alzheimer's. I found a place for him and found the next place when he needed a little more help, and I knew, as his savings were running out, what that day was. I knew the exact month that he was going to run out of his savings, and then he would go onto Medicaid. And that was a safety net. I actually knew I couldn't keep him at the same place, but I knew a place I could have him go to.

He ended up dying a year before that date happened. But there are so many people in our country that know the exact date when their parent or their grandparent is going to be able to have that safety net of Medicaid because they have actually run through all their savings.

Nationwide, Medicaid provides coverage for two-thirds of all nursing home care. And these cuts—what we are seeing out of the House budget, where they have put targets on the exact program that includes Medicaid—these cuts will be particularly disastrous for people with chronic conditions, including millions of veterans who become sick or disabled as a result of their service.

What is this all about? It is about funding giant tax breaks for billionaires. Yes, over 2 trillion of that money goes to people who are wealthy, people making over \$400,000 a year.

I am all for keeping in these tax cuts for people making under \$400,000 a year, but I do not know why, when you are facing the debt that our country has and when you are dealing with people's needs with Medicaid and the like, you would decide to add tax cuts and make permanent tax cuts for people who are making over \$400,000 a year.

We actually had a vote on this, late at night about a week ago, where we asked our Republican colleagues: OK.

Well, how about for people making over \$10 million a year? That was Senator WARREN's amendment. She said: OK. How about if they are making over 10 million? Could we at least agree we shouldn't cut their taxes?

And, unfortunately, our Republican colleagues, for that amendment, yelled out: No.

Then we said—Senator KELLY got up there and said: OK. How about if they are making over \$100 million? Then we should add more tax cuts?

Our colleagues voted against that amendment, which said we should not add more tax cuts for people making over \$100 million when our country is facing the debt it has, when you have got the needs for people in nursing homes and the needs for people with childcare and the like.

So then they tried one more time. Senator ANGUS KING, Independent of Maine, said: OK. How about for people making over \$500 million? Then, at least, you can agree with us—right?—that we shouldn't add more tax cuts for those people making over \$500 million a year. And, sadly, our colleagues voted no.

Instead of cutting costs for regular people and their prices and groceries, they are cutting Medicaid, which provides healthcare for 7.2 million seniors, almost 40 million children, nearly two-thirds of nursing home residents, and millions of people with rare diseases.

But this isn't just the numbers. There are moms and dads, brothers and sisters, friends and neighbors. I heard from one Minnesotan who, at 4 years old, was diagnosed with Duchenne muscular dystrophy, which causes rapid muscle weakness, making it harder to complete most physical tasks. But this Minnesotan, who is now 26, has been able to thrive because he has Medicaid coverage. He got an education. He got a job. He graduated with a master's degree in public policy. He is paying taxes. In his words, Medicaid gave him the affordable health coverage he needed to manage his rare condition.

For him and millions more, the cuts at the Department of Health and Human Services put their lives and livelihood at risk.

This week is rare disease week. I have met with many rare disease patients. I am the cochair of that caucus. And they are in town right now to convene and collaborate with Federal medical researchers, Ph.D. students, other families affected, drug and device reviewers and advocates.

Many of these rare disease patients were looking forward to attending the rare disease event that was supposed to be today. And this year it was going to be a collaboration between NIH and the FDA because of all that integral work that goes on with drugs being approved for people with rare diseases, but that annual event was canceled because the people carrying that out—these people here with very difficult, rare diseases—that was canceled because the people doing the event were fired.

The mission of the Department of Health and Human Services, which the thousands of Americans who were fired work every day to uphold, is enhancing the health and well-being of all Americans. These mass firings are a direct affront to that mission.

The building that houses the Department of Health and Human Services is named for Minnesota's "Happy Warrior," Vice President Hubert Humphrey. It has been that way through Democrat and Republican Presidents. He was a champion for expanding access to healthcare. Inscribed in the entrance hall of that building are words from Humphrey's final speech in 1977. By the way, he was someone who was loved right here in this Chamber by Democrats and Republicans. Some of the most conservative Republicans mourned his loss, and they loved the guy. And this is what he said in his final speech here:

The moral test of government is how that government treats those who are in the dawn of life, the children; those who are in the twilight of life, the elderly; and those who are in shadows of life, the sick.

And he added, given he had a child in his own family with Down syndrome, and those with disabilities.

The firing of those who care for kids and seniors and those who work on rare diseases and those who are bringing together our people who work on drugs that are supposed to solve and are solving the problems for these rare disease families and those that are doing the approvals and those that are doing the research and the families that want to talk to them about it—they were all here, and they canceled it because, just like that, Elon Musk came in with his chain saw.

Those families are not going to tolerate this much longer.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Mr. WELCH. Mr. President, I want to speak about the extreme cuts that have affected the Department of Health and Human Services, the Federal Drug Administration, the National Institutes of Health, and the Centers for Disease Control.

First of all, the DOGE operation starts out with a premise that it is attacking waste, fraud, and abuse. And I am for that. Anyplace that we can save taxpayers money by responsible assessment of what programs are working or aren't, anytime we can uncover waste or certainly fraud and abuse, I want to do that, and I want that to be done across the board. Whether you are talking about health programs where they could be better organized or they could be more efficiently run to achieve the goal of better services for the people you represent and I represent for all Americans, I want to do that.

But how is DOGE going about it?

And we are here to talk about how they are doing it in the Department of Health and Human Services, under Mr. KENNEDY. Basically, they are doing it by sending out firing notices to people. Over 5,000 people have been fired, and that includes 700 in the Food and Drug Administration, 1,200 in the National Institutes of Health, and 600 in the Centers for Disease Control.

Here is the question, and the answer is obvious: If you want to make a program more efficient, do you fire the people first and essentially erode any capacity of that program to deliver the services that the American people need? Or do you study the organization? Do you kick the tires? Do you investigate and analyze where the issues are that can be addressed by a comprehensive plan that would include getting rid of any waste? It would include getting rid, obviously, of any fraud and abuse.

But what DOGE is doing is not that. It doesn't have a plan. What it has is a decision to fire people. So, essentially, DOGE is saying that the higher the body count of people who are fired, then the more the savings will be. Well, there is truth in that. If you just fire people and they are not on the payroll, you are going to save taxpayer money. But does that mean that you are getting waste, fraud, and abuse out of the system, or are you just wrecking the program? It clearly is going to be the latter.

You are just wrecking the program because you didn't even take the time to examine what is going on and how best to do it. Think about it. In the National Institutes of Health, there are investigators, there are scientists. These are people who are working on research that is important to your State and mine about diseases, about cures, about vaccines, about pandemics, things that—you know, American people are entitled to have some confidence and security that we have the best minds addressing health issues and focusing on cures to diseases that all of us can be subject to or the people we love, that they will be doing that job.

But these people are now just fired. They are gone. That means—just think about it. An NIH scientist, that is somebody who probably has a Ph.D. went to one of our State institutions. It might have been a land-grant college in North Carolina or a land-grant college in Vermont. And there is probably an enormous amount of talent in that person who was able to achieve a Ph.D. in scientific research. And there is probably a good deal of public investment in the career of that person with the return being that person is going to be doing research on trying to cure diseases. And that person may well have gotten some Federal grants, including college assistance or Ph.D. investigation assistance.

That could be hundreds of thousands of dollars the taxpayers really invested

in supporting a person who has become a scientist, helping us on very important research that is really good for the American people.

Boom. They go to work, or they are at home. They get an email, and they say: Don't show up for work; you are fired.

There is a certain cruelty in a lot of these notices because it also has an assertion that your performance has been subpar. Of course, we find out there has been no performance review; and, in many cases, these people who were fired supposedly because of subpar performance, in fact, did just have a performance review that said you are doing a fantastic job.

Or think about Food and Drug Administration. Their job is to review, among other things, medications that can provide life-enhancing, lifesaving, life-extending, pain-relieving medications that Americans are going to need and can benefit by. The sooner that work of investigation gets done, the sooner that the approval decisions can be made, the sooner cures get to market and to the folks in this country.

Boom. They are fired.

Again, these people, some of whom do have Ph.D.s, as I mentioned, but others of whom have been at the FDA for 15 or 20 years and have that institutional knowledge of how it works—these people are getting fired independent of any performance review, independent of any assessment of where do we need more people or where do we need fewer people or what are some of the functions that no longer need to be done versus some functions where we actually may need to enhance the staff to get a better job for the American people.

What is so bogus about DOGE is that it is not about waste, fraud, and abuse. It really is not because there would have to be an investigation, a plan, people looking at how the functions are being performed. It is simply a mechanism to justify firing people and lowering the head count.

And as I mentioned, you know what? That will "save money," but it will destroy the capacity of these organizations that all of us agree are doing incredibly important work. It is going to destroy their ability to do it. It is just mangling the services in the area of Health and Human Services that are so essential to the well-being of the people in this country.

By the way, this has a real economic impact; and it is the economic impact, first and foremost, among those individuals who lost their jobs. But it is a real economic impact because we are eroding the infrastructure of science, of inquiry, and of investigation for better health cures. You don't destroy that and put it back together again overnight. That is what is so wrong-headed about the DOGE approach to things—body count versus better service, better performance, more sustainability.

Mr. President, you couldn't have a worse approach if your goal is more ef-

ficiency, better service, and better outcomes.

The other question that is going to be recurring for the American people is the likelihood—the inevitability, actually—of massive reductions in aid for Medicaid. Under the version of the House budget reconciliation act, they have to come up with trillions of dollars in savings. The only place you are going to get that is by cutting Medicaid.

We have a contradiction here because the President says he loves Medicaid, but he also says he loves the House bill. And the House bill does not love Medicaid. What the House bill does is it attacks Medicaid.

In Vermont, we have 20 percent or so, a little more, of our folks who depend on Medicaid for healthcare. It is kids from low-income families; it is seniors. Two out of three of our nursing home beds are paid for by Medicaid. You are going to have families where the kids are really trying to help their parents. Their parents need a nursing home, and they are going to get kicked out, literally. That is what happens.

Finally, what we know is, why is this happening? Why are these firings on a mass level being made when there has been no study and no plan in place to indicate that action will improve services or, in the long run, save money for the American people? It is being done because there is a goal to have a tax cut. That is a fair-and-square debate. What should our tax rate be; should we have a tax cut; if we have a tax cut, how do you allocate; how much goes to corporations; how much goes to billionaires; how much goes to everyday people?

But to have that debate without acknowledging that the way you are going to pay for it is by taking away healthcare for everyday Americans, that is not on the level. That is what is happening here, is that there is an agenda: Get that tax cut.

I happen to profoundly disagree with the tax cut for major multinational corporations, and I profoundly disagree with lowering taxes for billionaires—totally disagree with that. But when it is the situation that we are going to pay for it by taking away nursing home beds from Vermonters, from folks in the Carolinas, that is really appalling. We should not do it.

I am here with my colleagues to defend our commitment to good scientific research, to good cancer research, to good healthcare access for poor kids and seniors, and to sound the alert that that is what is at stake despite what the President may say about his "love" for Medicare. What he clearly has as his major agenda item is that tax cut.

I will acknowledge we can have a debate fair and square about that tax cut. But I think it is incumbent on all of us to acknowledge that the path to the President getting his tax cut marches right through access to healthcare in an attack on Medicaid.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Ms. ALSO BROOKS. Mr. President, I would like to use my time to highlight the attacks currently being thrown at our Federal workers and the unconscionable firings that are taking place.

We have heard baseless and callous criticisms of our Federal workers from this administration for weeks now. They are wrong, and much of what they are built on is a lie. And they are dehumanizing.

This is, in fact, a witch hunt. Our civil servants are among the best of what our Nation has to offer. They serve with no political motivation. Many have served for years under Democratic administrations and Republican administrations. They have one dedication: to their fellow Americans. It is a patriotic calling that they have all answered. They are not faceless villains. They are real people with real stories.

People like a woman I spoke with who has served at the Department of Health and Human Services for over 35 years, she has been put on leave as a part of the President's Executive orders. For her and people like her, to be caught up in these partisan attacks is infuriating.

The administration claims to be doing this in the name of efficiency. There is nothing efficient about gaining unauthorized access to private data and then blindly firing 5,200 employees across multiple Agencies. There is nothing competent about cutting the workforce without any thought about how it would impact operations.

This is not efficient. This is senseless, and this is heartless.

NIH is based in my State of Maryland, and many of the workers there are among the 150,000 civil servants who call Maryland home. Each one of them has made a commitment to public service. Each one of them is a civil servant that I am proud to represent. These abrupt and improper firings have shaken up the lives of thousands of dedicated workers who do not deserve this treatment. And what makes this even worse is that attacking our Federal workers doesn't just hurt them; it hurts all Americans, the people who rely on government programs to keep them healthy and safe.

These aren't hypothetical concerns. These firings will have real-world consequences. Eliminating staff at NIH will delay the development and approval of lifesaving treatments. Cancer patients will have to wait longer for promising new treatments as clinical trials still stall due to staffing shortages. This will slowly eliminate research and medical intervention and weaken our standing in global biomedical science.

Cuts to an already understaffed CMS workforce will hurt patient care. We

will see disruptions in medically necessary care and delays in payments to hospitals and other healthcare providers. Firing staff at HHS will cripple our ability to quickly identify and respond to public health threats. And right now, we are experiencing the worst flu season in over 15 years, resulting in school closures in at least 10 States. We are monitoring an outbreak of Ebola in Uganda. We are keeping track of the growing threat of avian influenza.

Without a strong workforce, we will not be able to react effectively. It is impossible to forget the significant role that NIH plays in developing and deploying vaccines and treatments. We are just beyond the clutches of the last major public health crisis. And without a strong workforce, we will not be prepared to face the next pandemic.

In the clearest terms possible, these cuts aren't about efficiency. To the American people, it quite literally could be the difference between life and death. They are as direct a contradiction as you can have of the priorities this administration claimed to set when they took control—to ease burdens on families. Instead, these firings could add enormous strain to a nation that is already in need of relief. They are irresponsible, they are inefficient, and they are undeserved.

What our civil servants deserve is a recognition of the work they do every day to make us stronger. What the American people deserve is for us to keep our obligation to ensure their health and their safety. I will continue to defend them and apply pressure to this administration until it happens.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I rise today to sound the alarm about what is happening to our Nation's ability to advance lifesaving medical research in the first month of the Trump administration.

As many of you know, I am a proud graduate of the University of Wisconsin-Madison Law School. In many ways, I grew up at the university, where both of my grandparents, who raised me, worked. My grandmother ran the costume lab at the theater department, and my grandfather was a scientist. He was a biochemist who spent four decades unlocking the key to how our metabolism works—in large part thanks to funding from the National Institutes of Health. My grandfather and his colleagues pioneered breakthroughs that impacted biochemistry around the world, leading to all kinds of developments to keep our bodies healthy, from nutrition and diet to advanced drugs, to, really, so much more.

I share my grandfather's story because it demonstrates why the NIH is

so essential. As the world's premier biomedical research institution, the NIH invests in our health, our national security, our economy, and our future. These investments influence our Nation's competitive edge, patients' treatment options, and, simply put, American lives for generations to come.

Research supported by the NIH has helped us find breakthroughs for treating diabetes, Alzheimer's disease, and substance use disorders. It is supporting clinical trials right now for patients battling terminal diagnoses for cancer. In fiscal year 2023, the NIH generated almost \$93 billion in economic activity—nearly twice the Agency's budget.

The engine behind all of it is, of course, researchers and scientists. They are dedicated scientists like my grandfather who right now are worried that their life's work—the work of keeping our loved ones healthy and saving lives—is in danger, all because Elon Musk and President Trump are firing nearly 1,200 critical staff across NIH Institutes and Centers, halting lifesaving research in its tracks, and indiscriminately and illegally freezing funding from going out the door to academic and research institutions across the country.

Across the Department of Health and Human Services, Trump and Elon Musk have fired more than 5,000 public servants. We are talking about scientists, doctors, researchers, and so many others who are doing this critical work to keep us healthy.

Musk and Trump are going so much deeper than firing the HHS workforce, which is damaging enough to research programs and puts Americans' lives at risk; they are throwing sand in the gears of the NIH—their basic grant-making operations—to prevent scientists from getting the resources they need to conduct lifesaving biomedical research in the first place.

For instance, the President has unilaterally fired more than 130 employees at the National Cancer Institute—many of them scientists. Across the NIH, Trump and Musk have fired 160 program officers, grant management specialists, and other key administrators whose job it is to get grant funding out the door to universities and other research institutions across the country.

Since President Trump took office, his administration has canceled more than 70 NIH study sections and advisory council meetings that are the final step in grant approval. This means that more than \$1.5 billion in funding has been withheld so far—illegally and in blatant defiance of court orders—by this administration. The impact is already having ripple effects across the research community.

Take, for instance, Alzheimer's disease research. The Trump administration has stopped tens of millions of dollars from going out the door for Alzheimer's research, halting studies, clinical trials, and moving us further from a cure.

The Trump administration is also terminating entire NIH training programs focused on supporting early career scientists from diverse backgrounds and folks who are underrepresented today in biomedical research. In its endless quest to cancel any program that even uses the word "diversity," the Trump administration has even paused research involving women.

Make no mistake, we will be feeling the impact of these cuts for decades to come. Universities are pausing graduate student admissions because they aren't sure they will have the funding to support the students they currently have enrolled.

What is at stake is not just a generation of talent and our Nation's competitive edge; it is also the next breakthrough that could cure cancer or Alzheimer's disease. Thanks to Donald Trump's actions, the United States may lose its global competitive edge in biomedical research and cede it to China.

In Wisconsin, our universities follow a long-held tradition known as the Wisconsin Idea. It is a pretty simple philosophy that says the work done at our universities should make an impact far beyond the classroom itself, and it does. From vitamin D, to human embryonic stem cells, to blood thinners and new treatments for Alzheimer's disease, Wisconsin universities and dedicated scientists like my grandfather have discovered breakthroughs that revolutionize the world of medicine and, more importantly, revolutionize how we keep our loved ones safe and well.

So when President Trump and Elon Musk come after this funding and come after these public servants, they aren't just coming after scientists in classrooms and laboratories; the impact will spread far beyond those institutions. When they come after the NIH, they are coming after patients with terminal illnesses, who are right now being turned away from potentially lifesaving clinical trials because of these cuts. They are coming after the next breakthrough that could have helped your loved one battling Alzheimer's. They are coming after a young scientist who is living paycheck to paycheck who will not be able to pursue a research career developing treatments to help others get better.

Now, you may be asking yourself: Why are Donald Trump and Elon Musk doing this? Well, the answer is pretty simple—so they can give tax breaks to billionaires. Why are they cutting off clinical trials and cancer research? So that people like Elon Musk don't have to pay their fair share. Why are they withholding funding to find a cure for Alzheimer's disease? So big corpora-

tions can pay less in taxes than the average American family. The cuts we are seeing right now will damage Americans' lives for the next generation—all so the wealthiest Americans can get wealthier.

We must stand up to this illegal freeze on funding, this assault on the Federal workforce, and these billions of dollars in cuts that will take decades to undo. Our health and the health of our loved ones depend upon it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

TRUMP ADMINISTRATION

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to make a simple point: The law cannot be in the eye of the beholder. The law is the law. But yet again, we are seeing the Trump administration break the law.

Many of us have been closely following the Trump administration's illegal freeze of congressionally appropriated funding, including of foreign aid not just from the State Department but also from USAID, the African Development Foundation, the Inter-American Foundation, and other independent Agencies. Each of those Agencies' existence as an independent entity has long been enshrined in statute and reaffirmed by bipartisan majorities in both Chambers year after year in annual appropriations.

Our appropriations law also explicitly requires the administration to notify and consult with Congress before undertaking any efforts to reorganize, realign, or downsize foreign affairs Agencies, as the sweeping reductions in force issued last week and many other brazen actions we have seen clearly seek to do.

The administration's actions, including firing the USAID inspector general and the State IG, will make waste and fraud more likely, will prevent even foreign assistance programs allegedly supported by the administration from being effectively implemented, and will also effectively block hundreds of millions of dollars for other programs enacted into law by bipartisan majorities. Needless to say, the Trump administration has not consulted or notified Congress about these changes. That is in violation of the law.

This week, they took a further step. The Trump administration has chosen to spit in the face of the law and Congress, expressing total disdain for a court order mandating they release the foreign aid funding they had illegally withheld. When finally told they must comply, Secretary Rubio personally approved the termination of 90 percent of the USAID programs and 60 percent of State Department programs virtually overnight. They terminated more than \$58 billion in multiyear programs and have told us they have no intention of utilizing those funds.

The termination of those awards is absolutely not what Congress intended.

Congress appropriated the funding on a bipartisan basis with the express intent to see those dollars spent. This is not trivial stuff. We are talking about resources that often mean the difference between life and death, resources that are imperative not just because they are lifesaving but because they are an investment in our own national security and in U.S. businesses.

Let's take Ebola, for example. USAID helps other countries around the world respond to and contain Ebola outbreaks. That is pretty darn important because there is no known cure for Ebola.

Thanks to the good work of USAID, along with our international partners—often supported by USAID awards—we have never had an Ebola outbreak here at home.

Yesterday, at President Trump's Cabinet meeting, Elon Musk even admitted that, yes, we want to fight Ebola. Of course, then he said they "accidentally" cut USAID's Ebola prevention efforts but that it had been "restored" with no "interruption."

Yet we know for a fact that is a lie. U.S.-based companies implementing these programs received termination notices yesterday. Any basic accounting of USAID's capacity to stop outbreaks abroad shows quite plainly any disease prevention efforts supported by the United States at this point are merely symbolic. You cannot break the foundation of public health systems overseas and expect that it won't have a damaging impact here at home.

This makes America less safe. If Ebola, Marburg, or any other infectious disease makes it to our shores, it will be thanks to Elon and Trump—two billionaires without a clue who are positively smug about their own ignorance.

But it is not just our infectious disease response that has now been gutted—everything from resources to help prevent kids from getting malaria to aid for refugees in war-torn places like Syria, where it is directly in our national security interests to foster stability.

It is not just resources from faraway places. This will hit home in blue and red States. U.S. universities in my home State, in Indiana, in Florida, in Texas, and other States have had their partnerships terminated.

American students from across our country who are now participating in exchange programs overseas are impacted by this. To put it into perspective for my colleagues, 5,800 of 6,300 USAID grants and contracts are being terminated. That is 9 out of 10. That is not to mention 4,100 of 6,800 State Department grants and contracts.

The only detail we have is from the NGO's faith-based organizations and U.S. contractors sending these termination notices to our committee. We do not have one shred of detail from the State Department, not one shred.

The scale is staggering, and it shows you that this administration's scheme

is to bulldoze right through restraining orders and court orders so that by the time the law does catch up with them, the damage will have been done. Compliance is easy at that point. What is left to fix once you have burned everything to the ground?

This administration knows full well they are breaking the law. They are showing us all in plain view their goal is to do irreparable damage, as much as possible, as fast as possible.

Well, I am here today to sound the alarm because this illegal power grab is in direct violation of congressional intent and appropriations laws.

The Supreme Court should act with haste to bring this administration to account and ensure that money Congress appropriated gets to where it was intended. Whether it is President Trump or Elon Musk or the Secretary of State calling the shots, Congress has no visibility into DOGE's actions, frustrating our ability to write funding bills when government funding runs out in weeks.

By ignoring the law and congressional intent, the administration has created chaos; they have eroded trust in the United States; and they made way for Russia and China to take advantage of this leadership vacuum.

No one should fall for this thin veneer about efficiency while this administration racks up legal fees, overdue payments to contractors, pays people not to work, and forces a global recall of staff.

We have a process to avoid this kind of chaos: The President submits his or her budget request to Congress. Congress holds hearings publicly, writes and passes bills that become law. We have explicit notification and consultation requirements for foreign assistance funding for a reason.

Do I need to march down to the National Archives? Do I need to make sure we still have a Constitution? Do I need to check whether the laws we passed are even still there or did they start running them through a shredder? Because as blatant and persistent as it has been, no one—no one—should ex-

pect this kind of lawlessness to fade away.

I cast my votes, and I speak on this floor as a voice for the people of the State I represent, Washington State. I was not elected to let the President of any party or some unaccounted billionaire decide how their tax dollars get spent.

Every Senator here should speak loudly with one unified voice: Congress holds the power of the purse. No President can unilaterally abolish an entire Agency or ignore our appropriations laws.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY,
MARCH 3, 2025, AT 3 P.M.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUSTED). Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 3 p.m. Monday.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 4:16 p.m., adjourned until Monday, March 3, 2025, at 3 p.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

INTERNATIONAL HOLOCAUST REMEMBRANCE DAY

HON. JENNIFER A. KIGGANS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 2025

Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD remarks submitted at the request of a Virginia Beach constituent, Rabbi Dr. Israel Zoberman of Temple Lev Tikvah, and are a reflection of his views:

INTERNATIONAL HOLOCAUST REMEMBRANCE DAY—80TH ANNIVERSARY OF AUSCHWITZ'S LIBERATION

Israeli author and lawyer Yishai Sarid was born in Tel Aviv in 1965, serving as an intelligence officer in the IDF. His law degree is from the Hebrew University of Jerusalem earning an M.A. Public Administration from Harvard University. His arousing, even disturbing novel, *The Memory Monster* (New York: Restless Books, 2020), raises profound questions reflecting the searing struggle of Israelis to come to grips with the Holocaust's enormous impact on their identity and very lives, with the Shoah's long shadow as constant backdrop. In addition, the genocide's implications touch on the universal human condition and its absurd dimension. As much as human memory is an honored, even revered, component in the Jewish lexicon laden with lessons, warnings, and guideposts, it carries within it, as the novel's title attests, no less than a devouring monstrous quality.

The mesmerizing account is a confessional report to Jerusalem's Memorial Yad Vashem's chairman of the rise and collapse as well as fall from grace of a once enthusiastic recruit on a sacred national mission of accompanying Israeli high-schoolers, military personnel, VIPs, and ordinary adult tourists to Poland seeking a very brief exposure to a death camp site. The heavy-laden theme is made bearable by a genuine literary talent utilizing a relieving dose of sarcasm and deprecating self-loathing. We do know that biting dark humor was used by the camps' condemned inmates as a survival mechanism in a universe turned upside down.

The author, however, finds tragic, grotesque and Kafkian qualities in a so-called normal post-Holocaust reality where the unnamed book's protagonist becomes consumed by the realization that the past is embedded in the present with "The Memory Monster" threatening to remind us that we cannot escape the past and thus we are destined to be doomed rather than redeemed. Yad Vashem's chairman turns from his respectful position "as the official representative of memory" to someone who enables carrying on painful memories which are bound to exact a heavy price on the living.

The Israeli military delegations' visits do have a commendable educational purpose and value, binding a torturous not too remote past with present able military personnel of a proud Jewish state. Not all the Israeli soldiers have family ties with the Holocaust, some are not from a European background and their ties with Polish Jewry are very tenuous. The sight of Israelis in military uniform is disturbing to some Poles in a land where antisemitism is still present

albeit with a small Jewish community. I vividly recall upon visiting Poland in 2017 and stepping out of the new state-of-art Polin Museum next to the giant Warsaw Ghetto Memorial, an Israeli military group getting ready to conduct a memorial service at the moving site. I introduced myself to a handsome colonel pilot who asked me to intercede with then-President Trump to advance peace between the Israelis and Palestinians.

Leading a day tour of Israeli adults whose goal in Poland was shopping and vacationing, not too serious Holocaust learning, provokes a questioning soul-searching response from their disappointed guide who regards his job as a sacred calling without God's participation, "What's the point of all these recitations? If it is our duty to carry on living, why not live life in all its stupidity?" The narrator's scholarly dissertation was prepared in a book form for the public with the attractive covet of Belzec SS officers exuding confidence.

Belzec is the last of the six major extermination camps on Polish soil to be properly maintained. It is also the place where many of my paternal relatives from Zamosc perished, including my great-grandparents Rabbi Yaacov and Dena Manzis Zoberman. Visiting there in 2017, I led our group of seventeen American Jews in the Kaddish, aware that I was touching my severed-sacred roots.

Rabbi Dr. Israel Zoberman is the founder of Temple Lev Tikvah in Virginia Beach. Hundreds of his family members were murdered in the Holocaust.

RECOGNIZING THE 2025 FAIRFAX COUNTY STUDENT PEACE AWARD RECIPIENTS

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 2025

Mr. CONNOLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the recipients of the 2025 Fairfax County Student Peace Awards.

The Fairfax County Student Peace Awards began with one high school in 2006 to encourage high school aged students to think about peace as both a means and an end, and to recognize young people who work as peace-makers. By 2013, the program was being offered to every public high school in Fairfax County, as well as in many private schools.

Participating high schools choose one Junior or Senior, or one student group active in promoting peace or removing the causes of conflict. Examples of outreach include committing to peace by engaging in activities that strive to end conflict, either locally or globally, promoting the understanding of divisive issues and situations to bridge differences, and working to resolve conflicts among students or members of the community who feel isolated or alienated.

I am pleased to include in the RECORD the names of this year's Student Peace Award winners: Sage Nagle, Annandale High School; Jayden Lee, Centreville High School; Nila Elangoan, Chantilly High School; Mia Martin-

Escandarani, Edison High School; Kiran Ashok, Fairfax High School; Shri Bala, Falls Church High School; Ava Saunders and Grace Varughese, Hayfield Secondary School; Clarissa Dantes, Herndon High School; Muslim Student Association, Justice High School; Essam Jazzaar, King Abdullah Academy (KAA); Manas Puri, Lake Braddock Secondary School; Anniyah Rizvi, Langley High School; Madison McLaughlin, John. R. Lewis High School; Hunter Guthrie, Madison High School; Ghalia Sakly, Marshall High School; Bushra Ehikhamenor, McLean High School; Jennifer Villalobos-Saenz, Mount Vernon High School; Julia DeVera, Mountain View High School; Isaac Rodriguez, Oakton High School; Jonathan Johnston, Quander Road School; Jasmine Sklarew, Robinson Secondary School; Ghazi "Zizo" Hanania, South County High School; Jahnavi Nandanavanam, South Lakes High School; TJ Send-a-Smile Club, Thomas Jefferson High School for Science and Technology; Salaiha Najeeb, West Potomac High School; Simeon Samuel, West Springfield High School; Westfield United Sports, Westfield High School; Harun Khan, Woodson High School.

Mr. Speaker, the efforts of these young people are the building blocks of a more peaceful and tolerant world. I commend them on their efforts and dedication and ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating each award recipient and thanking them as well as Fairfax County Public School System and sponsor organizations for all they have done for our community.

RECOGNIZING DOMINICAN HERITAGE MONTH AND CELEBRATING THE 181ST ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 2025

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dominican Heritage Month and to celebrate the 181st anniversary of the Independence of the Dominican Republic, observed on February 27th. This month provides an opportunity to reflect on the resilience, history, and achievements of the Dominican people—both in their homeland and across the diaspora.

Over the past 181 years, the Dominican Republic has overcome profound challenges, from civil wars to military occupations and authoritarian rule. Yet, through it all, Dominicans have demonstrated extraordinary strength and perseverance. Today, more than two million Dominicans call the United States home, with approximately 700,000 residing in New York City alone. In my district, spanning Brooklyn and Queens, the Dominican community is integral to our past, present, and future.

As a Nation, we are enriched by the contributions of Dominican Americans in the arts,

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

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

culture, sports, government, and business. In my own district, I am especially grateful for the Dominican community's role in shaping our small businesses, civic institutions, and cultural landscape. I am also proud that our community produced the first Dominican American elected Brooklyn Borough President, my friend Antonio Reynoso.

To honor Dominican Heritage Month, I am pleased to recognize six outstanding individuals whose dedication, public service, and leadership continue to inspire future generations. I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating: Maria Viera, Sonia Medrano, Socrate Liriano, Vincente Trinidad, Roberto Latinaga and Rufina Valdez. These honorees contribute to the vibrant tapestry of New York City.

Their achievements are a testament to the thriving Dominican presence in New York City and beyond. Let us continue to uplift and celebrate the Dominican community, not just this month, but every day.

RECOGNIZING DINAH WHIPPLE

HON. CHRIS PAPPAS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 2025

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Dinah Whipple of Portsmouth, New Hampshire, in celebration of Black History Month. Dinah Whipple was a monumental figure for educational equality in the State of New Hampshire.

Dinah was enslaved until her emancipation at the age of 21. On February 12, 1781, Dinah married Prince Whipple, who for many years was enslaved by William Whipple, one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence.

Dinah Whipple conducted the Ladies African Charitable School for several decades, providing education for formerly enslaved people and their children.

Over two centuries later, her legacy still lives on in New Hampshire with the Dinah Whipple STEAM Academy at the University of New Hampshire. This program offers underrepresented young teens of color the opportunity to explore science, technology, engineering, arts, math, and black history in America for no cost. In addition, the location of Dinah Whipple's trailblazing school is now a stop on the Black Heritage Trail of New Hampshire.

On behalf of my constituents in New Hampshire's First Congressional District, I recognize Dinah Whipple for her selflessness to New Hampshire's community and history. Now more than ever, it is important to honor and celebrate the lives of individuals who gave back to our communities, and Dinah Whipple's legacy and memory must be honored.

RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF FAMILY COUNSELING SERVICE

HON. BILL FOSTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 2025

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and celebrate the 100th Anniversary of

Family Counseling Service (FCS) in Aurora, Illinois. For a century, FCS has been a pillar of compassion, support, and guidance, providing critical mental health and social services to individuals and families in need.

Since its founding in 1925, Family Counseling Service has remained steadfast in its mission to strengthen communities through accessible and comprehensive counseling, advocacy, and outreach programs. Over the years, FCS has expanded its services to address the evolving needs of the community, offering mental health counseling, financial empowerment programs, crisis intervention, and support for survivors of domestic violence.

Through its dedicated team of professionals and community partnerships, FCS has transformed countless lives by ensuring that everyone, regardless of background or financial status, has access to the care and resources they need to thrive. Their century-long commitment to mental wellness and family stability has made an indelible impact on Aurora and beyond.

As they commemorate this remarkable 100-year milestone, I would like to extend my deepest gratitude to the staff, counselors, and volunteers of Family Counseling Service. Their unwavering dedication, compassion, and expertise have been the driving force behind the organization's success. Through their hard work, they have uplifted individuals, strengthened families, and transformed lives, making our communities stronger and more resilient.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent such an impactful organization in my district. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Family Counseling Service on its 100th Anniversary. Their tireless efforts have enriched the lives of so many, and I am confident that their legacy of service will continue for generations to come.

CELEBRATING THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF DENVER INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

HON. DIANA DEGETTE

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 2025

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today along with Representatives JASON CROW and BRITTANY PETTERSEN, to recognize the 30th anniversary of Denver International Airport, a cornerstone of Colorado's economy and a critical gateway to the world. Since opening its doors on February 28, 1995, Denver International Airport—commonly known as DEN—has played a transformative role in connecting Denver and the entire Rocky Mountain region to destinations across the globe.

Denver International Airport is more than just an airport—it is an economic powerhouse. Generating more than \$36.4 billion annually and supporting over 41,000 jobs, it has become the largest economic engine in the state of Colorado. From the beginning, its construction was guided by bold leadership and the support of voters, resulting in a facility designed for the future. Spanning 53 square miles, DEN was built with expansion in mind, with the ability to grow from six to twelve runways to meet increasing demand.

Over the past three decades, Denver International Airport has served nearly 15 billion

passengers and has risen to become the third-busiest airport in North America. With projections nearing 100 million annual passengers in the coming years, the airport continues to evolve, ensuring it remains a world-class hub for air travel. Its iconic tented terminal, with 21 Teflon peaks, is recognized around the world and symbolizes Colorado's welcoming spirit and pioneering ambition.

Beyond its economic contributions, Denver International Airport has been a leader in sustainability and inclusiveness. Through innovative construction and operational practices, it has demonstrated environmental responsibility while fostering opportunities for a diverse workforce. The airport's Center of Equity and Excellence in Aviation has been instrumental in creating partnerships with local businesses and developing career pathways for underrepresented communities.

Denver International Airport is also a champion of Colorado's unique character, offering travelers a true taste of the state through its locally inspired concessions, dedicated volunteer ambassadors in cowboy hats, and the world's largest airport therapy animal program. As a result, Denver International Airport is not only a transportation hub but also one of Colorado's most recognizable cultural ambassadors.

As we celebrate this milestone, we reaffirm our commitment to maintaining and enhancing Denver International Airport's role as a gateway to the Rockies and beyond. Its continued growth and innovation will ensure that it remains a vital link in our Nation's transportation network for generations to come.

On this 30th anniversary, we ask our colleagues to join us in recognizing the enduring impact of Denver International Airport and the many individuals who have contributed to its success.

IN MEMORY OF MR. BOBBY BEAGLES

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 2025

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize the life of my good friend, Mr. Bobby Beagles, who passed away on February 16, 2025, and is survived by his loving wife, Vickie, son, Thomas, daughter, Rachel, and his five grandchildren. Bobby was a loyal friend of mine for almost 60 years who dedicated his life to advocating for Florida's agriculture industry. Born on April 6, 1942, in Samson, Alabama, Bobby later moved to Florida, where we shared an alma mater, Maynard Evans High School, and community, Pine Hills, Florida. Following his graduation in 1961, Bobby began his lifetime service to the Central Florida community.

Bobby first served as an area representative for the Communications Workers of America for over 20 years. Representing an area of Florida that stretched from Jacksonville to Tampa, it was through this opportunity that Bobby first developed his passion for the political arena, an opportunity he contributed to his later years of service to Florida's agriculture industry.

From 1993 to 2000, Bobby served as President, Vice President, and Director of the Orange County Cattlemen's Association. It was

during this tenure that he also began serving on the Orange County Agricultural Advisory Board, a committee established as the voice for agriculture within the government of Orange County. Bobby took the lead on several issues but is best known for playing a vital role in the establishment of a vibrant agricultural education program in Orange County Public Schools. Thanks to his leadership, there is now an agriculture program in every middle and high school in Orange County, Florida.

Perhaps Bobby's most well-known role was through his service to the Orange County Farm Bureau. Bobby served in every position within Orange County Bureau and holds the distinct honor of the longest serving President. After his service on the Board of Directors, he continued devoting his time to the Farm Bureau as Executive Director, a position he held for 38 years.

Aside from his professional service, Bobby still devoted his time to growing the agriculture community within Central Florida. Through his cow-calf operation in Christmas, Florida that he established in 1956, serving in multiple capacities with the Central Florida Fair since 1987, serving as Chairman of the Large Animal Evacuation Team to aid livestock during natural disasters and emergencies, and serving on the Orange County Public Schools Career & Technical Education Advisory Board from 2013 to 2022, Bobby dedicated his life to serving Central Florida's agriculture industry.

Bobby was honored for his years of service by receiving many awards and acknowledgements including his induction into the Florida 4-H Hall of Fame, National FFA Honorary American Degree, Florida Farm Bureau Distinguished Service Award, Honorary State FFA American Degree, Partners in Education Award, Certificate of Appreciation for Commitment to Orange County Public Schools, and the Jefferson Award. There is no question that Bobby's commitment to agriculture was everlasting, and his legacy will continue to live on. It is hard to imagine Florida agriculture without Bobby. He embodies exactly what agricultural advocacy works to represent.

Throughout his life, Bobby worked tirelessly to grow, advance, and defend Central Florida agriculture, especially through his commitment to supporting youth involved in the industry. He will forever be remembered as a man of honor, of humility, and as one who served his community with the utmost dedication. I am truly thankful for Bobby's friendship and service to the Central Florida community.

RECOGNIZING BRIAN MATHIOWETZ

HON. BRAD FINSTAD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 2025

Mr. FINSTAD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a community leader and my good friend, Brian Mathiowetz, who received the 2024 Lifetime Achievement Award from the Associated General Contractors last Tuesday.

Brian joined the family business, Mathiowetz Construction, full-time in 1981, working for his father Richard.

Brian quickly proved to be a driving force behind the company's growing success, recognizing early on that good businesses invest in good people.

Across southern Minnesota, Mathiowetz Construction has become a respected name in the industry, relied upon by federal, state, and local partners, as well as commercial and private customers who have trusted Brian and his family business to bring these important projects to completion.

His leadership has grown the now-fourth-generation company into one of southern Minnesota's leading employers. Brian has contributed in many ways to the growth and development of Minnesota's First Congressional District, building many of the roads and bridges that connect us to our families and neighbors.

To me, there is no one more deserving of this Lifetime Achievement Award. I congratulate Brian on earning this accomplishment and thank him for his years of dedication to building a better community for all of us in southern Minnesota.

HONORING REVEREND JESSE HAWKINS FOR HIS 2025 LIFETIME ACHIEVEMENT AWARD

HON. BILL FOSTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 2025

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Reverend Jesse Hawkins, Pastor of the Cathedral of Grace St. John African Methodist Episcopal Church, in Aurora, Illinois, for receiving the 2025 Lifetime Achievement Award from the Aurora African American Heritage Advisory Board—a well-deserved recognition of his unwavering dedication and impactful leadership.

The Aurora African American Heritage Advisory Board honors individuals who embody excellence, dedication, and a commitment to the betterment of society. Pastor Hawkins is a shining example of these values, having devoted his life to both spiritual and civic leadership.

Reverend Hawkins was appointed to St. John AME Church in October 1982. For decades, he has dedicated himself to uplifting the people of Aurora, advocating for social justice, and fostering a spirit of unity. His work extends beyond the pulpit, touching lives through mentorship, community service, and outreach programs that provide support and empowerment to individuals and families in need.

Throughout his tenure, Reverend Hawkins has guided the congregation in the development of numerous ministries, including the Agape Connection Inc., a nonprofit organization dedicated to community outreach and support. His commitment to social justice has made the church's lectern a forum for addressing critical issues, with nationally recognized leaders and speakers gracing the congregation.

Reverend Hawkins holds his relationship with God, Christ, and people as the most valuable aspect of his journey. He shares this journey with his beloved wife, Mary Watson Hawkins, and their son, David Alexander. Together, they have built a legacy of faith and service that will endure for generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent such an honorable community leader in my district. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Reverend Jesse Hawkins on receiving

this distinguished recognition. His tireless service and devotion to his faith and community are truly commendable.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BILL HUIZENGA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 2025

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 36; YEA on Roll Call No. 37; and YEA on Roll Call No. 38.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SYDNEY KAMLAGER-DOVE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 2025

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Speaker, on Roll Call No. 36, the vote closed before I was able to cast my vote. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 36.

HONORING THE MINISTERS' COALITION

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 2025

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Fauquier County and Vicinity Ministers' Coalition. Since their establishment at Mount Olive Baptist Church in Rectortown, Virginia in 1991 the coalition has focused on faith-based community service, advocacy, and leadership development. The coalition will mark 34 years of faithful service this year on March 8th, which offers us an opportunity to reflect on the Coalition's impact since the time of its founding.

The Coalition was created to unite local ministers in a biblically sound fellowship so they would be well-equipped to provide spiritual leadership throughout the region. The 18 member churches serve as a dynamic force for the Kingdom of God, and their dedication to the principle of unity as described in 1 Corinthians 12:14–20 reflects well on how they approach service and care for the people of Virginia.

The Coalition's commitment to leadership and service in times of challenge such as First Responder Outreach, Homeless and Prison Ministries, and Christian Fellowship Initiatives throughout the region is something I am proud to honor and represent here today. Their initiatives—ranging from community-wide events to spiritual and emotional support in times of crisis—demonstrate an unwavering dedication to the well-being of all residents.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to join me in honoring the Fauquier County and Vicinity Ministers' Coalition and to tell you how proud I am of the work they have done to address critical social and spiritual needs as they strive to build bridges and empower communities. I pray for Christ's guidance as they continue to carry out their mission.

HONORING THEODIA GILLESPIE
FOR HER 2025 LIFETIME
ACHIEVEMENT AWARD

HON. BILL FOSTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 2025

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Theodia Gillespie, President and CEO of the Quad County Urban League for receiving the 2025 Lifetime Achievement Award from the Aurora African American Heritage Advisory Board—a fitting tribute to nearly four decades of tireless commitment to empowering communities and changing lives.

The Aurora African American Heritage Advisory Board honors individuals who embody excellence, dedication, and a commitment to the betterment of society. Theodia is a shining example of these values, as her lifelong pursuit of excellence and equality has been the foundation of her work, advocating for a “hand up, not a handout” approach that empowers individuals and families to create sustainable career paths and vibrant, thriving communities.

Since joining the Quad County Urban League in 1984 and assuming the role of President and CEO in 1993, Mrs. Gillespie has been a transformative leader. Under her leadership, the organization has experienced tremendous growth in education and workforce development programs, providing countless individuals with the tools they need to build better futures.

Her leadership has earned her numerous prestigious accolades, including: The Best Supporting Organization Award from the Aurora Hollywood Casino, The Good Samaritan Award from WBBM-TV, The Lifetime Achievement Award from the Urban League of Metropolitan St. Louis, and The Legacy Recognition Award from the National Urban League.

Beyond her role at the Quad County Urban League, Mrs. Gillespie continues to serve her community as Chairperson of the Board for The Marie Wilkinson Food Pantry and as a Board Member for East Aurora School District 131 Board of Education, Forefront, and the Dunham Foundation.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have such a dedicated leader in my district. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Theodia Gillespie on receiving this distinguished recognition. Her leadership, advocacy, and service have made an indelible mark on the lives of many.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BRITTANY PETTERSEN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 2025

Ms. PETTERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I missed votes due to recently giving birth. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 51; and NAY on Roll Call No. 52.

HONORING DR. KEITH D. THIBO

HON. DARIN LAHOOD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 2025

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor Dr. Keith D. Thibo, who celebrates forty years pastoring at Bay View Baptist Church in Washington, Illinois and fifty years in full-time ministry on March 2, 2025.

Born and raised in Michigan, Pastor Thibo first attended Bob Jones University before transferring to Maranatha Baptist Bible College in Watertown, Wisconsin. In May of 2010, he received his Doctorate of Divinity from Hyles-Anderson College.

Pastor Thibo met and married his wife, Christine, on December 20, 1978. He was called to Bay View Baptist Church in March of 1985 and, with the support of his wife and daughters, he founded King’s Kids Clubs, a children’s Bible memorization program. King’s Kids Clubs has impacted over 2,000 churches in over 100 countries around the world and thousands of young people. Pastor Thibo has also authored four books on Bible Doctrine and Apologetics. His ministry has not only shaped the lives of his congregants but has made a lasting impact on faith worldwide.

Pastor Thibo’s remarkable life of service, faith, and leadership will continue to inspire all who have been touched by his ministry. Please join me in thanking Pastor Thibo for his many years of service.

RECOGNIZING MR. GERARD J. GRIMALDI ON HIS RETIREMENT AND EXPRESSING APPRECIATION FOR A LIFETIME OF DEDICATED SERVICE TO OUR COMMUNITY

HON. EMANUEL CLEAVER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 2025

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a deep sense of gratitude for the opportunity to recognize a great Missourian, Mr. Gerard Joseph Grimaldi, for his exemplary personal and professional accomplishments as he begins his next chapter of life, enjoying retirement. An experienced leader, dedicated professional, and tireless advocate, Gerard serves as a prime example of a true public servant, and most importantly, a kind, caring, and genuine human being.

A Kansas City, Missouri, native, Gerald was born on September 16, 1959, to loving parents, Mary Jane and Frank Grimaldi. Along with his five brothers and sisters, Gerard grew up in the Crestwood neighborhood and their family was active at St. Francis Xavier Catholic Church, just off Troost Avenue. His parents, with strong Catholic roots, instilled a deep sense of faith, public service, and commitment to others, particularly the underserved, in all of their children.

Gerard would continue his Jesuit education at Rockhurst High School, before attending the University of Missouri-Columbia, where he would graduate with honors in 1980 with a bachelor’s degree in journalism. Following graduation, Gerard briefly enjoyed working as a reporter for the Kansas City Labor Beacon,

before joining the staff of U.S. Senator Thomas F. Eagleton. As the Senator’s staff assistant, Gerard handled constituent services, health care access, and economic development for the Western region of Missouri.

Known for his dedication, responsiveness, and affable personality, Gerard was hired in 1985 to serve as the District Director for U.S. Representative Alan Wheat, one of my predecessors. In that role, Gerard led the District-based team, while working closely with the Washington, D.C. legislative staff and leading the office’s media strategy. Gerard worked on several successful efforts, including a new U.S. Courthouse, Bruce Watkins Drive, and establishment of the Harry S. Truman National historic site. He would serve in that role for a decade, working on behalf of the people of Missouri’s Fifth Congressional District.

Following Representative Wheat’s unsuccessful bid for the United States Senate in 1994, Gerard continued working for the newly elected U.S. Representative Karen McCarthy, to share his knowledge of the Fifth District and ensure a smooth transition, before joining Kaiser Permanente, a nonprofit health plan in 1995. During his six-year tenure at Kaiser, Gerard would ultimately be elevated to Vice President for Human Resources and Public Affairs. Through this experience, Gerald’s knowledge of the local health care system continued to expand, and he was asked to serve on numerous civic organizations, including the Jackson County Mental Health Levy Board of Trustees, where he would serve as Board Chair for several years. Additionally, as I was serving as Mayor of Kansas City during this time, I had the pleasure of asking Gerard to serve on the Mayor’s Race Relations Task Force and on the Board of Directors of the Mayor’s Corps of Progress.

For the past nearly 24 years, Gerard has worked at Truman Medical Centers (now called University Health), our area’s safety net provider, helping to advance issues of health care access and health equity. He has served as the Chief Health Policy and Government Relations Officer, where he serves in a leadership role to help educate and advocate for the hospital system, to ensure adequate local, state, and federal resources are available to meet their mission. While Gerard considers himself a lifelong learner, he has been instrumental in helping to educate others on the health care needs in our region, particularly for some of our most vulnerable populations.

A comprehensive list of Gerard’s accomplishments would be too lengthy, but just a few examples of his impact, include: securing post-9/11 funding to modernize the hospital for bioterrorism and mass casualty incidents; leading multiple public election campaigns for property tax levy approval; securing approval of multiple bond issues for capital improvements on two hospital campuses; supporting the Hospital Hill property acquisition efforts and urban renewal attainment; securing numerous Affordable Care Act grants; securing the hospital’s selection with MO HealthNet; working alongside dozens of stakeholders to secure Missouri Medicaid expansion; advocating for vital hospital support during the COVID-19 global pandemic; providing community leadership by ensuring outreach and vaccinations were available during the pandemic; securing multiple sources of public funding for a Center for Recovery and Wellness, a substance use disorder outpatient center that

opened in October 2024; and numerous additional legislative accomplishments.

In addition to some of the civic engagements already mentioned, Gerard has served on numerous other professional and civic boards and committees, including with the Greater Kansas City Chamber of Commerce, Downtown Council, National Association of Public Hospitals, Labor Management Council, Missouri Hospital Association, American Hospital Association, Bannister Federal Complex Community Advisory Panel, Saint Thomas More Parish, and more recently, Gerard was honored for his service by being presented with the 2025 Mel and Jean Carnahan Public Service Award, which recognizes individuals who have dedicated their lives to serving the public. Former members of this esteemed body, including Representative Russ Carnahan and Representative Alan Wheat were among the many who attended the ceremony.

Beyond his extraordinary career achievements, Gerard has always been a dedicated family man. He and his lovely wife, Julie, are celebrating nearly 32 years of marriage, and enjoy the company of their four children and respective families, Mary Kate Rohlf (Brock), Caroline Riese (Ian), Matthew Grimaldi, and Gabrielle Grimaldi, as well as their grandchild, Penelope Rohlf.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to please join me and the people of Missouri's Fifth Congressional District, in congratulating Mr. Gerard J. Grimaldi as he retires from a successful and impactful career, having served as a champion and ally for our underserved communities at the local, state, and national levels. Gerard's friendship, positivity, and his infectious and distinctive laugh will forever be cherished. His legacy will continue to impact residents and communities across Missouri and in our beloved Kansas City region, for generations to come. On behalf of my colleagues and a grateful Nation, we wish him a relaxing and enjoyable retirement, and thank him for his dedication and commitment to our community.

HONORING PAUL M. CARROLL, JR.

HON. GREG STANTON

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 2025

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of an impactful Arizona LGBTQI+ rights advocate and trailblazer, Paul M. Carroll, Jr., who we lost on February 18, 2025, at the age of 61, following a long, hard-fought battle with cancer.

Paul was born to U.S. Air Force Veteran, Paul M. Carroll, Sr., and Margaret Carroll, on April 27, 1963, in Malden, Massachusetts. He spent the early years of his life in Malden where his parents would teach him and his four siblings the values of kindness and service.

Interested in STEM and computer science research, Paul completed a degree in Economics with a concentration in Computer Science and Mathematics from the University of Massachusetts Amherst in 1989. Early in his career, Paul took to heart the lessons taught by his parents—embedding himself in his community and working tirelessly to protect the rights of LGBTQI+ individuals. Paul worked closely with the Pride Board in Boston, where he fought to make our country more inclusive and welcoming for everyone.

Once Paul relocated to Arizona, his passion for service and his entrepreneurial spirit drove him to launch his finance and IT consulting firm in 2004. His firm, JR in Phoenix LLC, provided local business with IT support services, including financial analysis, planning, and accounting. And while Phoenix would remain his forever home, Paul always made time to travel the world with his husband and enjoy the company of his many friends and family.

Much like Boston, Phoenix was blessed by Paul's dedication to building a more inclusive community. He quickly established himself as a civil rights leader in our community and as a passionate defender of every Arizonan's fundamental right to marry who they love. Paul's

impact on Phoenix was felt most deeply during his various tenures on the Phoenix Pride Parade Board. Starting off as an operations volunteer in April 2004, he would later serve as Parade Director, Treasurer, Vice President, and Chair greatly expanding the parade and festival in Phoenix. He became Chair Emeritus in 2010, steering the organization wisely with his wealth of knowledge and financial expertise.

Paul's commitment to Arizona's LGBTQI+ community extended well beyond the Phoenix Parade Board. He helped shape iconic events around the Valley in support of the LGBTQI+ community, like the annual Aunt Rita's Red Brunch Charity Fundraiser, which provides relief for those living with HIV and AIDS. Additionally, Paul was a Board Director for ViVRE and the Volunteer One Voice Community Center Anti-Violence Project, which provides services for people in need, including LGBTQI+-friendly medical services, shelter for homeless youth, and suicide prevention counseling. We all owe a debt of gratitude to Paul.

Paul is survived by his beloved husband, Kevin Moore, his aunt, sisters, nieces and nephews. He will be remembered for his kind, loving nature, and his lifelong investment to move our state toward true liberty and justice for all, will be felt for generations to come. In this spirit of gratitude and remembrance, I extend my heartfelt appreciation for all he has done for Arizona. I thank him and Godspeed.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BRITTANY PETTERSEN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 2025

Ms. PETTERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I missed votes due to recently giving birth. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 46; NAY on Roll Call No. 47; YEA on Roll Call No. 48; and YEA on Roll Call No. 49.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S1413–S1443

Measures Introduced: Fifty bills and five resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 762–811, S.J. Res. 28, and S. Res. 101–104. **Pages S1428–29**

Measures Passed:

Waste Emissions Charge for Petroleum and Natural Gas Systems: By 52 yeas to 47 nays (Vote No. 97), Senate passed H.J. Res. 35, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to “Waste Emissions Charge for Petroleum and Natural Gas Systems: Procedures for Facilitating Compliance, Including Netting and Exemptions”. **Page S1419**

Authorizing Expenditures by Committees of the Senate: Senate agreed to S. Res. 94, authorizing expenditures by committees of the Senate for the periods March 1, 2025, through September 30, 2025, October 1, 2025, through September 30, 2026, and October 1, 2026, through February 28, 2027. **Page S1434**

Rare Disease Day: Senate agreed to S. Res. 104, designating February 27, 2025, as “Rare Disease Day”. **Page S1434**

Measures Indefinitely Postponed:

Waste Emissions Charge for Petroleum and Natural Gas Systems: Senate indefinitely postponed S.J. Res. 12, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to “Waste Emissions Charge for Petroleum and Natural Gas Systems: Procedures for Facilitating Compliance, Including Netting and Exemptions”. **Pages S1413–19, S1434**

Measures Considered:

Protection of Women and Girls in Sports Act—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 9, to provide that for purposes of determining compliance with title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 in athletics, sex

shall be recognized based solely on a person’s reproductive biology and genetics at birth. **Page S1434**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of Thursday, February 27, 2025, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of Linda McMahon, of Connecticut, to be Secretary of Education, on Monday, March 3, 2025. **Page S1434**

Message from the President: Senate received the following messages from the President of the United States:

Transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the continuation of the national emergency that was originally declared in Executive Order 13692 of March 8, 2015, with respect to the situation in Venezuela; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. (PM–10) **Page S1427**

Transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the continuation of the national emergency that was originally declared in Executive Order 13660 of March 6, 2014, with respect to Ukraine; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. (PM–11) **Page S1427**

McMahon Nomination—Agreement: Senate resumed consideration of the nomination of Linda McMahon, of Connecticut, to be Secretary of Education. **Pages S1419–24**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 51 yeas to 47 nays (Vote No. EX. 98), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Page S1424**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that all post-cloture time on the nomination be expired; and that Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination at 5:30 p.m., on Monday, March 3, 2025. **Pages S1423–24**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 3 p.m., on Monday, March 3, 2025, Senate resume consideration of the

nomination, under the previous order; and that following disposition of the nomination, Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 9, to provide that for purposes of determining compliance with title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 in athletics, sex shall be recognized based solely on a person's reproductive biology and genetics at birth, and that Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill.

Page S1434

Messages from the House:

Page S1427

Measures Referred:

Page S1427

Executive Communications:

Page S1427

Executive Reports of Committees: **Pages S1427–28**

Additional Cosponsors:

Pages S1429–30

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:

Pages S1430–33

Additional Statements:

Pages S1426–27

Authorities for Committees to Meet:

Pages S1433–34

Privileges of the Floor:

Page S1434

Record Votes: Two record votes were taken today. (Total—98) **Pages S1419, S1424**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 4:16 p.m., until 3 p.m. on Monday, March 3, 2025. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S1434.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

NOMINATION

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of John Phelan, of Florida, to be Secretary of the Navy, after the nominee, who was introduced by Senator Scott (FL), testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

GLOBAL NUCLEAR AND MISSILE THREATS

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Strategic Forces received a closed briefing on global nuclear and missile threats from Nicholas Baynes, Senior Defense Intelligence Analyst for Weapons of Mass Destruction and Nuclear Issues Defense Counterproliferation Office, Gregory Kastner, Senior Intelligence Analyst, Defense Counterproliferation Office/China Mission Group, and Jason Adams, Senior Intelligence Officer, Defense Counterproliferation Office, all of the Defense Intelligence Agency, Department of Defense.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Stephen Miran, of New York, to be Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, Jeffrey Kessler, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Industry and Security, William Pulte, of Florida, to be Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, and Jonathan McKernan, of Tennessee, to be Director, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Steven Bradbury, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of Transportation, and routine lists in the Coast Guard.

CARGO THEFT

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Surface Transportation, Freight, Pipelines, and Safety concluded a hearing to examine cargo theft, focusing on the threat to consumers and the United States supply chain, after receiving testimony from Chief Will Johnson, BNSF Railway Police Department, Fort Worth, Texas, on behalf of the International Association of Chiefs of Police; Rob Howell, Academy Sports and Outdoors, Katy, Texas; Adam Blanchard, Tanager Logistics and Double Diamond Transport, San Antonio, Texas, on behalf of the American Trucking Associations; and Lewie Pugh, Owner-Operator Independent Drivers Association, Grain Valley, Missouri.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Troy Edgar, of California, to be Deputy Secretary of Homeland Security, and James Bishop, of North Carolina, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee ordered favorably reported the nomination of Lori Chavez-DeRemer, of Oregon, to be Secretary of Labor.

NOMINATION

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Keith Sonderling, of Florida, to be Deputy Secretary of Labor, after the nominee, who was introduced by Senator Scott (FL) and former

Senator LeMieux, testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 331, to amend the Controlled Substances Act with respect to the scheduling of fentanyl-related

substances, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute; and

The nominations of Todd Blanche, of Florida, to be Deputy Attorney General, and Abigail Slater, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Attorney General, both of the Department of Justice.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 120 public bills, H.R. 1643–1762; 1 private bill, H.R. 1763; and 13 resolutions, H.J. Res. 63–65; H. Con. Res. 16; and H. Res. 168–176, were introduced.

Pages H1912–18

Additional Cosponsors:

Pages H921–22

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative McClinton to act as Speaker pro tempore for today.

Page H883

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”: The House passed 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”, by a yea-and-nay vote of 221 yeas to 198 nays with two answering “present”, Roll No. 53.

Pages H884–89

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday, March 3, 2025 for morning-hour debate.

Page H889

Presidential Messages: Received a message from the President transmitting a notification 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—referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed (H. Doc. 119–21).

Page H895

Received a message from the President transmitting a notification of the national emergency de-

clared in Executive Order 13660 of March 6, 2014 with respect to Ukraine, 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—referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed (H. Doc. 119–22).

Page H895

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea-and-nay vote developed during the proceedings of today and appears on page H889.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 2:10 p.m.

Committee Meetings

AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE PUBLIC WITNESS HEARING DAY 3

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled “American Indian and Alaska Native Public Witness Hearing Day 3”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

PROTECTING VICTIMS OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING AND ONLINE EXPLOITATION

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Crime and Federal Government Surveillance held a hearing entitled “Protecting Victims of Human Trafficking and Online Exploitation”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

**COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR MONDAY,
MARCH 3, 2025***(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)***Senate**

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

Committee on Rules, Full Committee, hearing 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”; 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”; and S.J. Res. 11, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management relating to “Protection of Marine Archaeological Resources”, 4 p.m., H-313 Capitol.

Next Meeting of the SENATE
3 p.m., Monday, March 3

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
12 noon, Monday, March 3

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will resume consideration of the nomination of Linda McMahon, of Connecticut, to be Secretary of Education, and vote on confirmation thereon at 5:30 p.m.

Following disposition of the nomination of Linda McMahon, Senate will vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 9, Protection of Women and Girls in Sports Act.

House Chamber

Program for Monday: To be announced.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Cleaver, Emanuel, Mo., E172
Connolly, Gerald E., Va., E169
DeGette, Diana, Colo., E170
Finstad, Brad, Minn., E171

Foster, Bill, Ill., E170, E171, E172
Huizinga, Bill, Mich., E171
Kamlager-Dove, Sydney, Calif., E171
Kiggans, Jennifer A., Va., E169
LaHood, Darin, Ill., E172
Pappas, Chris, N.H., E170

Pettersen, Brittany, Colo., E172, E173
Stanton, Greg, Ariz., E173
Velázquez, Nydia M., N.Y., E169
Webster, Daniel, Fla., E170
Wittman, Robert J., Va., E171



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶ Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at www.govinfo.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶ To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶ Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶ With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.