



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 119th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 171

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, 2025

No. 151

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 16, 2025.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CARLOS A. GIMENEZ to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

MIKE JOHNSON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2025, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

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

CONGRATULATING DR. MICHAEL WELSH

(Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS of Iowa was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Dr. Michael Welsh, a University of Iowa professor of internal medicine, on winning the 2025 Lasker-DeBakey Clinical Medical Research Award. The Lasker Award is one of the most prestigious biomedical and clinical research awards.

Dr. Welsh was recognized for his extraordinary research on cystic fibrosis,

which is helping to pave the way to new therapies that are dramatically improving health and extending life for people with cystic fibrosis.

Cystic fibrosis is a genetic lung disease that primarily affects young people. Dr. Welsh's research has been instrumental in understanding the function of a critical CFTR protein and how it causes cystic fibrosis, which has led to the creation of lifesaving therapies. Aided by his medical team, Dr. Welsh created a triple drug combination that treats up to 90 percent of those affected by cystic fibrosis.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Dr. Welsh for all of his body of research and congratulations on the Lasker Award.

CONGRATULATING KIRK FERENTZ, THE BIG TEN'S WINNINGEST COACH

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Iowa football coach Kirk Ferentz for becoming the Big Ten's all-time winningest coach.

With the Iowa Hawkeyes 47-7 win over UMass Minutemen on September 13, Coach Kirk Ferentz broke Woody Hayes' record. Coach Ferentz' career started as the first season head coach at the University of Iowa in 1999 and since then he has won two Big Ten titles and conference Coach of the Year four times.

Coach Ferentz is in his 27th season as coach of the Hawkeyes, and he won his 206th game with the program to break the conference's all-time list milestone. He is the longest tenured active head coach in college football, with a 206-124 record at Iowa and a 217-145 career record. This achievement is a testament to Coach Ferentz' leadership and commitment to excellence within the Hawkeye organization.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Coach Ferentz. Go Hawks.

I would like to extend birthday wishes to my amazing husband and partner, Curt Meeks. Happy birthday, Curt.

AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY FLY-IN

(Ms. SEWELL of Alabama was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Ms. SEWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome to our Nation's Capitol patient advocates from the American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network for their annual fly-in.

This week, 700 advocates representing every State and all 435 congressional delegations and districts will be raising awareness of the urgent need for policies that improve cancer prevention, early detection, treatment, and patient support. It is truly an honor to have these advocates with us this week sharing their stories of resilience, loss, determination, and hope.

Like so many of these advocates, I know firsthand the impact cancer can have on our families. On June 10, 2021, I lost my beloved mother, Nancy Gardner Sewell, to pancreatic cancer. Like so many patients diagnosed with pancreatic cancer, my mother's cancer was not detected until it was stage IV, and therefore, was not treatable.

Tragically, the cancer took her life 8 short weeks after her diagnosis. It was a shock to our entire family, the lingering effects of which I feel every day.

In an effort to turn my pain into passion, I made a commitment to do all that I could to prevent other families from experiencing such a painful loss. That is why I am proud to be leading legislation alongside my Republican colleague, Congressman JODEY ARRINGTON from Texas, to expand access to early detection cancer screenings.

Our bill, the Nancy Gardner Sewell Medicare Multi-Cancer Early Detection Screening Coverage Act, would create a pathway for Medicare to cover emerging blood tests, once FDA approved, which holds the promise of screening for up to 40 types of cancers with a single blood draw.

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.

When it comes to cancer, we know that early detection is our best protection, and that is exactly what this bill will do. It is about ensuring that those who are most at risk can catch cancer early and stop it before it spreads.

Thanks to the advocacy of the American Cancer Society and their partners, our bill has bipartisan support. Mr. Speaker, 295 House Members and 62 Senators have cosponsored it.

Last Congress, Jodey surprised me by renaming the legislation in honor of my late mother, Nancy Gardner Sewell, of Selma, Alabama, who passed away in 2021 from pancreatic cancer.

Who was she?

My mom was a devout Christian who lived a life of faith, an exemplary educator, and a library media specialist. She served in the Selma public school system for 36 years where she shaped minds and uplifted children. As a librarian, she was a strong advocate for reading, initiating the Reading is Fundamental, RIF, program in 1973, delivering books to children throughout Alabama, Mississippi, and Tennessee. It is a program that still serves children in Selma and Dallas County and Alabama's rural Black Belt today.

Nancy Sewell was a trailblazing civic leader. She became the first African-American woman elected to Selma's city council and served as an inspirational role model for women in politics.

Her favorite saying was: Bloom where you are planted.

We can make a difference right where we are, and she made a big difference in the lives of so many people whom she touched.

Again, I want to thank the American Cancer Society and their more than 700 supporters for honoring my mother on this day of advocacy, her birthday.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join us in this important effort. Let's pass H.R. 842, the Nancy Gardner Sewell Medicare Multi-Cancer Early Detection Screening Coverage Act and pave the way for a world without cancer.

□ 1010

HURRICANE MARÍA'S 8-YEAR ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. HERNÁNDEZ of Puerto Rico was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. HERNÁNDEZ. For the benefit of my constituents and the communities affected, I will offer my remarks in Spanish.

Hoy me paro aquí con la voz prestada de un pueblo que no olvida. Hace ocho años, el 20 de septiembre, Puerto Rico amaneció desgarrado—no sólo en términos de su infraestructura pero en cuanto al alma de su gente. El huracán María no fue solo un fenómeno atmosférico, sino una odisea que dolorosamente reflejó la fortaleza del pueblo de Puerto Rico y de lo que ocurre cuando se combina el colapso de

la infraestructura con años de negligencia institucional.

Por eso, hoy me honra presentar una resolución para conmemorar este aniversario solemne, para reconocer a quienes se perdieron, a quienes resistieron, y a un pueblo que se levantó con dignidad frente al abandono.

Se cayeron los techos. Se apagó la luz. Pero quizás lo más doloroso fue el silencio. No sólo la falta de comunicación, sino la ausencia de respuesta efectiva, de coordinación, de urgencia. Ese vacío se sintió como el silencio dentro del ojo del huracán: una calma engañosa, que no promete alivio, sino que anuncia que lo peor aún está por llegar.

Recuerdo a los viejitos cargando cubos de agua por lomas empinadas. Madres haciendo fila por hielo para conservar la insulina. Vecinos compartiendo una planta eléctrica como quien comparte un pedazo de esperanza. Y recuerdo a muchos—a demasiados—que murieron sin que su nombre contara en una estadística oficial. Más de 4,000 vidas. No fue una cifra. Fue una negligencia.

Pero los nuestros no esperaron permiso para sobrevivir. Rescataron a sus vecinos con sogas y machetes. Improvisaron clínicas. Reabrieron escuelas sin electricidad. María no solo destruyó edificios. Nos robó a abuelas, a padres, a hijos, que murieron no por el viento, sino por el abandono. Y esa es una verdad que debe doler. Que debe incomodar. Porque el olvido también es una forma de violencia.

Tantas conversaciones sobre los problemas que enfrenta Puerto Rico hoy, especialmente en términos de problemas de infraestructura, empiezan con mencionar al huracán María. “Desde María”, dicen. Y creo que, de tanto repetirlo, se nos olvida el dolor. El horror.

Por eso, hoy más que reclamar, quiero recordar. Recordar a los que no vivieron para contar su historia. Recordar a los que sobrevivieron, pero cargan cicatrices invisibles. Recordar lo que el país tuvo que hacer, solo, para poder respirar.

Porque honrar a los que sobrevivieron—y a los que no—exige memoria: exige justicia.

Hoy seguimos luchando por reconstruir nuestra red eléctrica, por modernizar nuestra infraestructura, por garantizar servicios de salud resilientes y acceso digno a la vivienda. Seguimos luchando por energía confiable, por justicia social, y por un trato justo ante la ley.

Puerto Rico siguió adelante porque su gente nunca se rindió. Porque en medio del caos, y la oscuridad, fue la solidaridad, el valor y la dignidad del pueblo lo que sostuvo la isla. Esa es la verdad que no se puede ignorar ni borrar. Porque aunque María fue una herida profunda, la respuesta de nuestra gente fue una de fuerza indomable. Y aunque aún estamos sanando, seguimos adelante. Seguimos

adelante, con la mirada puesta en la reconstrucción y en un futuro digno.

(English translation of the statement made in Spanish is as follows:)

Today I stand here with the voice borrowed from a people who do not forget. Eight years ago, on September 20, Puerto Rico woke up torn—not only in terms of its infrastructure but in the very soul of its people. Hurricane María was not just a meteorological event, but an odyssey that painfully reflected the strength of the people of Puerto Rico and what happens when the collapse of infrastructure is combined with years of institutional neglect.

That is why today I am honored to introduce a resolution to commemorate this solemn anniversary—to recognize those we lost, those who endured, and a people who rose with dignity in the face of abandonment.

Roofs collapsed. The lights went out. But perhaps the most painful thing was the silence. Not just the lack of communication, but the absence of an effective response, of coordination, and of urgency. That void felt like the silence inside the eye of the hurricane: a deceptive calm, which does not promise relief, but rather announces that the worst is yet to come.

I remember the elderly carrying buckets of water up steep hills. Mothers lining up for ice to keep insulin cold. Neighbors sharing a generator like someone sharing a piece of hope. And I remember many—too many—who died without their names being counted in an official statistic. More than 4,000 lives. It wasn't a number. It was negligence.

But our people did not wait for permission to survive. They rescued their neighbors with ropes and machetes. They improvised clinics. They reopened schools without electricity. María didn't just destroy buildings. It stole from us grandmothers, parents, children, who died not from the wind, but from abandonment. And that is a truth that should hurt. Which should make us uncomfortable. Because forgetting is also a form of violence.

So many conversations about the problems Puerto Rico faces today, especially in terms of infrastructure problems, begin with mentioning Hurricane María. “From María,” they say. And I think that, by repeating it so often, we forget the pain. The horror.

Therefore, today more than complaining, I want to remember. Remember those who did not live to tell their story. Remember those who survived, but carry invisible scars. Remember what the island had to do, alone, to be able to breathe.

Because honoring those who survived—and those who did not—demands more than memory: it demands justice.

Today we continue fighting to rebuild our electrical grid, to modernize our infrastructure, to guarantee resilient health services and dignified access to housing. We continue to fight for reliable energy, for social justice, and for equal treatment under the law.

Puerto Rico kept going because its people never gave up. Because in the midst of chaos and darkness, it was the solidarity, courage and dignity of the people that sustained the island. That is the truth that cannot be ignored or erased. Because although María was a deep wound, the response of our people was one of unbreakable strength. And although we are still healing, we move forward. We move forward, with our eyes set on reconstruction and a dignified future.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Puerto Rico will provide the Clerk a translation of his remarks.

VISIT TO BLUEBONNET DETENTION FACILITY

(Ms. JOHNSON of Texas was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, I visited the Bluebonnet Detention Facility in Anson, Texas, about 3 hours outside of Dallas. What I saw was deeply disturbing. It speaks to the harmful policies under Donald Trump and Secretary Noem, policies that are ripping families apart, wasting taxpayer dollars, and making our communities less safe.

Bluebonnet was built to house prisoners under the Texas Department of Criminal Justice, but in 2019 the first Trump administration handed a contract to a private prison company to convert it into an ICE detention center. Today, instead of prioritizing dangerous criminals, those who commit rape, murder, or trafficking drugs, people who pose real threats to our communities, ICE is filling this facility with people who have done absolutely nothing wrong and are being targeted simply because of the color of their skin.

As a Member of Congress and as a member of the Homeland Security Committee, I have both the right and the responsibility to see what is happening inside these facilities. For years, Members of Congress could visit unannounced, but under Secretary Noem, that right was stripped away. My team and I worked for weeks just to gain entry and finally got a scheduled appointment.

When I visited, 1,079 people were being detained at Bluebonnet. Nearly 700 of them, almost two-thirds, were designated by ICE itself as a low threat. Let me repeat: Hundreds of people with no violent history, no record of serious crimes, targeted solely because of the color of their skin, were denied their constitutional rights and then locked away in a detention center.

I met with several detained individuals. Here is a common story that we came across. A man came here more than two decades ago and worked a blue-collar job. He raised his family in Texas. He has children whom he loves and who depend on him. He hasn't committed any violent crimes or sold any drugs. His only offense was a traffic stop. Now, he faces deportation to a country he left decades ago.

My question is: How is this fair? Why are people who are contributing to our economy, who are working hard and making sure that our citizens are being taken care of, being targeted instead of all of the violent criminals?

This is what is happening under Trump. They are not prioritizing threats to public safety. They are not going after violent offenders. They are

taking workers out of our economy. They are spreading fear in communities where families should feel safe, and they are doing it with our taxpayer dollars.

Let me be very clear. Locking up people who pose no danger to our communities does not make us safer. It weakens us. It destabilizes families. It wastes resources that should be used to pursue violent criminals, traffickers, and those who actually endanger our neighbors.

As I left the detention center that day, an employee from ICE made one request: Stop politicizing us.

It is the White House that needs to hear this message most of all. Trump and Secretary Noem are not using taxpayer dollars to keep communities safe; they are using it as political theater. They dress up in ICE jackets, parade through detention centers, and turn detainees into props for their campaigns.

This isn't law enforcement. It is performance. It makes a mockery of our justice system by prioritizing sensational videos over safety and cruelty over compassion. This is political theater at the expense of human lives.

We need a smarter and fairer approach. That means alternatives to detention that allow people to remain with their families while their case moves forward. It means investing in an immigration system that is fair, fast, and final so that people can have their cases heard in front of a judge and are not left in limbo for years. It means prioritizing dangerous individuals, not hardworking parents who have built their lives in our communities.

People who play by the rules, follow the law, and adhere to the guidelines laid out before them should never be targeted because of the color of their skin and denied due process. Our society should not accept this, and this administration needs to put a stop to this injustice.

That is what I saw at Bluebonnet, a betrayal of our values as a nation. We are a country of immigrants. We are a country that claims to honor family, community, and fairness. Yet, the Trump administration is locking up people who are simply trying to work, raise families, and contribute to our community. This is not about fairness or safety, and it is not who we claim to be as Americans.

Congress must step up and hold this administration accountable. We must work in a bipartisan way to build an immigration system that keeps people safe and ensures that people's rights are respected. Locking up neighbors who pose no threat does not make us stronger. It divides us. It weakens us, and it undermines everything that we stand for.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF MILLIE ORTIZ SHEEHAN

(Mr. LATIMER of New York was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. LATIMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life and times of Millie Ortiz Sheehan. Today, we are naming a street after her in the town of Greenburgh where she did so much to help her community and her people.

Millie was born in New York City, the daughter of Miguel and Cruz Ortiz. She graduated from Baruch College where she met her husband, Francis. Together, they spent over 40 years married, with two children and four grandchildren.

Millie was a school psychologist with over 30 years of experience in the Greenburgh Central School District and still had time to be active in numerous community groups and worthwhile projects that helped her neighbors, particularly the youth of her town. She was a spectacular cook to boot.

Millie's loss came unexpectedly and tragically, but we remember her and her life, and we join the community in valuing her life spent caring about others. Her name on that street sign will ensure that Greenburgh will never ever forget her.

□ 1020

HONORING THE LIFE OF LYNNE TROTTER WAGSTAFF

Mr. LATIMER. Mr. Speaker, every now and then, there are people born who personify the essence of love in action. On November 2, 1946, Lynne Louise Trotter, later Lynne Louise Trotter Wagstaff, was born in Harlem, New York. She was one of those people.

Lynne attended St. Catherine of Siena and graduated from St. Pascal Baylon High School. She loved to dance and attended Johnson Dance Studio during her youth. Her summers were enriched, and she formed lifelong bonds at Camp Minisink, a camp for African-American youth in New York City.

Lynne met her husband of 47 years, William O. Wagstaff, Jr., at Central State. He was a Kappa and a football player, two criteria she later joked were on her checklist for potential mates in college. They were married on August 5, 1978, and purchased their first home in Mount Vernon, New York.

Although her childhood dream was to become an actress, she decided to pursue a career as an educator. Over the years, she was an elementary school teacher, a reading teacher, an assistant principal, and retired as the principal of P.S. 112, located in the Edenwald neighborhood of the Bronx.

Lynne spent her entire career in public education and felt it was her responsibility not only to educate but to provide care and safety for children who were often underserved and overlooked, either due to their race or economic status.

Lynne's love for her family was her foundation, and she poured into her family, always being a reliable supporter. Even when a relative might have felt that life's challenges left them fighting alone, she was always there.

Lynne leaves to carry on her legacy William O. Wagstaff, Jr.; William O. Wagstaff, III; William O. Wagstaff, IV; her daughter-in-law, Christina; and bonus children, grandchildren, great-grandchildren, cousins, and friends who have become family.

It is an honor to recognize Lynne on the House floor today.

CELEBRATING DAN OLDEWAGE ON HIS CENTENNIAL BIRTHDAY

(Mr. CORREA of California was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 100th birthday of my good neighbor, Dan Oldewage, another one of our Greatest Generation.

Dan began serving our country as a B-24 Liberator nose gunner with the U.S. Army in World War II. Just a few years later, he was again called to serve our great country, this time in the Korean war.

On a bombing mission over Korea, his plane was hit by enemy fire, and the crew was forced to parachute over enemy territory. Dan was captured by the North Korean army, where he was tortured for 30 months. He survived and returned to the United States in 1953. At that time, he moved to Orange County, where his family has lived since then.

Today, I wish Dan a happy birthday and thank him for his service to our great country.

CELEBRATING LOWRIDER CULTURE

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate "Lowrider Culture in the United States," a traveling exhibition that is currently on display in the city of Anaheim.

Lowriding is a Latino tradition that has been alive in this country since the 1940s. This car restoration tradition captures a blend of Latino soul, creativity, and perseverance. This new exhibit by the Smithsonian tells the stories of Mexican Americans in the United States since World War II.

From the beginning, Mexican Americans have always been part of this great country and our great national history. I invite everyone to visit the Muzeo Museum in Anaheim to celebrate this great culture.

RECOGNIZING BETH MARTINKO

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Beth Martinko for her advocacy for people with disabilities on Medicaid.

Beth's son, Josh, is an adult with severe autism who relies on Medicaid programs for medication and support. She asks all of us not to cut Medicaid.

Beth moved her family from Maryland to Anaheim not just because her

son loves Disneyland but also because of California's visionary healthcare programs.

Beth is her son's primary caregiver and knows just how devastating Medicaid cuts would be to her and her son. In her words, she fears that her son will "fall out of the network and die."

I call on my colleagues to join me in defending these programs that so many of our constituents rely on, on a day-to-day basis.

RECOGNIZING KATRINA JOY

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Katrina Joy for winning the National Education Association Foundation's 2025 Award for Teaching Excellence.

Ms. Joy has taught at Magnolia High School in Anaheim for 20 years. At Magnolia, she is active both inside and outside the classroom in helping students become better citizens.

Ms. Joy has always encouraged students to give back to their communities. Recently, her students built a pop-up library to help more students in the community have access to library books.

During the pandemic, she founded the nonprofit Magnolia SAFE to address food insecurity and other basic needs of Magnolia High School students and the surrounding community. She has also raised more than \$100,000 since March 2020.

I thank Ms. Joy, Teacher Joy, for being a role model in our community, and I congratulate her on an honor well-deserved.

HONORING FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH'S 225TH ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. CLINE of Virginia was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a cornerstone of faith and community in Winchester, Virginia, First Presbyterian Church, which is celebrating its 225th anniversary this September under the leadership of Rev. Amanda Maguire Thomas.

Founded in 1800 but with roots reaching back to the earliest days of Winchester, First Presbyterian has stood as a witness to history and as a steadfast presence in the lives of generations. From hosting the funeral of Revolutionary War hero Daniel Morgan to opening one of the first Sunday schools south of the Mason-Dixon Line, its story is woven into the fabric of our Nation's growth.

What really makes this church remarkable is its service. First Presbyterian helped to establish the Free Medical Clinic, Jubilee Kitchen, and many other initiatives that have lifted our neighbors in times of need. Even today, the congregation continues to live out its faith through community service, disaster response, and care for creation.

Mr. Speaker, for 225 years, First Presbyterian Church has embodied the values of faith, service, and resilience. On behalf of the people of Virginia's

Shenandoah Valley, I congratulate them on this milestone and thank them for their unwavering commitment to God and community.

CELEBRATING 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF SENIORS FIRST

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 50th anniversary of Seniors First, the Shenandoah Area Agency on Aging.

In 1965, with the passage of the Older Americans Act, Congress laid the foundation for home and community-based services so that older Americans could live with dignity, health, and independence. That vision remains alive today through organizations like Seniors First.

Since its incorporation in 1975, Seniors First has served as the only comprehensive regional provider for older adults across the northern Shenandoah Valley. From Meals on Wheels and personal care to transportation, senior centers, and insurance counseling, these services make it possible for older Virginians to remain at home while being supported and connected to their communities.

This vital work is carried forward by a dedicated team of senior center managers: Joe Babcock of Shenandoah County, Tina Landis of Winchester, Amy Courtney of Page County, Misty Alger of Warren County, Erica Owens of Clarke County, and Renee Carr of Frederick County, led by Executive Director Jimmy Roberts.

For 50 years, Seniors First has exemplified dignity, compassion, and service. I congratulate them on this milestone and thank them for their continued commitment to our older neighbors.

□ 1030

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF CHARLES JAMES KIRK

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Charles James Kirk. At just 31 years old, Charlie accomplished what many could only hope to accomplish in a lifetime. He built a movement, inspired the next generation to love their country, and stood for the principles he believed in.

Charlie's commitment to free speech and open dialogue on college campuses was at the core of his mission. He believed that young people should not only be heard but also equipped to engage respectfully in the exchange of ideas. In an era when open discussion is too often silenced, Charlie's voice reminded us all of the importance of defending our First Amendment rights.

He was a man of deep faith, grounded in Christ, and he shared those traditional values with countless people across the Nation.

His life reflected courage and conviction, a combination that left a lasting impact on students, colleagues, and all who had the privilege of knowing him.

While his time with us was far too short, Charlie's legacy will endure. It lives on in the students he mentored, the conversations he sparked, and the love of country he instilled in so many.

Today, we honor not only his achievements but also the values he championed and the example he set for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, may God comfort his wife, Erika, his children, and all those whose lives he touched. May we continue to carry forward his commitment to free speech and open dialogue that defined Charlie's remarkable life.

BOLSTERING AMERICA'S GRID RELIABILITY

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, families and businesses in Virginia's Sixth District are paying the price for failed energy policies. Reliability has suffered and communities are left uncertain whether the lights will stay on. That is why I strongly support the GRID Power Act.

This commonsense bill cuts through red tape and empowers grid operators to prioritize power generation projects that actually improve reliability and affordability. For too long, unreliable energy sources have been propped up while reliable options in coal, natural gas, nuclear, and hydropower have been forced into premature retirement. Meanwhile, subsidies have been shoveled into wind and solar despite these intermittent sources being unable to fully replace the stability and affordability that traditional energy generation provides.

The facts are clear: More than 95 percent of projects in the interconnection queue are wind, solar, or battery storage, yet only 5 percent are ever completed. Meanwhile, critical projects face years of delay. Families should not have to pay for two grids: one for wind and solar and another backup system for when the wind isn't blowing and the Sun isn't shining. The GRID Power Act ensures we get back to building affordable and reliable energy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

ACCOUNTABILITY FOR DOGE

(Mr. LARSON of Connecticut was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to discuss something that should alarm every American citizen.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, DOGE or so-called DOGE employees, have been rummaging through people's individual Social Security records.

For the general public's awareness, DOGE is the so-called Department of Government Efficiency, initially led by Elon Musk until there was a breakup of the bromance between he and President Trump, but DOGE still persists.

Mr. Speaker, as you know—and it has to be as much a concern to you as it is to me—having more than 127,000 Social Security recipients in your district whose information is private and secure, is being rummaged through by twentysomethings who have no accountability, have never been vetted, and who will not come before Congress.

I asked Chairman ESTES last week in our subcommittee meeting to bring

DOGE forward to please tell us what they are doing rummaging through everyone's personal data and information.

Ranking Member NEAL and I are going to introduce a resolution of inquiry to bring DOGE before Congress. Every Member, Republican and Democrat, should be concerned about this. Every American citizen should be aware that DOGE has taken all of that information and stored it in a cloud, a/k/a another site that is vulnerable, that anyone can hack into, and that the Social Security Administration has no access to. No one is allowed to look at that data who hasn't been vetted, as was testified before the Ways and Means Committee last week.

How is it that DOGE employees are exempt because they are above the law? It requires the United States Congress to call them in front of us. If they are doing such a great job with efficiency, and if that was their goal, clearly they ought to be able to come before Congress and testify as to what they have found.

Mr. Speaker, I think every American should be aware that what is really going on here is an attempt to get at your data and your information and to further attempt to privatize Social Security. That is the end goal.

When you look at the layoffs that have occurred at the Social Security Administration, when you look at what has happened to the regional offices, when you look at the basic phone service and the inability of people to contact and speak with a human being, it should astound and awaken every single American.

I hope that all Americans who may be listening to this or people in the audience who may be listening to this take to heart what is happening with their personal data and information.

Why should anyone, let alone unvetted, unaccountable DOGE people, go through your personal records? Why do they need that information? What does that have to do with government efficiency, and why did they steal them and put them in an unsecure cloud that anyone could hack from the outside?

This is an abomination, and it needs to be corrected. It can very easily be corrected by the legislation that we have introduced calling to make sure that DOGE comes before Congress.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans need to stand up and call them to come before us.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 37 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. YAKYM) at noon.

PRAYER

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

Holy and righteous God, You reign over all things. Your hand directs our steps, and Your Word determines the living of our lives.

Rule over this week and the legislation considered, the issues debated, and the answers sought. Place Your hand on our conduct and order our purpose. Reveal Your will that it would govern our actions and preside over our intentions.

With our whole hearts, minds, and souls, may we show our love for You by responding with every ounce of our emotion, every inclination of our will, to live according to Your revealed law.

May we ensure that our inner lives yield to Your control. May we take pains to conform our energy and reconcile our efforts to reflect to our children and our children's children, to our communities, and to our country that we owe everything to You. We serve You only, and so we dedicate ourselves to do what is right and good in Your sight.

In Your sovereign name, we pray.
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 Mississippi (Mr. EZELL) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. EZELL 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 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

RECOGNIZING ABUNDANT LIFE EVANGELISTIC CHURCH IN BILOXI, MISSISSIPPI

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

Mr. EZELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a remarkable milestone for a cornerstone of faith and service in south Mississippi.

This year marks the 35th anniversary of Abundant Life Evangelistic Church in Biloxi, Mississippi. For more than three decades, this church has been more than a house of worship. It has been a place of hope, healing, and community for thousands of families on the Mississippi Gulf Coast.

Under the steadfast leadership of Bishop Jason Johnson and his wife, First Lady Kim Johnson, Abundant Life has grown into a vibrant congregation committed to spreading the Gospel of Christ and uplifting those in need.

From youth outreach to disaster relief and from mentoring programs to feeding the hungry, the church has never wavered in its mission to live out the love of Christ.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the entire church family for their 35 years of faithful service, and I pray for many more years of impact and growth.

God bless Abundant Life Evangelistic Church, and God bless the great State of Mississippi.

RELEASE FOOD AID SITTING FOR 9 MONTHS

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

Mr. MAGAZINER. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise for the 40th time to call on the Trump administration to restore lifesaving food aid for malnourished children.

When kids are starving to death, their organs break down. Even if we are able to feed them conventional food, they cannot digest it. It takes specialized nutrition to bring them back to health, including the nutrition manufactured by Edesia Nutrition in North Kingstown, Rhode Island, in my district, where thousands of boxes of emergency food aid have been sitting in a warehouse since Donald Trump and Elon Musk froze the program back in January.

They continue to promise that the program is going to come back online any day now and that those boxes will be shipped, but it has been 9 months.

Starving children cannot survive on promises. They cannot survive on words. They cannot survive on tweets, purchase orders, or RFPs. They need this food aid to move.

The administration needs to keep its word and act with urgency, and I will speak on this floor every day until they do.

HONORING CONSTITUTION DAY

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

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as Constitution Day approaches.

The assassination of Charlie Kirk is a watershed moment for free speech. Charlie made a name for himself exercising his First Amendment rights. He was shot answering a question from a liberal influencer.

His assassination sends a message that if you disagree on the wrong issues, you might end up paying for it, even with your life.

Regardless of politics, Americans don't want a country where people are shot for their views.

Freedom of speech is under serious threat. From gender ideology to race, the far left has weaponized political correctness, punishing dissenters with social and professional consequences.

If we want the First Amendment to survive this moment, we must restore respect for the rule of law and confront the factors fueling division.

Charlie Kirk was reaching out to the other side when he died, and to honor his legacy, we should do the same.

PROVIDING STABILITY FOR FRANCHISES

(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 am glad to welcome franchisors, franchisees, and suppliers to our Nation's Capitol as we connect Main Streets across America.

I highlight H.R. 5267, the American Franchise Act. Congress must provide stability for the franchise model of small business by aligning Federal statute with longstanding precedent.

In North Carolina, there are more than 30,000 franchises, employing more than 300,000 workers and generating over \$30 billion in revenue. That represents jobs, paychecks, and opportunities for families.

H.R. 5267 ends the uncertainty, ensuring owners have the clarity they need to keep hiring and investing in communities across our country.

It is about fairness, opportunity, and ensuring entrepreneurs from every walk of life have a real shot at living the American Dream.

PROMOTING PEACE THROUGH STRENGTH

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I was grateful for the passage last week of the National Defense Authorization Act championed by Armed Services Committee Chairman MIKE ROGERS. The legislation supports over 45 executive orders from President Donald Trump and funds peace through strength.

Authorizations provide a 3.8 percent pay increase and improvement of housing and education, funds to fight drug traffickers and deploy troops to the

border, and funding to counteract the subversive activities of the Chinese Communist Party.

I appreciate initiatives to support funding for the defense research projects at the University of South Carolina and missions at the Savannah River Site.

In conclusion, God bless our troops as the global war continues. Trump is re-instituting existing laws to protect American families with peace through strength; revealing war criminal Putin lies; insulting Trump and mocking Trump as Russian drones invade Poland, repeating history of September 17, 1939, 86 years ago tomorrow, when Stalin joined Hitler in invading Poland, murdering over 60,000 Poles.

Remember Charlie Kirk, God, family, country.

□ 1210

RURAL REPRESENTATION MUST BE HEARD

(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, my colleagues might have heard about the redistricting scam going on in California, which has set off a wave of a bunch of them around the country.

Indeed, what has happened is that about 15 years ago Californians put in place a commission to take the responsibility of making the new district maps out of the grubby hands of legislators. We see the current process they are doing, if we want to call it a process, is exactly why.

They have taken maps of who represents what parts of the State and have completely drawn them for partisan reasons. Basically, in this case it is in order to eliminate up to five Republicans and make them into Democrat seats, drawing urban areas into the rural ones. What is really bad about that is that rural representation will no longer be heard. In those areas, we will have people who will only have their issues represented by urban people who want to take their water supply away from agriculture.

They keep introducing wolves into areas of the Northeast and the rural areas of California. This devastates wildlife and livestock. They let the timber burn so we have massive fires because they would rather kowtow to a few environmental groups in the urban areas. That is what we are getting with these district lines. We are only getting urban voices and not rural.

Mr. Speaker, I also ask everyone to please remember Iryna Zarutska. She was killed needlessly by a guy who had been released 14 times.

REMEMBERING GOVERNOR JIM EDGAR

(Mr. LAHOOD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of former Illinois Governor Jim Edgar, who passed away on September 14 at the age of 79.

Raised in Charleston, Illinois, Governor Edgar devoted his life to public service with integrity, humility, and thoughtfulness. After attending Eastern Illinois University, where he met his beloved wife, Brenda, he embarked on a career that led him to serve as the 38th Governor of Illinois.

Governor Edgar embodied the very essence of principled public leadership. From his early service in the Illinois House to his distinguished tenure as secretary of state and, ultimately, his election as Governor in 1990, he went on to win election by the widest majority of any incumbent Illinois chief executive.

Confronting the largest deficit in State history, he exercised prudence and courage, restoring fiscal discipline, reforming welfare, and advancing education for every child in Illinois.

In 2013, I was honored to participate in his namesake, the Edgar Fellows program, which reflects his vision of fostering bipartisanship and developing the next generation of principled leaders in Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, my heartfelt prayers are with his wife, Brenda; his children, Brad and Elizabeth; and the entire Edgar family. His legacy of service, statesmanship, and decency will endure for generations to come.

Rest in Peace, Governor Edgar.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4922, DC CRIMINAL REFORMS TO IMMEDIATELY MAKE EVERYONE SAFE ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5143, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICING PROTECTION ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5140, LOWERING AGE AT WHICH A MINOR MAY BE TRIED AS ADULT FOR CERTAIN CRIMINAL OFFENSES IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5125, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS REFORM ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1047, GUARANTEEING RELIABILITY THROUGH THE INTERCONNECTION OF DISPATCHABLE POWER ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3015, NATIONAL COAL COUNCIL REESTABLISHMENT ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3062, PROMOTING CROSS-BORDER ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE ACT; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 707 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 707

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House any bill specified in section 2 of this resolution. All points of order against consideration of each such bill are waived. Respective amendments in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of the Rules Committee Print specified in section 3 of this resolution shall be considered as adopted. Each such bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in each such bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on each such bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. The bills referred to in the first section of this resolution are as follows:

(a) The bill (H.R. 4922) to limit youth offender status in the District of Columbia to individuals 18 years of age or younger, to direct the Attorney General of the District of Columbia to establish and operate a publicly accessible website containing updated statistics on juvenile crime in the District of Columbia, to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to prohibit the Council of the District of Columbia from enacting changes to existing criminal liability sentences, and for other purposes.

(b) The bill (H.R. 5143) to establish standards for law enforcement officers in the District of Columbia to engage in vehicular pursuits of suspects, and for other purposes.

(c) The bill (H.R. 5140) to lower the age at which a minor may be tried as an adult for certain criminal offenses in the District of Columbia to 14 years of age.

(d) The bill (H.R. 5125) to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to terminate the District of Columbia Judicial Nominating Commission, and for other purposes.

SEC. 3. The Rules Committee Prints referred to in the first section of this resolution are as follows:

(a) With respect to H.R. 4922, Rules Committee Print 119-10.

(b) With respect to H.R. 5143, Rules Committee Print 119-11.

(c) With respect to H.R. 5140, Rules Committee Print 119-12.

(d) With respect to H.R. 5125, Rules Committee Print 119-13.

SEC. 4. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1047) to require the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to reform the interconnection queue process for the prioritization and approval of certain projects, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 119-9 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 5. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the

bill (H.R. 3015) to reestablish the National Coal Council in the Department of Energy to provide advice and recommendations to the Secretary of Energy on matters related to coal and the coal industry, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 6. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3062) to establish a more uniform, transparent, and modern process to authorize the construction, connection, operation, and maintenance of international border-crossing facilities for the import and export of oil and natural gas and the transmission of electricity. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 7. In the engrossment of the bill (H.R. 3633) to provide for a system of regulation of the offer and sale of digital commodities by the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, and for other purposes, the Clerk shall—

(a) add the text of the bill (H.R. 1919) to amend the Federal Reserve Act to prohibit the Federal reserve banks from offering certain products or services directly to an individual, to prohibit the use of central bank digital currency for monetary policy, and for other purposes, as passed by the House, as new matter at the end of H.R. 3633;

(b) conform the title of H.R. 3633 to reflect the addition of H.R. 1919, as passed by the House, to the engrossment;

(c) assign appropriate designations to provisions within the engrossment;

(d) conform cross-references and provisions for short titles within the engrossment; and

(e) be authorized to make technical corrections, to include corrections in spelling, punctuation, page and line numbering, section numbering, and insertion of appropriate headings.

SEC. 8. Section 5 of House Resolution 354, agreed to April 29, 2025, is amended by striking “September 30, 2025” and inserting “March 31, 2026”.

SEC. 9. Section 2 of House Resolution 313, agreed to April 9, 2025, is amended by striking “September 30, 2025” and inserting “March 31, 2026”.

SEC. 10. Section 4 of House Resolution 211, agreed to March 11, 2025, is amended by striking “for the remainder of the first session of the 119th Congress” and inserting “during the period from March 11, 2025, through March 31, 2026”.

SEC. 11. The provisions of section 202 of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622) shall not apply during the period from September 16, 2025, through March 31, 2026, to a joint resolution terminating the national emergency declared by the President on July 30, 2025.

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

□ 1220

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 707 provides for consideration of seven measures. The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 4922, H.R. 5140, H.R. 5143, and H.R. 5125 under a closed rule with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform or their respective designees.

The rule provides each bill with one motion to recommit.

The rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 3015, H.R. 3062, and H.R. 1047 under a closed rule with 1 hour of debate each equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their designees.

The rule provides each bill with one motion to recommit.

The rule also provides that in the engrossment of H.R. 3633, the Clerk shall add the text of H.R. 1919 as passed by the House as a new matter at the end of H.R. 3633.

Further, the rule tolls the day counts regarding resolutions of inquiry until March 31, 2026.

Finally, the rule tolls the day counts until March 31, 2026, regarding joint resolutions terminating the national emergencies declared by the President on February 1, 2025; April 2, 2025; and July 30, 2025.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and in support of the underlying legislation. The rule before us provides an opportunity for Congress to reverse the disastrous energy and climate policies left behind by the previous administration and restore accountability where needed the most.

For far too long, the American people have been forced to live under a regulatory agenda that drove up costs,

weakened our grid, and made our communities less safe. These measures begin to roll back that damage and put us on a stronger and safer trajectory.

To restore accountability in our energy policies, this rule provides for consideration of H.R. 3015, the National Coal Council Reestablishment Act. This legislation permanently restores the National Coal Council, an advisory body for nearly four decades, providing expert recommendations on matters affecting the American coal sector.

Established in 1984, the council delivered 40 reports to the Secretary of Energy on coal markets, research and development into clean coal technologies, and regulatory barriers that affect the coal industry.

However, in 2021, at the behest of leftwing organizations, the Biden administration disregarded this history and disbanded the council, replacing it with an advisory body charged with fulfilling the left's Green New Deal agenda. Make no mistake. This was not about policy, it was about shutting coal out of the conversation, an essential piece of our Nation's energy matrix.

The United States is home to the world's largest coal reserves, with approximately 440 years' worth of supply at current production levels. Today, our fleet of over 400 coal-fired power plants provide 16 percent of America's electricity, and in five States, coal provides more than one-half. In 17 States it provides more than 20 percent. Together, the coal industry supports hundreds of thousands of jobs, lifts up small communities across the country, and provides affordable and reliable baseload power that helps keep prices stable.

Premature retirements of coal plants are being driven by Federal and State policies that intentionally attack their financial viability, yet the demand for electricity is only going up.

Since 2022, the retirement of 29,000 megawatts of coal capacity has been delayed because of rising demand and insufficient replacement resources. To put it bluntly, removing coal from the grid at this moment in time would lead to higher costs and greater instability for families and businesses. This is a reality that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle refuse to acknowledge.

In New York we are already seeing what these anti-energy radical policies have done: shutting down production of reliable baseload power in favor of pursuing unrealistic and dangerous green agenda items.

Now, despite widespread public opposition, Governor Kathy Hochul and Albany Democrats are moving forward with a ban on natural gas and propane hookups in new construction starting in 2026. That means families in western New York, where winters are long, snow is great, and it is cold and often times dangerous in these terrible winter storms, they will be denied the ability to choose the energy source that best keeps them safe and warm in their

homes. Taking affordable and reliable options off the table is not sound policy.

It is assaults like this on consumer choice and on the freedom to use reliable, affordable energy like coal and natural gas that leave people more vulnerable when the power goes out. That is why it matters who is at the table. When it comes to energy policy, this measure makes the National Coal Council permanent, so future administrations can't simply shut it down for political reasons.

H.R. 3015 also reinforces President Trump's April 8, 2025, executive order to reinvigorate America's clean coal industry recognizing that coal must remain part of our future if we want to ensure future prosperity, meet rising electricity demands, and lower costs for families.

By reestablishing the National Coal Council, Congress will ensure that reliable, affordable baseload power remains a cornerstone of our energy policy while supporting family-sustaining jobs and fueling next-generation industries like artificial intelligence.

The rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 3062, the Promoting Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act. This measure creates a transparent and permanent framework for permitting pipelines and other cross-border energy projects.

For years, developers have been subject to political gamesmanship, destroyed investments, and stranded jobs. The cancellation of the Keystone XL pipeline was not based on science; it was simply based on politics. The Biden administration sided with radical activists over American workers in energy security for our country.

We have seen the same story play out in my own State of New York. The Northern Access pipeline was a major natural gas infrastructure project that promised thousands of good-paying jobs, more affordable energy for families across the northeastern United States, and new tax revenue for rural communities like mine in the southern tier.

However, instead of moving forward, that project was tied up with endless red tape and obstructed by regulators. Western New York and the southern tier lost jobs and investment in energy security that would have come from it. A project that should have supported a large construction workforce and strengthened our region was derailed again because of politics.

This is exactly why permitting reform is needed and is needed now. Without certainty, projects like this will continue to slip away, taking good jobs and economic growth with them.

Energy developers, workers, and communities all deserve better. Yet when it comes to the permitting reforms that would actually allow critical energy projects to move forward, Democrats have consistently acquiesced to the demands of radical environmental groups instead of the needs

of American workers and their families.

The result is higher costs and fewer options for American families. This legislation cuts through that red tape, gives developers certainty, and ensures critical projects can move forward.

□ 1230

In addition, the rule includes H.R. 1047, the Guaranteeing Reliability Through the Interconnection of Dispatchable Power Act.

Year after year, projects that would keep the lights on and lower bills are stuck in the interconnection queues and regulatory wait lists. Sometimes as long as 7 years they are stuck there. That is simply unacceptable. Families do not care about bureaucratic excuses. They care about whether their homes are heated in the winter and cooled in the summer. This legislation cuts through that backlog. It empowers grid operators to prioritize projects that actually enhance reliability.

Let us be clear about how we got here. Democrats have spent years forcing premature retirements of coal, nuclear, and natural gas through excessive regulation, while shoveling subsidies to wind and solar. The result is interconnection queues flooded with projects that only have a 5 percent completion rate.

Meanwhile, Democrat policies have left ratepayers footing the bill for two grids. One grid props up wind and solar with massive transmission costs. The other is the backup power we all rely on when the Sun is not shining and the wind is not blowing.

This measure puts reliability first. It follows the lead of major grid operators who know the danger of relying too heavily on intermittent sources, and it makes sure that the grid is strong enough not only to keep the lights on at home but also to power next-generation industries like AI and manufacturing so America, not China, leads the future.

Mr. Speaker, energy security is, simply put, national security. The rule before us takes important steps to keep power reliable and affordable and American made.

But security is not just about the strength of our grid. It is also about the safety of our communities. Nowhere is that failure of safety more visible than right here in our Nation's capital.

While Washington should be a place that is showcased as what is the very best of America, it has instead become a city struggling with violent crime, juvenile offenses, and weakened law enforcement. The next measures in this rule take direct aim at those failures and restore accountability where the D.C. council has refused to act.

The rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 4922, the D.C. Crimes Act of 2025. This legislation reasserts congressional oversight over the District by prohibiting the D.C. council from further pursuing its progressive, soft-on-crime sentencing guidelines.

The council has failed to keep residents and visitors from our country and from around the world safe. Even as violent crime has soared, police staffing has dropped to a 50-year low. This measure takes direct aim at the council's reckless decisions. It lowers the definition of a youth offender from under 25 to under 18 where it belongs so that adults are simply treated as adults.

It ends judicial discretion that allows juvenile, violent offenders to escape mandatory minimums, and it prohibits the council from weakening mandatory minimums on sentencing guidelines any further.

Make no mistake, carjackings and robberies by juveniles are out of control. More than 500 minors were arrested for robbery in 2023, and more carjackings were committed by juveniles. Every American should be able to visit their Nation's capital without fear of being the next victim.

We know all too well what happens when local leaders choose leniency over accountability. In my home State of New York, cashless bail has unleashed a wave of tragic and entirely preventable outcomes. Governor Hochul and Democrats have doubled down on procriminal policies that put violent offenders back on our streets, leaving families and communities to suffer the consequences. The American people deserve better. New Yorkers deserve better. People in Washington, D.C., deserve better, and President Trump has already stepped in to end cashless bail here in Washington. It is long past time for New York to follow that lead.

The rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 5140, the District of Columbia juvenile sentencing reform act. Since the pandemic, juvenile crime has surged. More than 2,000 juveniles were arrested in both 2023 and 2024. According to the Metropolitan Police Department, over half of robbery arrests last year were juveniles. This year, juveniles account for more than half of carjacking arrests. This legislation responds to that reality.

Current law allows juveniles 16 and older to be tried as adults for violent crimes. This measure lowers that age to 14. These are not youthful mistakes. They are violent, life-altering crimes.

Consider the tragic example of Mohammad Anwar, a hardworking immigrant killed in 2021 by two teenage girls during a carjacking. Both will be back on the streets by the age of 21.

In July of 2023, another Lyft driver, who previously served as an interpreter for the U.S. military in Afghanistan, was fatally shot while driving. The teen responsible was just 14 years old. They were sentenced to only 3 years of secure detention. Old enough to commit horrific and senseless murder, yet he will be back on the streets in just 3 years.

Let me be clear. This legislation applies only to violent crimes: murder, first degree sexual abuse, burglary in

the first degree, and robbery while armed. These are serious offenses that endanger residents and visitors to our Nation's capital every day. They demand serious consequences to truly restore law and order.

The rule further provides for consideration of H.R. 5143, the District of Columbia Policing Protection Act. In 2023, the council imposed a set of restrictions that require officers to evaluate a checklist of 14 factors to decide whether to pursue a fleeing suspect. One of those factors even requires an officer to determine whether anyone in the suspect's car had a chance to surrender a weapon. That is absurd. Officers rarely have time or information to work through such a checklist when a suspect takes off.

This legislation repeals those restrictions. It restores discretion to trained officers. It allows pursuit when an officer or supervisor determines it is necessary, the most effective means of apprehension, and does not present an unreasonable risk to bystanders. Officers must be able to act quickly to protect lives, and this measure restores that authority.

Finally, the rule provides for consideration of H.R. 5125, the District of Columbia Judicial Nominations Reform Act. The Judicial Nomination Commission currently limits President Trump's choices for D.C. judges to a very narrow list of names. That process is slow, it is politicized, and it is very likely unconstitutional under the appointments clause. The result has been persistent vacancies, clogged courts, and criminals slipping through the cracks.

This legislation abolishes the commission and restores normal constitutional processes. The President nominates; the Senate confirms. That is how it works everywhere else in America, and that is how it should work right here in D.C. A duly elected President should not be bound by a bureaucratic commission when choosing judges. By ending this broken system, we can fill vacancies faster, strengthen courts, and ensure justice is delivered without delay.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats' soft-on-crime policies have failed in D.C. just as they have failed in States like New York. These bills hold the line, restore accountability, and put public safety ahead of politics.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we just heard a whole lot of words from the gentleman from New York, but the bills before us today are yet another example of how backward Republican priorities are and how they are hurting this country, hurting the economic well-being of the people I represent, and hurting the economic

well-being of working people all over this country.

People are stressed about their budgets. They are worried about prices going up. They are scared they might lose their jobs. People are struggling to pay the bills and make ends meet, worried about saving for college for their kids and how they are going to deal with the exploding costs of healthcare.

Instead of addressing any of that, we are dealing with this. When we are not dealing with this, Republicans are obsessed with fighting culture wars. That is what they want 24/7: culture wars, culture wars, culture wars. Some of them are now proposing a new committee to investigate their political opponents, a new House un-American activities committee that would make Joe McCarthy blush. That is all this place is to Republicans: a venue for culture wars, a venue for legislation to further divide people and divide this country. Meanwhile, they do nothing, absolutely nothing for everyday people, nothing at all.

□ 1240

Actually, it is worse than nothing. They are actively trying to screw over regular people. Look no further than yesterday. Democrats tried to force a vote on Trump's tariffs, and nearly every Republican blocked it. Every one of them is now on record as supporting Trump's disastrous tariffs. They are not just ignoring the economy. They are making it worse.

For the other side, this is all about genuflecting to Donald Trump. It is all about power for the sake of power. It is not about the American people. It has never been about the American people for Republicans. It is about power, and they use that power to help the rich, the well-connected, and the well-off.

Four of these bills that we are going to be dealing with are about local issues in Washington, D.C., something none of my constituents have ever asked me about. For the record, 0.2 percent of the U.S. population lives in Washington, D.C., and Republicans want to get into the weeds about their local policing policies.

Do you know what my constituents ask me about? They don't ask me about local issues that affect Washington, D.C. They ask me about why their healthcare insurance premiums are going up. They ask me about prices going up because of Donald Trump's tariffs. They tell me they need more money in their pockets to make ends meet.

Yet, week after week, Republicans do nothing about healthcare and nothing about inflation. It is constant culture wars. It is constant giveaways to the rich and powerful. It is constant distractions.

One of the Republican bills that we are considering today reestablishes a coal council—not even establishes, reestablishes. Wow, that is really important, a coal council. Who the hell asked for that? A coal lobbyist?

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Energy already reestablished this stupid council months ago. It is apparently so important that President Trump hasn't even bothered to appoint anyone to it yet. If you look up their website, he still hasn't appointed anybody to the council. Go to the website.

This is stupid. We are wasting time by doing this. Energy prices are going up in this country, and this is the majority's response: reestablishing a coal council. You can't make this stuff up. This is laughable.

The other bills that Republicans are bringing forward today are giveaways to polluters who dump toxic chemicals into our air and water. Why? Follow the money. Did the CEO of ExxonMobil call Donald Trump and ask for a favor?

Mr. Speaker, all of these bills are a disgrace. The people we represent want us to address the real issues that we face every day. They want us to talk about the cost of living, healthcare, and fixing what is broken with this country's economic system.

Meanwhile, as we are gathering here to do this stuff, the clock is ticking toward a shutdown. Republicans control the House. They control the Senate. They control the White House. They should be able to fund the government, but they won't. They won't.

Let me be clear: Democrats are not going to stand by and do nothing while my Republican colleagues try to kick millions of people off their healthcare.

I hear that the Speaker of the House is saying that it is no big deal, that we will just kick the can down the road, deal with it sometime, maybe in December, and talk about it then.

Let me be clear. I will speak in "See Spot Run" language so that my Republican colleagues can understand. Mr. Speaker, the CBO, the Congressional Budget Office, says that 1.5 million people—that is a lot of people—will lose their healthcare if we wait. People's premiums—that is, their monthly payments—will go way, way up because the insurance companies are making important decisions right now about how much to charge. We do not have time to wait.

Mr. Speaker, now that that is clear, Republicans have three choices: First, they can work with us in a bipartisan way to make sure it doesn't happen. Second, they could do what Trump said and pass the CR alone since they control government. Third, they can choose to shut the government down.

Those are the three options. Democrats are for keeping the government open, but we are not for passing legislation that tells millions of people who we represent, including sick people: Good luck. You are on your own. Best wishes.

We are not for that. If there is a shutdown, I say that Republicans own this. It is their shutdown. If Republicans would rather shut down the government than protect people's healthcare, then we do not share the same values.

I want to keep people on healthcare, not kick them off. I go home and ask

people what they care about. I go to coffee shops and county fairs. I hold townhalls—something Republicans should try to do, by the way. Do you know what I hear from my constituents? They are sick and tired of those at the top getting ahead while they struggle to pay their bills.

They are sick and tired of Republicans in Congress passing bills to help the rich while everyone else has to breathe in dirty air and drink dirty water.

They are sick and tired of this culture war garbage and this weird obsession that Republicans have with micro-managing Washington, D.C. They want Republicans to leave Washington, D.C., the hell alone and focus on their own damned communities.

They are sick and tired of Republicans trying to kick people off of their healthcare to pay for taxes for multi-millionaires and billionaires.

These are rotten bills. To top it all off, we have seven more completely closed rules with no amendments allowed. Take it or leave it from this Republican majority. I think we ought to leave it. These are terrible bills that are going to hurt the people we represent.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle love to talk about affordability. They love to play class warfare, but if Democrats were serious about lowering costs for working families, then they wouldn't have spent the last 4 years driving energy prices higher with more regulations, higher taxes, and subsidies that pick winners and losers.

Families have felt the pain every time they fill up their gas tank, pay their rising utility bills, or try to keep their lights on in their small businesses.

Republicans, working with President Trump, are focused on real solutions: Restoring energy policy that unleashes production here at home secures our grid, delivers reliable, affordable power that families and businesses can count on, and creates jobs in the process. That is exactly what this rule is about.

The three energy bills before us are straightforward. They support family-sustaining energy jobs. They streamline approvals for cross-border infrastructure and ensure reliable and dispatchable generation for the grid. Together, they mean lower bills for families, stronger supply chains, and a more competitive America.

When Democrats talk about affordability, they don't have a leg to stand on in this fight because it is their assault on the American energy industry that led to so much of the inflation that this country suffered under for the last 5 years.

The answer is right here in the rule, and we need to support this legislation.

I strongly support the legislation and encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I want to touch on the gentleman's comments on tariffs.

Republicans are doing what Democrats promised the American people for generations that they would do but utterly failed at: ensuring fair trade, protecting American workers, and bringing countries to the negotiating table in the process. For years, Democrats sold a bill of goods to working-class Americans while they turned a blind eye as their factories closed and their jobs were shipped overseas.

Today, Democrats claim to be the party of working families, and we know that is not the case. Yet, it is President Trump, over the Democrats' loud objections, who is fighting for fair trade deals for our working families, like the working families in New York's 23rd Congressional District.

Access to the American economy is a privilege, not a right. President Trump is using tariffs as leverage to reduce reciprocal barriers, safeguard our national security, and level the global playing field for American producers and manufacturers, and it is working.

Treasury has already collected more than \$29 billion in tariff revenue this year, while countries like India, China, and South Korea are at the table negotiating new deals as we speak.

This is the same decisive leadership that secured stronger trade agreements with the EU, Japan, the U.K., and partners across Asia. These aren't trade wars. They are trade wins that deliver more jobs, higher wages, and greater opportunities for American families and American products around the world.

Mr. Speaker, the same focus on protecting working families is exactly what we are doing with the bills before us today. This rule advances common-sense legislation to strengthen our grid, unleash American energy, and restore coal's role in the mix.

Also, let's not underplay what it means to protect the people of Washington, D.C., which we do have a Federal oversight responsibility for. Having a crime-ridden Nation's Capital is unacceptable by any metric.

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

□ 1250

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, Republicans are protecting American families, my foot. You just passed this big, ugly bill that throws millions of people off of healthcare, that gives tax breaks to multimillionaires and billionaires, and then you accuse us of playing class warfare because we are trying to stick up for the middle class in this country, for working families. You can't call it class warfare when you are giving tax breaks to multimillionaires and billionaires while cutting people's healthcare benefits.

Let me just say for the record that in the gentleman's district, New York

District 23, as of 2024, 6,000 people in his district received tax credits to help lower their monthly premium payments to make quality comprehensive health insurance coverage more affordable, and these tax credits are due to expire. These people are going to lose their healthcare or they are going to see their premiums go through the roof.

For a 60-year-old couple earning \$82,800 a year in the gentleman's district, annual premiums would increase by \$7,349. That is a 110 percent increase.

For a family of four earning \$129,800 a year, ages 45 and up, the annual premium would increase by \$17,741. That is a 172 percent increase.

For a family of four earning \$64,000 a year, the annual premiums would increase by \$2,571. That is a 369 percent increase.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know. I guess in his district his constituents don't care about that. According to him, they care more about micromanaging D.C.

In my district and in other districts that I know of in this country, people are worried about their healthcare costs, and we ought to do something about it. We shouldn't kick the can down the road so more and more people end up feeling the pain.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to strike sections 9, 10, and 11, which together block privileged consideration of measures ending the administration's global tariffs and tariffs on Canada, Mexico, and Brazil until March 31, 2026.

Mr. Speaker, President Trump made a campaign promise that he would lower prices "on day one," yet Trump's disastrous trade war continues to increase the prices Americans are paying for food, for gas, and for other everyday goods.

According to independent estimates, Trump's current tariff regime is resulting in a \$2,300 tax increase in 2025 alone for the average American household. Fruits, vegetables, beef, and coffee are just some of the products experiencing the highest price increases. Go to a supermarket for heaven's sake in your district and you will know what I am talking about.

This is not what the American people voted for. The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit recently held that Trump's tariffs that he imposed under the guise of bogus emergencies are unlawful and that Congress, not the President, must make the calls when it comes to imposing new tariffs.

As we await the Supreme Court's decision, Congress should be voting on these tariffs and whether they should remain in place, but in the Republican rule, they are, again, blocking the Congress from taking a vote on whether we should keep or remove these emergency tariffs.

The President imposed huge tariffs on Canada and Mexico in February, global tariffs in April, and most recently, a 50 percent tariff on Brazil be-

cause he didn't like that his friend, Brazil's disgraced former President, was just tried and convicted of trying to overthrow a democratic election to stay in power.

Mr. Speaker, does that remind you of anyone, by the way?

The American people paid \$30 billion in new tariff taxes in August alone, and Republicans are continuing to hide their heads in the sand.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment into the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, for God's sake, we ought to do our work. We ought to live up to our constitutional responsibility and debate and vote on these things. I am sorry that the President has instructed you to do nothing, but we ought to do something.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS), the distinguished ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, to discuss our proposal.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. McGOVERN for his continued leadership on the Rules Committee. I thank him for his leadership in the people's House and for him always putting the working American first.

Mr. Speaker, I heard my colleague say he is proud of the tariffs. We need to do one thing: let's vote on it. Let's vote. That is how you will see where we are. Let's vote on it. Let it go to the floor. Let's review the tape from the past year.

President Trump has declared bogus international emergencies as a pretext to tax imports from Canada, Mexico, and then the whole world, passing these costs right to the hardworking American people. He wanted to protect his friend, as Mr. McGOVERN said, former President Bolsonaro, so he then announced another pseudo emergency to impose yet more tariffs on Brazil.

The law that Donald Trump is using for tariffs on everyday consumer goods was, in fact, meant to respond to actual global emergencies, not personal vendettas. That is why Congress reserved power under the law to author privileged resolutions to end any fake emergencies used to grab Congress' power to tax.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleague from New York: Let's vote on it. Why block a vote on the floor to see where Members of the House stand?

Just as multiple courts have now found, Trump's tariffs are illegal. The House is also acting in contravention of the spirit of the law by avoiding votes instead of having votes like the vote on my privileged resolution to end these unjustified tariffs that harm Americans. We can vote on it.

Speaker JOHNSON is doing this by literally declaring, again, that a day is

not a day for the purpose of the international emergency law. A day is not a day, but he is just doing what the other Speaker—the President, but he is acting as Speaker—is doing what he is told.

This gameplaying is not the norm. Actually, just across the Capitol, the Republican Senate, they are taking votes on similar resolutions that have been offered. The Senate voted in a bipartisan way to end the Canada emergency, but Speaker JOHNSON is refusing to allow that to happen.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MEEKS. The House should have a say. Even last Congress, the Republican majority had votes on privileged resolutions under the emergency law.

I can understand why some of my colleagues across the aisle might wish to avoid such a vote. They don't want to be seen raising taxes and increasing costs on everyday families in this country, but their inaction is doing just that, by letting Donald Trump's fake emergencies and tariffs continue unchecked.

Let me propose a solution: Do your job. The American people elected us to take those tough votes. It is our time. The cameras of history are rolling and what they are going to see is the Republican majority shying away from the spotlight. Vote "no" on this rule.

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

Mr. Speaker, let's set the record straight. There is a lot to unpack there and a lot of talk about playing games, but what my colleagues on the other side of the aisle refuse to admit is how during the COVID-19 pandemic they had intentionally passed premium tax credits with a sunset allowing them to expire and, in the process, playing politics with the healthcare of millions of Americans.

If Democrats truly supported these credits, as they claim they now do, being made permanent, they would have made them permanent when they controlled both Chambers of Congress and the White House. It would have been suggested by President Biden when he was in the White House that it should have been a priority of the Congress. They refused to do so. They never brought that up.

□ 1300

Mr. Speaker, this is a pattern with Democrats. They would rather use working families for their political means and ends than genuinely work to make their lives better. The American people see that for what it is. Mr. Speaker, you are hearing: The sky is falling. Everyone is going to lose their healthcare if this is not attached to a CR at this moment.

Yes, we do have the majority. I am confident we will pass the CR in the

House. However, Mr. Speaker, you know darn well that in the Senate, Leader SCHUMER will hold the majority hostage using the filibuster to force us into a shutdown, just like they threatened to do in March. I mean, that is the tactic that is being played. All these expectations are being set by the other side, knowing that they have a trap door, and they intend to try to leverage the American people to get more of their political will accomplished.

Republicans already voted to deliver lower premiums for patients by passing H.R. 1, which targeted waste, fraud, and abuse across the ACA marketplace. Democrats unanimously opposed this bill, showing once again they are not serious about solving affordability problems for everyday Americans, just like they are not serious about trying to keep the government open. If they were, they would have supported these commonsense policies. Instead, they would rather play politics.

Mr. Speaker, what we are actually debating today are commonsense measures in this rule to strengthen American energy policy, to keep violent crime off our streets here in our Capital City. These bills are about lowering costs for working families, keeping our communities safe and restoring accountability. We are getting the job done with or without their support.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am confused by what the gentleman said. I don't know whether he supports the ACA tax credits or not. If he doesn't, then 6,000 of his constituents will be adversely impacted. If he does, then we should just fix it right now. By the way, Republicans all opposed the ACA when it came up, so I don't want to hear that garbage.

Don't blame the Senate. Donald Trump just said to Republicans over in the Senate: Do it on your own. I think what he is referring to was just last week Republicans nuked the filibuster when it comes to nominations. Republicans control the House, the Senate, and the White House. Basically what they are telling us is that they don't give a damn about working families in this country, and that is what is at stake here.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT.)

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, this rule further erodes the system of checks and balances that has served our democracy so well. Republicans, through it, are surrendering more and more unrestrained power to President Trump. This rule is but another step on the march to tyranny.

Trump is seeking to create a master file of information on every single American, a digital ID tracking your movements, where you live, where you work, when you see a doctor, how much money you have, even child support agreements, and much more. Today, Republicans are simply

rubberstamping that plan, the very kind of surveillance and intrusion that Libertarians have always opposed.

Today, these Republicans are blocking us from presenting any resolution of inquiry concerning the Trump administration, like the one that I introduced on June 11 to demand the facts from the administration about all of its wrongdoing, including what confidential information it has accumulated on each American. Your data becomes fully public and available to President Trump even as the Epstein files remain fully buried.

Republicans are keeping the American people ignorant of what Trump is doing with their private data: Ignorant of how he may use it against his political enemies or his business competitors, ignorant of what he may do if you have ever expressed any criticism of him, his family, his policies, or maybe you just expressed support for someone that with his latest whim he is opposed to. Now he will have a master file that includes you to persecute and even prosecute.

Too intimidated by this self-proclaimed king, Republicans are empowering what could become a police state. To shed light on this descent into authoritarian darkness, to let the American people know how their own government is centralizing their personal data, I introduced a resolution of inquiry demanding that the administration produce all the information related to the creation of this vast searchable database with its handpicked contractor, Palantir, a company that one Silicon Valley executive accused of building the infrastructure of the police state.

I do agree with one Republican, Representative WARREN DAVIDSON, who does believe in freedom and has described Trump's deal with Palantir as dangerous and has said when you start combining all these data points on individuals into one database, it really essentially creates a digital ID, and it is a power that history says will eventually be abused. With this administration, "eventually" will be very soon.

A vote for this rule is a vote to bury the truth and allow the Federal Government to track Americans and invade their privacy with no restraint. I strongly urge my colleagues to stand up for freedom and reject this rule.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues across the aisle want to pretend Republicans are manufacturing a crime crisis in our Nation's Capital, but the facts tell a completely different story. Under President Biden and Democratic leadership, Washington, D.C., became one of the most dangerous cities in America.

In 2023, D.C. had the fourth highest homicide rate in the Nation, trailing only New Orleans, St. Louis, and Detroit. If D.C. were a State, it would have had the highest homicide rate in America. That number could be even higher because, as we know, D.C. officials may have manipulated the crime

data to hide the true extent of the problem.

Democrats would rather fudge the numbers to justify their radical policy experiments in places like D.C. than actually protect communities from violent crime. The same thing is happening in my home State of New York. They would rather quibble over process arguments and gaslighting using false statistics than acknowledge how many lives have been saved since President Trump took action to enforce law and order in the streets of Washington.

This is how unserious and radical today's Democratic Party has become. Contrast this with what has happened since President Trump stepped in. In the 20 days following the Federal surge, carjackings dropped 87 percent compared to the same period last year. Across the board, violent crime fell 39 percent, burglaries dropped 45 percent, and carjackings fell 75. More than 2,700 arrests were made and 323 firearms were recovered. These aren't talking points. They are results. They are real safety improvements felt by families here in the District of Columbia.

While Democrats scramble to defend their failed policies and liberal experiments in America's major cities, and they downplay the true cost in lives that come from policies that have long been supported in these cities, Republicans are restoring accountability, enforcing the law, and delivering real results to make our communities safer. That is exactly what this rule is about.

The legislation before us strengthens accountability here in Washington, D.C., our Nation's Capital. It should be the gem of the country, and it will be again. If Democrats are truly serious about protecting families, they should support this rule and all of the underlying legislation, which is common sense to support law and order and protect the lives of the residents and the visitors to this great city.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, you have got to love these Republicans. They spend more time talking about micromanaging 0.2 percent of the American population in D.C. and more worried about that than they are worried about the fact that over 99 percent of the American people are about to see their premiums go up. Millions of people are going to lose their healthcare. We just have a different set of priorities. We have a different set of priorities.

By the way, when we talk about national security, healthcare is part of it. If you don't have healthcare, you don't have security.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, when Republicans vote in favor of today's rule, they will be voting in favor of higher coffee prices, higher car prices, and higher prices for

car seats and strollers. Republicans will be voting for inflation.

They buried a provision in today's rule which prevents the House from voting or even debating Trump's tariffs. Trump imposed a 50 percent tariff on Brazil because he didn't like the fact that that sovereign country was prosecuting a former President for staging a violent coup.

Now Republicans are making people pay for Trump's protection of that convicted President in Brazil every time they buy coffee. That tariff doesn't serve any economic purpose. Thanks to Trump's tariffs, Americans across the country are already paying more for their coffee, whether they drink Folgers or the New Mexico Pinon Coffee that we love at the Albuquerque International Balloon Fiesta.

□ 1310

The Constitution says Congress should levy taxes and tariffs, but Republicans don't have the courage to stand up to Trump, to stand up for their constituents, the constituents who are taking food out of their grocery carts because grocery inflation is back.

Remember, consumers pay for the tariffs, not foreign countries. Don't brag about how much has been collected for tariffs because that is money that has essentially been taken away from American families.

I hope my Republican colleagues realize what they are doing to American working families and stop this madness. They can't hide behind this rule and say they didn't vote on the tariffs.

Republicans have been warned. They should know what they are doing when they vote for this rule. When they vote for this rule, they are voting to continue Trump's tariffflation.

Vote against tariffflation. Vote against this rule.

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

Mr. Speaker, the authors of inflation, the creators of inflation on the other side of this Chamber, the people who hypercharged an economy and drove down the value of our dollar, are now going to lecture us on why groceries cost so much. Where the hell have they been for the last 4 years? Where were they when Americans were struggling with the cost of their groceries because gas was up near \$4 a gallon?

Their policies determined that when they ran all facets of the government. Now, they have this revisionist history, and they want to talk about a cup of coffee.

The tariff negotiations that President Trump has used have created new deals and new markets for our products around the globe. It is making a more competitive America, and we are not going to be taken advantage of by other countries anymore.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned just a few moments ago, Republicans are blocking a vote on Trump's tariffs in this rule. I think it is pretty obvious why. The consequences of his economic policy are being felt in communities across this country, and Republicans know they can't defend it. That is why they are not doing townhalls.

Moms and dads are coming home with pink slips because their employers don't know if they can keep the doors open. Small businesses are shuttering. Farmers are struggling under higher input costs and shrinking markets.

Food, gas, electricity, basic goods and services—the prices are all up. They are likely to climb even higher as Trump's tariffs ripple through the supply chain. It is clear that the Trump economy is not working for average Americans.

President Trump and Republicans promised to reduce inflation. Instead, last month, we saw the largest monthly increase in inflation since January.

They promised to reduce grocery prices. Instead, last month, grocery prices spiked at the fastest pace in 3 years, driven in part by tariff-fueled costs.

They promised to cut electricity prices in half. Instead, August electricity prices were 6 percent higher than they were a year ago, and Americans are having to navigate a weakening job market and rising costs.

Fruits and vegetables are up nearly 2 percent. Dairy products are up 1.3 percent. Cereal and bread are up 1.1 percent. Meat, poultry, fish, and eggs are all up a whopping 5.6 percent. Give me a break.

Mr. Speaker, let's be frank. The only winners in Trump's economy are millionaires and billionaires. He packed his Cabinet with the rich and well-connected. Republicans' reconciliation bill hands out nearly \$100,000 in tax cuts for those making over a million dollars a year in 2027 alone.

Just last week, the Trump administration started rolling back efforts to crack down on offshore tax shelters that billionaires and giant corporations use to avoid paying their fair share of taxes. Who does that?

Mr. Speaker, Trump promised an economy for the American people, but time and time again, his tariffs and policies have only delivered for the ultrarich, while families, farmers, and small businesses pay the price. We ought to be voting on this stuff.

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

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

Again, more and more class warfare, Mr. Speaker. We hear the term "millionaires and billionaires" thrown around. Yet, every single one of them voted against all the tax benefits that would have helped the middle class and will continue to help the middle class.

The minority voted against no tax on tips, against no tax on overtime,

against doubling the child tax credit, and against doubling the standard deduction, all things that put serious money back into the pockets of my constituents.

Now, to my colleague, \$1,800, \$2,000, \$2,500 might not seem like a lot to him, but it might be two mortgage payments to my constituents. Yet, every single one of them voted no.

I will not be lectured, and none of us should be lectured by people who stood in the way of getting that tax code made permanent.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman talking about the reconciliation bill that the Republicans brought to the floor that resulted in trillions and trillions of dollars and more debt, all to give multimillionaires and multibillionaires a tax cut? I mean, I am sorry. If there is class warfare going on here, I know which side my Republican friends are on.

Mr. Speaker, millions of everyday Americans all across the country are about to get notice that their healthcare premiums are going to skyrocket, including in the gentleman's district. Moms, dads, and grandparents, people working two jobs just to get by, are going to be at their kitchen tables, facing the awful decision of which bills to pay.

For nearly 24 million people in this country who have ACA marketplace health insurance, premiums will increase, on average, by 93 percent. A 60-year-old couple making \$80,000 per year will see their premiums increase by over \$17,000 per year. That is like \$1,400 per month. A family of four earning \$64,000 will owe an extra \$2,600 in healthcare premiums every year.

Where on Earth are families supposed to find this kind of extra money, Mr. Speaker? We are talking hundreds and hundreds, if not thousands, of dollars. That is not extra change that you can find in your couch cushion.

It will mean 5 million people, including 2 million with chronic conditions, lose their healthcare coverage altogether.

It will mean older adults have to choose between paying their high energy bills and affording their healthcare.

It will mean families going without food because their healthcare premiums are unaffordable.

It will mean people fall behind on their rent just so they can afford basic healthcare in the United States of America, the richest country in the history of the world.

This is a crisis, Mr. Speaker. It is a crisis of the Republicans' own making. Instead of spending the summer working with Democrats to address this looming healthcare cliff, Republicans spent it instead slashing Medicaid by a trillion dollars, kicking 15 million people off their coverage altogether,

blocking access to cancer screening and prenatal care by defunding Planned Parenthood, cutting NIH's budget, and taking food away from families with teenagers, veterans, and older adults, which will make them less healthy, all to give tax breaks to Elon Musk and Trump's billionaire friends.

Honest to God, Mr. Speaker, I have no idea what to say to the working families who visit my office scared to death that their healthcare costs are going to force them to go broke.

I don't know how my Republican friends can talk to people back home in their districts, regular people, hard-working people, and somehow justify what they are doing. I guess many of them don't because they don't do townhalls.

With all due respect to the Speaker of the House, no, this actually cannot wait. I understand why they are trying to minimize the crisis that they created, I really do, but hardworking people back home are counting on us, Mr. Speaker.

Congress must address this looming healthcare crisis now, including one of the most significant healthcare premium hikes in history, and the historic cuts to Medicaid that are closing hospitals and nursing homes on a daily basis, to give families peace of mind that they won't go bankrupt trying to afford their healthcare.

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

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FINE). The gentleman from Massachusetts has 1 minute remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am losing my voice but not my passion.

Mr. Speaker, the truth is simple. Families are being crushed by high prices. Rent, groceries, gas, and healthcare are all going up.

What are Republicans doing? They are obsessed with micromanaging Washington, D.C., with not one, not two, not three, but four different bills today about Washington, D.C.

I hate to break it to Republicans, but none of the people whom I represent, and I think none of the people from the gentleman's district, live in Washington, D.C., which leads me to wonder why the hell Republicans are wasting time on this nonsense.

□ 1320

Mr. Speaker, the other bills that we are dealing with hand out favors to Big Coal and Big Oil. Again, there is nothing for regular families from these guys. There is nothing for average Americans. They have no vision and no plan for economic growth.

The bottom line is that healthcare premiums are about to go through the

roof. People will see their healthcare bills explode because these guys refuse to act.

Republicans are putting ideology over everyday people. They are putting headlines over solutions. They are playing games instead of governing.

All of this—micromanaging D.C. and the coal commission garbage—is what the Republicans are focused on while the government teeters on the edge of a shutdown, while Trump's tariffs drive up prices, and while millions of people are about to get kicked off their health insurance.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, for far too long, Americans have been forced to endure higher costs, weaker energy security, and rising crime because of policies pushed by the left.

The American people rejected that approach last November, and they elected a President and a Congress committed to restoring accountability, protecting families, and ensuring our future is built on reliable and affordable American energy.

The measures in this rule fulfill that promise. They strengthen our grid, cut through bureaucratic red tape, and make sure America, not China, leads in powering the next generation.

They also hold the line on public safety by rolling back soft-on-crime policies here in our Nation's Capital in Washington, D.C., and they restore the accountability that local leaders have refused to enforce.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the rule before us today and the underlying legislation.

The material previously referred to by Mr. McGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 707 OFFERED BY MR. McGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

Strike sections 9, 10, and 11.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1330

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FINE) at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 707;

Adoption of House Resolution 707, if ordered; and

Motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 2721.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4922, DC CRIMINAL REFORMS TO IMMEDIATELY MAKE EVERYONE SAFE ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5143, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICING PROTECTION ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5140, LOWERING AGE AT WHICH A MINOR MAY BE TRIED AS ADULT FOR CERTAIN CRIMINAL OFFENSES IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5125, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS REFORM ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1047, GUARANTEEING RELIABILITY THROUGH THE INTERCONNECTION OF DISPATCHABLE POWER ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3015, NATIONAL COAL COUNCIL RESTABLISHMENT ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3062, PROMOTING CROSS-BORDER ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE ACT; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 707) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4922) to limit youth offender status in the District of Columbia to individuals 18 years of age or younger, to direct the Attorney General of the District of Columbia to establish and operate a publicly accessible website containing updated statistics on juvenile crime in the District of Columbia, to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to prohibit the Council of the District of Columbia from enacting changes to existing criminal liability sentences, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5143) to establish standards for law enforcement officers in the District of Columbia to engage

in vehicular pursuits of suspects, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5140) to lower the age at which a minor may be tried as an adult for certain criminal offenses in the District of Columbia to 14 years of age; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5125) to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to terminate the District of Columbia Judicial Nomination Commission, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1047) to require the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to reform the interconnection queue process for the prioritization and approval of certain projects, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3015) to reestablish the National Coal Council in the Department of Energy to provide advice and recommendations to the Secretary of Energy on matters related to coal and the coal industry, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3062) to establish a more uniform, transparent, and modern process to authorize the construction, connection, operation, and maintenance of international border-crossing facilities for the import and export of oil and natural gas and the transmission of electricity; and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 213, nays 207, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 267]

YEAS—213

Aderholt	Crawford	Guthrie	McCormick	Garcia (CA)	Nadler
Alford	Crenshaw	Hageman	Chu	Garcia (IL)	Neal
Allen	Davidson	Hamedah (AZ)	Cisneros	Garcia (TX)	Neguse
Amodei (NV)	De La Cruz	Haridopolos	Clark (MA)	Golden (ME)	Norcross
Arrington	DesJarlais	Harrigan	Clarke (NY)	Goldman (NY)	Ocasio-Cortez
Babin	Diaz-Balart	Harris (MD)	Cleaver	Gomez	Olszewski
Bacon	Donalds	Harris (NC)	Clyburn	Gonzalez, V.	Omar
Baird	Downing	Harshbarger	Cohen	Goodlander	Pallone
Balderson	Dunn (FL)	Hern (OK)	Conaway	Gottheimer	Panetta
Barr	Edwards	Higgins (LA)	Houlahan	Green, Al (TX)	Pappas
Barrett	Ellzey	Hill (AR)	Hoyer	Harder (CA)	Pelosi
Baumgartner	Emmer	Hinson	Hoyle (OR)	Hayes	Perez
Bean (FL)	Estes	Houchin	Huffman	Brown	Peters
Begich	Evans (CO)	Hudson	Jackson (IL)	Brownley	Pettersen
Bentz	Ezell	Huizinga	Jacobs	Budzinski	Pingree
Bergman	Fedorchak	Hunt	Castor (FL)	Budzinski	Pocan
Bice	Feeenstra	Hurd (CO)	Castro (TX)	Bynum	Pou
Biggs (AZ)	Fine	Issa	Cherfilus-Dove	Carbajal	Pressley
Biggs (SC)	Finstad	Jack	Garcia (CA)	Carson	Quigley
Bilirakis	Fischbach	Jackson (TX)	Garcia (IL)	Carter (LA)	Ramirez
Boebert	Fitzgerald	James	Garcia (NY)	Casar	Randall
Bost	Fitzpatrick	Johnson (SD)	Garcia (TX)	Case	Raskin
Brecheen	Fleischmann	Jordan	Garcia (VA)	Casten	Riley (NY)
Bresnahan	Flood	Joyce (OH)	Garcia (WA)	Castor (FL)	Rivas
Buchanan	Fong	Joyce (PA)	Garcia (WI)	Castro (TX)	Ross
Burchett	Foxx	Kean	Garcia (WV)	Cherfilus-Dove	Ruiz
Burlison	Franklin, Scott	Kelly (MS)	Garcia (WV)	Garcia (CA)	Sadler
Calvert	Fry	Kelly (PA)	Garcia (WV)	Garcia (IL)	Scanlon
Cammack	Fulcher	Kennedy (UT)	Garcia (WV)	Garcia (TX)	Schakowsky
Carey	Garbarino	Kiggans (VA)	Garcia (WV)	Garcia (WV)	Schneider
Carter (GA)	Gill (TX)	Kiley (CA)	Garcia (WV)	Garcia (WV)	Schulman
Carter (TX)	Gimenez	Kim	Garcia (WV)	Garcia (WV)	Larsen (WA)
Ciscomani	Goldman (TX)	Knott	Garcia (WV)	Garcia (WV)	Schrader
Cline	Gonzales, Tony	Kustoff	Garcia (WV)	Garcia (WV)	Larsen (WA)
Cloud	Gooden	LaHood	Garcia (WV)	Garcia (WV)	Schrier
Clyde	Gosar	LaLota	Garcia (WV)	Garcia (WV)	Larson (CT)
Cole	Graves	Langworthy	Garcia (WV)	Garcia (WV)	Scott (VA)
Collins	Greene (GA)	Latta	Garcia (WV)	Garcia (WV)	Scott, David
Comer	Griffith	Lawler	Garcia (WV)	Garcia (WV)	Sewell
Crane	Grothman	Lee (FL)	Garcia (WV)	Garcia (WV)	Sherman
Crank	Guest	Letlow	Garcia (WV)	Garcia (WV)	Simon
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Smith (WA)
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Sorensen
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Salinas
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Sánchez
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Scanlon
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Schakowsky
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Schneider
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Schulman
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Larsen (WA)
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Schrader
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Larson (CT)
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Scott (VA)
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Scott, David
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Sewell
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Sherman
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Simon
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Smith (WA)
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Sorensen
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Salinas
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Sánchez
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Scanlon
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Schakowsky
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Schneider
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Schulman
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Larsen (WA)
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Schrader
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Larson (CT)
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Scott (VA)
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Scott, David
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Sewell
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Sherman
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Simon
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Smith (WA)
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Sorensen
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Salinas
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Sánchez
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Scanlon
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Schakowsky
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Schneider
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Schulman
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Larsen (WA)
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Schrader
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Larson (CT)
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Scott (VA)
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Scott, David
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Sewell
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Sherman
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Simon
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Smith (WA)
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Sorensen
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Salinas
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Sánchez
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Scanlon
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Schakowsky
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Schneider
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Schulman
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Larsen (WA)
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Schrader
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Larson (CT)
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Scott (VA)
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Scott, David
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Sewell
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Sherman
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Simon
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Smith (WA)
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Sorensen
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Salinas
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Sánchez
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Scanlon
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Schakowsky
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Schneider
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Schulman
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Larsen (WA)
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Schrader
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Larson (CT)
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Scott (VA)
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Scott, David
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Sewell
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Sherman
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Simon
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Smith (WA)
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Sorensen
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Salinas
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Sánchez
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Scanlon
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Schakowsky
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Schneider
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Schulman
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Larsen (WA)
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Schrader
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Larson (CT)
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Scott (VA)
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Scott, David
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Sewell
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Sherman
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Simon
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Smith (WA)
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Sorensen
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Salinas
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Sánchez
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Scanlon
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Schakowsky
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Schneider
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Schulman
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Larsen (WA)
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Schrader
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Larson (CT)
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Scott (VA)
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Scott, David
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Sewell
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Sherman
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Simon
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Smith (WA)
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Sorensen
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Salinas
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Sánchez
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Scanlon
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Schakowsky
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Schneider
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Schulman
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Larsen (WA)
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Schrader
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Larson (CT)
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Scott (VA)
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Scott, David
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Sewell
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Sherman
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Simon
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Smith (WA)
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Sorensen
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Salinas
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Sánchez
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Scanlon
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Schakowsky
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Schneider
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Schulman
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Larsen (WA)
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Schrader
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Larson (CT)
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Scott (VA)
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Scott, David
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Sewell
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Sherman
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Simon
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Smith (WA)
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Sorensen
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Salinas
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Sánchez
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Scanlon
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Schakowsky
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Schneider
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Schulman
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Larsen (WA)
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Schrader
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Larson (CT)
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Scott (VA)
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Scott, David
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Sewell
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Sherman
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Simon
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Smith (WA)
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Sorensen
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Salinas
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Sánchez
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Scanlon
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Schakowsky
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Schneider
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Schulman
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Larsen (WA)
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Schrader
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Larson (CT)
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Scott (VA)
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Scott, David
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Sewell
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Sherman
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Simon
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Smith (WA)
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Sorensen
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Salinas
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Sánchez
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Scanlon
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Schakowsky
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Schneider
			Garamendi	Garcia (WV)	Schulman
			Garamendi		

Huizenga	McGarvey
Hunt	McGovern
Hurd (CO)	McGuire
Issa	McIver
Ivey	Meeks
Jack	Menendez
Jackson (IL)	Meng
Jackson (TX)	Meuser
Jacobs	Miller (IL)
James	Miller (OH)
Jayapal	Miller (WV)
Jeffries	Miller-Meeks
Johnson (GA)	Mills
Johnson (LA)	Min
Johnson (SD)	Moolenaar
Johnson (TX)	Moore (AL)
Jordan	Moore (NC)
Joyce (OH)	Moore (UT)
Joyce (PA)	Moore (WI)
Kamlager-Dove	Moore (WV)
Kaptur	Moran
Kean	Morelle
Keating	Morrison
Kelly (IL)	Moskowitz
Kelly (MS)	Moulton
Kelly (PA)	Mrvan
Kennedy (NY)	Mullin
Kennedy (UT)	Murphy
Khanna	Nadler
Kiggans (VA)	Neal
Kiley (CA)	Neguse
Kim	Nehis
Knott	Newhouse
Krishnamoorthi	Nunn (IA)
Kustoff	Obernolte
LaHood	Ocasio-Cortez
LaLota	Ogles
LaMaifa	Olszewski
Landsman	Omar
Langworthy	Onder
Larsen (WA)	Owens
Larson (CT)	Pallone
Latimer	Palmer
Latta	Panetta
Lawler	Pappas
Lee (FL)	Patronis
Lee (NV)	Pelosi
Lee (PA)	Perez
Leger Fernandez	Perry
Letlow	Peters
Levin	Pettersen
Licciano	Pfluger
Lieu	Pingree
Lofgren	Pocan
Loudermilk	Pou
Lucas	Pressley
Luna	Quigley
Luttrell	Ramirez
Lynch	Randall
Mace	Raskin
Mackenzie	Reschenthaler
Magaziner	Riley (NY)
Malliotakis	Rivas
Mann	Rogers (AL)
Mannion	Rogers (KY)
Massie	Rose
Mast	Ross
Matsui	Rouzer
McBath	Ruiz
McBride	Rulli
McCaul	Ryan
McClain	Salazar
McClain Delaney	Salinas
McClellan	Sánchez
McClintock	Scalise
McCollum	Scanlon
McCormick	Schakowsky
McDonald Rivet	Schmidt
McDowell	Schneider

NOT VOTING—19

Boyle (PA)	Mfume	Stauber
Buchanan	Norcross	Swalwell
Gray	Norman	Titus
Harris (MD)	Roy	Torres (CA)
Houahan	Rutherford	Walberg
Maloy	Self	
Messmer	Sherrill	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1449

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. MALOY. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 269.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from the floor and missed Roll Call No. 267 through 269. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 267, on ordering the previous question; NAY on Roll Call No. 268, on agreeing to the resolution H. Res. 707; and YEA on Roll Call No. 269, on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 2721.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 721

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM: Mr. Walkinshaw to rank immediately after Mr. Min.

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE: Mr. Frost.

Mr. AGUILAR (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read.

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

Ms. BOEBERT. Objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Ms. MACE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of Rule IX, I rise to give notice of my intent to raise a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of the resolution is as follows:

H. Res. 713, censuring Representative ILHAN OMAR of Minnesota and removing her from the Committee on Education and Workforce and the Committee on the Budget.

Whereas Charlie Kirk was a lifelong advocate for freedom of speech, civil political discourse, and the political engagement of youth;

Whereas Charlie Kirk was a man of deep faith, a husband, and a father to two young children;

Whereas on September 10, 2025, Charlie Kirk was assassinated on the campus of Utah Valley University while exercising his First Amendment right to freedom of speech;

Whereas on September 11, 2025, one day after the assassination of Charlie Kirk, Representative ILHAN OMAR gave an interview on a Zeteo Town Hall with Mehdi Hasan in which she smeared Charlie Kirk and implied he was to blame for his own murder;

Whereas on September 12, 2025, two days after the assassination of Charlie Kirk, Representative ILHAN OMAR reposted a video on X (formerly known as Twitter), which disparaged the character of Charlie Kirk and those mourning his death;

Whereas the video Representative ILHAN OMAR reposted on X states “Charlie Kirk is dead, and before the body got cold, the far-Right propped his corpse up as a cudgel for their holy war”;

Whereas the video Representative ILHAN OMAR reposted on X further states “Don’t be fooled, these people don’t give a single shit about Charlie Kirk, they are just using his death to further their Christofascist agenda”;

Whereas the video Representative ILHAN OMAR reposted on X further states Charlie Kirk “was a reprehensible human being. He enacted his political agenda by preying on weak minded people. He took complex socio-economic issues and simplified them by pointing fingers at out-groups, demonizing those groups, and siccing his massive following on them”;

Whereas the video Representative ILHAN OMAR reposted on X further states Charlie Kirk was a “stochastic terrorist, an adamant transphobe, he denied the genocide happening in Palestine, he believed in the subjugation of women, and in his last dying words he was spewing racist dog whistles”;

Whereas the video Representative ILHAN OMAR reposted on X further states “Charlie Kirk was Dr. Frankenstein and his monster shot him through the neck”;

Whereas the video Representative ILHAN OMAR reposted on X further blames Charlie Kirk for his own murder;

Whereas clause 1 of rule XXIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives provides, “A Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, officer, or employee of the House shall behave at all times in a manner that shall reflect creditably on the House”; and

Whereas Representative ILHAN OMAR’s actions in the wake of the assassination of Charlie Kirk are reprehensible and affect the dignity and integrity of the proceedings of the House and do not reflect credibility on the House: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that—

(1) Representative ILHAN OMAR of Minnesota be censured;

(2) Representative ILHAN OMAR forthwith present herself in the well of the House of Representatives for the pronouncement of censure;

(3) Representative ILHAN OMAR be censured with the public reading of this resolution by the Speaker; and

(4) Representative ILHAN OMAR be, and is hereby, removed from the Committee on Education and Workforce and the Committee on the Budget of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under Rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentlewoman from South Carolina will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

**NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER
RESOLUTION RAISING A QUESTION
OF THE PRIVILEGES OF
THE HOUSE**

Mr. CASAR. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of Rule IX, I rise to give notice of my intention to raise a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of the resolution is as follows:

Resolution censuring Representative CORY MILLS.

Whereas, Representative CORY MILLS has on several occasions conducted himself in a manner that reflects discredit upon the House of Representatives;

Whereas, on February 19, 2025, Washington, D.C., Metropolitan Police Department officers were called to resolve a private matter at Representative CORY MILLS' residence, where officers were called to the 1300 block of Maryland Avenue, Southwest, around 1:15 p.m. for the report of an assault;

Whereas, police reports obtained by NBC4 Washington confirmed that the Washington, D.C., Metropolitan Police Department was investigating Representative CORY MILLS for an alleged assault of a 27-year-old woman that took place on February 19, 2025, at the residence of Representative CORY MILLS.

Whereas, the first police report, provided to NBC4 Washington by a source and confirmed by a second source familiar with the investigation, said that the 27-year-old woman accused her significant other for over a year of having grabbed her, shoved her, and pushed her out of the door, and also said that the woman involved showed the officer "bruises on her arm which appeared fresh";

Whereas, NBC4 Washington also reported that the Metropolitan Police Department identified Representative CORY MILLS as the significant other of

the alleged victim of assault—which alleged victim was a 27-year-old woman who was not the wife of Representative CORY MILLS—and that the alleged victim "let officers hear Subject 1 [now identified by MPD as Mills] instruct her to lie about the origin of her bruises . . . Eventually, Subject 1 [who we now know is Representative CORY MILLS] made contact with police and admitted that the situation escalated from verbal to physical, but it was severe enough to create bruising";

Whereas, on February 21, 2025, The Washington Post also confirmed two D.C. police officials said that the alleged victim of assault initially told 911 and police that she had been assaulted and that officers said she also had what seems to be visible injuries, and that while a supervisor initially classified the offense internally as a family disturbance, police commanders later learned of the incident, reviewed the reports and body camera footage and reclassified the case as domestic violence assault;

Whereas, on February 21, 2025, NBC4 Washington also reported that the Metropolitan Police Department determined that probable cause to arrest Representative CORY MILLS for misdemeanor assault existed and sent an arrest warrant for Representative CORY MILLS to the United States Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia; however, then-Acting United States Attorney for the District of Columbia Ed Martin refused to sign the arrest warrant for Representative CORY MILLS and instead returned the case to the Metropolitan Police Department for further investigation;

□ 1500

Whereas, on July 14, 2025, a different former romantic partner of Representative CORY MILLS, who was apparently in a relationship with Representative MILLS from November 2021 to February 2025, reported to authorities in Florida that Representative MILLS threatened to release nude images and other intimate videos of her and threatened to harm her future romantic partners in retaliation for her decision to end a relationship with Representative MILLS after seeing the public reports described above concerning the alleged February 2025 physical assault;

Whereas, in August 2024, the Office of Congressional Conduct adopted and transmitted to the Committee on Ethics of the House of Representatives a report indicating that there was substantial reason to believe that Representative CORY MILLS may have omitted or misrepresented required information in his financial disclosure statements, accepted excessive contributions to his campaign committee in the form of personal loans and contributions that may not have derived from Representative CORY MILLS' personal funds; entered into, held, or enjoyed contracts with Federal agencies while he was a Member of Congress; and may have accepted through his

campaign committee in-kind contributions or other contributions not lawfully made;

Whereas, individuals who served with Representative CORY MILLS have called into question the veracity of the account of events which formed the basis of a recommendation that Representative CORY MILLS receive an award of a Bronze Star, bestowed in 2021, for his service under enemy fire in Iraq in 2003;

Whereas, in August 2024, Representative MILLS provided the Daytona Beach News with documents purporting to prove that he earned a Bronze Star with heroism, including a Department of the Army Form 638 recommending Representative MILLS for a Bronze Star, which includes a signature from then-Army Brigade Commander Arnold N. Gordon-Bray; however, Retired Brigadier General Bray told the Daytona Beach News-Journal in August 2024 that he did not sign a Bronze Star recommendation for Congressman CORY MILLS;

Whereas, five people who served with Representative CORY MILLS, including two men who were reported as having been personally saved by Representative MILLS at great risk to his own life as a basis for his recommendation for his Bronze Star in the Department of the Army Form 638, disputed that Representative CORY MILLS was involved in their rescue or provided lifesaving care.

Whereas, one private first class cited as having been involved in one of the listed achievements on Representative CORY MILLS' Army Form 638 recommending him for a Bronze Star denied that Representative Cory Mills provided him any aid and also denied that his injuries were life-threatening.

Whereas, one sergeant cited as having been involved in one of the listed achievements on Representative CORY MILLS' Army Form 638 recommending him for a Bronze Star called the account a "fabrication" and claimed that he "was not involved in any claims that Cory Mills makes about me"; and

Whereas, despite the numerous available contradictions of the accounts forming the basis of the recommendation for his Bronze Star, Representative CORY MILLS described the legitimate factual disputes raised by individuals he purportedly served with and rescued as "slander and defamation" in a statement to the Daytona Beach News-Journal: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that—

One, Representative CORY MILLS be censured;

Two, Representative CORY MILLS forthwith present himself in the well of the House of Representatives for the pronouncement of the censure; and

Three, Representative CORY MILLS be censured with the public reading of this resolution by the Speaker.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the

floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from Texas will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

DC CRIMINAL REFORMS TO IMMEDIATELY MAKE EVERYONE SAFE ACT

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 707, I call up the bill (H.R. 4922) to limit youth offender status in the District of Columbia to individuals 18 years of age or younger, to direct the Attorney General of the District of Columbia to establish and operate a publicly accessible website containing updated statistics on juvenile crime in the District of Columbia, to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to prohibit the Council of the District of Columbia from enacting changes to existing criminal liability sentences, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIFFANY). Pursuant to House Resolution 707, the amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 119-10 is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 4922

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 “D.C. Criminal Reforms to Immediately Make Everyone Safe Act of 2025” or the “DC CRIMES Act of 2025”.

SEC. 2. YOUTH OFFENDERS.

(a) LIMITING YOUTH OFFENDER STATUS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO INDIVIDUALS UNDER 18 YEARS OF AGE.—

(1) LIMITATION.—Section 2(6) of the Youth Rehabilitation Act of 1985 (sec. 24-901(6), D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking “24 years of age or younger” and inserting “under 18 years of age”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) REPEAL OF CONSIDERATION OF INDIVIDUALS 18 THROUGH 24 YEARS OF AGE IN STRATEGIC PLAN FOR FACILITIES, TREATMENT, AND SERVICES.—Section 3(a-1) of such Act (sec. 24-902(a-1), D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking paragraph (3).

(B) COMMUNITY SERVICE FOR INDIVIDUALS UNDER ORDER OF PROBATION.—Section 4(a)(2) of such Act (sec. 24-903(a)(2), D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking “15 to 24 years of age” and inserting “15 to 18 years of age”.

(b) PROHIBITING ISSUANCE OF SENTENCE LESS THAN MANDATORY-MINIMUM TERM.—Sec-

tion 4(b) of such Act (sec. 24-903(b), D.C. Official Code) is amended—

- (1) by striking “(b)(1)” and inserting “(b)”; and
- (2) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3).

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT AND OPERATION OF WEBSITE ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA JUVENILE CRIME STATISTICS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT AND OPERATION.—Subchapter I of chapter 23 of title 16, District of Columbia Official Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

§ 16-2340a. Website of updated statistics on juvenile crime

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT AND OPERATION OF WEBSITE.—The Attorney General of the District of Columbia shall establish and operate a publicly accessible website which contains data on juvenile crime in the District of Columbia, including each of the following statistical measures:

“(1) The total number of juveniles arrested each year.

“(2) The total number and percentage of juveniles arrested each year, broken down by age, race, and sex.

“(3) Of the total number of juveniles arrested each year, the total number and percentage arrested for petty crime, including the following crimes:

“(A) Vandalism.

“(B) Theft.

“(C) Shoplifting.

“(4) Of the total number of juveniles arrested each year, the total number and percentage arrested for crime of violence (as defined in section 23-1331(4)).

“(5) Of the total number of juveniles arrested each year, the total number and percentage who were arrested for their first offense.

“(6) Of the total number of juveniles arrested each year, the total number and percentage who had been arrested previously.

“(7) Of the total number of juveniles arrested each year who had been arrested previously, the total number and percentage of the number of arrests.

“(8) Of the total number of juveniles arrested each year, the declination rate for prosecutions by the Office of the Attorney General for the District of Columbia.

“(9) Of the total number of juveniles sentenced each year, the number and percentage who were tried as adults.

“(10) Of the total number of juveniles prosecuted each year, the number and percentage who were not sentenced, who were sentenced to a misdemeanor, and who were sentenced to a felony.

“(11) Of the total number of juveniles sentenced each year, the number and percentage of the length of time that will be served in a correctional facility as provided by the sentence.

“(b) UPDATES.—The Attorney General shall update the information contained on the website on a monthly basis.

“(c) MAINTAINING ARCHIVE OF INFORMATION.—The Attorney General shall ensure that the information contained on the website is archived appropriately to provide indefinite public access to historical data of juvenile arrests and prosecutions.

“(d) FORMAT.—The Attorney General shall ensure that the information contained in the website, including historical data described in subsection (c), is available in a machine-readable format available for bulk download.

“(e) PROHIBITING DISCLOSURE OF PERSONALLY IDENTIFIABLE INFORMATION.—In carrying out this section, the Attorney General shall ensure that the website does not include any juvenile's personally identifiable information.

“(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘crime’ has the meaning given the term ‘offense’ in section 23-1331(2); and

“(2) the term ‘juvenile’ has the meaning given the term ‘youth offender’ in section 2(6) of the Youth Rehabilitation Act of 1985 (sec. 24-901(6), D.C. Official Code).”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS RELATING TO AUTHORIZE RELEASE OF INFORMATION.—

(1) JUVENILE CASE RECORDS OF FAMILY COURT.—Section 16-2331, District of Columbia Official Code, is amended—

(A) by redesignating subsection (i) as subsection (j); and

(B) by inserting after subsection (h-2) the following new subsection:

“(i) Notwithstanding subsection (b) of this section, a person shall provide information contained in juvenile case records to the Attorney General for purposes of the website established and operated under section 16-2340a.”.

(2) JUVENILE SOCIAL RECORDS OF FAMILY COURT.—Section 16-2332, District of Columbia Official Code, is amended—

(A) by redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (i); and

(B) by inserting after subsection (g) the following new subsection:

“(h) Notwithstanding subsection (b) of this section, a person shall provide information contained in juvenile social records to the Attorney General for purposes of the website established and operated under section 16-2340a.”.

(3) POLICE AND OTHER LAW ENFORCEMENT RECORDS.—Section 16-2333, District of Columbia Official Code, is amended—

(A) by redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (i); and

(B) by inserting after subsection (f) the following new subsection:

“(g) Notwithstanding subsection (a) of this section, a person shall provide information contained in law enforcement records and files concerning a child to the Attorney General for purposes of the website established and operated under section 16-2340a.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The Attorney General of the District of Columbia shall establish the website under section 16-2341, District of Columbia Official Code, as added by subsection (a), not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

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

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GARCIA) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COMER. 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 measure under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 4922, a bill providing commonsense reforms to the District of Columbia criminal code.

It is clear to Members of the committee and the public that D.C.’s soft-

on-crime policies have failed to keep D.C. residents and visitors safe.

The DC CRIMES Act overturns targeted portions of the D.C. Council's Youth Rehabilitation Act by amending the definition of a "youth offender" from a person under the age of 25 to under the age of 18.

Let me emphasize Washington, D.C.'s current law. Currently, D.C. code allows a criminal under the age of 25 to be given the same leniency that is afforded to minors. This bill requires that we treat adult criminals as adults, like the rest of the country. It also removes judicial discretion to sentence youth offenders under the minimum sentencing structures in place.

Our Capital cannot continue to let criminals freely roam the streets and expect this crime crisis to end.

As juvenile crime soars in the District, the bill also requires the D.C. Attorney General to create a publicly available website that better tracks juvenile crime data. This data will inform Congress, the District's elected officials, the Metropolitan Police Department, the public, and others of the severity of juvenile crimes in the city.

Citizens of D.C. and visitors to our Nation's Capital deserve to feel safe.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DONALDS) for leading this effort again in this Congress, and I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

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

Mr. GARCIA of California. Mr. Speaker, we are considering today the first of four bills which represent a serious violation of the rights of Washington, D.C., and the democratic process.

Mr. Speaker, we know that D.C. has more residents than two States; D.C. taxpayers pay more Federal taxes per capita than any State; and D.C., as a whole, contributes more Federal taxes than 12 States. There are over 700,000 active residents here who deserve a voice.

D.C.'s government is accountable to the people who live here, and local leaders should and are empowered to solve local problems without Congress interfering.

Mr. Speaker, I have said this many times: If Donald Trump wants to run D.C., he should resign as President and run for Mayor. If my colleagues here want to legislate for D.C., there are plenty of opportunities to run for the D.C. Council.

Mr. Speaker, I was a mayor of my city for 8 years before I came to Congress, and I love local government. A lot can get done and accomplished. Yet, let's not sit here in Congress and pretend to be a super city council, imposing our pet policies on residents who reject this agenda.

□ 1510

Now, the bill before us right now is the so-called DC CRIMES Act. This bill will impose longer sentences on young people who commit crimes.

How does it do this?

It eliminates the ability for judges to make the best sentencing decisions for young adults. It will lead to worse outcomes, more reoffenders, and less safety.

Now, let's be clear: This bill is not about making anyone safer or D.C. safer. It is about stripping decision-making away from the people and the judges of D.C., and instead handing the power of judges over to politicians in this room who don't live here, who don't vote here, and certainly don't answer to D.C. residents.

This bill amends D.C.'s Youth Rehabilitation Act, or the YRA as it is known.

Now, the YRA is not radical. It has been in place since 1985, and it actually mirrors laws in States like Florida and Michigan. Its purpose is simple: to give judges discretion in sentencing young adults.

Now, judges can punish some young people, when appropriate, in ways that reduce their risk of reoffending, but this bill would rip away discretion.

It eliminates a judge's ability to waive mandatory minimums, even when the facts show a one-size-fits-all sentence makes no sense.

Judges, not politicians, should decide sentences. Now, individuals whose convictions are set aside under the YRA are less likely to reoffend. That means the law works, and it keeps communities safer.

Now, we also know that in nearly 80 percent of cases, judges impose a mandatory minimum sentence anyway. These waivers are rarely granted and only when a judge determines it is appropriate. This bill is an undemocratic attack on D.C., its residents, and is also just bad policy.

Now, Republicans in the majority claim D.C.'s policies are too soft, but we know that the sponsor of this bill is also from Florida, which has allowed judges to waive mandatory minimums for decades.

Florida even caps youth offender sentences at 6 years, something D.C., by the way, has never done. Let's be clear: We can all agree that violent crime has no place in our communities. People are rightly concerned about crime in D.C. and back home in their communities. Democrats, of course, want safe streets, but we believe in investing in solutions that actually make people safer, not political stunts or short-term gimmicks or cheap tough talk.

We know what works: supporting local police departments, investing in community-based partnerships, and creating economic opportunity to drive down shootings, homicides, and burglaries.

Now, getting guns out of the hands of violent criminals keeps us all safer. Instead of doing that work, Republicans are wasting time attacking the District while ignoring the crises in their own backyards.

Now, President Trump is doing nothing to address violent crime in States

with some of the highest crime rates in the country. In fact, his administration has made things worse.

Trump has opposed efforts to expand criminal background checks. He has blocked attempts to reduce ghost guns and machine gun conversion devices. His Department of Justice has gutted the number of inspectors who stop businesses from selling guns to criminals, cutting that workforce down by two-thirds.

On top of that, Trump illegally froze or canceled \$3.8 billion in DOJ grant programs, including COPS grants for our police departments that, of course, help communities hire and train police officers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this misguided power grab, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DONALDS), sponsor of the bill.

Mr. DONALDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of my bill, H.R. 4922, the DC CRIMES Act.

Now, in reference to what the gentleman was just talking about, Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 of the United States Constitution is quite clear. It grants Congress the power to exercise exclusive, exclusive jurisdiction over the Federal District, which all Americans know now is Washington, D.C., and it is the Nation's Capital.

That is in the Constitution that was ratified by several States. Congress does have the constitutional authority to regulate activities within the Federal District. When it is said that somehow Congress is now eroding local control, that is simply not true.

Any local powers by the D.C. Council have been granted to the D.C. Council by Congress, and Congress is the seat of authority when it comes to the Federal enclave.

He also talked about Florida's laws. Let's be very clear: Florida has established itself as a beacon of law and order, making sure that our citizens are safe throughout all of our jurisdictions. If there are some abilities for some measures of flexibility, Florida has proven, beyond a shadow of a doubt, that it knows how to keep its people safe, which is very different with respect to the D.C. Council and with respect to escalated crime here in the Nation's Capital.

Our great Nation's Capital has been plagued by violence, destruction, disorder for far too long, and decades of weak, pro-crime leadership has turned this once great city into a dystopia.

I will remind my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that some of their colleagues have been victimized by the crime here in Washington, D.C. Rather than prioritizing the safety of law-abiding citizens and protecting the lives of innocent residents and visitors, District officials have actively facilitated dysfunction and chaos through

their progressive, soft-on-crime policies.

Instead of addressing the clear epidemic of youth crime in this city, the D.C. Council increased the age of youth offenders to individuals 24 years old and younger. Meaning fully grown, legal adults in the District of Columbia can receive sentences meant for children.

This is simply insane, and that is why I introduced the DC CRIMES Act, which lowers the definition of youth from under the age of 25 to under the age of 18, removes the ability of judges to sentence youth offenders below mandatory minimum guidelines, and requires the D.C. attorney general to establish a public website containing much-needed statistics on juvenile crime in D.C.

The Trump administration's efforts have shown that lawlessness is a choice, and it is time for Congress to step up, adhere to our constitutional duty, and firmly address crime in the Nation's Capital.

For the citizens of D.C., I would say, we wish your Council did this the right way, but they did not and we will act.

Mr. GARCIA of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON.)

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose this undemocratic and paternalistic bill, which amends D.C. law. The over 700,000 D.C. residents, the majority of whom are Black and Brown, are capable and worthy of governing themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters opposing this bill from D.C. Mayor Muriel Bowser, the entire D.C. Council, and D.C. Attorney General Brian Schwalb.

SEPTEMBER 10, 2025.

Hon. JAMES COMER,
Chairman, House Committee on Oversight and
Government Reform, Washington, DC.

Hon. ROBERT GARCIA,
Ranking Member, House Committee on
Oversight and Government Reform, Washington,
DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN COMER AND RANKING MEMBER GARCIA: As Mayor and Chief Executive Officer of the District of Columbia, I am proud of the work we have accomplished to invest in our people, strengthen our neighborhoods, and drive down crime. Building on this progress, my Administration established the Safe and Beautiful Emergency Operations Center to coordinate public safety and beautification efforts as the presidential emergency declaration ends. This structure ensures that DC will remain proactive—bringing together local and federal partners to sustain momentum on reducing crime and improving quality of life for every resident.

We have worked collaboratively with this Committee on shared priorities, including public safety, the federal Return to Work, implementing a DC budget Fiscal Year 2025 fix (which is still pending in the House) and revitalizing the RFK campus; but I write now to ask you to reject 13 of the DC bills before you today that encroach on DC's Home Rule.

Bills like H.R. 5183, the District of Columbia Home Rule Improvement Act, make the

District less efficient, competitive, and responsive to the needs of a highly complex unique local government that serves local, county and state functions. Bogging down legislative and executive action only adds costs and uncertainty, making it more difficult to handle the economic headwinds and growth opportunities ahead.

Bills like H.R. 5214, the District of Columbia Cash Bail Reform Act, make DC less safe. Replacing our very effective pre-trial detention regime, which focuses on charged violent offenses and repeat violent offenders, not just on cash bail. I credit recent changes to our laws related to pre-trial detention for helping to drive down violent crime in the last two years.

And the bills to abolish the Judicial Nominations Commission and to convert the elected DC Attorney General to a Presidentially appointed legal officer for the District are both less democratic and untenable for District operations. The Judicial Nominations Commission, with seven members appointed by the Mayor, DC Council, President, US District Court for DC, and the DC Bar, works. As recently as last month, President Trump nominated three federal judicial nominees who were selected from the Commission's candidate pool—a process that demonstrates the value of maintaining local input. DC residents also voted to elect an Attorney General who represents the public interest. Changes to these charter agencies would significantly undercut the already thin ties to autonomy that limited home rule provides.

Finally, I urge you not to end our three-part education funding SOAR Act. I have long supported the program to expand opportunity for DC students. However, my support has always been contingent on parity among all three education sectors—public, private, and charter—and this approach is working. We will not support changes that tip the scales away from this core principle of fairness for DC families. As the fastest improving urban school system, DC has become a model for urban education. We outpace the national average on all tested subject areas. We boast free, full-day Pre-K access serving more than 13,200 young learners—an investment which supports our children and our workforce. DC ranked top of the nation in parental satisfaction regarding school choice. Mayoral control, council oversight, and deep, targeted investments in our students, teachers, and buildings made these remarkable achievements possible.

I look forward to continuing a productive partnership with the Committee—one that respects the will of DC residents and honors the principles of home rule. Together, we can build on our successes while protecting the autonomy that, as history reflects, has made our city stronger.

Sincerely,

MURIEL BOWSER,
Mayor.

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF
COLUMBIA, OFFICE OF THE ATTOR-
NEY GENERAL
Washington, DC, September 9, 2025.

Hon. JAMES COMER,
Chairman, House Committee on Oversight and
Government Reform, Washington, DC.

Hon. ROBERT GARCIA,
Ranking Member, House Committee on
Oversight and Government Reform, Washington,
DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN COMER AND RANKING MEMBER GARCIA: The House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform is scheduled to markup fourteen bills tomorrow related to the operations of the District of Columbia. With the exception of H.R. 2693, the District of Columbia Electronic Transmittal

Act, I write in strong opposition to these bills. They address inherently local issues and laws that were passed after careful consideration by the District's elected representatives, who are directly accountable to District residents. Members of this very Committee have long advocated for the principles of federalism on which this nation was founded. They have consistently condemned federal overreach and fought forcefully and convincingly for the uniquely American values of local control, freedom, and self-governance. These principles should apply to the more than 700,000 people who call Washington, DC home, just as they do for your constituents across the country.

I specifically want to call attention to the significant incursion on local self-governance reflected in two bills, the District of Columbia Attorney General Appointment Reform Act and the District of Columbia Judicial Nominations Reform Act. Both laws would displace the ability of District residents to have a voice in the selection of local leaders who wield significant power over local judicial matters: the judges on our local courts and the Attorney General for the District. The judges on the DC Court of Appeals and DC Superior Court rule on inherently local matters such as criminal prosecutions, landlord-tenant cases, probate proceedings, civil cases, and divorce proceedings, all of which have profoundly important impact on our community. For more than 50 years, the Judicial Nominations Commission (JNC) has successfully allowed DC residents to have a voice in judicial appointments, while also granting the President and Senate a role in confirming our judges. I urge the Committee not to overturn that well-established process.

The DC Attorney General, as the District's chief law officer, is also responsible for local legal issues, namely, protecting the District and its residents in a wide range of matters, such as enforcing child support laws, handling abuse and neglect proceedings in the child welfare system, enforcing our housing code, and defending District agencies and officers when they are sued. In no other place in the United States are such local issues determined by a federally appointed person with no local accountability. The proposed legislation would be especially undemocratic in light of the fact that, in 2010, an overwhelming majority of District voters (76 percent) exercised their right to amend the District Charter to make the DC Attorney General an independent, elected office, rather than a position appointed by and subordinate to the Mayor. With that vote, District residents clearly expressed their desire that the Attorney General should be independent and accountable to them. The pending bill would displace that choice in favor of installing an Attorney General accountable not to District residents, but to the President. Given that the U.S. Attorney for the District is already appointed by the President, if passed, this bill would concentrate all criminal and civil litigation authority in the President, divesting the District and its residents of any local control over these essential functions.

No one knows or cares more about keeping DC safe than DC residents who work, live and raise their families here. Our democratically elected officials work closely with local law enforcement, policy experts, and community leadership to pass laws that are in the best interests of all Washingtonians. Substituting the will of DC voters with the whim of federal politicians is undemocratic and un-American.

I urge you to reject these measures and uphold the values Congress sought to advance more than 50 years ago when it passed the District of Columbia Home Rule Act: that

District residents should enjoy the “powers of local self-government” that all other Americans enjoy. *See DC Code § 1-201.02.*

Respectfully submitted,

BRIAN L. SCHWALB,
Attorney General for the District of Columbia.

COUNCIL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, DC, September 8, 2025.

Hon. JAMES COMER,
Chair, House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform,
Washington, DC.

Hon. ROBERT GARCIA,
Ranking Member, House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN COMER AND RANKING MEMBER GARCIA: The Council of the District of Columbia is aware that the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform is planning to mark up more than a dozen proposed measures that would severely and negatively impact the operations, public safety, and autonomy of the District of Columbia. We ask that you oppose these measures in full, save one, H.R. 2693, District of Columbia Electronic Transmittal of Legislation Act. While we have not seen the final text of this legislation, the public summary of H.R. 2693 is consistent with the long held request by the District of Columbia to allow the ability to electronically transfer legislative acts to Congress, rather than only allowing physical copies be transferred. The challenge and barriers created by this current requirement were clearly exposed during both the recent COVID pandemic restrictions as well as the Capitol campus restrictions following the January 6, 2021 attacks on the Capitol.

The other 13 measures that have been shared with us would do direct and serious harm to the District of Columbia and we urge you to reject these measures completely. These bills represent an unprecedented attack on the autonomy and home rule of our local government and the more than 700,000 Americans that call it home. The breadth of these bills is remarkable, and if passed, would result in an erosion of accountability and public safety for the District of Columbia. They range from eliminating and replacing our elected and accountable Attorney General for the District of Columbia with a President’s hand-picked and unaccountable associate requiring no confirmation by the U.S. Senate and no local ties, to a full repeal of multiple local DC laws that have been in place for many years, if not decades, that are tested, proven, and effective components of our public safety infrastructure and ecosystem. The effect of these Congressional repeals would put our legal and Court system into chaos and directly undermine successful tools that focus on serious accountability and effective rehabilitation when a crime occurs. As always, when revisions or amendments to DC laws are necessary, those changes should only take place within our local legislature which has the best capacity to provide effective oversight and accountable actions for the residents of the District of Columbia.

We respectfully request that all members of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and all members of Congress, reject these harmful measures whether in committee mark up or before the full House of Representatives. Given the breadth of the multiple measures before you, we also request an opportunity to provide a more in-depth discussion of each bill before the Committee’s mark-up, especially in light that the Committee will not hold public hearings on these measures.

Sincerely,

Chairman Phil Mendelson; Councilmember Anita Bonds, At-Large; Councilmember Rob-

ert White, Jr., At-Large; Councilmember Brooke Pinto, Ward 2; Councilmember Janeese Lewis George, Ward 4; Councilmember Charles Allen, Ward 6; Councilmember Trayon White, Sr., Ward 8; Councilmember Kenyan McDuffie, At-Large; Councilmember Christina Henderson, At-Large; Councilmember Brianne Nadeau, Ward 1; Councilmember Matthew Frumin, Ward 3; Councilmember Zachary Parker, Ward 5; Councilmember Wendell Felder, Ward 7.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, the local legislature, the Council, has 13 members. If D.C. residents do not like how members vote, residents can vote them out of office or pass a ballot measure. That is called democracy.

Congress has 535 voting Members. None are elected by D.C. residents. If D.C. residents do not like how Members vote on local D.C. matters, residents cannot vote them out of office or pass a ballot measure. That is the antithesis of democracy.

The substance of this bill should be irrelevant since there is never justification for Congress to legislate on local D.C. matters. Nevertheless, I will discuss it.

Republicans claim D.C.’s Youth Rehabilitation Act treats adults as juveniles. They are wrong. They either do not understand the act or are misleading the public about it intentionally. The act’s sentencing and set aside provisions apply only in adult court, not juvenile court.

Let me repeat: The provisions apply in adult court, not juvenile court. A judge may, but is not required to, sentence a person under the act, and certain crimes are ineligible under the act.

□ 1520

D.C. is not the only jurisdiction with a so-called young adult offender law. Alabama, Florida, Michigan, New York, South Carolina, and Vermont have such laws. The sponsor of this bill is from one of those States.

D.C. residents have all the obligations of American citizenship, including paying Federal taxes, serving on juries, and registering with the Selective Service, yet Congress denies them full local self-government and voting representation in Congress. The only solution to this undemocratic treatment is to grant D.C. statehood.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter explaining why D.C. statehood is constitutional from leading constitutional scholars, including Larry Tribe.

MAY 22, 2021.

Re Washington, D.C. Admission Act, H.R. 51 and S. 51 (the “D.C. Admission Act”).

Hon. NANCY P. PELOSI,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. CHARLES E. SCHUMER,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. KEVIN O. McCARTHY,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. MITCH McCONNELL,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSIONAL LEADERS: As scholars of the United States Constitution, we write

to correct claims that the D.C. Admission Act is vulnerable to a constitutional challenge in the courts. For the reasons set forth below, there is no constitutional barrier to the State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth (the “Commonwealth”) entering the Union through a congressional joint resolution, pursuant to the Constitution’s Admissions Clause, just like the 37 other states that have been admitted since the Constitution was adopted. Furthermore, Congress’s exercise of its express constitutional authority to decide to admit a new state is a classic political question, which courts are highly unlikely to interfere with, let alone attempt to bar.

The D.C. Admission Act. The House passed the Act, as H.R. 51, on April 22, 2021, and as of this writing, the substantively identical companion bill (S. 51) is under consideration by the Senate. The Act provides for the issuance of a congressional joint resolution declaring the admittance as a State of most of the territory currently comprising the District of Columbia, while the seat of government (defined as the “Capital”) will fall outside of the boundaries of the new State and remain under federal jurisdiction. The Act also repeals the provision of federal law that establishes the current mechanism for District residents to participate in presidential elections, pursuant to Congress’s authority under the Twenty-Third Amendment; and provides for expedited consideration of the repeal of that Amendment.

The Admissions Clause grants Congress constitutional authority to admit the Commonwealth into the Union. The starting point for a constitutional analysis of the Act is the Constitution’s Admissions Clause (Art. IV, Sect. 3), which provides that “New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union.” The Clause “vests in Congress the essential and discretionary authority to admit new states into the Union by whatever means it considers appropriate as long as such means are framed within its vested powers.” Every State admitted into the Union since the Constitution was adopted has been admitted by congressional action pursuant to this Clause; no State has been admitted pursuant to a constitutional amendment.

The Supreme Court has broadly construed Congress’s assigned power to admit new states and has never interfered with Congress’s admission of a state, even when potentially legitimate constitutional objections existed. For example, in 1863, Congress admitted into the Union West Virginia, which had been part of the State of Virginia, in potential violation of a provision of the Admissions Clause that bars the formation of a new State out of a portion of the territory of another State without the consent of the ceding State. The Supreme Court, however, did not bar West Virginia’s admission; to the contrary, it later tacitly approved of it.

Some critics of the D.C. Admission Act have suggested that Maryland’s consent might be required under the foregoing provision of the Admissions Clause. This objection mistakenly presupposes that Maryland retains a reversionary interest in the territory currently comprising the District of Columbia, which Maryland ceded to the federal government when the District was established in 1791. In fact, Maryland expressly relinquished all sovereign authority over the territory at issue when the federal government accepted it. The express terms of the cession state that the territory was “for ever ceded and relinquished to the congress and government of the United States, in full and absolute right, and exclusive jurisdiction.

... As Viet D. Dinh, who served as an Assistant Attorney General during the presidency of George W. Bush, has explained, because Maryland's cession of the territory now constituting the District was full and complete, it severed D.C. residents' now far distant "political link with" Maryland. The current District is not part of Maryland, and Maryland has no claim on any portion of the District's territory. There is accordingly no basis to require Maryland's consent for the establishment of the new State.

The Constitution's District Clause poses no barrier to admitting the Commonwealth into the Union. The Constitution's District Clause grants Congress power to "exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the Acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States." Based on this Clause, Congress established the current District of Columbia, which (as explained) was taken from territory ceded by Maryland, as well as Virginia.

The D.C. Admission Act complies with the District Clause because it provides that the Capital—which is defined in the Act to include (among other things) the White House, the Capitol Building, the United States Supreme Court Building, and the Federal executive, legislative, and judicial office buildings located adjacent to the Mall—will not become part of the new State and will remain under the sovereignty of the federal government.

Some critics have argued that the District Clause somehow mandates that the District of Columbia permanently retain all of its current territory, and that its size may neither be increased or reduced by Congress. The plain language of the District Clause says no such thing; it does not mandate that the District be any size or shape, except it limits the maximum size of the federal enclave to ten square miles.

Historical practice confirms that Congress can change the size of the District. In 1791, Congress altered the District's southern boundary to encompass portions of what are now Alexandria, Virginia and Anacostia. Then, in 1846, Congress retroceded Alexandria and its environs back to Virginia. As a result, the territory composing the District was reduced by a third.

At the time of the 1846 retrocession, the House's Committee on the District of Columbia considered, and rejected, the very argument that critics of the D.C. Admission Act are raising today, reasoning that the "true construction of [the District Clause] would seem to be solely that Congress retain and exercise exclusive jurisdiction" over territory comprising the "seat of government." The language of the District Clause, the legislators observed, places no mandate on the size, or even the location, of that seat of government, other than preventing the government from "hold[ing] more than ten miles for this purpose." The House's judgment was correct in 1846, and remains so today.

The Twenty-Third Amendment does not prevent Congress from granting the Commonwealth statehood. Opponents of statehood have suggested that the Twenty-Third Amendment bars Congress from exercising its constitutionally enumerated authority to grant statehood to the Commonwealth. In fact, the Amendment poses no barrier to the admission of the Commonwealth into the Union through an act of Congress, in accordance with the plain language of the Admissions Clause, just as Congress has done in connection with the admission of several other States, including most recently Alaska and Hawaii.

Section 1 of the Twenty-Third Amendment, which was ratified in 1961, provides:

The District constituting the seat of Government of the United States shall appoint in such manner as the Congress may direct: A number of electors of President and Vice President equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives in Congress to which the District would be entitled if it were a State, but in no event more than the least populous State; they shall be in addition to those appointed by the States, but they shall be considered, for the purposes of the election of President and Vice President, to be electors appointed by a State.

By its plain terms, the Amendment poses no barrier to Congress's admission of the Commonwealth into the Union. Indeed, it is entirely silent on the matter.

The only question raised by the existence of the Twenty-Third Amendment is a practical, not a constitutional one: How best to address the Twenty-Third Amendment's provision for the assignment of presidential electors to what will become a vestigial seat of government, with virtually no residents? The Act satisfactorily addresses this question by providing for the repeal of the provision of federal law that establishes the current mechanism for District residents to participate in presidential elections, pursuant to Congress's authority under the Twenty-Third Amendment, as well as by commencing the process for repealing the Amendment itself.

Initially, the Act provides for an expedited process for repeal of the Twenty-Third Amendment, a process that should move forward to ratification swiftly and successfully once the Commonwealth is admitted as a State. None of the other 50 States has reason to seek to retain three electors for a largely unoccupied seat of government.

But the Act also addresses the possibility that the Twenty-Third Amendment is not promptly repealed by mandating the immediate repeal of the provision of federal law that provides the current mechanism for District residents to participate in federal elections.

In 1961, following the adoption of the Twenty-Third Amendment, Congress exercised its enforcement authority by enacting legislation (codified at 3 U.S.C. §21), providing that the District residents may select presidential electors; the votes of the electors are currently awarded to the ticket prevailing in the District's presidential election.

The existing statutes, fall within the broad authority granted to Congress by the Twenty-Third Amendment to define the terms of, and effectuate, the District's participation in presidential elections. The Amendment allows for the appointment of a number of Electors "in such manner as the Congress may direct." The Amendment also allows Congress to select the number of Electors the District may receive, subject only to a maximum: The District may participate in the presidential Electoral College through the appointment of no more electors than those of the smallest State, i.e., three. And section 2 of the Amendment grants Congress the power to "enforce" the provision "by appropriate legislation," as it did in 1961.

But once Congress acts again, pursuant to its express grant of constitutional authority, and repeals the legislation that creates the existing procedure for District residents to select presidential electors, that will remove the legislative provision providing for the District's participation in presidential elections. Without such a provision, there is no mechanism for identifying the Capital area's electors or allocating their votes.

Some scholars have questioned whether that approach is satisfactory. They contend that the Twenty-Third Amendment is self-enforcing, and effectively mandates the ap-

pointment of electors on behalf of the District of Columbia, regardless of whether such appointment is called for under a federal statute. Some of us disagree; indeed, the very existence of Section 2 of the Amendment makes clear that enabling legislation is required to effectuate the District's participation in the presidential election process. And Congress's 1961 enforcement legislation supports this interpretation.

Even if this self-enforcement argument were to be accepted, however, Congress could easily address it by replacing the current law mandating that the Capital area's electors vote in accordance with the outcome of the popular vote in the District with a new legislative mandate that the Capital area's electors vote in other ways. For example, Congress could require District electors to vote in favor of the presidential ticket that receives the most Electoral College votes (of the remaining 538 electors). Or, alternatively, Congress could require that District electors vote for the winner of the national popular vote winner.

A recent Supreme Court decision confirms that a legislative directive to the Capital area's electors would be enforceable. The Twenty-Third Amendment provides that the District "shall appoint" electors "in such manner as Congress may direct"; this language is a direct parallel to the Constitution's grant of broad authority to each of the States to appoint and instruct their respective electors. In its recent decision in *Chiafalo v. Washington*, the Supreme Court held that electors do not have discretion to decide how to cast their Electoral College votes, but rather are legally bound to follow the instructions given by their respective states.

As Columbia Law School Professors Jessica Bulman-Pozen and Olatunde Johnson have observed, it follows from the Court's holding in *Chiafalo* that Congress could legally bind any electors to vote in accordance with the overall vote of the Electoral College or the national popular vote, just as the existing enabling statute currently binds them to vote in the Electoral College in accordance with the outcome of the popular vote in the District.

In sum, none of the critics' constitutional objections to the D.C. Admission Act are meritorious; and the contention that a constitutional amendment is required to admit the Commonwealth into the Union is incorrect. The D.C. Admission Act calls for a proper exercise of Congress' express authority under the Constitution to admit new states, a power that it has exercised 37 other times since the Constitution was adopted.

Courts are unlikely to second-guess Congress's exercise of its constitutional authority to admit the Commonwealth into the Union. Apart from the fact that the legal objections to admission of the Commonwealth as a State are without merit, it is also unlikely that the courts will ever consider those objections. As Mr. Dinh has observed, the decision whether to admit a state into the Union is a paradigmatic political question that the Constitution expressly and exclusively assigns to Congress. The Supreme Court has long, and strenuously, avoided adjudicating disputes respecting matters that the Constitution makes the sole responsibility of the coordinate, elected branches.

The remaining objections to Statehood do not concern applicable constitutional law, but rather matters of policy.

For example, some have argued that the District should not be admitted to the Union because it is a single city and have instead proposed that most of the District's territory be retrocessed to Maryland. There is, however, no constitutional barrier to a large, diverse city, with a population comparable

to that of several existing States, joining the Union. Furthermore, the Maryland retrocession proposal is subject to many of the same supposed constitutional objections raised by those who object to statehood for the District. For example, retroceding the District to Maryland would decrease the size of the remaining federal enclave, which objectors to District Statehood have claimed is constitutionally impermissible. A forced merger of the District and Maryland would also do nothing to address the purported constitutional objection to leaving the residual seat of government with three potential electors, pursuant to the terms of the Twenty-Third Amendment, prior to the Amendment's repeal.

Opponents also argue that Congress should not grant the District statehood because it will lead to a lawsuit. But any court challenge will be without merit, and indeed likely will be dismissed as presenting a political question. We respectfully submit that Congress should not avoid exercising its express constitutional authority to admit the Commonwealth into the Union because of meritless threats of litigation.

Sincerely yours,

Caroline Fredrickson, Georgetown University Law Center; Erwin Chemerinsky, University of California, Berkeley School of Law; Stephen I. Vladeck, University of Texas Law School; Franita Tolson, University of Southern California, Gould School of Law; Jessica Bulman-Pozen, Columbia Law School; Leah Litman, University of Michigan Law School; Laurence H. Tribe, Harvard Law School; Paul Smith, Georgetown University Law Center; Geoffrey R. Stone, University of Chicago Law School; Peter Edelman, Georgetown University Law Center.

Kermit Roosevelt, University of Pennsylvania Carey Law School; Eric Segall, Georgia State College Law; Trevor Potter, Campaign Legal Center; Gregory P. Downs, University of California Davis; Larry Sabato, University of Virginia; Aziz Huq, University of Chicago Law School; Jennifer Hochschild, Harvard University; Neil S. Siegel, Duke University School of Law; Beau Breslin, Skidmore College; David C. Vladeck, Georgetown University Law Center; Sanford Levinson, University of Texas at Austin School of Law; Ira C. Lupu, George Washington University Law School; Peter M. Shane, Ohio State University Moritz College of Law; Ira P. Robbins, American University Washington College of Law; Michael Greenberger, University of Maryland Francis King Carey School of Law.

David Pozen, Columbia Law School; Mark Tushnet, Harvard Law School; Michael C. Dorf, Cornell Law School; Miguel Schor, Drake University School of Law; David S. Schwartz, University of Wisconsin Law School; Caroline Mala Corbin, University of Miami School of Law; Jonathan Askin, Brooklyn Law School; Aziz Rana, Cornell Law School; John Mikhail, Georgetown University Law Center; Richard Ford, Stanford Law School; Richard Primus, University of Michigan Law School; Joseph Fishkin, University of Texas Law School; Kate Masur, Northwestern University; Chris Edelson, American University.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, the D.C. statehood bill, H.R. 51, the Washington, D.C. Admission Act, grants D.C. residents full local self-government and voting representation in Congress. H.R. 51 reduces the size of the Federal district from 68 square miles to 2 square miles, consisting of the White House, Capitol, the Supreme Court, and The National Mall and remaining under the

control of Congress. The new State consists of the residential and commercial areas of D.C. The new State has a larger population than two States, pays more Federal taxes per capita than any State, and pays more total Federal taxes than 21 States.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to vote “no” on the D.C. CRIMES Act, keep their hands off D.C. and free D.C.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the D.C. CRIMES Act, legislation that builds on the extraordinary progress we have seen under President Trump's leadership to restore law and order in Washington, D.C.

Thanks to President Trump and his administration, we are finally seeing real results in this city. Crime is down, homicides are down, carjackings are down, and most importantly, people feel safer in their Nation's Capital.

President Trump has handed us the blueprint to restore safety in America's cities. Families are safely going out to restaurants, businesses are seeing life return to their neighborhoods, and tourists feel secure, knowing law enforcement officers are empowered to do their job and enforce the law.

The D.C. CRIMES Act ensures that the gains we have made are not rolled back by more Democratic pro-crime policies. Republicans are the party of safe cities. We are the party that stands with our police and responds to our communities that demand law and order.

This bill sends a simple message: Criminals will be held accountable, victims will be protected, and Washington, D.C., will remain on the path to becoming the safe, thriving Capital our Nation deserves.

I urge my colleagues to support the D.C. CRIMES Act and keep our Capital safe, strong, and beautiful.

Mr. GARCIA of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. CROCKETT).

Ms. CROCKETT. Mr. Speaker, as I sat and listened to the beginning of this debate, my heart simply broke, and many people know me for being able to do alliterations, and all I could think about was: Amnesia allows adolescents accountability avoidance agility from across the aisle.

Work with me for a second. Imagine being a young man born to Jamaican and Panamanian parents who messed up not once but twice. Imagine standing in front of a judge with your whole future hanging in the balance. Instead of prison, you are given a promise of mercy. Your record gets wiped clean, and you get a second chance at life.

Now imagine taking that promise and turning it into promotion. You go to college. You get a job and even become a Member of Congress. That is what redemption looks like. That is what America is supposed to be about,

and that is exactly the story of the next wannabe Governor from Florida.

As a young man, he went through pretrial diversion for misdemeanor marijuana possession. As an adult, yet younger than 24, he was charged with and ultimately placed on probation for felony bribery charges, which ultimately were, too, expunged.

He was given a third chance, and now he is the face of a bill that would not afford young people in Washington, D.C., the same opportunities afforded to him.

Let me be real. If he had grown up under Donald Trump's America or under the very D.C. crime bill he is pushing today, he wouldn't be standing here as a Member of Congress. He would still be living with the weight of those charges.

Let's call this what it is: Opportunities for me, but not for thee. He climbed the ladder of redemption, and now he is yanking it right up from under D.C. youth. Most of us were taught to lift as you climb, but clearly some have forgotten to lift as they climb. Now they are committed to telling the next generations to pull themselves up by their bootstraps.

I will not sit quiet while a man who was saved by grace turns around and tries to snatch grace away from others.

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

Mr. GARCIA of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. CROCKETT. If we are going to be real about crime, about communities, about second chances and even third chances, then it needs to start with us looking in the mirror and remembering that even the author of this bill has a story, too, before he tries to lecture D.C. on safety.

It would be complete hypocrisy to have, hypothetically, someone convicted of 34 felonies to lecture D.C. on what to do with youthful offenders who have been scientifically shown not to have fully developed brains under the age of 25, especially if said multi-count convicted felon was in his seventies when he was convicted. What would be his excuse since his brain would be fully developed?

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BURCHETT).

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in disbelief over the fact that in our own Nation's Capital, prosecutors are allowed to prosecute criminals as old as 25 years old as minors.

While President Trump has restored law and order to the District, I am not surprised that D.C.'s local government continues to protect the criminals and ignore victims. The D.C. CRIMES Act puts an end to this madness and ensures safety and security across D.C.

At 18 years old, you are given adult responsibilities, like being able to vote or sign up for the military. At 18 years, you become responsible for your

choices and your decisions and should be treated as such. At 21 years old, you are able to legally consume alcohol. At 25 years old, you can become a Member of Congress.

This is why the D.C. CRIMES Act is essential to ensuring the long-term safety and security of our Nation's Capital so that violent offenders are not just handed any more get-out-of-jail-free cards. The bill also orders judges to stop sentencing youth offenders below the minimum sentencing guidelines.

It is time to bring back justice in America. It is time for fair punishment for the people who interfere with people's daily lives, specifically those with prior convictions. The revolving door of justice ends today. I cannot thank Representative DONALDS enough for his vital work on this legislation.

It is time to push back against soft-on-crime judges and DAs. We are a nation of laws, Mr. Speaker, and Washington, D.C., should be a model for justice across our great Nation.

In no way, shape, form, or fashion should we be charging adults as minors and allowing them to return to commit similar or more violent crimes. The citizens, tourists, businesspeople, and every other member of this city deserve safety and security. I urge my colleagues to support this bill, which will ensure just that.

We will restore D.C. to become the shining city on the hill that our Founders envisioned it to be. I again thank my dear friend Congressman DONALDS. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this bill.

Mr. GARCIA of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. BOEBERT).

Ms. BOEBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman COMER and the free State of Florida's next Governor, BYRON DONALDS, for introducing this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4922, the D.C. CRIMES Act, which is sponsored by Congressman DONALDS. This critical legislation is a direct response to the failed pro-crime policies that have turned our Nation's Capital into a war zone.

Under failing leftist policies, Washington, D.C., has seen an epidemic of violence: carjackings surging 300 percent, homicides ravaging communities, and young thugs, some as old as 24, treated as juveniles, slapped with lenient sentences below mandatory minimums.

□ 1530

It endangers young families and small businesses struggling in this crime-ridden city. Innocent residents live in fear, while criminals roam free, mocking the rule of law.

H.R. 4922 cuts through this madness. It ensures adults face adult consequences. It repeals judges' abilities to dodge mandatory minimums for

youth crimes. Crucially, it blocks the D.C. Council from gutting sentencing laws, reclaiming Congress' constitutional oversight over this Federal District, as it should be.

As President Trump declared in his March 2025 executive order, if D.C. won't act, we must, restoring order, beauty, and safety to our Capital.

This bill isn't about politics. It is about protecting lives. Republicans are delivering real reform, tougher accountability, transparent juvenile crime data via a public website, and a safer D.C. for all.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join us and pass H.R. 4922 now to make America and this District safe again.

Mr. GARCIA of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. HAGEMAN).

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4922 so that we may redefine what is considered to be a youth offender from 24 years to 18 years and repeal the D.C. criminal court provision that allows youthful offenders to receive sentences less than the mandatory minimum required by law.

There is no question that there has been a crime epidemic across the District of Columbia, and the citizens of this great city deserve better. President Trump recognized this fact and has exercised his authority to restore safety. It is now time for Congress to build on his good work.

H.R. 4922 is designed to begin to address many of the problems that stem from the D.C. courts and their refusal to hold criminals accountable. We need to start with recognizing that 19- to 24-year-olds shouldn't be treated as youthful offenders.

Local news has recently reported that the number of juveniles arrested in Washington, D.C., has increased every year since 2020 and that 60 percent of carjackings in the District in 2025 so far are for those over 20 years old.

Knowing that the District of Columbia currently classifies anyone 24 years or younger as a youth offender, it is fair to ask how many of these so-called youthful offenders running rampant, terrorizing the hardworking people of Washington, D.C., are actually adults and should be tried as such. The situation is untenable and should not be tolerated in a civilized society.

I am, therefore, pleased to support the solutions presented by H.R. 4922, including the establishment of a website on District of Columbia's juvenile crime statistics.

Passage of this bill will go a long way to correcting the broken, soft-on-crime policies here in Washington, D.C., that coddle criminals and place at risk the good, honest, and hardworking people who call the District home.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative DONALDS for sponsoring this important

legislation and applaud Chairman COMER for his steadfast leadership on this critically important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 4922.

Mr. GARCIA of California. Mr. Speaker, I oppose passage of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this common-sense legislation to ensure that citizens of Washington, D.C., and the many visitors to our Nation's Capital feel safe.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 707, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

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

Mr. GARCIA of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

LOWERAGE AT WHICH A MINOR MAY BE TRIED AS ADULT FOR CERTAIN CRIMINAL OFFENSES IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 707, I call up the bill (H.R. 5140) to lower the age at which a minor may be tried as an adult for certain criminal offenses in the District of Columbia to 14 years of age, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 707, the amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 119-12, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 5140

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

SECTION 1. LOWERAGE AT WHICH A MINOR MAY BE TRIED AS ADULT FOR CERTAIN CRIMINAL OFFENSES IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

(a) LOWERAGE AT WHICH MINOR MAY BE EXCLUDED FROM JURISDICTION OF FAMILY COURT.—Section 16-2301, District of Columbia Official Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking “sixteen years of age” and inserting “fourteen years of age”; and

(2) in paragraph (3) in the matter following subparagraph (C), by striking “the age of sixteen” and inserting “the age of fourteen”.

(b) LOWERING AGE AT WHICH MINOR MAY BE TRANSFERRED TO CRIMINAL PROCEEDING.—Section 16-2307(a), District of Columbia Official Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “fifteen” and inserting “fourteen”; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking “sixteen” and inserting “fourteen”.

(c) APPLICABILITY.—This Act, and the amendments made by this Act, shall apply with respect to criminal offenses committed on and after the date of the enactment of this Act.

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

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GARCIA) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER).

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the measure under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 5140 to lower the age at which a minor may be tried as an adult for certain criminal offenses in the District of Columbia to 14 years of age.

The District of Columbia has seen a staggering increase in juvenile crime since the pandemic. According to the Metropolitan Police Department, 51.8 percent of all robbery arrests in 2024 were juveniles, and 53 percent of all carjacking arrests in 2025, as of August, were juveniles.

Congress must respond to these violent crimes being committed by juvenile perpetrators. Currently, minors 16 years old and older are eligible to have their case moved up to criminal court and to be tried as an adult in D.C. This bill lowers that age to 14 years old, making 14- and 15-year-olds who commit violent crimes eligible to be charged as adults.

Violent crime refers to murder, first-degree sexual abuse, burglary in the first degree, and robbery while armed, for example. When juveniles commit crimes of this magnitude, they deserve sentencing that reflects the seriousness of the crimes they committed.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative BRANDON GILL for leading this legislation. I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1540

Mr. GARCIA of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, once again, we are back with a second bill to undermine Washington, D.C., with an undemocratic and misguided policy.

Republicans in Congress are once more acting again as a city council for D.C., overriding the choices of local residents and their elected officials, while ignoring the real issues the rest of the country faces.

Nearly 700,000 taxpaying Americans in D.C. deserve the same right to self-governance as every other community including control over criminal laws.

Democrats on the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform strongly oppose this bill, which would allow children as young as 14 years old to be charged as adults. Let's be clear. This bill is not about safety. It is about stripping away judicial discretion and sending more children into the adult prison system.

This bill lowers the age at which children can be tried as adults in D.C. from 16 to 14 years old for certain crimes. If a crime is committed, a person should be held accountable. We all can agree on this. A 14-year-old is not an adult. They are middle schoolers. Their brains are still developing. Treating them as adults is shameful.

We can all agree that children should be treated differently by our courts. That matters when it comes to accountability and rehabilitation. Here is what the research shows.

Youth charged as adults are more likely to reoffend than youth that go through the juvenile courts. That is not speculation. It is what decades of data show.

The CDC reviewed the evidence and found that sending kids to adult prisons increases violence and does not reduce it. The National Research Council concluded that keeping punishment in line with age is the best way to prevent future offending. Every shred of research says the same thing. Putting kids in adult prison makes us less safe, not more safe.

House Democrats know that violent crime, of course, has no place in our communities. People are right to be concerned about crime. Democrats are taking it seriously. If the goal is safer communities, this bill moves us in the wrong direction.

Mr. Speaker, let's also talk about who this bill impacts. More than 93 percent of youth arrests in D.C. in the first half of this year were Black youth. D.C. already has the highest youth incarceration rate in the country. It is more than three times the national average. This bill would take those discrepancies and make them worse, funneling even more children into the adult system.

The bottom line is simple. The legislation in front of us would not make us safer. It does not make D.C. safer. It makes D.C. less safe. It will deepen ra-

cial disparities. It will push more kids into adult prisons where they are more likely to come out worse off than they were and not better. If we care about public safety, the last thing we should do is put 14-year-olds in adult prison.

Instead of taking power away from D.C. residents and our elected officials, Congress should focus on real national priorities like addressing gun violence that threatens communities, threatens schools, and threatens our cities every single day.

Finally, the rules in front of us have been created through the incredible work of the community, through hearings, through meetings, and through public testimony. Let's not all throw it out now. This bill is not about making D.C. safer.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “no,” and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GILL), the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. GILL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Washington, D.C., is the Capital of the United States. It should reflect the glory, the beauty, and the grandeur of the most powerful civilization that has ever existed on the face of the Earth.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, that is not the case under Democrat rule. Under Democrat rule, especially in our Nation's Capital, we are forced to live under the cloud of anarcho-tyranny where criminals roam free and law-abiding families live in fear.

Mr. Speaker, under President Trump's leadership, Republicans are restoring law and order to cities that have been virtually abandoned by the left. That is why I introduced the District of Columbia Juvenile Sentencing Reform Act. It will make sure violent criminals are treated like violent criminals, no matter what their age.

Mr. Speaker, in 2021, Uber Eats driver Mohammad Anwar was murdered in D.C. during a carjacking by two teenage girls. One of the criminals was 15 years old. She was convicted of felony murder, and she was given a maximum sentence under D.C. law. She will be free when she turns 21 years old. That is 6 years for murder. That is 6 years for taking a father away from his family. This bill ensures that that travesty of justice never happens again.

Mr. Speaker, the reality of crime in D.C. is bleak. D.C.'s homicide rate in 2024 was 27.3 per 100,000. That is the fourth highest in our Nation. The first 6 months of 2025 alone, juveniles in D.C. were arrested 900 times. Many of those arrests were for repeat violent offenders. Around 200 juveniles arrested for violent crimes in 2024 had prior violent crime arrests.

Mr. Speaker, this isn't rehabilitation. This is a revolving door of crime that the left has created in this city. Meanwhile, the D.C. Council passed reforms to weaken policing and reduce penalties for carjacking and robbery. As a matter of policy, they are choosing criminals over innocent Americans.

Mr. Speaker, we hear from the other side of the aisle that locking up criminals by some weird and bizarre logic increases crime. The reality, which we all know because it is self-evident, is that when a criminal is in jail, by definition, they are not committing crimes on our streets and not terrorizing innocent Americans.

We are told that if we care about public safety, we shouldn't put criminals in prison. Mr. Speaker, this is insane. They know it. The American people know it.

If we want to live in a law-abiding society, we have to get these violent and ruthless offenders off of our streets. That is what Republicans are doing, and that is what Democrats on the other side of the aisle are fighting right now.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation lowers the age for transfer to adult court from 16 to 14 for the most heinous crimes. We are talking about murder, first-degree sexual assault, armed robbery, and burglary.

It expands the cases that can be tried by the U.S. Attorney's Office, ensuring that woke, weird prosecutors like D.C. Attorney General Brian Schwalb can't let violent offenders slip through the cracks. It sends a simple message: Democrats may tolerate crime, but Republicans do not.

Mr. Speaker, every American should be able to walk down our streets without fear of being murdered or raped or having their car broken into. Every parent should be able to put their child to bed without wondering if their home is going to be broken into.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FONG). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GILL of Texas. This bill restores order and common sense to the laws of our Nation's Capital. The American people and every visitor in D.C., as well, deserve nothing less.

Mr. GARCIA of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose this undemocratic and paternalistic bill which amends D.C. law. The over 700,000 D.C. residents, the majority of whom are Black and Brown, are capable and worthy of governing themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters opposing this bill from D.C. Mayor Muriel Bowser, the entire D.C. Council, and D.C. Attorney General Brian Schwalb.

September 10, 2025.

Hon. JAMES COMER,
Chairman, House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Washington, DC.

Hon. ROBERT GARCIA,
Ranking Member, House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN COMER AND RANKING MEMBER GARCIA: As Mayor and Chief Executive

Officer of the District of Columbia, I am proud of the work we have accomplished to invest in our people, strengthen our neighborhoods, and drive down crime. Building on this progress, my Administration established the Safe and Beautiful Emergency Operations Center to coordinate public safety and beautification efforts as the presidential emergency declaration ends. This structure ensures that DC will remain proactive—bringing together local and federal partners to sustain momentum on reducing crime and improving quality of life for every resident.

We have worked collaboratively with this Committee on shared priorities, including public safety, the federal Return to Work, implementing a DC budget Fiscal Year 2025 fix (which is still pending in the House) and revitalizing the RFK campus; but I write now to ask you to reject 13 of the DC bills before you today that encroach on DC's Home Rule:

Bills like H.R. 5183, the District of Columbia Home Rule Improvement Act, make the District less efficient, competitive, and responsive to the needs of a highly complex unique local government that serves local, county and state functions. Bogging down legislative and executive action only adds costs and uncertainty, making it more difficult to handle the economic headwinds and growth opportunities ahead.

Bills like H.R. 5214, the District of Columbia Cash Bail Reform Act, make DC less safe. Replacing our very effective pre-trial detention regime, which focuses on charged violent offenses and repeat violent offenders, not just on cash bail. I credit recent changes to our laws related to pre-trial detention for helping to drive down violent crime in the last two years.

And the bills to abolish the Judicial Nominations Commission and to convert the elected DC Attorney General to a Presidentially appointed legal officer for the District are both less democratic and untenable for District operations. The Judicial Nominations Commission, with seven members appointed by the Mayor, DC Council, President, US District Court for DC, and the DC Bar, works. As recently as last month, President Trump nominated three federal judicial nominees who were selected from the Commission's candidate pool—a process that demonstrates the value of maintaining local input. DC residents also voted to elect an Attorney General who represents the public interest. Changes to these charter agencies would significantly undercut the already thin ties to autonomy that limited home rule provides.

Finally, I urge you not to end our three-part education funding SOAR Act. I have long supported the program to expand opportunity for DC students. However, my support has always been contingent on parity among all three education sectors—public, private, and charter—and this approach is working. We will not support changes that tip the scales away from this core principle of fairness for DC families. As the fastest improving urban school system, DC has become a model for urban education. We outpace the national average on all tested subject areas. We boast free, full-day Pre-K access serving more than 13,200 young learners—an investment which supports our children and our workforce. DC ranked top of the nation in parental satisfaction regarding school choice. Mayoral control, council oversight, and deep, targeted investments in our students, teachers, and buildings made these remarkable achievements possible.

I look forward to continuing a productive partnership with the Committee—one that respects the will of DC residents and honors the principles of home rule. Together, we can build on our successes while protecting the

autonomy that, as history reflects, has made our city stronger.

Sincerely,

MURIEL BOWSER,
Mayor.

COUNCIL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, DC, September 8, 2025.

Hon. JAMES COMER,
Chair, House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Washington, DC.
Hon. ROBERT GARCIA,
Ranking Member, House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN COMER AND RANKING MEMBER GARCIA: The Council of the District of Columbia is aware that the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform is planning to mark up more than a dozen proposed measures that would severely and negatively impact the operations, public safety, and autonomy of the District of Columbia. We ask that you oppose these measures in full, save one, H.R. 2693, District of Columbia Electronic Transmittal of Legislation Act. While we have not seen the final text of this legislation, the public summary of H.R. 2693 is consistent with the long held request by the District of Columbia to allow the ability to electronically transfer legislative acts to Congress, rather than only allowing physical copies be transferred. The challenge and barriers created by this current requirement were clearly exposed during both the recent COVID pandemic restrictions as well as the Capitol campus restrictions following the January 6, 2021 attacks on the Capitol.

The other 13 measures that have been shared with us would do direct and serious harm to the District of Columbia and we urge you to reject these measures completely. These bills represent an unprecedented attack on the autonomy and home rule of our local government and the more than 700,000 Americans that call it home. The breadth of these bills is remarkable, and if passed, would result in an erosion of accountability and public safety for the District of Columbia. They range from eliminating and replacing our elected and accountable Attorney General for the District of Columbia with a President's hand-picked and unaccountable associate requiring no confirmation by the U.S. Senate and no local ties, to a full repeal of multiple local DC laws that have been in place for many years, if not decades, that are tested, proven, and effective components of our public safety infrastructure and ecosystem. The effect of these Congressional repeals would put our legal and Court system into chaos and directly undermine successful tools that focus on serious accountability and effective rehabilitation when a crime occurs. As always, when revisions or amendments to DC laws are necessary, those changes should only take place within our local legislature which has the best capacity to provide effective oversight and accountable actions for the residents of the District of Columbia.

We respectfully request that all members of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and all members of Congress, reject these harmful measures whether in committee mark up or before the full House of Representatives. Given the breadth of the multiple measures before you, we also request an opportunity to provide a more in-depth discussion of each bill before the Committee's mark-up, especially in light that the Committee will not hold public hearings on these measures.

Sincerely,
Chairman Phil Mendelson; Councilmember Anita Bonds, At-Large; Councilmember Robert White, Jr., At-Large; Councilmember

Brook Pinto, Ward 2; Councilmember Janeese Lewis George, Ward 4; Councilmember Charles Allen, Ward 6; Councilmember Trayon White, Sr., Ward 8; Councilmember Kenyan McDuffie, At-Large; Councilmember Christina Henderson, At-Large; Councilmember Brianne Nadeau, Ward 1; Councilmember Matthew Frumin, Ward 3; Councilmember Zachary Parker, Ward 5; Councilmember Wendell Felder, Ward 7.

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,

Washington, DC, September 9, 2025.

Hon. JAMES COMER,
Chairman, House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Washington, DC.
Hon. ROBERT GARCIA,
Ranking Member, House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN COMER AND RANKING MEMBER GARCIA: The House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform is scheduled to markup fourteen bills tomorrow related to the operations of the District of Columbia. With the exception of H.R. 2693, the District of Columbia Electronic Transmittal Act, I write in strong opposition to these bills. They address inherently local issues and laws that were passed after careful consideration by the District's elected representatives, who are directly accountable to District residents. Members of this very Committee have long advocated for the principles of federalism on which this nation was founded. They have consistently condemned federal overreach and fought forcefully and convincingly for the uniquely American values of local control, freedom, and self-governance. These principles should apply to the more than 700,000 people who call Washington, DC home, just as they do for your constituents across the country.

I specifically want to call attention to the significant incursion on local self-governance reflected in two bills, the District of Columbia Attorney General Appointment Reform Act and the District of Columbia Judicial Nominations Reform Act. Both laws would displace the ability of District residents to have a voice in the selection of local leaders who wield significant power over local judicial matters: the judges on our local courts and the Attorney General for the District. The judges on the DC Court of Appeals and DC Superior Court rule on inherently local matters such as criminal prosecutions, landlord-tenant cases, probate proceedings, civil cases, and divorce proceedings, all of which have profoundly important impact on our community. For more than 50 years, the Judicial Nomination Commission (JNC) has successfully allowed DC residents to have a voice in judicial appointments, while also granting the President and Senate a role in confirming our judges. I urge the Committee not to overturn that well-established process.

The DC Attorney General, as the District's chief law officer, is also responsible for local legal issues, namely, protecting the District and its residents in a wide range of matters, such as enforcing child support laws, handling abuse and neglect proceedings in the child welfare system, enforcing our housing code, and defending District agencies and officers when they are sued. In no other place in the United States are such local issues determined by a federally appointed person with no local accountability. The proposed legislation would be especially undemocratic in light of the fact that, in 2010, an overwhelming majority of District voters (76 percent) exercised their right to amend the District Charter to make the DC Attorney Gen-

eral an independent, elected office, rather than a position appointed by and subordinate to the Mayor. With that vote, District residents clearly expressed their desire that the Attorney General should be independent and accountable to them. The pending bill would displace that choice in favor of installing an Attorney General accountable not to District residents, but to the President. Given that the U.S. Attorney for the District is already appointed by the President, if passed, this bill would concentrate all criminal and civil litigation authority in the President, divesting the District and its residents of any local control over these essential functions.

No one knows or cares more about keeping DC safe than DC residents who work, live and raise their families here. Our democratically elected officials work closely with local law enforcement, policy experts, and community leadership to pass laws that are in the best interests of all Washingtonians. Substituting the will of DC voters with the whim of federal politicians is undemocratic and un-American.

I urge you to reject these measures and uphold the values Congress sought to advance more than 50 years ago when it passed the District of Columbia Home Rule Act: that District residents should enjoy the "powers of local self-government" that all other Americans enjoy. See DC Code § 1-201.02.

Respectfully submitted,

BRIAN L. SCHWALB,
Attorney General for the District of Columbia.

Ms. NORTON. While Congress has authority to legislate on local D.C. matters, it does not have a duty to do so. It is a choice.

In Federalist 43, James Madison said of D.C. residents: ". . . as a municipal legislature for local purposes, derived from their own suffrages, will, of course, be allowed them."

Since 1802, Congress has established various types of local government for D.C. In 1953, the Supreme Court held: ". . . there is no constitutional barrier to the delegation by Congress to the District of Columbia of full legislative power."

The local D.C. Legislature, the Council, has 13 members. If D.C. residents do not like how members vote, residents can vote them out of office or pass a ballot measure. That is called democracy.

Congress has 535 voting Members. None are elected by D.C. residents. If D.C. residents do not like how Members vote on local D.C. matters, residents cannot vote them out of office or pass a ballot measure.

□ 1550

That is the antithesis of democracy.

The substance of this bill is irrelevant, since there is never justification for Congress to legislate on local D.C. matters. Nevertheless, I will discuss it.

I strongly oppose charging 14-year-olds as adults. However, whether to amend D.C. law to reduce or increase the minimum age a minor can be charged as an adult should be a decision for D.C. alone.

In a series of cases since 2005, the Supreme Court has recognized that children are "constitutionally different from adults for purposes of sentencing."

In these cases, the court noted that childhood is marked by "rashness, proclivity for risk, and inability to assess consequences." The court said its decisions "rested not only on common sense—on what any parent knows—but on science and social science as well."

This bill is not only cruel, but counterproductive too. Most incarcerated people return home. The evidence shows that a minor charged as an adult is more likely to reoffend and be violent after release than a minor charged as a juvenile.

D.C. residents have all the obligations of American citizenship, including paying Federal taxes, serving on juries, and registering with the Selective Service, yet Congress denies them full local self-government and voting representation in Congress.

The only solution to this undemocratic treatment is to grant D.C. statehood.

Mr. Speaker, I enter into the RECORD a letter explaining why the D.C. statehood bill is constitutional from leading constitutional scholars, including Larry Tribe.

MAY 22, 2021.

Re Washington, D.C. Admission Act, H.R. 51 and S.51 (the "D.C. Admission Act")

Hon. NANCY P. PELOSI,
Speaker of the House,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. KEVIN O. McCARTHY,
Minority Leader,
U.S. House, Washington, DC.
Hon. CHARLES E. SCHUMER,
Majority Leader,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Minority Leader,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSIONAL LEADERS: As scholars of the United States Constitution, we write to correct claims that the D.C. Admission Act is vulnerable to a constitutional challenge in the courts. For the reasons set forth below, there is no constitutional barrier to the State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth (the "Commonwealth") entering the Union through a congressional joint resolution, pursuant to the Constitution's Admissions Clause, just like the 37 other states that have been admitted since the Constitution was adopted. Furthermore, Congress's exercise of its express constitutional authority to decide to admit a new state is a classic political question, which courts are highly unlikely to interfere with, let alone attempt to bar.

The D.C. Admission Act. The House passed the Act, as H.R. 51, on April 22, 2021, and as of this writing, the substantively identical companion bill (S.51) is under consideration by the Senate. The Act provides for the issuance of a congressional joint resolution declaring the admittance as a State of most of the territory currently comprising the District of Columbia, while the seat of government (defined as the "Capital") will fall outside of the boundaries of the new State and remain under federal jurisdiction. The Act also repeals the provision of federal law that establishes the current mechanism for District residents to participate in presidential elections, pursuant to Congress's authority under the Twenty-Third Amendment; and provides for expedited consideration of the repeal of that Amendment.

The Admissions Clause grants Congress constitutional authority to admit the Commonwealth into the Union. The starting

point for a constitutional analysis of the Act is the Constitution's Admissions Clause (Art. IV, Sect. 3), which provides that "New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union." The Clause "vests in Congress the essential and discretionary authority to admit new states into the Union by whatever means it considers appropriate as long as such means are framed within its vested powers." Every State admitted into the Union since the Constitution was adopted has been admitted by congressional action pursuant to this Clause; no State has been admitted pursuant to a constitutional amendment.

The Supreme Court has broadly construed Congress's assigned power to admit new states and has never interfered with Congress's admission of a state, even when potentially legitimate constitutional objections existed. For example, in 1863, Congress admitted into the Union West Virginia, which had been part of the State of Virginia, in potential violation of a provision of the Admissions Clause that bars the formation of a new State out of a portion of the territory of another State without the consent of the ceding State. The Supreme Court, however, did not bar West Virginia's admission; to the contrary, it later tacitly approved of it.

Some critics of the D.C. Admission Act have suggested that Maryland's consent might be required under the foregoing provision of the Admissions Clause. This objection mistakenly presupposes that Maryland retains a reversionary interest in the territory currently composing the District of Columbia, which Maryland ceded to the federal government when the District was established in 1791. In fact, Maryland expressly relinquished all sovereign authority over the territory at issue when the federal government accepted it. The express terms of the cession state that the territory was "for ever ceded and relinquished to the congress and government of the United States, in full and absolute right, and exclusive jurisdiction . . ." As Viet D. Dinh, who served as an Assistant Attorney General during the presidency of George W. Bush, has explained, because Maryland's cession of the territory now constituting the District was full and complete, it severed D.C. residents' now far distant "political link with" Maryland. The current District is not part of Maryland, and Maryland has no claim on any portion of the District's territory. There is accordingly no basis to require Maryland's consent for the establishment of the new State.

The Constitution's District Clause poses no barrier to admitting the Commonwealth into the Union. The Constitution's District Clause grants Congress power to "exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the Acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States." Based on this Clause, Congress established the current District of Columbia, which (as explained) was taken from territory ceded by Maryland, as well as Virginia.

The D.C. Admission Act complies with the District Clause because it provides that the Capital—which is defined in the Act to include (among other things) the White House, the Capitol Building, the United States Supreme Court Building, and the Federal executive, legislative, and judicial office buildings located adjacent to the Mall—will not become part of the new State and will remain under the sovereignty of the federal government.

Some critics have argued that the District Clause somehow mandates that the District of Columbia permanently retain all of its

current territory, and that its size may neither be increased or reduced by Congress. The plain language of the District Clause says no such thing; it does not mandate that the District be any size or shape, except it limits the maximum size of the federal enclave to ten square miles.

Historical practice confirms that Congress can change the size of the District. In 1791 Congress altered the District's southern boundary to encompass portions of what are now Alexandria, Virginia and Anacostia. Then, in 1846, Congress retroceded Alexandria and its environs back to Virginia. As a result, the territory composing the District was reduced by a third.

At the time of the 1846 retrocession, the House's Committee on the District of Columbia considered, and rejected, the very argument that critics of the D.C. Admission Act are raising today, reasoning that the "true construction of [the District Clause] would seem to be solely that Congress retain and exercise exclusive jurisdiction" over territory comprising the "seat of government." The language of the District Clause, the legislators observed, places no mandate on the size, or even the location, of that seat of government, other than preventing the government from "hold[ing] more than ten miles for this purpose." The House's judgment was correct in 1846, and remains so today.

The Twenty-Third Amendment does not prevent Congress from granting the Commonwealth statehood. Opponents of statehood have suggested that the Twenty-Third Amendment bars Congress from exercising its constitutionally enumerated authority to grant statehood to the Commonwealth. In fact, the Amendment poses no barrier to the admission of the Commonwealth into the Union through an act of Congress, in accordance with the plain language of the Admissions Clause, just as Congress has done in connection with the admission of several other States, including most recently Alaska and Hawaii.

Section 1 of the Twenty-Third Amendment, which was ratified in 1961, provides:

The District constituting the seat of Government of the United States shall appoint in such manner as the Congress may direct: A number of electors of President and Vice President equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives in Congress to which the District would be entitled if it were a State, but in no event more than the least populous State; they shall be in addition to those appointed by the States, but they shall be considered, for the purposes of the election of President and Vice President, to be electors appointed by a State.

By its plain terms, the Amendment poses no barrier to Congress's admission of the Commonwealth into the Union. Indeed, it is entirely silent on the matter.

The only question raised by the existence of the Twenty-Third Amendment is a practical, not a constitutional one: How best to address the Twenty-Third Amendment's provision for the assignment of presidential electors to what will become a vestigial seat of government, with virtually no residents? The Act satisfactorily addresses this question by providing for the repeal of the provision of federal law that establishes the current mechanism for District residents to participate in presidential elections, pursuant to Congress's authority under the Twenty-Third Amendment, as well as by commencing the process for repealing the Amendment itself.

Initially, the Act provides for an expedited process for repeal of the Twenty-Third Amendment, a process that should move forward to ratification swiftly and successfully once the Commonwealth is admitted as a State. None of the other 50 States has reason

to seek to retain three electors for a largely unoccupied seat of government.

But the Act also addresses the possibility that the Twenty-Third Amendment is not promptly repealed by mandating the immediate repeal of the provision of federal law that provides the current mechanism for District residents to participate in federal elections.

In 1961, following the adoption of the Twenty-Third Amendment, Congress exercised its enforcement authority by enacting legislation (codified at 3 U.S.C. § 21), providing that the District residents may select presidential electors; the votes of the electors are currently awarded to the ticket prevailing in the District's presidential election.

The existing statutes fall within the broad authority granted to Congress by the Twenty-Third Amendment to define the terms of, and effectuate, the District's participation in presidential elections. The Amendment allows for the appointment of a number of Electors "in such manner as the Congress may direct." The Amendment also allows Congress to select the number of Electors the District may receive, subject only to a maximum: The District may participate in the presidential Electoral College through the appointment of no more electors than those of the smallest State, i.e., three. And section 2 of the Amendment grants Congress the power to "enforce" the provision "by appropriate legislation," as it did in 1961.

But once Congress acts again, pursuant to its express grant of constitutional authority, and repeals the legislation that creates the existing procedure for District residents to select presidential electors, that will remove the legislative provision providing for the District's participation in presidential elections. Without such a provision, there is no mechanism for identifying the Capital area's electors or allocating their votes.

Some scholars have questioned whether that approach is satisfactory. They contend that the Twenty-Third Amendment is self-enforcing, and effectively mandates the appointment of electors on behalf of the District of Columbia, regardless of whether such appointment is called for under a federal statute. Some of us disagree; indeed, the very existence of Section 2 of the Amendment makes clear that enabling legislation is required to effectuate the District's participation in the presidential election process. And Congress's 1961 enforcement legislation supports this interpretation.

Even if this self-enforcement argument were to be accepted, however, Congress could easily address it by replacing the current law mandating that the Capital area's electors vote in accordance with the outcome of the popular vote in the District with a new legislative mandate that the Capital area's electors vote in other ways. For example, Congress could require District electors to vote in favor of the presidential ticket that receives the most Electoral College votes (of the remaining 538 electors). Or, alternatively, Congress could require that District electors vote for the winner of the national popular vote winner.

A recent Supreme Court decision confirms that a legislative directive to the Capital area's electors would be enforceable. The Twenty-Third Amendment provides that the District "shall appoint" electors "in such manner as Congress may direct"; this language is a direct parallel to the Constitution's grant of broad authority to each of the States to appoint and instruct their respective electors. In its recent decision in *Chiafalo v. Washington*, the Supreme Court held that electors do not have discretion to decide how to cast their Electoral College votes, but rather are legally bound to follow

the instructions given by their respective states.

As Columbia Law School Professors Jessica Bulman-Pozen and Olatunde Johnson have observed, it follows from the Court's holding in *Chiafalo* that Congress could legally bind any electors to vote in accordance with the overall vote of the Electoral College or the national popular vote, just as the existing enabling statute currently binds them to vote in the Electoral College in accordance with the outcome of the popular vote in the District.

In sum, none of the critics' constitutional objections to the D.C. Admission Act are meritorious; and the contention that a constitutional amendment is required to admit the Commonwealth into the Union is incorrect. The D.C. Admission Act calls for a proper exercise of Congress' express authority under the Constitution to admit new states, a power that it has exercised 37 other times since the Constitution was adopted.

Courts are unlikely to second-guess Congress's exercise of its constitutional authority to admit the Commonwealth into the Union. Apart from the fact that the legal objections to admission of the Commonwealth as a State are without merit, it is also unlikely that the courts will ever consider those objections. As Mr. Dinh has observed, the decision whether to admit a state into the Union is a paradigmatic political question that the Constitution expressly and exclusively assigns to Congress. The Supreme Court has long, and strenuously, avoided adjudicating disputes respecting matters that the Constitution makes the sole responsibility of the coordinate, elected branches.

The remaining objections to Statehood do not concern applicable constitutional law, but rather matters of policy.

For example, some have argued that the District should not be admitted to the Union because it is a single city and have instead proposed that most of the District's territory be retrocessioned to Maryland. There is, however, no constitutional barrier to a large, diverse city, with a population comparable to that of several existing States, joining the Union. Furthermore, the Maryland retrocession proposal is subject to many of the same supposed constitutional objections raised by those who object to statehood for the District. For example, retroceding the District to Maryland would decrease the size of the remaining federal enclave, which objectors to District Statehood have claimed is constitutionally impermissible. A forced merger of the District and Maryland would also do nothing to address the purported constitutional objection to leaving the residual seat of government with three potential electors, pursuant to the terms of the Twenty-Third Amendment, prior to the Amendment's repeal.

Opponents also argue that Congress should not grant the District statehood because it will lead to a lawsuit. But any court challenge will be without merit, and indeed likely will be dismissed as presenting a political question. We respectfully submit that Congress should not avoid exercising its express constitutional authority to admit the Commonwealth into the Union because of meritless threats of litigation.

Sincerely yours,

Caroline Fredrickson, Georgetown University Law Center; Erwin Chemerinsky, University of California, Berkeley School of Law; Stephen I. Vladeck, University of Texas Law School; Franita Tolson, University of Southern California, Gould School of Law; Jessica Bulman-Pozen, Columbia Law School; Leah Litman, University of Michigan Law School; Laurence H. Tribe, Harvard Law School; Paul Smith, Georgetown University Law Center; Geoffrey R. Stone, Uni-

versity of Chicago Law School; Peter Edelman, Georgetown University Law Center.

Kermit Roosevelt, University of Pennsylvania Carey Law School; Eric Segall, Georgia State College of Law; Trevor Potter, Campaign Legal Center; Gregory P. Downs, University of California, Davis; Larry Sabato, University of Virginia; Aziz Huq, University of Chicago Law School; Jennifer Hochschild, Harvard University; Neil S. Siegel, Duke University School of Law; Beau Breslin, Skidmore College; David C. Vladeck, Georgetown University Law Center; Sanford Levinson, University of Texas at Austin School of Law; Ira C. Lupu, George Washington University Law School; Peter M. Shane, Ohio State University Moritz College of Law; Ira P. Robbins, American University Washington College of Law; Michael Greenberger, University of Maryland Francis King Carey School of Law.

David Pozen, Columbia Law School; Mark Tushnet, Harvard Law School; Michael C. Dorf, Cornell Law School; Miguel Schor, Drake University School of Law; David S. Schwartz, University of Wisconsin Law School; Caroline Mala Corbin, University of Miami School of Law; Jonathan Askin, Brooklyn Law School; Aziz Rana, Cornell Law School; John Mikhail, Georgetown University Law Center; Richard Ford, Stanford Law School; Richard Primus, University of Michigan Law School; Joseph Fishkin, University of Texas Law School; Kate Masur, Northwestern University; Chris Edelson, American University.

Ms. NORTON. The D.C. statehood bill, H.R. 51, the Washington, D.C. Admission Act, grants D.C. residents full local self-government and voting representation in Congress. H.R. 51 reduces the size of the Federal District from 68 square miles to 2 square miles, consisting of the White House, the Capitol, the Supreme Court, and the National Mall and remaining under the control of Congress.

The new State consists of the residential and commercial areas of D.C. The new State has a larger population than two States, pays more Federal taxes per capita than any State, and pays more total Federal taxes than 21 States.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to vote "no" on H.R. 5140, keep their hands off D.C. and free D.C.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, we have debated these bills in a sincere effort to work with the President of the United States to lower crime in D.C. We have heard nothing from the Democrats other than there is no crime problem in D.C., and that a solution is to make Washington, D.C., a State.

We are serious about lowering crime. We applaud the efforts of the President of the United States. We will continue to work with him to make our Capital City as safe as possible. I appreciate BRANDON GILL, the sponsor of the bill, and BYRON DONALDS for sponsoring the last bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARCIA of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY).

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member GARCIA for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this legislation. This bill seeks to create 14-year-old prisoners in the adult criminal legal system. We know this approach doesn't improve public safety. It only traumatizes our babies. History tells us as much.

Antron McCray, 15 years old;
Yusef Salaam, 15 years old;
Raymond Santana, 14 years old;
Korey Wise, 16 years old; and
Kevin Richardson, 14 years old.

These five boys with big smiles and bright futures ahead of them went on to experience fear and manipulation that no child should. They were threatened, harassed, coerced, abused, and tried as adults, the very harm that this Republican bill would expand.

From the moment of their arrest these teenage boys, these Black boys, were treated as guilty of a horrific crime in Central Park, despite being innocent of all accusations. It was part of the hyper-punitive culture that prioritized political talking points about being tough on crime and targeted Black and Brown communities rather than investing in resources and policies that actually keep us all safe.

Does this sound familiar, Mr. Speaker?

During their trial, there was a PR campaign against the boys on TV and in newspapers. Donald J. Trump himself spent the equivalent of more than \$200,000 advocating for them to get the death penalty.

These five Black and Brown children were innocent, but Trump wanted them killed. To this day, he has not even apologized, and Republicans in Congress are supporting him and his bigotry with this bill.

The story of the "Exonerated Five" is a tragedy and part of our shared history, but Republicans want it to be the future.

First, their rhetoric demonized their communities. Then they began weaponizing National Guard against citizens. Now they are changing laws to incarcerate more people at an even younger age. Of course, the prison industrial complex will reap the profits.

What Republicans do in D.C., they want to apply to the entire country.

This Republican bill perpetuates racism. The Department of Justice statistics show that Black kids are twice as likely to be incarcerated compared to White kids, despite committing crimes at the same rate.

This Republican bill is flawed. By treating children as adults, Mr. Speaker, you deny them protections from abuse from adults in prison, including bullying, physical violence, sexual assault, and rape.

This Republican bill makes children's lives worse. Unlike in other States, when kids in D.C. are treated as adults, the Bureau of Prisons ships them hundreds of miles away from their family and loved ones to places like South Dakota or Texas. This makes rehabilitation harder and increases the likelihood of recidivism.

Don't just take my word for it, Mr. Speaker. There is a large coalition opposing this bill.

Scientists tell us that young people's brains are not fully developed until their twenties. They don't share the same culpability for their actions as adults when they are only 14 years old.

Lawyers explain that children treated as adults, even when they are innocent, are denied age-appropriate legal protections for the rest of their lives.

Sociologists find that children who commit crimes are overwhelmingly influenced by adults and their surroundings, not their own thinking.

Of course, the people of D.C. did not vote for Trump or any Republican for that matter to be a city councilor.

Republicans are supporting this legislation not because they care about public safety. If Republicans cared about reducing crime, then they would tell Trump to stop delaying funding for community violence prevention programs that already were passed with bipartisan support.

If Republicans cared about victims, then they would stop making cuts to the crime victims fund so that people who experience harm get the help that they need.

If Republicans cared about our kids, then they would invest in restorative justice programs that teach children how to resolve their conflicts without violence.

If Republicans cared about our kids, then they would support commonsense legislation to prevent school shootings.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill to keep our babies safe from trauma, abuse, and fear.

In the words of James Baldwin, "The children are always ours, every single one."

I challenge you, Mr. Speaker, to protect them all.

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

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time that I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, that is a perfect example of the difference in the two sides on how to handle crime in D.C.

You have to hold people accountable for crimes, Mr. Speaker. If you don't, then they will continue to commit crimes. That is what we have here in Washington, D.C. That is why we are here today. That is why we are here today.

Just coddling criminals, hiring therapists, hiring more social workers, and creating more government programs have failed to work in Washington, D.C., and many of the cities around the United States.

We have a President who is going to be tough on crime and tough on criminals. That is what the theme of this legislation is, Mr. Speaker. That is our way to reduce crime in Washington, D.C.

Their way hasn't worked. We are going to do it our way if we get the support in the Chamber today.

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

□ 1600

Mr. GARCIA of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I remind our Republican colleagues that crime in D.C. over the last few years has actually been going down. Quite frankly, the idea that we are now going to put middle schoolers in prison—this should be called the middle schoolers for prison act—is inhumane and shameful.

We can all agree that crime should be taken on, that D.C. and other cities we want to make safer, but this idea that we are going to penalize children in middle school at the age of 14 and put them in prison is irresponsible and, quite frankly, it is un-American.

I remind my colleagues that at this moment, what we are doing right now, is stripping 700,000 residents who have come together in D.C. to create laws, to bring community together, to fight for statehood and representation, we are going to strip them from their ability to manage their own city.

These efforts do nothing to reduce crime or improve public safety. Once again, I know that the President is obsessed with Washington, D.C. He is obsessed with its local laws. I ask him once again that he should step down as President and run for mayor if he is so interested. Let's not put 14-year-olds in prison.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose passage of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Again, we are talking about violent crimes, violent crimes. What we have seen in Washington, D.C., is an out-break of juvenile crime because the definition of juvenile in this city is 7 years higher than every other city in America.

With this legislation, we are talking about addressing issues of violent crime with juveniles. I think, Mr. Speaker, this is the path to try to get the crime under control in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation to ensure that violent crime, including murder and first degree sexual abuse, are taken seriously in the District of Columbia.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 707, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

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

Mr. GARCIA of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1630

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WEBER of Texas) at 4 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Passage of H.R. 4922; and
Passage of H.R. 5140.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

DC CRIMINAL REFORMS TO IMMEDIATELY MAKE EVERYONE SAFE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on passage of the bill (H.R. 4922) to limit youth offender status in the District of Columbia to individuals 18 years of age or younger, to direct the Attorney General of the District of Columbia to establish and operate a publicly accessible website containing updated statistics on juvenile crime in the District of Columbia, to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to prohibit the Council of the District of Columbia from enacting changes to existing criminal liability sentences, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 240, nays 179, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 270]

YEAS—240

Aderholt	Arrington	Baird
Alford	Auchincloss	Balderson
Allen	Babin	Barr
Amodei (NV)	Bacon	Barrett

part, thinking the borough would eventually be connected to the Bald Eagle and Spring Creek branch of the Pennsylvania Canal, though it was never realized.

Nestled in the Bald Eagle Valley between Tyrone and State College, the borough is a glimpse into small town America. Its most famous landmark from the 1800s, the Port Matilda Hotel & Tavern, is still in business today.

In the late 19th century, Port Matilda was a working village of mills and shops. In the 20th century, the borough's industrial base was anchored by the McFeely Brick Company, a major employer until its closure in 1959. Across nearly two centuries, Port Matilda has flourished as a crossroads town with a rich history.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Port Matilda on this milestone occasion.

SERVICING THE RIGHT TO BREATHE CLEAN, SAFE AIR

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

Ms. DEXTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share some good news and a step forward in protecting those who protect us.

For generations, wildland firefighters have battled infernos with little more than a bandana between them and the clouds of toxic smoke.

As the only pulmonologist serving in the United States Congress, I know just how dangerous that is. Exposure to wildfire smoke isn't just uncomfortable. It leads to heart and lung disease. It causes cancer. It shortens lives.

That is why, during a recent House Natural Resources Committee hearing, I pressed the U.S. Forest Service chief to do more to protect our firefighters. Within hours, the Forest Service made clear that masks would be made available to wildland firefighters.

This is welcomed news, but we cannot let up now. I look forward to my briefing with Forest Service Chief Schultz to further these protections for our firefighters. The right to breathe clean, safe air, whether you are battling a megafire or walking your child to school, is fundamental.

It is time for every Member of this body to recommit to that goal and take action to make it real.

THE FIGHT FOR WESTERN CIVILIZATION

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

Mr. HARRIS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Western civilization is under siege.

Violent criminals roam free. Foreigners who hate this country are infiltrating our universities, and, worst of all, innocent people are silenced or even killed for their beliefs.

In recent weeks, tragedies in North Carolina and Utah shook our country to its core. Mr. Speaker, 23-year-old Iryna Zarutska was stabbed to death by a repeat offender on a train in Charlotte just outside my district, and 31-year-old Charlie Kirk was assassinated for sharing his ideas and his love for this country.

These tragedies are not isolated incidents but signs of a national epidemic of lawlessness and division that threatens the very fabric of our society. Iryna and Charlie have opened many eyes to the battle being waged against our Nation, but this war isn't just against America. It is an assault against the entire West.

We can't let fear silence us. Their deaths should only fuel our resolve. We must protect the West and all that it represents. Is America ready to stand against those who would threaten this Republic? I hope so, so let's roll.

FED RATES AND STAGFLATION

(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, the Federal Reserve Board meets this week to consider easing interest rates, a move that the President has been urging for months.

Inflation remains stubborn. Consumer prices rose by 2.9 percent in August compared to last year. Job growth is slowing. Unemployment has climbed to 4.3 percent, the highest in 4 years. We are now veering toward stagflation: rising prices and a cooling job market.

No matter what you call it, the reality is clear: American families and small businesses are struggling. The President came into office promising to lower costs and make life more affordable. Instead, he has delivered the opposite with a massive tax and spend bill and a reckless tariff agenda that is driving prices even higher and creating apprehension for employers.

Lower interest rates might offer some short-term relief. Yet, for real, lasting stability, you need a change in course and a change in policies coming from the top.

CONSTITUENT OF THE WEEK: EDIE BROOKS

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

Mr. VINDMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Edie Brooks on being named Teacher of the Year by the Virginia Business Educators Association.

Edie is a business and IT career education teacher at Post Oak Middle School. She was honored for her innovative teaching strategies, unwavering commitment to student success, and active pursuit of professional growth. Through her commitment to education, Edie has left a lasting impact on both her students and colleagues.

Edie's service and devotion to Spotsylvania County Public Schools is truly deserving of this recognition. I am honored to congratulate her on this well-earned moment and recognize her as this week's Constituent of the Week.

I congratulate and thank Edie for all that she does for our young minds.

VIOLENCE NOR SILENCE IS THE ANSWER

(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, violence is never the answer, but neither is silence.

We must reject political violence in all of its forms and push back against all who would seek to stoke further violence, division, and fear amongst us. In fact, the very foundation of our democracy is built on the idea that the voices of our people are our most powerful tool, exercised at the ballot box, the debate podium, and in our communities. That is how we come together as a nation to form a more perfect Union.

Indeed, the very concept of democracy was forged in that crucible, that a government by the people and for the people is exercised through the fellowship of debate.

Let us join in that fellowship to see our fellow Americans as brothers and sisters, as neighbors and friends, even when we disagree. Yet, let this not become a moment to silence debate or silence dissent or silence the truth or those of conscience who work to hold our leaders accountable and right the wrongs of an unjust world. That is how history will remember us: those who stood, those who spoke, and those who fought to protect our democracy and bend the arc of history toward justice.

□ 1730

WE ARE BORROWING \$72,000 A SECOND

(Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, Mr. SCHWEIKERT of Arizona was recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.)

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, for everyone's sanity, I hope not to go 60 minutes. I might go 40.

Mr. Speaker, first, the good news. If anyone else is a geek out there, there is this app put out by the Atlanta Fed, Atlanta Federal Reserve, and what they do is they do certain samples in trying to constantly estimate what the gross national product, GDP, will actually be.

A little while ago, they actually updated it saying the U.S. economy looks like it is running at 3.4 percent.

That is remarkable. If you stop and think about it, this is absolutely—think about all the headwinds and all the things over tariffs and all these

other, the economy actually is surprisingly healthy.

Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons I am up here today and every other week is, our fiscal year ends in a couple weeks and our best estimate is this fiscal year we will have borrowed \$2.4 trillion, maybe \$2.5 trillion. We have one model in our office that says more than \$2.5 trillion. That is like \$70,000, \$72,000 every second of every day we are borrowing.

Let's think of a world where you are borrowing \$70,000 a second, yet the economy is actually fairly decent. What is going on? Is it Republican? Is it Democrat?

It turns out it is the very thing we hate to talk about. It is the cost of interest and the cost of healthcare, and that healthcare is primarily driven because we are unwilling—Mr. Speaker, you are a doctor, if I remember. We are unwilling to have the honest conversation of how we deliver, where we can revolutionize the cost, where we can adopt technology because we are in the incumbent protection business. We protect incumbent bureaucracies and incumbent business models.

If we don't take this seriously, do you think you can have a country that is borrowing \$70,000, \$72,000 every second? Do you think you can keep that going?

Remember, once again, I am going to try to show versions of this. In 7 years, the Medicare trust fund is empty. In 2032, 7 years, halfway through that year, the Medicare trust fund is empty. In 2033, the first full year, our best estimate is that there is about \$140 billion shortfall.

Mr. Speaker, in 7 years, the Social Security trust fund is empty. Meaning, in 2033, if you are going to cover Medicare and Social Security, you are approaching almost \$600 billion. How many of us get behind these microphones and actually talk about things that are truly terrifying?

Are we really going to avoid dealing with our actual jobs? Are we going to allow the doubling of senior poverty in America in 7 years at the same time we are bankrupting much of the medical system?

In 7 years, grandma gets a 24 percent cut in her check and our model says that it will double the poverty of seniors. Yet, often the solution we get is, well, we will just raise taxes.

Okay. The first year of the shortfall—I am rounding up a bit—it is \$600 billion. You really think you are going to do a \$600 billion tax hike.

Here is my battle. I have tried for years and years and said, we need to do a fiscal commission. The fact of the matter is, we have the same number of 18 year olds as we had 20 years ago, but we have double the number of Americans, our brothers and sisters, who are now 65 and up.

Twenty years ago, we had 35 million Americans 65 and up. Now we are at 70 million Americans that are 65 and up, and I think we have another 10, 15 mil-

lion that will be 65 and up in the next few years.

We are incapable of telling the truth. How many of us want to get up in front of our voters back home or put into our newsletter saying, we have a demographic financing crisis? Are we going to do all the things necessary to skyrocket productivity because wages—sorry.

Do you remember your high school economics class? Wages go up by inflation, but that doesn't mean you get anything. You are just treading water. Our wages go up by productivity. Are we going to do the things that are necessary for productivity?

It means Democrats and Republicans need to stop saying things like you can't automate ports. You can't automate this. We don't want to allow that technology. There is a way to make this not be dystopian.

Mr. Speaker, I am so tired of coming behind this microphone. The poor staff here has to be just exhausted, but I am trying not to speak like a machine gun anymore. I am trying to slow down.

Every time I come up here, the numbers are a little bit worse and what is frustrating is, the economy is actually doing fairly well, but it is the scale of the debt because we keep spending and spending and spending.

Let's actually do some of the charts to try to see if I can get this to sink in.

Next year, for every dollar of tax collection, we are going to spend \$1.43.

Let's do that again. For every dollar in tax collection next year, starting in a couple weeks, October 1, we start the new fiscal year. This is for the 2026 fiscal year; we are going to spend \$1.43.

How long is that sustainable? For everyone going in your head, oh, we will just raise taxes. Let's do this again. In the way back machine, like in the beginning of the year, I think I did entire presentations on Democrat tax proposals and what we have talked about in just cuts on the Republican side.

Our best estimate is this fiscal year, which we are finishing in the next couple of weeks, we are going to borrow 7.3 percent of the entire economy. Our borrowing would equal 7.3 percent of the economy.

Every tax hike that we have scored that the Democrats have proposed, capital gains, income tax, corporate taxes, the whole litany, when you do the economic adjustment, it comes in at 1.5 percent, maybe 1.6, but the math is easier, 1.5 percent of the economy. That is what we get for all the tax hikes.

For those of us on the Republican side when we walk through, we can cut this, we can cut this, we can cut this, it is coming in at about 1 percent of the economy.

Anyone see the math problem? I got 2½ percent and that is all you have ever heard behind these microphones, but we are borrowing 7.3 percent of the economy this year.

How many idiots like me will get up behind these microphones and tell you the truth?

Next year, for every dollar of tax collections, we are going to spend \$1.43. Let's say you are the most liberal Member here. Do you have any understanding when this hits the wall, the devastation, the crushing of poor people? How about if you are the most libertarian or free market? Do you understand the crushing of the economic system, which has produced so much prosperity, that will happen when we are in crisis mode? Let's not let it happen.

□ 1740

Let's actually walk through this because this is actually one of my things. We are actually borrowing a little over this. We borrow about \$6.5 billion a day. I always love the debates here: We are going to save \$100 million. Great. Great. We borrow about \$260, \$270 million an hour, so a quarter trillion dollars an hour. We will have debates here that go on for sometimes an hour to save functionally a minute, half a minute. We have had one where it was like 15 seconds of borrowing.

In 9 years, we are over \$10 billion, my math is closer to \$10.5 billion a day. That is just the structural borrowing.

One of the deceiving things is, over the next 10 years, we functionally spend \$70 trillion, and you will get someone who says: Well, you guys voted for this. Well, you guys wanted to tax this. You actually start to help them understand, saying, we are talking fractions of our exposure.

I accept, you don't need to be an accounting major or math major to be a Member of Congress. We make some very pretty charts, though. For anyone who actually gives a darn about what is going on, every single month, the Joint Economic Committee Republicans publish a monthly fiscal update. We have tried to make it as simple as possible to understand, page after page, to show you what the hell is really going on.

One of the things that is incredibly frustrating is we live in a world where so much of what you are going to find on the internet right now isn't true. Let me prove it.

Here is an article I was very disturbed to find out: Complex infection keeps the Pope in hospital. This is Newsweek from a couple days ago. Apparently, the Pope is in the hospital. This is actually a story that was posted September 8, except the small problem is, this Pope has been dead for months.

Welcome to the quality of what we call news anymore. This is Newsweek. They just let their AI generate a story, fill it up. There is no human that bothered to look at it. Yet, you and I have to help our voters. Our constituents call us and say: Is this true? You can't find the story. You ask them if they can send it to you. You think, well, that doesn't make any sense. It is someone who hit a computer button.

What also happens when we actually see stories like: OMB says Trump's economic agenda will cut the deficit in half. I am trying to find the policies.

You start to go over it, and many of these stories are actually someone was giving a speech, and so the AI wrote a story. It is not actually what was said.

My frustration with this is, I have Members here right now who say: David, we are going to take in \$300 billion in tariff receipts—customs duties if you want to be accurate—next year. We are fine.

Okay. Next year, we are borrowing about \$270, \$280—sorry, we will borrow about \$2.5 trillion in the 2026 year. So \$300 billion is very, very helpful, but you are still borrowing \$2.2 trillion. We haven't actually done all the economic effects of does that actually change purchasing behavior.

Actually, we have some great stories today on the Bloomberg terminal of companies that look like they have been actually undervaluing their customs duties, meaning they are lying to the Customs Service, and we are taking in less receipts than we should.

The scale of what is going on is just intensely frustrating. Let's actually start to also knock down one of the urban folk legends: It is defense spending. How often do we go home and I will have a liberal person saying: If you would just cut defense, we would be fine.

Okay, here is your problem: Healthcare is about 28 percent of our spending, Social Security is 22 percent of our spending. This is 2025 to fiscal date. Net interest is 14 percent of our spending. If you do all the other outlays, it is 14 percent. Income security, that is actually—well, it is what it is—10 percent. National defense is 12 percent. It turns out national defense is now number 5. The thing that is actually in the Constitution is actually number 5 in the spending stack.

Your government is functionally an insurance company with an Army. You laugh, but you know you are going to quote that later.

Let's actually sort of take a look. This is net receipts by category, 2024 compared to 2025. Hopefully, this will make sense. I am going to put this chart up on our website later because I know it is really hard to see. If you actually take a look at what is happening, how do we finance this government? It is mostly individual income taxes.

Now, for someone who says: Well, it should be corporate. Remember, in the late 1980s, early 1990s, all across the country we were moving to LLCs, professional partnerships, pass-through entities, so much of what you would have seen back in the early 1980s, 1970s, 1960s as corporate now passes through, so some of it was a corporate structure. You always have to be careful when you say: Why are corporate taxes down so much? It is now because it flows through on the individual line. I am just trying to make that point.

Take a look at this. Here is Social Security and retirement taxes. Well, that is FICA. Actually, you were getting \$1.7 trillion last year. This year it

is up 3 percent. This year it is \$1.761 trillion. Corporate income tax, last year we took in \$529 billion. Then you start to look at customs duties.

Now, this is interesting. I am going to say this two or three times to try to make a point. In the 2024 fiscal year, we took in \$77 billion in customs duties. That is tariffs. All right. We estimate this year it is going to be up 146 percent, but that is \$190 billion. That is a lot of money, Mr. Speaker, but 177 minus the 190 . . .

Did I mention, next year we are set to borrow about \$2.5 trillion is our estimate? CBO, I know, has a number that is lower, but I will tell you in this fiscal year, my Joint Economic Committee was more correct than CBO.

If we are borrowing \$6.5, \$6.7 billion a day, you can do the math. The step-up in customs duties, we might be picking up 3 weeks of borrowing. This is my frustration.

What happens when our brothers and sisters get in front of televisions or put out things and say stories like: Well, DOGE is going to pay for everything. Well, the customs duties, the tariffs are going to pay for everything. Then some of us have to actually try to make the math work.

The voters are much smarter than we ever give them credit for. Hell, I think they are much smarter than we are. Maybe we can tell them the truth. We have got a problem. Interest and healthcare costs are consuming this society, consuming this government. You start to take a look at the debt outlays, and you start to see, well, Social Security taxes, oh, they are up 8.3 percent over last year. Excuse me, sorry, this is outlays, so spending on Social Security went up 8.3 percent over last year. It is the baby boomers.

We actually have an unusual thing happening. If you take a look at the Social Security actuary report, a lot of our brothers and sisters are choosing to retire at 62, which actually is hurting productivity because many of these folks are very productive workers, but they are fearful, saying: Well, in 2032, I get a 24 percent cut, so I am going to take my money now. That is another reason why we should fix that cliff, but you are not allowed to actually talk about it because the other side will run attack ads beating the crap out of you in the next election because you dared talk about the morality of actually fixing these things.

□ 1750

Look, right now, I am in a 50/50 district. There is someone over at the DCCC taking clips saying: He said the words "Social Security." We have our attack ad.

Then, we wonder why no one here will work on it.

The point on the net outlays is, last year, we spent \$7.746 trillion. This year we are going to spend \$7.148 trillion. Remember that 2025 is an estimate because I still have a couple of weeks, and there are always weird timing ef-

fects at the end of the year where we roll a bill over into the next fiscal year.

What happens with our total receipts? We are going to take in \$5.254 trillion and spend \$7.148 trillion. The point there is that we are spending a hell of a lot more money than we are taking in.

A bunch of the money is not stuff you can touch. It is Social Security and what goes into the Medicare part A trust fund.

Let's go down to geekdom. On your FICA tax, your payroll tax, a portion of that is Medicare, Social Security, unemployment, and other things. That tax only covers about 38 percent of Medicare. The other portion of Medicare, it can be 10 to 15 percent, is you paying copays if you are in traditional Medicare. The rest comes right out of the general fund.

That is why the fact is that, in the next 7 years, Medicare goes from \$1 trillion of spend this year to \$2 trillion, in 7 years. It is demographics and healthcare inflation.

This gap, from here to here, is the annual deficit, 7.3 percent of the entire economy. For those who want to say that it is the legislation from—no. This was structural. This is what we were built on.

The increase in spending, once again—discretionary, what we talk about, what we work on, keeps getting smaller. Defense as a percentage, as we are going down from years—years ago, defense was number one. Now, the way you actually stack it, it is either number four or number five in our spending.

Yet, if you go home and tell people that, what continues to shock me is how many people say, "If we just did this." Show them the math that you just covered about 30 minutes of borrowing, and they look at you angrily because, my belief is, the political class for so long hasn't told the truth.

Let's go on our truth binge. Anyone I am making unhappy, grab your phone, grab your computer, and go hit DOGE.gov. It is right there. It is live right now. You can go look it up. I actually really support using technology to crawl through every ounce of this government.

In the NDAA, year after year—and I got it attached this year, the ability to use AI to audit the Pentagon. Remember, the Pentagon has now gone 8 or 9 years. It is unauditible. That is the term. It has not been audited. We don't even know the stuff we own.

On DOGE's own website, at this moment, they say they have found \$206 billion. Now, the reality is that only a fraction of that has actually been executed by us in Congress or the White House.

If we are going to borrow \$2.3, \$2.4, \$2.5 trillion next year, 8 percent, and that is if you have the face on it. We have all seen the articles. They have only been able to actually execute on a fraction of this.

Yet, I can show you some of our colleagues who run around and say: Well, with DOGE and the customs duties, we are going to be fine, so, SCHWEIKERT, shut up. We don't have to tell people how much trouble we are in. Don't go and mention that the Social Security trust fund is gone in 7 years and that they are taking a 24 percent cut. Don't tell anyone that the Medicare trust fund is gone in 7 years and that their hospital is probably going bankrupt. Yay, this is what we got elected to do.

Yet, 2025 total receipts—receipts are tax collections. It is just Ways and Means speak. We don't call them taxes. We call them receipts. For this year, we gained 3.7 percent of our total receipts from customs duties. Wonderful.

We can have a whole other presentation, debate, on its effect on the economy, who actually pays it, whether it is paid by the consumer or shipper. Fine, we will have the intellectual debate later, but it is more revenue receipts coming in.

Our best guess, if we give the full faith of what we believe, \$300 billion next year, 5, 5.6 percent on top of all the additional tax collections. It is helpful.

Borrowing, in many ways, is a tax. It is a tax paid for in the future, probably by our kids. It is a tax paid for with interest.

Stop pretending we have solved the problem.

Here is where it gets really uncomfortable once again. This is sort of the Social Security chart, and the point was the trust fund balance. We peaked about 2001, 2002. Baby boomers were in the peak of their earning years, but here, it is gone. We need to step on this.

If you are someone out there and you say they stole the Social Security money, no, they didn't. It was loaned to the Treasury.

There are some great articles. If you go back to the original design of Social Security, they thought they would have a certain amount of money. They would loan it for building bridges, dams, and all sorts of things and get yield, but they loaned it to the Treasury.

The Treasury pays a fairly decent interest rate back. Our Treasury pays the interest back to the Social Security trust fund twice a year. That is why there are certain months where there is this sudden, big spike of interest payments that are credited to the Social Security account.

The chart is the chart. About halfway through 2032, so 7 years from now, the trust fund is gone.

Here is the irony of our budgeting. When we talk about future debts and deficits, CBO is instructed to act like we just keep spending the money. The actual Social Security law says you have to cut benefits. If you follow the Social Security law, that is a 24 percent cut.

In reality, about halfway through 2032, be prepared to have your check

cut by 24 percent. Our calculation is a few months later. We double the poverty of seniors in America.

The fastest-growing homeless population is baby boomers right now.

Look at this chart. Look, I just threw this one on. It is a little more complicated than I wanted to do tonight, but this is actually showing the increases in spending.

One of the reasons I brought this chart is trying to help folks understand. We are all so acculturated around here to Social Security is always going to be the biggest spend. Except, when you get in the out-years—I accept some of this is 20-some years from now, 25 years from now.

Actually, healthcare costs, this is something we could actually have a miracle in changing. I have come behind this mic over and over and said we are on the cusp of miracles. A couple of weeks ago, I went to New Hampshire to a lab where they were growing undifferentiated islet cells. Apparently, islet cells don't need antirejection drugs to get bodies to be able to start making their own insulin again. There are crazy ideas.

□ 1800

Mr. Speaker, can we do a thought experiment? I am probably going to get beat up for this. This is a thought experiment. Give me some leeway on it. I am trying to help our brothers and sisters, and anyone crazy enough to watch this, to think.

We have turned healthcare into a financing debate. The ACA, ObamaCare, was a financing bill. It is who gets subsidized and who has to pay. It was mostly borrowed money. The Republican alternative was a financing bill. It was a little bit of an actuarial curve, but it was a financing bill. The Medicare For All Act is a financing bill.

I am begging us: Could we have a revolutionary thought between Democrats and Republicans, maybe if we actually talk about what we pay and what we get for what we pay?

The debate right now is about a number of the expanded subsidies on the ACA expire. There are parts of the country where there are high medical costs and high income, where a person can make up to \$600,000 a year and get \$4,000-plus in subsidies paid to the insurance company.

Here is the perversity. These subsidies, the \$33 billion it would take for one year—\$40 billion if it is made permanent—are paid to insurance companies.

Mr. Speaker, here is just a crazy thought experiment. Ozempic goes off patent in Canada in January. States like Florida and Colorado have already gotten the FDA to approve reimportation. We actually have a chart that is looking at the potential of generic manufacturers producing it from \$60 to \$120 a month.

This is a crazy thought. We know Milken researchers a couple of years ago said obesity is 40 percent of U.S.

healthcare. Diabetes is 33 percent of U.S. healthcare. It is 31 percent of Medicare. How many lives are lost right now because of multiple chronic conditions?

What would happen if we took a portion of that money for our brothers and sisters who are on Medicaid, Indian Health Service, VA, or other subsidized government programs and we actually said: Screw it. We are going to allow the reimportation. We are going to buy it. It is off the patent. We can actually get an incredible deal. Yay.

What would be the actual cost of healthcare? What would be the health statistics of our brothers and sisters? What would the effect be on labor force participation, family formation, and all the other crazy things we have seen in this data? What would it look like 1 year from now, 2 years from now, or 3 years from now?

That is actually the thought experiment. Do we want to hand \$33 billion of subsidies to insurance companies, or do we want to affect the actual cost of delivering services and maybe have our brothers and sisters live healthier and longer?

Why can't we think this way? Is that Republican or Democrat? I would argue it is just moral. It is trying to be creative with the limited resources we have. Every dollar of that is borrowed. Why wouldn't we want a society that is actually getting healthier? I am just trying to come up with solutions.

There will be an army of lobbyists outside my office tomorrow, beating the crap out of me, because it turns out sick people are business models. It is cruel to say that. It is just really cruel to say that. We have to change it. The morality of cures, the morality of—and it is also really good economics.

Mr. Speaker, I have two last boards. I want to make a point. We updated this as of a couple of hours ago. We are actually remarkably lucky. In other industrialized countries, the debt is starting to scare the hell out of bond markets. A bunch of our longer term—10 years and out—have actually been operating very efficiently.

Does it bother anyone that France just took down their government because they were trying to do some fiscal consolidation? They won't let them deal with their debt, but they can sell a bond for about 50 basis points cheaper than we can.

Greece is actually about 70 basis points cheaper. When Greece takes a 10-year bond to market, it is a substantially lower interest rate than the United States. If we look at the credit rating of what people are willing to buy the debt for, all of these countries have a better credit rating than the United States.

Mr. Speaker, there are 18 States that actually have a better credit rating than the Federal Government. I don't know other ways and I keep struggling to find ways to get folks to take this seriously.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, the hallways will be full of people knocking on

our doors, saying: We want more money.

They don't show up to say: Hey, we have an idea to do something better, faster, and cheaper. We want a free market. We believe in creative destruction.

Mr. Speaker, I never liked the CHIPS Act because it directs cash subsidies. Often, subsidizing last-generation technology leads to what is going on right now. Should Intel give up 10 percent of its ownership? What would happen if Intel were forced to break up? We might end up with four or five creative, efficient, and cutting-edge companies. As an example, one company is doing design.

Do we remember our high school economics class? Creative destruction is what brings us to that next level of productivity, which raises wages.

For working people in my district, who are not making about 27 or 28 percent more than the first year of the Biden administration, they are poor today. I think at the end we came in number two. Yet, I have seen some numbers in Arizona that are making me very nervous on the growth of unemployment and the stagnation of wages.

There are ways to make this another American century. The first thing we have to do is tell the truth. We have a country that is borrowing \$70,000 to \$72,000 a second. How long do we think we can keep that up?

Yet, if we get our taxes from a regulatory system and legalize, once again, creativity, legalize productivity, instead of barrier after barrier—those barriers may be great politics. They show up in our fundraisers and help us. Maybe we can get a union to vote for us, but it is crap economics.

Mr. Speaker, I am incredibly optimistic for the future. I am 63. My wife is 63. I have said this a few times, and people think I am insane. We have adopted a 3-year-old and a 9-year-old. We are the luckiest family on Earth.

When my little boy is about 21 or 22 years old, every tax in America needs to be doubled just to maintain baseline services. My kids will be part of the first generation to be poor because of our unwillingness to tell the truth. Is that the America we aspire to? We are better than this.

I am sick and tired of having the leadership and others say: DAVID, we will do it after the next election.

Mr. Speaker, guess what? There is always another election.

I believe the American people would reward us if we demonstrated to them that we told them the truth. We tried to do hard things and we saved the future, because that future is coming very fast.

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

□ 1810

TRUMP'S LABOR AGENDA: UNSAFE AND UNDERPAID

(Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, Mrs. McIVER of New Jersey was recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.)

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MCIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include material on the subject of my Special Order hour into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ONDER). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MCIVER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of our Nation's workers, to give voice to their fear, their concerns, and their anger.

While the American people are focusing on putting food on their tables, the Labor Department has quietly dismantled decades of hard-fought protections for our communities. These rollbacks are not just isolated attempts. They are part of a broader, calculated effort to weaken the rights, safety, and dignity of America's workers in the hopes that no one would notice.

But guess what, Mr. Speaker?

We have noticed. We will not let them get away with it.

My colleagues and I have demanded the Labor Secretary end these attacks on working people and their families. If the Secretary will not act, we will take matters into our own hands. That is why we are here tonight, to bring these actions to light and to show the American people exactly what is at stake.

Tonight, Mr. Speaker, you will hear from my colleagues about the impact of each of these rollbacks and about the way that our friends, our neighbors, our coworkers will be hurt by something the administration is trying to do in the shadows.

Mr. Speaker, you will hear about the specific rules that this administration has rolled back, rules that put home care aides, farmhands, construction workers, workers with disabilities, minors, and so many more at risk. As you hear about these rules, ones that don't always get a lot of attention but that matter so much to the people they protect, you will come to the same conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that we have.

If you work in America today, Mr. Speaker, you are less safe than you were 1 year ago, and you are more likely to be underpaid, exploited, and ignored. You are more likely to be hurt on the job, Mr. Speaker, underrepresented, and left to fend for yourself.

That is unacceptable.

I am proud to have led my colleagues in urging the Secretary of Labor to immediately reverse course on these actions. As I yield to my colleagues standing with me tonight, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues across the aisle to consider:

How many more of these rules do we let the Trump administration get away with before saying enough is enough?

I hope this convinces them to follow suit.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), who is the ranking member on the Committee on Education and Workforce.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I thank her for organizing this Special Order so we can discuss the actions of the Department of Labor.

Right now, the Trump administration and congressional Republicans are starting to implement an aggressive deregulatory agenda that harms workers. Trump's deregulatory agenda weakens workers' civil rights, undermines worker protections and hard-earned wages, and downgrades the U.S. economy.

Right now, the Trump administration is in the process of rolling back labor regulations that do a lot of things, such as promote nondiscrimination and strengthen the regulations we have. The ones they are trying to undermine are the regulations that promote nondiscrimination and strengthen registered apprenticeship standards. They are rolling those back.

They are rolling back the regulation that prevents the privatization of State civil services. They are rolling back the regulation that strengthens fair wage protections for home care workers that would enable them to keep minimum wage and other protections. They are rolling that back.

The regulation requiring Federal contractors to pay workers at least \$15 an hour. They are rolling that back. They are rolling back regulations to create clear and specific requirements for occasions when employers must require the use of respirators that prevent exposure to toxic chemicals that can cause cancer and other diseases.

Regulations to bolster labor protections for farmworkers on guest worker visas; they are rolling those protections back.

The implementation of Federal law requiring affirmative action for employees and applicants with disabilities, ensuring that they are hired, retained, and promoted by Federal contractors; they are rolling that back.

Enforcement of antidiscrimination and affirmative action requirements that ensure that Federal contractors are for equal employment opportunities for workers, they are rolling that back.

There are more rollbacks waiting in the wings, because, in fact, the Labor Department in a draft rule that is sitting in the White House regulatory office right now would likely weaken the rules that prohibit children from working in particularly dangerous jobs.

All workers deserve to be paid fairly, earn good benefits, and come home safely at the end of the day. If we truly want to prioritize workers, then we

must strengthen the laws, including regulations that protect workers' health and safety on the job and that empower workers' ability to form unions and bargain for their rights.

The Trump administration, instead, is rolling back regulations that protect workers. We should be doing better.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for organizing this Special Order and giving us the opportunity to discuss what is going on with the Department of Labor.

Mrs. McIVER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member, the fine gentleman from Virginia, for his remarks and for coming here this evening to talk with us.

Mr. Speaker, home health aides are some of the most essential workers in our economy, taking care of our parents and grandparents as they age and ensuring that sick and disabled people can live with dignity.

It is downright despicable that this administration has proposed to reverse the rule requiring that these vital workers be paid the Federal minimum wage.

This reckless rollback threatens the dignity, wages, and basic rights of nearly 4 million of our lowest paid and most essential workers, the majority of whom are women and women of color.

These care workers are certified nursing assistants, home health aides, personal care attendants, and direct support professionals. They provide skilled, often medically necessary care, from administering medication to helping with daily activities like bathing, dressing, and eating.

Their work is both physically and emotionally demanding. It is essential to the health, safety, and independence of nearly 10 million older adults and people with disabilities who rely on these services to remain in their homes and communities.

For some, it is the care they receive from these aides that actually helps them enter or remain in the workforce. It is difficult to capture the profound impact they have on not only families but our economy.

While they wait for that proposal to go through, the administration has already announced that they will no longer enforce the care worker rule, effectively stripping these workers of basic wage protections without notice, without public comment, and without regard for the devastating impact this will have on families, caregivers, and our long-term care system.

Mr. Speaker, I just can't wrap my head around some of these changes. Home care workers are too valuable. They are already underpaid and unprotected, with 2 in 5 already living at or near the poverty line. Nearly one-half rely on public assistance to make it, and now Trump wants to give the green light to pay these folks less than \$7.25. Yes, I said it, \$7.25 an hour.

It is just wrong. It is completely unsustainable. We are already in the midst of a staffing crisis in the care

economy. I know my colleagues are afraid of the Bureau of Labor Statistics these days, but BLS says that demand for home care workers will grow by more than 20 percent in the next decade as our population ages.

Mr. Speaker, how are we going to recruit and retain the workforce we need to take care of our seniors if we don't pay them?

Surely, they can't make it if we don't pay them. They can't stay employed if we don't pay them.

Mr. Speaker this is not just a labor issue. It is a civil rights issue. It is a women's right issue. It is a disability issue.

I know this administration is already sick of hearing from me, but that is too bad. In August, I wrote to the Secretary of Labor urging her to stop these rollbacks. Today, I want to again call on the Department of Labor to withdraw this dangerous and disgusting proposed rule immediately, to reinstate full enforcement of the 2013 rule, and to focus its efforts where they belong, on improving wages, training, and conditions for our home care workers.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the fine gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER) to discuss the conditions for some of our most vulnerable workers, those with disabilities.

□ 1820

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, first, I thank the gentlewoman from New Jersey for having this session, for bringing us together to highlight how the Trump administration is undermining hard-won protections for workers. I really appreciate the comments and sort of the introduction to my comments, a community that I have been close to and worked for diligently for a long time.

This used to be a bipartisan issue. This is an opportunity to discuss a group of workers who are often overlooked but who are also being very much hurt by the deregulatory agenda of this administration, workers with disabilities.

In December, the previous administration, under President Biden's leadership and the Department of Labor, released a proposed rule that would phase out, as quickly as possible, subminimum wage certificates which allow employers to legally pay workers with disabilities below the Federal minimum wage. This was long, long overdue.

About 38,500 disabled workers earned a subminimum wage in 2024 because of these certificates. Those 38,000 people deserve better, much better.

In taking action, the Biden Department of Labor spoke for those workers and pushed for them to have a livable, honorable wage. The Department noted that opportunities, legal protections, and support for disabled workers have increased since 1989 when the regulation was last updated.

However, in July, the Trump Department of Labor decided to undo that

long, long overdue progress that was enacted by the Biden administration and House and Senate Democrats and instead continued issuing subminimum wage certificates.

Reminder to people around the country and Californians: The Federal minimum wage is \$7.25. They were being paid below that.

In doing so, this administration is turning back the clock on disability rights. Multiple States, including the State I live in and represent, California, have already prohibited subminimum wages for workers with disabilities. Good for them. These subminimum wage laws federally have been used to justify paying people just a few cents per hour for work.

The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights and the National Council on Disabilities have called for an end to the practice by paying disabled workers less and paying them what they deserve, at least a minimum adjustment.

While disabled individuals continue to face challenges in achieving equal opportunity and treatment, we have made great strides in our understanding of disability and workplace accommodations.

Paying these American workers less can no longer be justified by any standard, yet this administration insists on doing it.

Rather than allow employers to continue underpaying disabled workers, this administration must and should reverse course and respect the dignity and contributions of these workers.

Again, I thank Representative McIVER for coming here and bringing this to the attention of the American public.

Mrs. McIVER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks and for joining me this evening.

At this very moment, the Department of Labor is working to rescind the Farmworker Protection Rule, a Biden-era standard that gave farmworkers, many of them seasonal workers here under the H-2A visa program, the basic right to speak up about unsafe working conditions without fear of being fired or deported.

Let's be clear. This rule that the administration is attacking wasn't about politics. It wasn't about gangs or drugs or any of the disgusting tropes the other side will paint against hard-working immigrants. It was about seatbelts in vans, safety on the job, and the simple human dignity of not being punished for demanding better conditions.

What has this administration done? They have proposed stripping those protections, both for transportation safety and for organizing on farms. While they wait for that change to take effect, they have announced they will not enforce the 2024 Farmworker Rule at all.

What does that mean in practice? It means workers, including the 300,000 seasonal workers worked for come to

our country to do vital work, supporting our Nation's agriculture industry, are once again forced to choose between their safety and their survival. It means transportation will remain the leading cause of death for farmworkers, and it means that the worst of the worst employers get a free pass.

It doesn't stop there. The Trump Department of Labor also wants to stop coordination between the Department of Labor's Wage and Hour Division, OSHA, and the Employment and Training Administration on enforcement of farmworker protections. These agencies are supposed to work together to stop abuse.

Corrupt recruiters have infiltrated the H-2A program, charging workers illegal fees and taking advantage of the most desperate migrant workers and actually facilitating human trafficking.

The administration's answer? Make it harder to investigate them; make it harder to kick these abusive recruiters out of the H-2A system; and, against their own promises, let the trafficking continue.

Let's be clear again. The H-2A program is one of the largest sources of labor trafficking in the United States.

The safety regulations the Department of Labor is going after were designed to keep workers safe, but Trump's regulatory changes sent a clear message to employers. Retaliate against your workers, is what the administration is saying. Trump says: Silence them all you want. No one is coming to stop you.

This doesn't just hurt migrant farmworkers. It drags down the working conditions and wages of all agricultural workers in America. Every time protections are stripped away from one group, it undercuts the baseline for everyone else.

This is all by design. While this administration is gutting legal protections, they are slashing transparency, too. The National Agricultural Statistics Service just announced it will eliminate the Farm Labor Survey, the very tool we use to understand what farmworkers are paid and how they are treated. This survey informs wages for H-2A jobs. Eliminating it makes exploitation easier and accountability harder.

Mr. Speaker, the cruelty here is not accidental. It is deliberate. It is rooted in a despicable framework that sees farmworkers, particularly those from other countries and those that are Black and Brown, as disposable.

These workers feed America. They feed you every night. They do the work most people can't and won't.

Instead of protecting them, this administration wants to strip away their voice and hand power to the very people who exploit them.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. OMAR) to discuss the tools available to OSHA to keep Americans safe at work.

□ 1830

Ms. OMAR. Mr. Speaker, as the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Workforce Protections, I rise today to speak about the sweeping set of proposals from Trump's Department of Labor that threatens worker safety, fair pay, and basic protections for millions of Americans.

The Department is moving to rewrite or repeal more than 60 workplace regulations. Let me say that again: 60 workplace regulations. It will affect conditions in farms, factories, construction sites, and mines.

These changes are being framed as modernization. In reality, they put workers at greater risk and undermine decades of hard-won labor protections.

Among the most far-reaching proposals is the narrowing of OSHA's general duty clause, one of the most important tools protecting workers when no specific safety standard exists. For more than 50 years, the general duty clause has allowed OSHA to step in when employers expose workers to recognized hazards that are serious, preventable, and likely to cause harm.

Under the Trump administration's labor proposal, OSHA will no longer be able to cite employers for hazardous conditions intrinsic to a job. That could leave construction workers, factory workers, farmworkers, and others in high-risk professions with fewer protections and less accountability when something goes wrong.

The administration's rollbacks go well beyond the general duty clause. Millions of home healthcare workers could be paid below minimum wage and denied overtime protections, leaving them vulnerable to long hours and financial insecurity.

Migrant farmworkers could lose critical safeguards, including seatbelt requirements on employer-provided transportation and protections against retaliation for reporting unsafe conditions.

Construction workers could see basic requirements for adequate lighting eliminated.

Miners could lose critical oversight on ventilation, roof safety, and training.

Even respiratory and chemical safety standards in hazardous workplaces are being rolled back.

These changes represent a fundamental shift in priorities, putting corporate convenience over worker safety. Eliminating all of these rules is a clear signal from the Trump administration that they view workers' lives as expendable.

When protections for the most vulnerable workers are stripped away, the consequences will be severe and immediate.

American workers are not disposable. They deserve workplaces that are safe, fair, and accountable. They deserve the dignity of protection that ensures that they can return home from work alive and uninjured.

Congress must reject efforts that roll back the clock on worker safety and labor rights.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative LAMONICA MCIVER for hosting tonight and for her leadership on this issue.

Mrs. MCIVER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. OMAR) for joining me tonight and for her remarks.

Mr. Speaker, when it comes to Trump's attacks on the diversity of our workforce, the Department of Labor is his biggest cheerleader and superfan. As a matter of fact, they are president of the fan club.

After Trump rescinded the Equal Employment Opportunity executive order, the Department of Labor proposed to remove the requirement that those who do business with the Federal Government cannot discriminate in hiring.

On top of that, Trump is demanding that companies send proof that they are eliminating their antidiscrimination programs and show proof that they abandoned affirmative action plans.

Federal contractors may sound to some people like a narrow, far-off group. Who even are they? In reality, Federal contractors are a massive segment of our economy, and chances are that you or someone you know relies on Federal contracts for work.

Under Trump, their employers would no longer be able to even collect data on the racial, ethnic, and gender make-up of their workforce. Let me repeat that: The Federal Government is proposing that contractors no longer even track discrimination.

If you stop collecting the evidence, you can pretend the crime no longer exists. The result: an older, Whiter, more male-dominated workforce that doesn't really reflect the diversity of backgrounds that makes our Nation great.

Let's call it what it is: a calculated, careless, cowardly rollback of hard-won protections carried out under false pretenses and driven by an agenda that wants to take us back to 1964.

If that weren't enough, just weeks after the Trump administration announced its plans to eliminate the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs, the agency charged with enforcing antidiscrimination in Federal contracting, the Department of Labor has now launched a full-scale attack on workers with disabilities. It is shameful.

Trump's DOL is dismantling the requirement that Federal contractors take steps to employ qualified individuals with disabilities. At a time when disabled Americans face historic employment gaps, this administration wants to turn back the clock and undo the progress that we have made over decades of disability work. As my colleagues have mentioned, they even want to bring back the cruel, outdated policy of allowing employers to pay disabled workers less than minimum wage, often pennies on the dollar. How

disgusting for someone who is doing the same work as everyone else each and every day.

My colleagues across the aisle want you to be afraid of Federal DEIA programs, maybe even to think they are stopping you from getting a job. In reality, these are things like paid internships, so you don't have to come from a well-off family to work a Federal job, or basic disability accommodations in the office, like making sure the office coffee pot is in reach of someone in a wheelchair.

Are these destroying our workforce like the President says?

These moves are not about fairness. They are about power and about stripping protections from the most marginalized so that the powerful can operate without accountability.

We need to be open and honest about the truth. These actions will increase discrimination in the workforce. They will make us less productive, not more productive. They will turn the focus of Federal hiring away from merit.

Some of these rollbacks, Mr. Speaker, are terribly awful, but some of them seem like they are just torn from a law textbook. Seriously, the administration wants to get rid of the minimum lighting standards for construction sites. Let me say that again for the public who may be watching. This Trump administration wants to get rid of the minimum requirement for lighting standards for construction sites.

For those of you watching at home, I know that, sometimes, what we do here is a bit hard to follow, and maybe you don't want to sift through the jargon that gets thrown around. Let me just read to you the standard that this administration wants to get rid of. Here is what Trump wants to take out of the Code of Federal Regulations. It reads as follows: "Construction areas, aisles, stairs, ramps, runways, corridors, offices, shops, and storage areas where work is in progress shall be lighted with either natural or artificial illumination."

This gets rid of the requirement for good lighting on construction sites so that you can't see the nail you are hitting. Who okayed this?

Seriously, let's just think about this for a second. If you are working on a construction site, under the Trump administration, your boss does not have to make sure that any electrical equipment rooms, first aid stations, and the rest of the job site actually have enough light to allow you to see what you are doing.

We hear all day about the regulations supposedly weighing down our economy and all about the red tape. Without a doubt—I sit on the Committee on Small Business—I am happy to talk about red tape, but these are basic safety standards.

What do I know, right? I am here to represent the people of New Jersey's 10th Congressional District. I don't work on a construction site every day. Like me, you may want to know what

the experts think. In 1962, Congress created the Advisory Committee on Construction Safety and Health to answer just that question.

Mr. Speaker, guess what. The Trump administration fired all the members of the committee, and OSHA just issued a final rule removing the requirement that it consult with the committee before modifying or repealing construction safety regulations. Trump's OSHA doesn't have to consult the experts because it said so. It is just because they said so. It is truly unbelievable.

Let's make something clear, Mr. Speaker: The administration's actions at the Department of Labor aren't just tinkering, and they are not just some complicated, bureaucratic procedure. They are life-and-death decisions that, right now, the Department of Labor is rolling back protections on that generations of miners fought and died for.

Earlier this year, the Department of Labor planned to shutter dozens of the Mine Safety and Health Administration field offices across the country. These are the frontline offices that work to keep mines safe and help to review plans, inspect sites, and make sure someone is there to look out for workers when lives are on the line.

Eventually, when that plan came to light, the administration changed course and announced that it would not close the 34 offices it wanted to. Mr. Speaker, they are now trying to shutter the offices another way: by gutting the rules that give the Mine Safety and Health Administration the power to act, even if the offices stay open.

□ 1840

Let me walk you through just how dangerous these rollbacks are.

One repeal removes the requirement to inspect drilling areas for hazards before operations begin and gets rid of the need to repair dangerous drilling equipment.

Another rollback narrows the training protocols that the Mine Safety and Health Administration district managers can require before approving mining operations. In fact, Trump wants to limit what can be required in a roof control and ventilation plan, which would help protect miners from roof collapses and toxic dust in the air. He wants to deregulate roofing and necessary ventilation.

Mine operators are no longer required to give workers hard copies of hazard communications, or HAZCOM. Historically, employers are required to inform their employees in a mine of what chemicals or hazards they may face to help prevent injury and illness. Trump and his cronies are even going after the tools used to measure lighting and visibility underground, as I mentioned about the construction sites, as well.

As we speak, Trump is working to give more control to mine operators about their safety and health plans, even when we know that injuries and deaths will follow.

We know what keeps miners safe, but this administration doesn't think we should let the Mine Safety and Health Administration require it. Maybe the most unbelievable decision is the delay of the toxic silica rule, a rule 40 years in the making.

The science is crystal clear: Silica exposure causes lung cancer, chronic respiratory disease, black lung, and even death.

The Mine Safety and Health Administration itself had estimated this rule would prevent more than 1,000 deaths and 3,700 cases of silica-related illness, but the Trump administration says it is on hold.

What are we talking about here?

Weakening or removing respiratory requirements, fit testing, medical evaluations, and training for exposure to some of the most dangerous substances like asbestos, lead, vinyl chloride, and more.

Look, colleagues and Americans watching at home, the administration says it is too prescriptive to ensure workers don't inhale poisons that actually kill them. It is too much of a burden to make sure a respirator actually fits. It is too much red tape to make sure a worker's lungs can survive the shift.

What do you say?

Let's be clear: Miners and workers didn't ask for these rollbacks. The only people calling for these changes are the lobbyists and executives who have never stepped foot inside of a mine, who have never watched a coworker die in a collapse, who have never buried a friend with black lung.

Safety cannot be optional. Miners cannot be expendable. Congress cannot stand idly by while the Labor Department turns on the people it was created to protect.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. STANSBURY).

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Speaker, I am here tonight to stand union strong with our workers across America and in solidarity with my sister from New Jersey, Representative McIVER.

We stand union strong, labor strong, America strong, and worker strong.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is notable, as we stand on this floor tonight, that there is not a single Republican here to stand with our workers.

Let's be honest: When my colleagues across the aisle say that they stand for American manufacturing and American jobs, they don't mean that they stand with American workers. They are there to stand with the corporations and the people who line their pockets off of the sweat of the hard-working men and women who actually do the work in this country.

Unfortunately, as I look around this floor this evening, I don't see a single one of them standing in solidarity.

Under this administration, we have seen an unprecedented attack on our unions and worker protections. Protections that keep our workers safe from

injury, illness, and death on the job, all to shield employers from accountability and to increase their profits.

Instead of standing with workers, they weakened rules on overtime, rolled back safety standards, and gutted protections for wage theft. If you want any indication where the current President stands on the Department of Labor and American workers, all you have to do is walk down the street and you will see a three-story picture, not of the American worker on the front of the Department of Labor, but of Donald Trump's face, who spent American taxpayer, hard-earned dollars to put his face on the Department of Labor, which is the United States agency that is supposed to demand protections for our workers.

Now, for me this isn't just political. It is personal because I grew up in a labor family. My mother was a factory seamstress. In fact, she sewed 79,000 pockets on jeans and tried to organize a garment workers union at her factory and was fired for trying to demand fair wages for factory seamstresses like herself and thousands of women and people across the country who work every day for this country.

She was fired for daring to demand better conditions and higher pay, but it is her grit and her determination and her belief in the dignity of workers that I carry with me into this Chamber every day because even upon her firing for trying to organize as a factory worker, my mother became one of the first women operating engineers to work on heavy equipment in the State of New Mexico. That is the spirit I see all across our State.

Just last week, we stood in solidarity with striking workers and our Teamsters local at the Creamland Dairy fighting for fair wages and safe conditions. That solidarity has resulted in a fair wage and a new labor contract for those workers.

At the University of New Mexico, we stood with graduate students who were holding work-ins as they demand a fair contract. We stood with SEIU and our residents in our medical schools who are demanding fair pay. We are standing with our teachers who are demanding fair pay. And we stood with the Wells Fargo workers in Albuquerque who made history in becoming the first unionized branch ever in the history of this country. It was that solidarity, when we stood with 80,000 flight attendants stuck in endless negotiations, which helped us to get fair wages and a new contract for our flight attendants.

That is what it means to stand for workers. It is not just speeches and pictures on buildings, but it is action in standing with our unions and standing for fair pay because, Mr. Speaker, the theme here is simple: Workers just want a fair shot and they want dignity.

Unfortunately, under this administration, the rug is being pulled out from under their feet. It is shameful, dangerous, and it flies in the face of everything that this country was built on

because let us not forget that unions built this country.

It is unions that gave us the weekend. It is unions that gave us the 5-day workweek. It is unions that gave us overtime pay. It is unions that gave us safe workplaces. It is unions that gave us fair wages. Every worker in America benefits from the courage of organized labor and every man and woman who has stood for their fellow workers.

Mr. Speaker, I will end with this. I know where I stand. I stand with my mother and the countless generations that come before us of workers across the United States and in my home State who stood with the American worker. We will always stand for unions, we will always stand for labor, and we will always stand for the American worker.

□ 1850

Mrs. MCIVER. Thank you so much to the gentlewoman from New Mexico for joining us and for your remarks.

Mr. Speaker, tonight we have heard about the increased discrimination in the workplace, the repealing of protections for those with disabilities, and the dangerous construction sites our neighbors are forced to show up to.

All of this is part of the dangerous campaign the Department of Labor has launched to dismantle decades of progress for working Americans. These rollbacks are a direct assault on workers' safety, wages, and dignity.

From healthcare workers, many of them women and women of color, at risk of losing minimum wage and overtime protections; to construction workers who could now be forced to operate in unsafe conditions with no guarantee of adequate lighting or visibility standards; to farmworkers who already endure grueling conditions are being stripped of hard-fought protections.

None of this is okay. This is not normal.

Allow me to say this plainly for the second time tonight: If you work in America today, you are less safe than you were a year ago. You are more likely to be underpaid, exploited, or ignored. This is unacceptable.

I am proud to have led 64 of my colleagues in urging the Secretary of Labor to reverse course, and I am proud of the work we have done here tonight to make sure that none of this goes unnoticed.

This work is about the people, the people we serve and every single American. It is about the home care worker pulling double shifts. It is about the construction worker trying to make it home to his kids. It is about the farm worker who feeds our families and us but can't protect their own families.

We have heard about the rules that will put America's workers in danger, and if we do not do something about these rules, things will get worse for American workers. They are unsafe and underpaid, and it is time we do something about it.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MOORE of West Virginia). Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

REMEMBERING CHARLIE KIRK

(Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, Mr. CARTER of Georgia was recognized for 30 minutes.)

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of a true American patriot, Charlie Kirk. Charlie Kirk was a beacon of Conservative politics, a patriotic American who engaged young people on issues that mattered and encouraged critical thinking.

At just 18 years old, he founded Turning Point USA, which brought an entirely new generation of young, enthusiastic minds to the Republican Party.

Charlie was never afraid to defend his values, speak out for the voiceless, and do what was right, even when it was unpopular. He truly inspired thousands of voters to join the MAGA movement, attracting people with his unwavering conviction and ability to cut through the noise to get to what we are all searching for—that is the truth.

No one worked harder than Charlie Kirk. He is irreplaceable and already sorely missed. To quote President Trump: Charlie was great and even legendary. He was loved and admired by all. Today, with a broken heart, I echo the President's words.

This senseless political assassination must be met with the fullest extent of the law. Political violence of any kind must be condemned. It is un-American, and we will not stand for it. Please join me in prayers for Charlie's wife, Erika, his young children, and the entire family.

May we take comfort in knowing that he was a man of faith and is being embraced by his Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ.

HONORING VICTOR WATERS

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Victor Waters for his remarkable legacy as a musician, writer, and entertainer.

Born in Tattnall Square, Mr. Waters spent his entire years along the Sapelo River in McIntosh County before attending Benedictine Military School in Savannah.

Immediately after graduating high school, he began a rock and roll career that spanned six decades. Over the years, he signed with major record labels and even toured with the godfather of soul, James Brown.

Vic's great artistic success came after returning to McIntosh County to launch a solo career, releasing three acclaimed albums that captured the spirit and culture of coastal Georgia.

Yet, his proudest achievement was the family he built and the community he nurtured. In 1962, he met Sherry Elston of St. Petersburg, and 2 years later they married. Together, they

raised two sons, Shad and Mason, who joined their father on stage as a drummer and a bass player.

Today, we honor Vic Waters for his enduring influence and inspiration.

CONGRATULATING JEFF HEWITT ON HIS RETIREMENT

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Jeff Hewitt for his dedication to the city of Savannah and to congratulate him on his retirement.

Mr. Hewitt has served our community through Visit Savannah for 15 years, playing an instrumental role in expanding our hospitality and tourism sectors. With an impressive 40-plus years of experience in his field, Mr. Hewitt made significant contributions to Savannah, including record-breaking room-night production growth and projects such as the Savannah Convention Center expansion.

In addition to his impressive achievements, he has greatly expanded Visit Savannah's national and international sales reach through his relationship-building expertise. The city of Savannah is grateful for the impact Mr. Hewitt has made during his career, and we will continue to benefit from the legacy that he leaves behind.

I wish the best to Mr. Hewitt as he begins his retirement at the end of this year.

REMEMBERING JACK ROSS BRIGDON II

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jack Ross Brigdon II, a resident of Georgia's First District and a captain in the Savannah Fire Department.

Captain Brigdon's life as a public servant began in 1992 as a volunteer firefighter with the Thunderbolt Volunteer Fire Department. In 1996, he joined the Savannah Fire Department, where he would ultimately serve a distinguished career that spanned from January 29, 1996, until his retirement on July 1, 2024, at the rank of captain.

Among his many accolades were being recognized as the 1995 State of Georgia Rookie Firefighter of the Year and the Savannah Rookie Firefighter of the Year in 1998.

Above all, Captain Brigdon was a devoted family man. He was the proud father of three beloved sons, Jack, Alex, and Ashton.

In remembering Captain Brigdon's legacy, we are reminded of the enduring values of servant leadership and steadfast devotion to others.

RECOGNIZING GEORGIA'S PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today I am proud to recognize Georgia's public schools for their remarkable achievements in the latest round of standardized test results. Despite the challenges and setbacks brought on by the pandemic, our students and educators have shown incredible perseverance.

One standout success is in mathematics, where most grade levels improved compared to last year, and both fourth and eighth graders even sur-

passed prepandemic achievement levels.

Reading levels also rose across much of the state, showing that the investments in literacy support and tutoring are paying off. In addition, the progress we see in reading ability shows strong signs of momentum.

Our students are also excelling in science and social studies.

These accomplishments speak to the dedication of teachers, families, and communities working together to ensure every child has the opportunity to succeed. Let us celebrate the progress and let it inspire us to keep building a bright, strong future for every Georgia student.

□ 1900

HONORING GEORGIA'S COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES ON BEST COLLEGES LIST

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Georgia's colleges and universities that have earned national recognition by being named The Princeton Review's "Best 391 Colleges." Seven institutions in our State received this distinction, each offering students a unique and powerful educational experience.

At Agnes Scott College, the innovative SUMMIT curriculum equips students to lead with purpose, while Berry College is recognized for its strong culture of mentoring and personal growth. Emory University stands out for its world-class research, and Georgia Tech continues to be known for innovation and hands-on learning. Mercer University was highlighted for outstanding study-abroad opportunities that connect students to the global community, while Spelman College carries forward its proud tradition of shaping generations of Black women leaders. The University of Georgia, our flagship institution, was praised for its wide range of programs, the Double Dawgs initiative, and its highly regarded honors program.

Together, these schools exemplify Georgia's commitment to academic excellence, opportunity, and innovation.

CONGRATULATING TYBEE ISLAND MARITIME ACADEMY ON AWARD

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate one of Georgia's finest educational institutions, Tybee Island Maritime Academy, for being recognized by the Association for Middle Level Education as a 2025 school of distinction.

This honor did not come easily. It was earned through a rigorous review process that included comprehensive schoolwide assessment, continuous improvement planning, and interviews with staff, students, and families.

After this intense evaluation, the panel decided to award the school the distinction due to their STEAM culture, place-based interdisciplinary learning, and strong community partnerships.

Tybee Island Maritime Academy has demonstrated their commitment to excellence in the classroom while fos-

tering a thriving middle school community.

As Georgians, we take great pride in our educators, and it is wonderful to see the fruits of their labor receive appreciation.

We are so grateful for the staff, administrators, teachers, parents, and families in our State who realize the importance of a well-rounded education and invest in our younger generations.

Mr. Speaker, Tybee Island Maritime Academy has impressed us all, and we hope to share their story with educators around the world.

CELEBRATING ROSS DRUG'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and celebrate the 50th anniversary of Ross Drug, a true cornerstone of the Sylvania, Georgia, community.

Founded in 1975 by Sonny Ross, this family-owned pharmacy has stood the test of time.

Today, under the leadership of Ben Ross and Jesse Underwood, it continues to carry forward the same spirit of service and dedication.

As the last independent pharmacy in the area, Ross Drug has always gone above and beyond for the people it serves, whether it is delivering medications to residents who cannot leave their homes or helping busy families manage their prescriptions.

Over the decades, despite facing many challenges in a changing healthcare landscape, Ross Drug has remained reliable and deeply committed to its neighbors.

For 50 years, Ross Drug has put the community in community care.

Mr. Speaker, the story of Ross Drug reflects the strength, values, and commitment that make a place like Sylvania so great.

HONORING ANGEL MOMS COLLECTIVE

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the mothers who carry the weight of the loss of a child yet continue to stand with strength and dignity.

In Atlanta, more than 300 survivors of crime are gathering for Crime Survivors Speak, a national conference dedicated to healing and lifting the voices of those most deeply impacted by violence.

Among those voices is a mother, Tiffany Smith, who lost her beloved son, Cameron Jackson, at just 15 years old. Cameron is remembered as a bright and caring young man, devoted to his family and community.

In his memory, Tiffany founded the Angel Moms Collective, which now unites more than 300 mothers who share this heartbreak loss.

The Angel Moms Collective offers these mothers a safe space to heal and grieve while building a supportive community. Their courage is a testament to their perseverance, even in the face of tragedy.

Mr. Speaker, in honoring them today, we remember their children and honor their strength and unity.

RECOGNIZING KENDALL RAE JOHNSON

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an exceptional young Georgian, Kendall Rae Johnson.

At only 6 years old, Kendall became the youngest certified farmer in the United States, an achievement earned through her passion and hard work in her pursuits.

Today, at the age of 10, Kendall has been awarded a full scholarship to South Carolina State University, where she plans to study agriculture.

With the support of her family, Kendall's farm produces fruits and vegetables and raises animals. Beyond her own farm, she owns a business, runs a nonprofit called Kendall Rae's Green Heart, and serves as a USDA National Urban Agriculture Youth Ambassador.

Kendall's goal is to one day farm 100 acres of her own land, and she is already laying the groundwork to make that dream a reality.

Mr. Speaker, today, we recognize Kendall Rae Johnson for her determination, leadership, and example she sets for young people across our Nation.

RECOGNIZING JARVIS JONES

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jarvis Jones, a Georgia native and former All-American and NFL player who has returned home to lead and give back to his community.

As a student athlete, Jarvis helped lead Carver High School to its first State football championship in 2007. He went on to star at the University of Georgia and play in the NFL before returning to complete his degree and serve on Georgia's coaching staff. In 2025, Jarvis became the head coach at Carver High School in Columbus, his alma mater.

Carver is the reigning Class 2A State champion, and Jones is building on that tradition with a vision rooted in discipline and community. He is committed to uplifting the next generation of student athletes, instilling values of hard work and perseverance.

Mr. Speaker, we thank Mr. Jones for his service and the example he sets for young people across his community and across our State.

RECOGNIZING KATE MILLER

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Kate Miller as the new president of the Pooler Chamber of Commerce.

After beginning her career in the corporate world, Ms. Miller made a pivotal decision to shift her focus. About 11 years ago, she stepped into Chamber work, driven by a desire to give back to the community that had long supported her. She hasn't looked back since.

In this role, Ms. Miller is passionate about supporting local businessowners and professionals through development opportunities that strengthen their careers. She believes advocacy not only helps businesses grow but also uplifts individuals and the broader community.

Ms. Miller is especially focused on promoting sustainable growth and helping to shape Pooler's economic future through impactful projects and initiatives.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Ms. Miller on this well-deserved opportunity and commend her dedication to the city of Pooler. I wish her continued success as she leads the chamber in this exciting new chapter.

RECOGNIZING PAIGE EWING

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize one of Georgia's own, Paige Ewing.

On August 27, 2025, Mrs. Paige Ewing of Tattnall County was crowned Mrs. America 2025.

The Mrs. America pageant was established to honor the most accomplished married women in our Nation, recognizing their dedication to family, service, and community.

Paige reflects these very qualities. A graduate of Pinewood Christian Academy, she has brought pride not only to her hometown but to the entire State of Georgia. She has carried herself with grace and conviction, demonstrating a steadfast commitment to her faith, her family, and the values that define us as Americans.

In January 2026, she will represent the United States at the Mrs. World competition, where we know she will shine as an example of Georgia's spirit and America's strength.

Mr. Speaker, today, we honor Mrs. Paige Ewing, a true representative of both Georgia's pride and our Nation's values.

□ 1910

HONORING REVEREND NELSON PRICE

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and the legacy of Nelson Price. For 35 years, Price faithfully served as pastor of Roswell Street Baptist Church in Marietta, guiding the congregation through a season of remarkable growth.

Under his leadership, the church expanded its campus and became the second largest sanctuary in the Southeast at the time of its completion. Membership grew from a few hundred to nearly 10,000, a testament to his vision and his unwavering commitment to building a strong and faith-centered community.

Price's influence reached far beyond his church. He preached before President Jimmy Carter and his Cabinet. He also served as vice president of the Southern Baptist Convention.

To colleagues and parishioners alike, he was not only a pastor but also a mentor, known for his passion for preaching and his ability to guide others with wisdom and humility.

Mr. Speaker, for decades, Nelson Price loved and was deeply loved by his community. His leadership will continue to inspire generations.

HONORING BENNY CURL AND WILLIAM T. DANIEL, JR.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the 2025

Savannah Business Hall of Fame Laureates, Benny Curl and William T. Daniel, Jr.

As a Savannah native and veteran, Benny Curl serves as chairman emeritus of Byrd Cookie Company. He purchased the company in 1988 and transformed it into a nationally recognized business celebrated for its flavors and packaging design.

Throughout his career, Mr. Curl has served in numerous leadership and advisory capacities for Georgia businesses and associations.

Longtime Savannah resident William T. Daniel, Jr., is the owner of Lassiter Investments, LCC, and former vice president and general counsel of the Vaden Automotive Group. As owner of Lassiter, he has led the company to acquire and manage over \$17 million in commercial properties across Georgia. Daniel remains an active community member, serving in many advisory positions.

Mr. Speaker, both gentlemen achieved impressive accomplishments within their businesses and contributed significantly to our communities. For that, we celebrate and we thank them.

HONORING THE LIFE OF LENTON BROWN

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Lenton Brown.

Born and raised in Reidsville, Georgia, Mr. Brown lived a life dedicated to service and building community. His career led him to serve in the United States Air Force and as an engineer for the State of California before returning to Georgia.

He quickly got to work, serving his community as he launched the EE Foundation. In this, he started a small Easter egg hunt that grew into one of the largest in the country. The hunt grew to 90,000 eggs a year and raised money to provide food, clothes, back-to-school supplies, and toys for community members. This became so popular that donations continued year-round.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Brown was known as a jack-of-all-trades. He used his talents to help those around him as best he could. Mr. Brown gave his all for those around him. For that, we celebrate his legacy.

HONORING RICHARD J. BURRELL

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Richard J. Burrell, a resident of Georgia's First District, a Korean war veteran, and emeritus trustee of Young Harris College.

Mr. Burrell was drafted into the U.S. Army during the Korean war and served in the inspector general's office in Yokohama, Japan. During his deployment, he spent his free time teaching English to local residents.

In 1954, he married Nancy Chisholm. Together, they raised three children, Steve, Greg, and Pamela. He built a 40-year career at Household Financial Corporation, rising to Southeastern Director of Public Affairs and earning the Chairman's Award twice.

He also served on the board of Tucker Federal Savings & Loan and the Georgia Financial Services Association, helping shape consumer finance legislation.

Mr. Burrell remained deeply connected to Young Harris College, serving on both the alumni board and the Board of Regents. In 1995, Governor Zell Miller appointed him to the Stone Mountain Memorial Association board.

Mr. Speaker, his life embodied service, humility, and dedication, and we are grateful for his legacy.

HONORING MARK ROBERTSON

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the work of Mark Robertson, a Lowcountry radio legend. Mark has been working in radio for 50 years, 48 of which have been with 98.7, The River, based out of Savannah, Georgia.

While hosting the morning radio show for The River for many years, Mark has gained a dedicated audience of thousands of listeners every day. He also began the radio station's longtime tradition of playing Christmas music for the entire show starting in late November.

Mark is loved for his active presence in the greater Savannah community, supporting many local organizations and businesses. Mark is also well-known for his love of animals, volunteering and being active with many humane organizations throughout the area.

Mr. Speaker, today we celebrate Mark Robertson for his brilliant career as a radio show host and wish him the best of luck in retirement.

HONORING CECILIA TRAN ARANGO

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Cecilia Tran Arango for being selected for the second time to the list of Top 100 Influential Women. The list honors women across the State of Georgia who are currently making a significant impact in engineering and engineering-adjacent industries.

Mrs. Arango has worked for the past 24 years at Thomas & Hutton, an engineering and consulting firm, where she serves as principle and director of communications.

Since her time at Georgia Southern, she has selflessly given back to her community, volunteering for a wide variety of charitable organizations such as the Savannah Book Festival and March of Dimes, just to name a few.

She dedicates her time to mentoring the youth in our community and setting an excellent example for future leaders in every industry.

Mr. Speaker, the city of Savannah and the State of Georgia are proud to have someone like Mrs. Arango representing our values and commitment to excellence.

HONORING THE LIFE OF TRACY DALE SANDS

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and remember the life of Tracy Dale Sands. Born in Savannah and raised in Glennville,

Tracy was beloved by his family, profession, and local community.

A 25-year veteran of the Georgia Bureau of Investigation, Tracy exemplified lifelong service to our State, our country, and his community of Glennville, an achievement we can all applaud and strive to emulate.

His dedication to public service and justice was recognized in 2015 when he was given the Bob Kirk Memorial Award for investigative excellence.

A man of faith, the Harmony Church was a cornerstone of his life, helping guide him throughout his life.

Leaving behind his loving wife, Melissa, and loving family, the values Tracy lived by can be seen through his pride and joy, his son, Matthew.

The First District of Georgia and I would like to honor Mr. Sands, a man who has selflessly dedicated his life to his faith, his family, and his country.

HONORING THE LIFE OF HARVEY JOHN GILBERT

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor and to recognize the life of my friend, Harvey John Gilbert.

Born and raised in Savannah, Georgia, Harvey made it a priority in life to set a great example for his family and community around him.

Serving in a variety of civic and charitable organizations, Harvey gave his time and effort to anyone in need. An example of this was when he shared a sustainable development organization with his business partner, Stephen Ezelle, and his son, John.

The one thing Harvey loved most in this world was family. He married the love of his life and college sweetheart, Cindy. Together, they raised two wonderful children, Mary and John. Hosting friendly family competitions dubbed "La Competition," he would bring everyone together to connect and have a good time, even if at times that could get a little competitive.

Mr. Speaker, a man who dedicated his life to his family, friends, and hometown of Savannah, Georgia, Harvey Gilbert has left a legacy for all of us to follow.

□ 1920

FREEDOM THE EAGLE MASCOT

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Georgia Southern University's treasured live bald eagle mascot, Freedom.

We are deeply saddened by the loss of this beloved symbol. Freedom served as an ambassador not only for Georgia Southern but also for wildlife conservation and for the entire Nation.

For two decades, he inspired thousands of Georgia Southern athletic events, the St. Patrick's Day parade in Savannah, and countless community gatherings across Georgia and beyond.

Freedom became part of the university family in 2004, after being rescued from a nest in Maitland, Florida. A permanent injury to his beak prevented his release into the wild, but he found a new home representing the

strength and unity of Georgia Southern.

His presence embodied resilience, pride, and community spirit, and his absence will be felt by many.

Today, we celebrate Freedom's life and honor him here in the United States Capitol.

Fly high, Freedom. You will be remembered.

ARMY BEST SQUAD

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an extraordinary group of warfighters from Georgia's First Congressional District, our very own squad from the 1st Ranger Battalion at Hunter Army Airfield.

These Rangers have earned a place among the Army's top 12 squads, competing in the Army's prestigious Best Squad Competition.

After overcoming weeks of intense physical, tactical, and knowledge-based challenges, they will represent our district and the U.S. Army during the final round in Washington, D.C., culminating at the Association of the United States Army Expo in October.

On Saturday, October 11, they will take to the National Mall for a fitness event during Community Day.

I encourage my colleagues and the public to attend and show their support for our soldiers. Their excellence exemplifies the strength, discipline, and readiness of our Armed Forces.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand behind them, and I invite all of us to uplift their efforts through steadfast support and advocacy.

CONGRATULATING LEANDREA MIKELL

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate LeAndrea Mikell on her appointment as assistant vice president for government and community relations by Savannah State University.

As an accomplished alumna of SSU, Ms. Mikell will bring her expertise in government relations, strategic communications, community engagement, economic development, and higher education to this role.

Thus far in her service to the university, her leadership has played a critical role in securing nearly \$20 million in funding and in coordinating high-profile events, such as the historic visit of the Dutch royal couple.

She has been an invaluable member of the SSU community as she has brought strategic insight and unwavering commitment to their mission.

From her board memberships to her recognition as an Emerging Leader of the Year, she exemplifies the values of dedication and community stewardship.

The work she accomplishes in her new role will play a key role in advancing SSU's mission, fostering relationships, and enhancing the university's impact.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate LeAndrea.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF JERRY "SHAG" WRIGHT

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and the legacy of Jerry "Shag" Wright.

Jerry was a proud descendant of the Wright family who came to Pierce County as part of the Gilmer migration in the early 1900s.

Jerry honorably served in the U.S. Army during the Vietnam war as a frontline munitions carrier and being one of only 37 of the 185 in his unit to return home in 1969, a testament to his courage and resilience.

Following his service, he began a long career at Rayonier, from which he later retired.

Mr. Wright was deeply committed to public service, serving 10 years on the Screven City Council before being elected as a representative on the Wayne County Board of Commissioners, a position he held for 25 years.

Jerry was truly a man of the people, representing his community with pride and helping everyone he could, whether they were his constituent or not.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 17, 2025, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-1928. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions: California [EPA-R09-RCRA-2024-0298; FRL-12239-02-R9] received September 11, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1929. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's withdrawal of direct final rule — Hazardous and Solid Waste Management System: Disposal of Coal Combustion Residuals From Electronic Utilities; CCR Management Unit Deadline Extension Rule [EPA-HQ-OLEM-2020-0107; FRL-7814.2-03-OLEM] (RIN: 2050-AH36) received September 4, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1930. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; West Virginia; Revision to the State Operating Permits Program Under Title V of the Clean Air Act to Revise 45 Code of State Rules 33; Acid Rain Provisions and Permits [EPA-R03-OAR-2023-0026; FRL-11859-02-R3] received September 4, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1931. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; ID; Regional Haze Plan for the Second Implementation Period [EPA-R10-OAR-2024-0545; FRL-11879-02-R10] received September 4, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1932. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; California; State Implementation Plan Revision for Chico, Modesto and Stockton Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Areas [EPA-R09-OAR-2024-0473; FRL-12323-02-R9] received September 4, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1933. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Extension of the Attainment Date of the Coachella Valley Extreme Nonattainment Area Under the 1997 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R09-OAR-2024-0570; FRL-12518-02-R9] received September 4, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1934. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's Direct final rule — Revisions to the Clean Air Act Operating Permit Program; California; San Diego County Air Pollution Control District [EPA-R09-OAR-2025-0038; FRL-12574-02-R9] received September 4, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1935. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Michigan; Second Period Regional Haze Plan [EPA-R05-OAR-2021-0577; FRL-12588-02-R5] received September 4, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1936. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting

the Agency's final rule — Approval of Air Quality Implementation Plans; California; Regional Haze State Implementation Plan for the Second Implementation Period [EPA-R09-OAR-2025-0203; FRL-12755-02-R9] received September 4, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1937. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Missouri; Control of Sulfur Dioxide Emissions and Approval and Promulgation of State Plan (Negative Declaration) for Designated Facilities and Pollutants [EPA-R07-OAR-2025-0263; FRL-12807-02-R7] received September 4, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1938. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final authorization — Massachusetts: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions [EPA-R01-RCRA-2025-0188; FRL-12874-02-R1] received September 4, 2025, pursuant

to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1939. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Withdrawals of Findings of Failure To Submit State Implementation Plan and Finding of Failure To Attain for the Rusk and Panola Counties, Texas 2010 Sulfur Dioxide Primary National Ambient Air Quality Standard Area [EPA-R06-OAR-2022-0311; FRL-12956-01-R6] received September 4, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1940. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Arizona Underground Injection Control (UIC) Program; Class I-VI Primacy [EPA-HQ-OW-2025-0087; FRL 11786-02-OW] received September 11, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1941. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Guam; Clean Data Determination for the Piti-Cabras Nonattainment Area for the 2010 1-Hour Sulfur Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standard [EPA-R09-OAR-2025-0137; FRL-12752-02-R9] received September 11, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1942. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; New Jersey; Memorandum of Agreement to address NOx SIP Call Requirements [EPA-R02-OAR-2025-0088; FRL-12760-02-R2] received September 11, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1943. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Minnesota: Final Approval of State Underground Storage Tank Program Revisions, Codification, and Incorporation by Reference [EPA-R05-UST-2023-0631; FRL 12762-02-R5] received September 11, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1944. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Maryland: Final Approval of State Underground Storage Tank Program Revisions, Codification, and Incorporation by Reference [EPA-R03-UST-2025-0091; FRL 12797-02-R3] received September 11, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1945. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Wyoming; R-35 Wyoming Air Quality Standards and Regulations Rule Package [EPA-R08-OAR-2025-0204; FRL-12942-02-R8] received September 11, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1946. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national

emergency that was declared in Executive Order 13894 of October 14, 2019, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-1947. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a semiannual report detailing telecommunications-related payments made to Cuba pursuant to Department of the Treasury licenses during the period from January 1 through June 30, 2025, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 6004(e)(6); Public Law 102-484, Sec. 1705(e)(6) (as amended by Public Law 104-114, Sec. 102(g)); (110 Stat. 794); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-1948. A letter from the Assistant for Legislative Affairs, Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, transmitting the Department's final rule — Civil Monetary Penalty Inflation Adjustment Rule (RIN: 0710-AB57) received September 1, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mrs. HOUCHEIN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 722. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5371) making continuing appropriations and extensions for fiscal year 2026, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 719) honoring the life and legacy of Charles "Charlie" James Kirk; and for other purposes (Rept. 119-299). Referred to the House Calendar.

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. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Mr. NEAL, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. SEWELL, Ms. CHU, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. EVANS of Pennsylvania, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. PLASKETT, and Mr. SUOZZI):

H.R. 5370. A bill to provide low-income individuals with opportunities to enter and follow a career pathway in the health professions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLE:

H.R. 5371. A bill making continuing appropriations and extensions for fiscal year 2026, and for other purposes; to the Committees on Appropriations and the Budget.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 5372. A bill to provide grants for the conduct of demonstration projects designed to provide education and training for eligible individuals with an arrest or conviction record to enter and follow a career pathway in the health professions through occupations that are expected to experience a labor shortage or be in high demand, under the health profession opportunity grant program under section 2008 of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. BONAMICI (for herself and Mr. BACON):

H.R. 5373. A bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to prohibit the manufac-

ture, processing, use, and distribution in commerce of commercial asbestos and mixtures and articles containing commercial asbestos, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DOGGETT:

H.R. 5374. A bill to ensure that health professions opportunity demonstration projects train project participants to earn a recognized postsecondary credential, and to clarify that community colleges are eligible for grants to conduct such a demonstration project; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. CHU:

H.R. 5375. A bill to remove barriers to health professions by providing resources to access foundational educational training, such as English language proficiency and adult basic education, and to require the provision of child care, in demonstration projects funded under the health profession opportunity grant program under section 2008 of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER:

H.R. 5376. A bill to ensure an evidence-based funding approach to study the effects of health profession opportunity grant demonstration projects, and to evaluate the demonstration projects; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SEWELL:

H.R. 5377. A bill to require geographical diversity in the provision of health profession opportunity grants under section 2008 of the Social Security Act, and to require the support services provided through the use of the grants to include a transportation assistance plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOMEZ:

H.R. 5378. A bill to provide a set-aside of funds for Indian populations under the health profession opportunity grant program under section 2008 of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 5379. A bill to guarantee that grants are made under the health profession opportunity grant program under section 2008 of the Social Security Act to grantees in each State that is not a territory, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5380. A bill to require applications for a health profession opportunity grant under section 2008 of the Social Security Act to contain evidence of in-demand jobs or worker shortages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SUOZZI:

H.R. 5381. A bill to make opioid treatment programs eligible for grants under section 2008 of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PANETTA:

H.R. 5382. A bill to improve training requirements for health profession opportunity grant programs and exclude assistance provided by those programs from income tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVANS of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5383. A bill to provide for the use of peer support, peer mentoring, and career coaching in demonstration projects conducted under the health profession opportunity grant program under section 2008 of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVANS of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5384. A bill to require preference to be given to applicants for health profession opportunity grants under section 2008 of the Social Security Act who have certain kinds of business and community partners; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORSFORD:

H.R. 5385. A bill to ensure that hospitals are considered an eligible entity when awarding health profession opportunity grants under section 2008 of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORSFORD:

H.R. 5386. A bill to provide for technical assistance under the health profession opportunity grant program under section 2008 of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALFORD (for himself, Mr. CORREA, Mr. MANN, Ms. PETTERSEN, Mr. LAWLER, Mr. RILEY of New York, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mrs. HOUCHEIN, Ms. CRAIG, Ms. MCBRIDE, Mr. SUBRAMANYAM, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, and Mr. GARCIA of California):

H.R. 5387. A bill to require certain covered agency heads to enter an memorandum of understanding and submit a report with respect to certain housing policy issues, and for other purposes; to the Committees on Financial Services and Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BAUMGARTNER:

H.R. 5388. A bill to provide a national framework to sustain American leadership in artificial intelligence, to require an actionable Federal plan aligned to that policy, and to establish a temporary moratorium preempting certain State laws that restrict artificial intelligence models and systems engaged in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. BURCHETT:

H.R. 5389. A bill to codify Executive Order 14347 (relating to restoring the United States Department of War); to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. FIGURES, Ms. SEWELL, Ms. ANSARI, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BERA, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. SIMON, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. WHITESIDES, Ms. CHU, Ms. RIVAS, Ms. FRIEDMAN, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. GOMEZ, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. LIEU, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. GARCIA of California, Ms. WATERS, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. TRAN, Mr. MIN, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. JACOBS, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. CROW, Ms. PETTERSEN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. HIMES, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MCBRIDE, Mr. SOTO, Mr. FROST, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. MOSKOWITZ, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mrs. MCBAH, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CASE, Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. CASTEN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. BUDZINSKI, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. SORENSEN, Mr. MRVAN, Mr. CARSON, Mr. McGARVEY, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. McGOVERN, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. KEATING, Mr. OLSZEWSKI, Ms. ELFRETH, Mr. IVEY, Mr. HOYER, Mrs. MCCLAIN DELANEY, Mr. MFUME, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. SCHOLTE,

Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. McDONALD RIVET, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. THANEDAR, Ms. CRAIG, Ms. MORRISON, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. OMAR, Mr. BELL, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. ROSS, Mrs. FOUSHÉE, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. GOODLANDER, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. MCIVER, Ms. SHERRILL, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. STANSBURY, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Ms. TITUS, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. MENG, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mr. NADLER, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mr. LATIMER, Mr. RILEY of New York, Mr. TONKO, Mr. MANNION, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. LANDSMAN, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. BROWN, Mrs. SYKES, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. DEXTER, Ms. HOYLE of Oregon, Ms. BYNUM, Ms. SALINAS, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. EVANS of Pennsylvania, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. HOULAHAN, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Mr. DELUZIO, Mr. HERNÁNDEZ, Mr. AMO, Mr. MAGAZINER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. CROCKETT, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. CASAR, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. MCCLELLAN, Mr. BEYER, Mr. SUBRAMANYAM, Mr. WALKINSHAW, Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. BALINT, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. RANDALL, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. POCAN, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, and Mr. LICCARDO):

H.R. 5390. A bill to provide paid family and medical leave benefits to certain individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DELUZIO (for himself and Mr. GARBARINO):

H.R. 5391. A bill to increase the Federal share of the Patrick Leahy Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. CRANE, Ms. HAGEMAN, and Mr. NEWHOUSE):

H.R. 5392. A bill to nullify Presidential Proclamation 10606, establishing Baaj Nwaavjo Itah Kukveni-Ancestral Footprints of the Grand Canyon National Monument and withdrawing certain land in Arizona from mineral entry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 5393. A bill to nullify Presidential Proclamation 7320 and restrict the designation of national monuments in southern Arizona; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HARRIGAN (for himself, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. PERRY, and Mr. RULLI):

H.R. 5394. A bill to amend chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code, to withhold from a State certain highway funds if the State operates an automated speed enforcement system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HERNÁNDEZ (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, and Mr. STANTON):

H.R. 5395. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to direct the expedient disbursement of funds, and for other purposes; to the

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HILL of Arkansas (for himself, Mr. STUTZMAN, and Mr. DONALDS):

H.R. 5396. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to remove the mandate on the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Open Market Committee to focus on maximum employment; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. HINSON:

H.R. 5397. A bill to amend the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 to provide leave for the spontaneous loss of an unborn child, and for other purposes; to the Committees on Education and Workforce, Oversight and Government Reform, House Administration, and Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUIZENGA (for himself, Ms. BOEBERT, Ms. TENNEY, Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia, Mr. FINSTAD, Mr. BEAN of Florida, and Mrs. BICE):

H.R. 5398. A bill to provide salary and expenses for Department of Homeland Security personnel during a Government shutdown during fiscal year 2026 or fiscal year 2027, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE (for herself, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. FIELDS, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. THANEDAR):

H.R. 5399. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to carry out a grant program to support arts education at minority-serving institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Mr. KHANNA:

H.R. 5400. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Defense to annually review the amount of financial assistance for child care and youth program services providers provided by the Secretary; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia (for herself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. MACE, Mr. KEAN, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. NUNN of Iowa, Mrs. LUNA, Ms. PEREZ, Mr. MOYLAN, Mr. CISCOMANI, Mr. WITTMAN, Ms. BOEBERT, Mr. MILLS, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. EZELL, Mr. MESSMER, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. BACON, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. VAN ORDEN, Mr. TRAN, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. MCCORMICK, Mr. GIMENEZ, Mr. CRANK, Mr. BELL, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Mr. TURNER of Ohio, Mr. STRONG, Mr. BRESNAHAN, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. SCHMIDT, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. GOLDEN of Maine, Mr. BEAN of Florida, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. MCGUIRE, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. HURD of Colorado, Mr. HAMADEH of Arizona, Ms. GOODLANDER, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mr. LUTTRELL, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mr. FEENSTRA, Mr. FINSTAD, and Mr. SELF):

H.R. 5401. A bill making continuing appropriations for military pay in the event of a Government shutdown; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mrs. KIM (for herself and Ms. BYNUM):

H.R. 5402. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to clarify Federal law with respect to reporting certain full-file consumer credit information to consumer reporting agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LANDSMAN (for himself, Mr. CAREY, Mrs. SYKES, and Mr. MILLER of Ohio):

H.R. 5403. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to authorize law enforcement agencies to use COPs grants to recruit and retain law enforcement officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAWLER:

H.R. 5404. A bill to codify Executive Order 14212, relating to establishing the President's Make America Healthy Again Commission; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MACE:

H.R. 5405. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide for automatic continuing resolutions; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin:

H.R. 5406. A bill to provide grants for the conduct of demonstration projects designed to provide education and training for eligible individuals to enter and follow a career pathway in the field of pregnancy, childbirth, or postpartum, under the Health Profession Opportunity Grant Program under section 2008 of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORELLE (for himself, Ms. SEWELL, Mrs. TORRES of California, and Ms. JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 5407. A bill to require certain States to submit a continuity of operations plan for elections in the event of a major disaster, to require the Comptroller General of the United States to report on assistance for election administration in the event of a major disaster, and to require the Election Assistance Commission to award grants to strengthen elections against climate change-driven disasters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. NORCROSS (for himself, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. DELUZIO, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. BUDZINSKI, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. BACON, Mr. RILEY of New York, Mr. LAWLER, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. RULLI, Mr. GOLDEN of Maine, Mr. LALOTA, Ms. RANDALL, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. BRESNAHAN, Mr. MAGAZINER, Mr. MOORE of West Virginia, Mr. MCGARVEY, Mr. GARBARINO, Ms. STEVENS, and Mr. LYNCH):

H.R. 5408. A bill to accelerate workplace time-to-contract under the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Ms. PLASKETT (for herself, Mr. MOYLAN, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Ms. KINGHINDS, and Mr. HERNÁNDEZ):

H.R. 5409. A bill to provide a set-aside of funds for the territories under the health profession opportunity grant program under section 2008 of the Social Security Act, to make the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands eligible for the grants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 5410. A bill to direct the Secretary of Energy to support research and development on extraction of critical minerals from brine to reduce the dependence of the United States on the importation of such minerals, illustrating that innovative technology for domestic extraction could be a more cost efficient and environmentally friendly alternative than traditional extraction methods, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Ms. STEFANIK:

H.R. 5411. A bill to prohibit State and local law enforcement from arresting foreign nationals within the United States solely on the basis of an indictment, warrant, or request issued by the International Criminal Court, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SYKES (for herself, Ms. DE LA CRUZ, and Ms. BYNUM):

H.R. 5412. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to make

grants to assist in the establishment and operation of healthy food pharmacies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. TENNEY:

H.R. 5413. A bill to deny pretrial release for certain individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN DREW (for himself and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 5414. A bill to amend the National Dam Safety Program Act to reauthorize certain assistance to States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. VINDMAN (for himself and Mr. BAUMGARTNER):

H.R. 5415. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to permanently schedule the class of benzimidazole-opioids known as nitazenes, and for other purposes; to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITESIDES (for himself, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. MRVAN, and Ms. SALINAS):

H.R. 5416. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to modify the procedures used by the United States Postal Service for the closure or consolidation of contract postal units, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia (for herself, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. KENNEDY of New York):

H.R. 5417. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to award grants to faith- or community-based organizations to address persistent health inequities and chronic disease challenges; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana (for himself, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. BIGGS of Arizona, Mr. CISCOMANI, Mr. CRANE, Mr. HAMADEH of Arizona, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. BOST, Mr. KENNEDY of Utah, Mr. MOORE of Utah, Mr. OWENS, Ms. MALOY, Mr. MILLS, Mrs. LUNA, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. ALFORD, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. AMODEI of Nevada, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. BABIN, Mr. BACON, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. BARR, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BEAN of Florida, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BENTZ, Mrs. BICE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BURCHETT, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. CLINE, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. COMER, Mr. CRANK, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. DAVIDSON, Ms. DE LA CRUZ, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. DUNN of Florida, Mr. ELLZEEY, Mr. EMMER, Mr. EVANS of Colorado, Mr. EZELL, Mr. FALCON, Ms. FEDORCHAK, Mr. FEENSTRA, Mr. FINE, Mr. FINSTAD, Mrs. FISCHBACH, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. FONG, Ms. FOXX, Mr. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mr. FRY, Mr. GARBARINO, Mr. GIMENEZ, Mr. GOLDMAN of Texas, Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas, Mr. GOODEN, Mr. GRAVES, Ms. GREENE of Georgia, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. HARIDOPOLOS, Mr. HARRIGAN, Mr. HARRIS of North Carolina, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mr. HERN of Oklahoma, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. HILL of Arkansas, Mrs. HINSON, Mrs. HOCHIN, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. HUNT, Mr. ISSA, Mr. JACK, Mr. JACKSON of Texas, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Ms. KING-HINDS, Mr. KNOTT, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. LANGWORTHY, Mr. LATTA, Mr. LAWLER, Ms. LETLOW, Mr.

LOUDERMILK, Mr. MANN, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. MAST, Mrs. MCCLAIN, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. McDOWELL, Mr. MCGUIRE, Mr. MESSMER, Mr. MEUSER, Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. MOORE of West Virginia, Mr. MOORE of North Carolina, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. NUNN of Iowa, Mr. PATRONIS, Mr. PERRY, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ROSE, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. RULLI, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. SCHMIDT, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHREVE, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. SMUCKER, Mrs. SPARTZ, Mr. STAUBER, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. STEIL, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. STRONG, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. TAYLOR, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. VAN DREW, Ms. VAN DUYNE, Mr. VAN ORDEN, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. WIED, Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. YAKYM, Mr. BRESNAHAN, Mr. PALMER, Mrs. CAMMACK, Mr. GUEST, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. KUSTOFF, Mr. GILL of Texas, and Mr. ZINKE:

H. Res. 719. A resolution honoring the life and legacy of Charles "Charlie" James Kirk; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. MCCLELLAN (for herself, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MC CORMICK, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. MCIVER, Mr. CARSON, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. BELL, Ms. OMAR, and Mr. SUBRAMANYAM):

H. Res. 720. A resolution expressing support for the designation of September 2025 as "African Diaspora Heritage Month"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. AGUILAR:

H. Res. 721. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. ELFRETH (for herself, Mr. LALOTA, Mr. DELUZIO, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. ELLZEEY, Mr. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. VAN ORDEN, and Mr. JACKSON of Texas):

H. Res. 723. A resolution recognizing the 180th anniversary of the United States Naval Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HERNÁNDEZ (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. NEAL, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. SOTO, Ms. POU, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. DELAUR, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mrs. RAMIREZ):

H. Res. 724. A resolution recognizing the eighth anniversary of Hurricane Maria's destruction of Puerto Rico and the United States Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. LUNA:

H. Res. 725. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1908) to prohibit stock trading and ownership by Members of Congress and their spouses and dependent children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MORELLE (for himself, Ms. SEWELL, Mrs. TORRES of California, and Ms. JOHNSON of Texas):

H. Res. 726. A resolution supporting the recognition of September 16, 2025, as "National Voter Registration Day"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PATRONIS (for himself, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. ALFORD, Mrs. LUNA, Mr. MILLS, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. BEAN of Florida, Mr. GIMENEZ, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. VAN ORDEN, and Mr. COLLINS):

H. Res. 727. A resolution expressing support of the House of Representatives that October 14, 2025, be designated as a "National Day of Remembrance for Charlie Kirk"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. PETTERSEN (for herself, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. HURD of Colorado, Ms. BOEBERT, Mr. CRANK, Mr. CROW, and Mr. EVANS of Colorado):

H. Res. 728. A resolution condemning the tragic act of violence on September 10, 2025, in Evergreen, Colorado, recognizing the victims, survivors, and responders and expressing condolences and support to their families and their communities; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. MOULTON introduced a bill (H.R. 5418) for the relief of Blanca Martinez; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 5370.

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 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. COLE:

H.R. 5371.

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

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . ." In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: "The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . ." Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 5372.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution: To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the powers enumerated under section 8 and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. BONAMICI:

H.R. 5373.

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

Article 1 Section 8 United States Constitution

By Mr. DOGGETT:

H.R. 5374.

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

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. CHU:

H.R. 5375.

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

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. SCHNEIDER:

H.R. 5376.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. SEWELL:

H.R. 5377.

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

Article I, Section 8 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. GOMEZ:

H.R. 5378.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 5379.

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

Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution

By Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5380.

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

Spending Clause, Article 1, Section 8, Cl. 1 and the Necessary and Proper Clause, Article I, Section 8, Cl. 18.

By Mr. SUOZZI:

H.R. 5381.

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

Article I, Section 8, clause 1

By Mr. PANETTA:

H.R. 5382.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. EVANS of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5383.

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

Article I, Section 8, clause 1, provides Congress with the power to "lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises" in order to "provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States."

By Mr. EVANS of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5384.

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

Article I, Section 8, clause 1, provides Congress with the power to "lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises" in order to "provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States."

By Mr. HORSFORD:

H.R. 5385.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. HORSFORD:

H.R. 5386.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. ALFORD:

H.R. 5387.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 "The Congress shall have power to . . . provide for the . . . general welfare of the United States; . . ."

By Mr. BAUMGARTNER:

H.R. 5388.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. BURCHETT:

H.R. 5389.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 5390.

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

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 Ms. DELUZIO:

H.R. 5391.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 5392.

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

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (the Property Clause)

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 5393.

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

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (the Property Clause)

By Mr. HARRIGAN:

H.R. 5394.

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

Article I, Section 9 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. HERNÁNDEZ:

H.R. 5395.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. HILL of Arkansas:

H.R. 5396.

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

This legislation is based on the authority of the U.S. Congress to "regulate Commerce . . . among the several States". U.S. Const. art. I, § 8, cl 3, ". . . coin money [and] regulate the value thereof . . .", U.S. Const. art. I, § 8, cl. 5, and "make all Laws . . . necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers[.]" U.S. Const. art. I, § 8, cl. 18.

By Mrs. HINSON:

H.R. 5397.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. HUIZENGA:

H.R. 5398.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE:

H.R. 5399.

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. KHANNA:

H.R. 5400.

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

Article I, section 8

By Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia:

H.R. 5401.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Mrs. KIM:

H.R. 5402.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. LANDSMAN:

H.R. 5403.

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. 5404.

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

Article I Section 8 Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. MACE:

H.R. 5405.

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

Article I, Section 8 and Article I, Section 9 of the Constitution.

By Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin:

H.R. 5406.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. MORELLE:

H.R. 5407.

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

Congress has broad authority to regulate the time, place, and manner of congressional elections under the Elections Clause of the U.S. Constitution (Article I, Section 4, Clause 1).

By Mr. NORCROSS:

H.R. 5408.

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

Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1, Sec. 8, Cl. 18)

By Ms. PLASKETT:

H.R. 5409.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 5410.

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

Article 1 Section 8

By Ms. STEFANIK:

H.R. 5411.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mrs. SYKES:

H.R. 5412.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution

By Ms. TENNEY:

H.R. 5413.

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

Article I

By Mr. VAN DREW:

H.R. 5414.

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

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. VINDMAN:

H.R. 5415.

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

Article I Clause 8 Section 18

By Mr. WHITESIDES:

H.R. 5416.

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

Clause 7 of Section 8 or Article I of the Constitution

By Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia:

H.R. 5417.

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

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. MOULTON:

H.R. 5418.

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

Article 1, Section 8.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 17: Mr. WALKINSHAW.

H.R. 51: Mr. VASQUEZ.

H.R. 288: Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 429: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 464: Mr. VINDMAN.

H.R. 467: Mr. EZELL.

H.R. 488: Mr. VINDMAN.

H.R. 585: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 654: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 657: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. STANSBURY, and Ms. McDONALD RIVET.

H.R. 740: Mr. MASSIE and Mr. EZELL.

H.R. 842: Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. BABIN, Mr. MOYLAN, Mr. SHREVE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MOORE of Utah, Mr. TURNER of Ohio, and Mr. KEAN.

H.R. 880: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 909: Ms. GILLEN, Ms. MORRISON, Mr. LATIMER, Ms. ESCOBAR, and Mrs. MCCLAIN DELANEY.

H.R. 929: Ms. MORRISON.

H.R. 979: Mrs. WAGNER and Ms. ESCOBAR.

H.R. 1004: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 1028: Mr. CLINE and Mr. MOORE of West Virginia.

H.R. 1063: Mr. VINDMAN.

H.R. 1094: Mr. MCGUIRE.

H.R. 1200: Ms. DEXTER.

H.R. 1241: Mr. KENNEDY of Utah.

H.R. 1262: Mr. HIMES, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. OLSZEWSKI, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. RANDALL, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. RIVAS, Ms. McDONALD RIVET, Ms. FRIEDMAN, Mr. GOODEN, Mr. FEENSTRA, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Ms. PEREZ, and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 1294: Mr. VINDMAN.

H.R. 1305: Mr. MAGAZINER.

H.R. 1330: Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 1366: Mr. BEGICH.

H.R. 1383: Mr. CRANE.

H.R. 1394: Mr. FEENSTRA.

H.R. 1404: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 1410: Mr. GIMENEZ.

H.R. 1417: Ms. PEREZ.

H.R. 1422: Ms. FEDORCHAK and Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 1437: Mr. HORSFORD.
 H.R. 1464: Mr. PETERS.
 H.R. 1509: Ms. OMAR and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
 H.R. 1510: Ms. JACOBS.
 H.R. 1531: Mr. LAWLER.
 H.R. 1564: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
 H.R. 1623: Mrs. BICE.
 H.R. 1652: Mr. SESSIONS.
 H.R. 1685: Mr. QUIGLEY.
 H.R. 1712: Mrs. FOUSHEE.
 H.R. 1799: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
 H.R. 1810: Mr. TONKO.
 H.R. 1826: Mr. WITTMAN.
 H.R. 1827: Mr. VARGAS.
 H.R. 1845: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.
 H.R. 1851: Mrs. TRAHAN.
 H.R. 1970: Mr. CONAWAY.
 H.R. 1991: Mr. VINDMAN.
 H.R. 2042: Mr. CAREY.
 H.R. 2055: Mr. SORENSEN.
 H.R. 2081: Mr. MOORE of Alabama.
 H.R. 2082: Mr. MANN and Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCORMICK.
 H.R. 2147: Mr. HARIDOPOLOS.
 H.R. 2189: Mr. KEAN and Mr. STUTZMAN.
 H.R. 2213: Mr. MILLER of Ohio.
 H.R. 2231: Mr. FINE.
 H.R. 2232: Mr. GROTHMAN.
 H.R. 2253: Mr. AMO.
 H.R. 2264: Mr. QUIGLEY and Mr. SORENSEN.
 H.R. 2478: Mr. NUNN of Iowa.
 H.R. 2496: Ms. MALOY.
 H.R. 2497: Mrs. BEATTY.
 H.R. 2514: Mr. PAPPAS.
 H.R. 2577: Ms. MALLIOTAKIS and Ms. ROSS.
 H.R. 2598: Mr. OBERNOLTE and Mr. MENENDEZ.

H.R. 2605: Mr. MCGUIRE, Mr. MORAN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas.
 H.R. 2672: Mr. VARGAS, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. WEBER of Texas.
 H.R. 2687: Ms. HOULAHAN, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. LOUDERMILK, and Mr. BELL.
 H.R. 2692: Mr. BELL.
 H.R. 2709: Mr. GRAY.
 H.R. 2736: Mr. BELL.
 H.R. 2799: Mr. MULLIN.
 H.R. 2853: Mr. COLLINS.
 H.R. 2878: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
 H.R. 2909: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI.
 H.R. 2925: Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 2998: Ms. HOULAHAN, Ms. SALAZAR, and Mr. LAWLER.
 H.R. 3006: Mr. LIEU.
 H.R. 3045: Mr. LEVIN and Mr. EVANS of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 3088: Ms. SCHOLTEN.
 H.R. 3112: Mr. AMO and Ms. TLAIB.
 H.R. 3124: Ms. ESCOBAR.
 H.R. 3128: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. MULLIN.
 H.R. 3130: Ms. CRAIG.
 H.R. 3131: Mr. VINDMAN.
 H.R. 3235: Mr. LAMALFA.
 H.R. 3305: Ms. SEWELL.
 H.R. 3449: Mr. TORRES of New York.
 H.R. 3489: Mr. CARSON.
 H.R. 3514: Mr. NEGUSE.
 H.R. 3583: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
 H.R. 3591: Mr. VAN DREW.
 H.R. 3595: Ms. JOHNSON of Texas.
 H.R. 3607: Mr. BELL.
 H.R. 3623: Ms. PINGREE.
 H.R. 3639: Mr. SORENSEN.
 H.R. 3682: Ms. DE LA CRUZ, Mr. LAWLER, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. NUNN of Iowa.
 H.R. 3699: Ms. BOEBERT.
 H.R. 3753: Mr. SORENSEN.
 H.R. 3757: Mr. TONKO and Mr. LATIMER.
 H.R. 3858: Mr. HARIDOPOLOS.
 H.R. 3860: Mr. HARIDOPOLOS.
 H.R. 3867: Mr. VINDMAN, Mr. MANNION, and Ms. LEE of Florida.
 H.R. 3962: Ms. JAYAPAL and Mr. EZELL.
 H.R. 4032: Ms. SCHOLTEN.
 H.R. 4154: Mr. STUTZMAN.

H.R. 4176: Ms. MATSUI and Mr. HUFFMAN.
 H.R. 4235: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 4242: Mr. MCGUIRE.
 H.R. 4270: Mr. HIMES and Mr. FROST.
 H.R. 4365: Ms. OMAR.
 H.R. 4418: Mr. LYNCH.
 H.R. 4486: Mr. LAWLER and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI.
 H.R. 4503: Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia and Mr. AUCHINCLOSS.
 H.R. 4546: Mr. RULLI.
 H.R. 4581: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 4606: Mr. DOGGETT and Mr. TONKO.
 H.R. 4661: Mr. OBERNOLTE.
 H.R. 4768: Mr. AMO.
 H.R. 4788: Mr. MCGUIRE and Mrs. BIGGS of South Carolina.
 H.R. 4849: Ms. BALINT, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. PINGREE, and Mrs. DINGELL.
 H.R. 4888: Mr. LEVIN, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. RANDALL, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. OLSZEWSKI.
 H.R. 4895: Mr. SMUCKER and Mr. LAWLER.
 H.R. 4945: Mr. VINDMAN.
 H.R. 4948: Mr. PETERS, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. CHU, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. WHITESIDES, Mr. CISNEROS, Ms. RIVAS, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. AGUILAR.
 H.R. 4961: Mr. LEVIN.
 H.R. 4963: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.
 H.R. 4972: Mr. BEAN of Florida.
 H.R. 4979: Mr. LAWLER.
 H.R. 4980: Mr. LAWLER.
 H.R. 4981: Mr. LAWLER and Mr. RYAN.
 H.R. 5010: Mr. BISHOP and Mr. MOORE of Alabama.
 H.R. 5026: Mr. COLLINS.
 H.R. 5073: Mr. SOTO and Mr. CORREA.
 H.R. 5103: Mr. COLLINS.
 H.R. 5106: Mr. FROST, Mr. MOSKOWITZ, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. CORREA.
 H.R. 5108: Mr. COLLINS.
 H.R. 5125: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
 H.R. 5140: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
 H.R. 5151: Mr. VARGAS.
 H.R. 5169: Mr. EDWARDS.
 H.R. 5195: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. BERGMAN, and Ms. ESCOBAR.
 H.R. 5206: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI and Mr. NADLER.
 H.R. 5220: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 5227: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 5228: Mrs. MCCLAIN DELANEY.
 H.R. 5248: Mr. McCaul and Mr. MOYLAN.
 H.R. 5260: Mrs. HARSHBARGER.
 H.R. 5267: Mr. KILEY of California, Mr. BEAN of Florida, and Mr. HARRIGAN.
 H.R. 5301: Mr. VAN DREW.
 H.R. 5330: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
 H.R. 5333: Ms. NORTON and Mr. CORREA.
 H.R. 5338: Mrs. DINGELL.
 H.R. 5343: Ms. TENNEY and Mrs. FISCHBACH.
 H.R. 5345: Ms. MALLIOTAKIS.
 H.R. 5352: Mr. HUNT.
 H.R. 5369: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
 H.J. Res. 12: Mr. RESCHENTHALER.
 H.J. Res. 80: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts and Mr. MIN.
 H.J. Res. 118: Mr. COLLINS.
 H. Res. 69: Mr. SUBRAMANYAM.
 H. Res. 209: Mr. NEGUSE.
 H. Res. 506: Mr. LALOTA.
 H. Res. 629: Ms. TLAIB.
 H. Res. 670: Mr. VAN ORDEN.
 H. Res. 680: Ms. SIMON, Mr. CARSON, Mr. FIGURES, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. BROWN, Mr. EVANS of Pennsylvania, Ms. BALINT, and Mr. MIN.
 H. Res. 684: Mr. FROST.
 H. Res. 694: Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida.
 H. Res. 695: Mr. OBERNOLTE.
 H. Res. 697: Mr. DELUZIO.
 H. Res. 700: Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. HARIDOPOLOS, Mr. HARRIS of Maryland, and Mr. ONDER.
 H. Res. 702: Mr. MANN and Mr. ONDER.

H. Res. 704: Ms. OMAR and Ms. McDONALD RIVET.

H. Res. 706: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H. Res. 710: Ms. TOKUDA.

H. Res. 711: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Mrs. FOUSHEE, and Mr. HARRIS of North Carolina.

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. COLE

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Appropriations in H.R. 5371, the Continuing Appropriations and Extensions Act, 2026, do not contain any con-

gressional 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. 4700: Mr. SELF.