AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 119th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 172 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JANUARY 13, 2026 No. 9

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 13, 2026.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ANDREW S. CLYDE, 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 6, 2026, 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.

RECOGNIZING A'SHELLARIEN ADDISON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Delaware, Representative MCBRIDE, for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCBRIDE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Lieutenant Colonel Chaplain Reverend Dr. A'Shellarien Addison on her recent promotion at the Delaware Army National Guard.

Earlier this month, I was honored to attend her promotion ceremony and celebrate her historic role as the first woman to hold this rank at the Delaware National Guard, and I was moved hearing about her commitment to her fellow National Guardsmen.

Before her time at the Delaware National Guard, she served as the first woman chaplain at the National Guard Bureau in Arlington, Virginia. Her devotion to spiritual empowerment and trauma-informed healing has made her an indispensable leader to Delaware's Army National Guard.

I look forward to seeing the work that she will continue to do in shaping the spiritual lives of those around her.

Well done, Lieutenant Colonel Addison.

CLOSING OF GRASSROOTS

Ms. MCBRIDE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the closing of GrassRoots, a gift shop in Newark, Delaware, after 50 years in business.

What started as a small shop on Newark's Main Street grew into a Delaware institution, with locations across our State from Wilmington to Hockessin to Rehoboth Beach, but its heart always stayed in Newark.

GrassRoots weathered changing times. It survived recessions, and it adapted as retail shifted online. Through it all, it remained a constant presence, helping to define the character of downtown Newark for a generation.

Marilyn Dickey, who cofounded GrassRoots in 1975, poured more than half of her life into the store. GrassRoots wasn't just a business. It was part of the rhythm of Newark, a reminder that local businesses create connections and build community.

As GrassRoots closes this chapter and Marilyn begins a well-earned retirement, Delaware wishes her all the best and thanks her for her years of community service and creativity.

RECOGNIZING DREAMS OF FAITH

Ms. MCBRIDE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the voices of my Delaware constituents, Dwain and Karen Johnson, who turned the unimaginable loss of their daughter, Faith Deanna Johnson, into lifesaving advocacy through their organization, Dreams of Faith.

Faith was just 26 years old when she died from ovarian cancer. For years, her symptoms were dismissed or misdiagnosed until it was too late. Faith's ovarian cancer cut her life far too short. Before she passed, Faith made one request of her parents: Make sure this doesn't happen to someone else.

In Delaware, we listened. When I served in the State Senate, I was proud to help pass House Bill 15, the Faith Deanna Johnson Act, which requires individual health insurance plans to cover annual ovarian cancer screenings for women at risk and expand monitoring for survivors.

That law is already saving lives because it treats women's medical needs seriously and acts before it is too late. Here is why this matters: Ovarian cancer is often caught too late, but when detected early, survival rates dramatically increase. Early detection isn't just good medical practice; it is the difference between life and death.

Today, I carry the Johnsons' story with me to Congress. Their advocacy reminds us that policy is personal and that too often families are failed not just by delayed diagnosis but by the very system tasked with caring for our health. It is one that too often puts barriers between people and the care that they need.

We owe it to Faith and families across this country to keep pushing for early detection, meaningful insurance coverage, and a healthcare system that truly puts patients first.

RECOGNIZING RIVERVIEW HOTEL'S 110TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 110th anniversary of the Riverview Hotel in St. Marys, Georgia, one of our State's most cherished historic landmarks.

Built in 1916, the Riverview Hotel rests on the banks of the St. Marys River and has welcomed travelers and locals for more than a century. For generations, this hotel has offered hospitality and a sense of belonging to visitors from near and far. It has welcomed notable guests over the decades and stood as a testament to seaside Georgia's heritage.

The spirit of Riverview reflects the heart of St. Marys. Its veranda overlooking the river and its proximity to the ferry for Cumberland Island connects visitors with the history and natural beauty of our coastal region.

Today, we honor the Riverview Hotel for preserving tradition, welcoming families and travelers, and contributing to the vibrant life of southeast Georgia for 110 years.

RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF GALLERY 209 IN SAVANNAH

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Gallery 209, located at 209 East River Street in Savannah, on celebrating 50 years at its historic location.

Founded in February 1975 by a group of Savannah artists, Gallery 209 has remained a member-driven space where artists come together to sell their work, share resources, and support one another.

For five decades, it has been a cornerstone of Savannah's artistic community and a vital part of River Street's identity. The gallery has showcased the work of countless local artists, offering visitors ceramics, fiber art, jewelry, paintings, photography, woodworking, and other handcrafted pieces that reflect the creative spirit of our region.

Artists like Randee Powell and Sharon Saseen speak to the sense of family and shared purpose that defines Gallery 209.

As Savannah continues to grow, Gallery 209 stands as a reminder that local art and culture remain essential to our community. I commend its artists for sustaining this tradition and wish them continued success for generations to come.

RECOGNIZING SWANN SEILER

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Swann Seiler, named the 2026 Woman of the Year by the United Way of the Coastal Empire at the annual Women Who Rule event in Savannah, Georgia.

Ms. Seiler's leadership, service, and commitment to community reflect the very best of civic engagement and personal dedication. A graduate of the University of Georgia's Henry W. Grady School of Journalism, Ms. Seiler built a distinguished career in corporate communications and public affairs before retiring.

Ms. Seiler served Georgia Power and contributed her talents to community boards and nonprofit organizations throughout the region. Ms. Seiler's service includes leadership roles with cultural institutions, historic preservation efforts, education foundations, and civic organizations that strengthen families and neighborhoods across the Coastal Empire. She has lifted up countless causes and encouraged others to give back in meaningful ways.

The Women Who Rule campaign supports reliable transportation for women and caregivers, helping them to get to work, school, and medical appointments. Ms. Seiler's example inspires us to build stronger communities through service. I congratulate Swann.

RECOGNIZING SPECIAL AGENT JOE CEPHUS

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Special Agent Joe Cephus of the Georgia Bureau of Investigation, who was honored by the Evans County Sheriff's Office with the 2025 Support Officer of the Year Award.

Special Agent Cephus has served his community and State with integrity and courage. His work alongside local law enforcement in Evans County demonstrated steadfast support during critical investigations and helped to strengthen the bond between State and local public safety partners. His commitment to protecting families and upholding the rule of law reflects a deep sense of duty to his neighbors and fellow Georgians.

The Support Officer of the Year Award is given to individuals whose actions have gone above and beyond their normal responsibilities to help keep the community safe.

By stepping forward in challenging circumstances and offering assistance without hesitation, Special Agent Cephus embodies what it means to serve with professionalism and care.

Today, we thank Special Agent Joe Cephus for his service, partnership, and example of servant leadership in law enforcement.

RECOGNIZING FRANK CHAPMAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair now recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois, Mrs. RAMIREZ, for 5 minutes.

Mrs. RAMIREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the legacy of the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., by commending a liberation leader, Frank Chapman.

Frank's political education began in St. Louis, where he experienced the violence of racism and repression and was wrongfully convicted and sentenced to 50 years in prison during his twenties. Yet Frank has always been an organizer and educator.

Frank taught himself law and launched a movement to desegregate the prison, where Black prisoners had faced brutal and inhumane treatment. The bars in prison didn't break him or limit his spirit. On the contrary, it propelled him to fight for the liberation of those imprisoned and all people.

After his release, Frank established himself as a fixture in the struggle for liberation in Chicago and beyond. Whether through his leadership in the Chicago Alliance Against Racist and Political Repression, his successful campaigns for community control of the police, or his solidarity with immigrant communities in the fight to protect our neighbors from ICE, Frank has consistently fought to defend the most fundamental of our collective human rights and our shared liberation.

Mr. Speaker, this week carries profound significance for Frank. It marks the 50th anniversary of his release from prison.

I am honored on behalf of Illinois' Third Congressional District to commend Frank Chapman for his lifelong commitment to building the beloved community, championing civil and human rights, and practicing solidarity across our intersections, our identities, and our issues.

I thank and congratulate Frank for all of his efforts, and all power to the people.

RECOGNIZING JULIET DE JESUS ALEJANDRE

Mrs. RAMIREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor my constituent, Juliet De Jesus Alejandre.

Juliet is a triracial Latina who honors her African and indigenous ancestry with roots in Ecuador and Puerto Rico. She is a healer, organizer, poet, visionary, and she is the current executive director of Palenque LSNA.

Juliet's love for Black, Brown, indigenous, and immigrant communities and her bold vision of collective liberation is deeply rooted in healing, joy, and solidarity, especially among young Latinos and ''madres immigrantes''; ''immigrant mothers.''

To fight erasure, she connects young leaders to their history and genealogy. To fight displacement, she builds collective ownership. To fight dehumanization, she offers mutual support and collective care.

Through her artistry and creativity, she invokes our ancestral histories as she casts visions that help us to imagine new ways forward that leave all of our communities better and stronger.

On behalf of Illinois' Third Congressional District, it is my honor to commend Juliet De Jesus Alejandre for her bold, loving, and creative leadership that builds people power to shape our future because we know ''el pueblo unido jamas sera vencido''; ''the people united shall never be defeated.''

Mr. Speaker, I thank and congratulate Juliet for all of her work.

RECOGNIZING MAYOR DAVID BLACK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska, Mr. FLOOD, for 5 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Papillion, Nebraska's, Mayor David Black, as a paragon of public service and remarkable stewardship.

Through more than two decades of service to the people of Papillion, Mayor Black helped to guide the city into the thriving economic hub that it is today. This month, he announced that he will not seek reelection, which will conclude 17½ years as mayor and nearly 5 additional years of serving the city in other roles.

Mayor Black leaves behind a strong foundation built on partnership with an exceptional professional staff and the business community.

Decades of engagement and community outreach have produced clear results, attracting firms like Google and Facebook to expand to Papillion.

□ 1015

He will be deeply missed by the people of Papillion, and I am hopeful he will continue public service down the road. Mayor Black has more than earned the opportunity to spend additional time with his family once his final term in office concludes.

Papillion, Mr. Speaker, is a special place, with Mayor Black's legacy being built yet another example of that truth. I thank Mayor Black for his outstanding public service.

BEN SASSE NEVER STOPS FIGHTING

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize former U.S. Senator Ben Sasse.

Ben is a Nebraskan, a native, and a Fremonter. He lives in the First Congressional District. Early in his career, he served as chief of staff for a previous member of the same district.

Last month, Ben announced that he had been diagnosed with stage IV pancreatic cancer. This news stunned me, and, quite frankly, it stunned the world.

Ever since Ben has stepped back from public life following his time in the Senate and at the University of Florida, his intellect and voice have continued to influence conversation across the country.

From education to healthcare and beyond, he has shaped debates in higher ed, politics, journalism, and more through the years. Ben did this all at a young age. Even though he has a very public profile, he and his wife, Melissa, have built a vibrant family. All of this made the cancer diagnosis seem almost unthinkable.

While this is hard news for all of us to hear, we know this isn't the end of the story. Ben has a lot of fight left in him, and as he has joked himself: ''He is not dead yet.''

From the people of the First District and across Nebraska, Mr. Speaker, may Ben know that we are praying for him. We are with him, with Melissa, and his kids. I know he won't back down from this fight.

GREENLAND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Thank you. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from New York, Mr. LATIMER, for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATIMER. Mr. Speaker, in the Holy Bible's Book of Exodus, a book which is sacred to both Christians and Jews, it is written that Almighty God hands down, through Moses, Ten Commandments that represent the bedrock of ethical behavior and rules that govern human conduct.

My colleagues in Texas and Louisiana have State laws that post them inside public facilities. In one form or another, secular laws are written with these commandments in mind to provide civil sanctions against those who would commit murder or lie in a court proceeding under oath. Such laws govern against stealing what others legitimately own, their property and possessions.

We now face one of the most important tests of our democracy in over 150 years: Whether the Federal Government will blatantly steal the assets of an independent sovereign nation, who is our ally, for no legitimate reason other than lust for land.

In the rhetoric of coveting thy neighbor's goods, the President of the United States is fixed on coveting the sovereign land of the kingdom of Denmark, the island of Greenland. The President has spoken about it in his frequent public ruminations, and we have learned he has tasked our military to plan how he might take Greenland by force without the consent of Denmark.

This would open a shameful chapter, as we celebrate the 250th year of our own independence, that we would turn our backs on the principles established by the Founding Fathers and act as if we are one of the thug nations of the world ourselves.

Saddam Hussein's Iraq seized Kuwait. Vladimir Putin's Russia launched war to take over Ukraine. Adolf Hitler grabbed Poland and Czechoslovakia and, for a while, all of continental Europe. Mussolini took Ethiopia, and Chairman Xi has long coveted Taiwan. Each presented their flimsy reasons for their actions, justifications that fooled no one.

Is this who America wants to emulate? Putin, Hitler, Hussein?

The flimsy reason offered by the President and his minions, notably Stephen Miller, references our ability to protect America from an Arctic region threat.

With that very thought in mind, in 1951, we signed an agreement with Denmark that allows us to place military assets in Greenland that we feel we need with the support and agreement of Denmark. They have not reneged on that deal or thrown up roadblocks to American defense needs. We are trying to burst into a room by force when the door is set wide open and the welcome mat is displayed.

Denmark, a NATO ally, owns Greenland legally. If it doesn't choose to sell it, it remains legally theirs. Thy neighbor's ox and house, not ours.

Any U.S. military action against Greenland breaks the NATO rule and puts us at odds with our allies, allies that in the post-World War II era have helped us restrain Russian aggression for nearly a century. Denmark, as an ally, responded to our action in Afghanistan. They lost 43 men there simply because they honored their NATO commitment and stood by their friend, the United States of America.

Perhaps this President hates NATO so much that he has rallied against elements of it before, and in that he supports the wishes of Vladimir Putin that sees NATO as an impediment to his empire building, the desire for retaking Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, and Ukraine.

We have, as of late, decided that it is okay to insult European leaders at the U.N., threaten the countries of Latin America, disrespect our closest friend, Canada, and generally act with an arrogant swagger. We have the world's greatest military, but it is not a toy to be used to glorify any one man's lust for an expanded control of land. It is not the Department of War. It is the Department of Defense. That is how Americans view our role in the world, to defend ourselves and to defend freedom in a world with dictators and thugs who would subjugate us all if they could.

God stop us if we become the thug, if we become the dictatorship that uses our economic and military strength to bully this world.

The power of any President is not about what one man thinks is moral. It is guided by constitutional limitations, including three branches of government, not a dominant dictator and a subservient politburo and judiciary.

Harry Truman understood this. Dwight Eisenhower understood this. John F. Kennedy understood this, and so did Lyndon Johnson, Richard Nixon, Gerald Ford, Jimmy Carter, Ronald Reagan, George H.W. Bush, Bill Clinton, George W. Bush, Barack Obama, and Joe Biden. These men, whether you deem their Presidencies good or bad, understood what it is to have allies across the globe and how to keep America as the shining light to guide this planet.

Attacking Greenland for no strategic benefit that they don't already have puts us in a league with Russia and China. We will regret such a decision every day that we live thereafter.

Let this Congress make a strong, unambiguous statement that America does not take land for some trumped up reason.

We stand for the rule of law and for freedom and respect for others. That is what sets our Nation apart. If we snatch Greenland as a show of power, we give no reason for the people of the world to side with us when some other nation confronts us in a future year.

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

HUMAN TRAFFICKING AWARENESS MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from—the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas, Mr. LUTTRELL, for 5 minutes.

Mr. LUTTRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Human Trafficking Awareness Month and to speak about the serious threat human trafficking represents here and globally.

Human trafficking is the second largest criminal enterprise in the world, second to only that of drug trafficking. Human trafficking generates an estimated $150 billion a year and enslaves nearly 50 million people. The most vulnerable are our children and young adults. They are being targeted and exploited through their phones, through their computer systems, through gaming systems, and through social media. Every 30 seconds a child is sold into slavery. Every 30 seconds another child is sold into slavery.

Human trafficking is not just a distant overseas problem. The issue is here. It is in our communities. It is in our small towns. It is in our big cities.

I am from Texas and Texas being a border State, we are a hot spot for human trafficking. We lead the country in that issue. I asked our elected officials and I asked our law enforcement officials: How do we combat this? How do we defeat this mechanism? These cartels and these gangs move these people every day.

It starts with community awareness. You have to be willing to recognize the problem. You have to be willing to watch. We have the FIFA World Cup and we have the Super Bowl coming up. This will swarm our country even more so than now with this issue.

I have talked to school board members. I have talked to parents. I have spoken to young men and women who have been trafficked, and it is hard to speak about. A lot of the young ladies like to keep that to themselves, but we have to look past that.

We in Congress have to legislate forcefully. We have to go after these bastards who are taking advantage of our babies every single day. If we don't, this problem will continue to exist. I asked law enforcement: What do you need? They need technology. They need us to listen. They need funding. They need our help.

This is an American problem. It will not go away. With the advancements of technology that we are seeing today, they will reach out and touch every single person they possibly can because it makes them money.

This is like cancer, unfortunately. If cancer does not touch you or your family, you don't want to recognize it. You will not address it until it lands on the house. Mr. Speaker, this issue is here. These babies cannot protect themselves. It is our responsibility to watch over them. We have to do that. Enough is enough.

In 2021, the estimated report again was 50 million people are sold into slavery, 50 million people. This is a problem the United States and the globe should not have. This is not a red or blue issue. This is a red, white, and blue issue.

I talk to my colleagues in Texas on a daily basis. They are just as engaged as we are, but I talk to the American people and I say to you: We need your help. We have to Facebook this thing. It has to spread like a wave. Do not be shy about this issue, Mr. Speaker. Our babies depend on us to watch over them.

I have two beautiful sons, and I give them the latitude they need, but I watch over them every single day because I am one county away from the worst county in the country when it comes to human trafficking. Honestly, Mr. Speaker, I am embarrassed to have to say that, but we have to fix that here. We have to fix that in every single State in the country, and we can do that if we just activate and show the bad actors that we will tolerate this no more.

IMPEACH SECRETARY NOEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Thank you. The Chair now recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois, Ms. KELLY, for 5 minutes.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, before my colleague from Texas walks out, I will do whatever I can do to help him because the Chicagoland area is number three.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to announce I will be impeaching Homeland Security Secretary Kristi Noem. Secretary Noem has violated the Constitution, and she needs to be held accountable for terrorizing our communities.

Operation Midway Blitz has torn apart the Chicagoland area. President Trump declared war on Chicago, and then he brought violence and destruction to our city and our suburbs in the form of immigration enforcement.

In my district, Federal agents rapelled down from Black Hawk helicopters and burst into an apartment building in the South Shore area. They dragged U.S. citizens and noncitizens alike out of their beds in the middle of the night. They claimed the apartment was infiltrated by members of a Venezuelan gang. I don't understand this President's obsession with Venezuela, but they did not arrest a single member from that gang.

I visited that apartment building and saw firsthand the destruction those agents left. Doors to people's homes or apartments were kicked down. Belongings, including little kids' toys, were strewn about in the hallway. That raid and so many others shook our community, not just immigrants, but everyone.

Now, Secretary Noem has brought her reign of terror to Minneapolis after she left Charlotte and Raleigh. We have all seen what happened. An ICE officer shot and killed Renee Nicole Good in cold blood.

Without knowing any of the facts or an investigation, Secretary Noem lied about what happened. She called a beloved 37-year-old mom a domestic terrorist.

Secretary Noem and her rogue agents are the ones terrorizing our communities, and she is breaking the law to do so. I will hold her accountable, and I am filing three Articles of Impeachment against Secretary Noem.

Number one, obstruction of Congress. Secretary Noem has denied me and other Members of Congress oversight of ICE detention facilities. It is our constitutional duty to find out what is happening in these centers where people are reportedly being treated like less than animals.

Two, violation of public trust. Secretary Noem directed ICE agents to arrest people without warrants, used tear gas against citizens, and ignored due process. She claims she is taking murderers and rapists off our streets, but none of the 614 people arrested during Operation Midway Blitz has been charged or convicted of murder or rape.

Three, self-dealing. Secretary Noem has abused her power for personal benefit. She steered a Federal contract to a new firm run by a friend, her friend. Her propaganda campaign to recruit ICE agents cost taxpayers $200 million.

☐ 1030

She made a video that turned the South Shore raid into something that looked more like a movie trailer. Make no mistake, this is not a movie. This is real life, and real people are being hurt and killed.

I really have to wonder who the people are behind the mask. These DHS agents have no identifying factor. From all their botched raids and officer-involved shootings, I have to ask: What is their training like? What is the vetting? Is Secretary Noem recruiting January 6 insurrectionists?

I was one of the last Members of Congress to escape the House gallery on January 6. I remember hiding on my hands and knees and running through the hallways to a safe room. Insurrectionists are not fit to serve as law enforcement.

I realize that the impeachment of Secretary Noem does not bring Renee back. True justice would be Renee alive today, at home with her family. Impeachment doesn't bring back the four other people killed by immigration officers this year, including a man in Chicago. We cannot bring them back to their loved ones. What we can do, though, is impeach Secretary Noem, hold her accountable, and let her know the public is watching.

In this country, we do not kill people in cold blood without consequences. These are not policy disagreements. These are violations of her oath of office, and she must answer for her impeachable actions.

RECOGNIZING JAMES ''JIM'' P. CITRANO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Florida, Mr. RUTHERFORD, for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of James ''Jim'' P. Citrano, who passed away this last August at the age of 83.

Jim was born on January 2, 1942, in Newark, New Jersey. After graduating from Colgate University, he was commissioned as a second lieutenant in the U.S. Marine Corps.

In 1967, Jim was deployed to Vietnam as an H–34 helicopter pilot with the HMM–363, also known as the Lucky Red Lions. They were flying assault support missions, earning Jim the Distinguished Flying Cross.

After the war, Mr. Speaker, this American hero relocated to Jacksonville, Florida, with his wife and four children. There, he built a successful 40-year career in commercial real estate property management, development, and brokerage.

Always a community servant, Mr. Citrano generously dedicated his time, serving on numerous boards, including St. Vincent's Hospital and the University of North Florida.

As a law-and-order man, Jim was also a faithful supporter of the Jacksonville Sheriff's Office. As sheriff, I was very proud to call him my friend.

Jim was a valued member of our northeast Florida community and will be greatly missed by all. I pray for Mr. Citrano's beloved family and friends as they mourn this great loss.

CHINA IS NOT SCAMMING EUROPE AND UNITED STATES ON WIND POWER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Thank you. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. COURTNEY, for 5 minutes.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, President Trump hosted a meeting at the White House with all the major oil company executives and members of his Cabinet to talk about Venezuelan oil.

During the televised gathering, he veered off topic and rambled on one of his pet peeves, wind power. In addition to his usual complaints about how aesthetically ugly wind turbines are, he added another new, startling criticism to his repertoire, mainly that Europe and the U.S. are suckers for allowing China to sell us wind turbine parts while at the same time China doesn't even use wind power in its own country.

Here is exactly what he said: ''All you have to do is say to China, how many windmill areas do you have in China? So far, they are not able to find any. They use coal, and they use oil and gas and some nuclear, not much. But they don't have windmills. They make them and sell them to suckers like Europe and suckers like the United States.''

Mr. Speaker, the truth of the matter is, as this headline yesterday from Forbes magazine states: ''China Does In Fact Have Wind Turbines, A Lot Of Them.'' Forbes, of course, is hardly a leftwing, anti-Trump media outlet. As its article accurately reports, not only does China's wind industry exist, but it is huge.

According to the International Energy Agency, which has been tracking energy production by country for decades, China not only manufactures wind equipment but also enjoys the largest wind production in the world and today has twice as much new wind power under construction as the rest of the world combined. The wind turbines are sited both onshore and offshore.

Ironically, one of the oil executives who was in the room on Friday, from Conoco, is an investor and partner in a wind project in Bohai Bay, China.

Mr. Speaker, on a scale of 1 to 10, 10 being accurate and 1 being false, President Trump's comments deserve a score of minus 10. China is not scamming Europe and the U.S. on wind power. It is, in fact, the most aggressive domestic user and builder of wind power in the world.

I raise this point, Mr. Speaker, not to play gotcha—although this is a pretty embarrassing gotcha—but rather to remind the House that, right now, in real life, the Trump bogus attack on wind power, for no good reason, is destroying good American jobs and cutting off an abundant supply of new energy, which our economy and American electricity ratepayers desperately need.

For example, a couple of weeks ago, for the second time, the administration issued a decree terminating five offshore wind projects, many of which are close to completion and which were supported by billions of dollars of private investment and years of permitting approval.

Together, these projects will bring in thousands of new megawatts of power to consumers in New England, New York, and Virginia. Trump's halt work order cited vague, nonspecific national security concerns as justification for this antiworker, anti-ratepayer, and antigrowth decree.

Luckily, Mr. Speaker, we have a government of laws. Yesterday, U.S. District Court Judge Royce Lamberth here in Washington struck down this frivolous decree so that crane operators, laborers, and electricians can get back to work this morning to create a modern and robust energy grid for the 21st century.

Judge Lamberth, a Reagan appointee, thoroughly reviewed the record of the New England-based Revolution Wind offshore project and correctly determined that the Department, in fact, did not find a national security problem but instead specifically issued a written finding a year ago that Revolution's turbines ''would not have adverse impacts to DOD missions.''

Mr. Speaker, you may recall, last September, the House debated an amendment to the 2026 National Defense Authorization Act, where there was an attempt to create a statutory bar to offshore wind based on national security reasons. The House voted to reject such a straitjacket on wind power and instead rely on the experts at DOD to judge each project on the facts and science.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, just for the record, the turbine blades and components in the Revolution Wind project are not made in China. Up in New England, we pride ourselves on not, in fact, being suckers.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the administration's unfounded, irrational attack against wind power to stop. Contrary to what the President said, the rest of the world, including China, is aggressively pursuing this abundant source of power. For the United States to intentionally deprive American building trade workers of good-paying jobs and deprive our national grid of much-needed energy supply makes no sense.

The best way to cut electricity rates for consumers is to expand the energy supply. As the rest of the world recognizes, wind has to be part of that solution.

Mr. Speaker, the only suckers in this area are policymakers in Washington who are spouting off blatantly false narratives about the value of wind energy.

RECOGNIZING EASTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY'S ADAPTIVE ATHLETICS PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Washington, Mr. BAUMGARTNER, for 5 minutes.

Mr. BAUMGARTNER. Mr. Speaker, there are many things that make eastern Washington the greatest place to live in these wonderful United States of America. Today, I rise to recognize one of those wonderful things, the Eastern Washington University Adaptive Athletics Program, home of the first collegiate National Wheelchair Basketball Association team in the Western United States.

Founded in 2019, this program embodies the values of leadership, teamwork, positivity, and integrity, helping student athletes build confidence, discipline, and independence both on and off the court. These athletes balance the same rigorous demands as all EWU varsity players—classes, practices, study sessions, travel, and competition—all while setting a powerful example of determination and excellence.

They continue to raise the bar for what collegiate athletics can be, showing that true greatness is defined by heart and perseverance.

I know, on a personal level, each and every time I see these wonderful student athletes in person, I am inspired. I have seen the team traveling to and from games on my own trips to D.C., and I couldn't be prouder of their dedication and the way they represent Eastern Washington University. Go Eags.

HONORING OFFICER KELLSEY TORRES

Mr. BAUMGARTNER. Mr. Speaker, last week was National Law Enforcement Day, and I rise to recognize wonderful Officer Kellsey Torres of the Spokane Police Department, who was named officer of the quarter, and to shine the eastern Washington spotlight on her outstanding service.

This recognition is not just about one moment or one case. It reflects a pattern of service, compassion, and integrity that defines Officer Torres' work every single day. She embodies the values that make eastern Washington so special: hard work, humility, and a deep commitment to helping neighbors in need. Her dedication reminds us that public service is about people and showing up, lending a hand, and treating every person with dignity and respect while protecting us.

It is officers like Kellsey Torres who strengthen the trust between law enforcement and our communities and give us pride in the place we call home.

Today, we honor her not only for her outstanding service but for embodying the very best of the eastern Washington spirit. We honor all of our Nation's law enforcement officers, and may this body back the blue.

CELEBRATING NORTH COUNTY FOOD PANTRY

Mr. BAUMGARTNER. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to celebrate the North County Food Pantry in rural Elk, Washington.

Nestled between the pristine forests and recovering farmland, this small 1982 mobile home has nourished hundreds of families in body and soul for decades.

The pantry does far more than provide food. It offers connection, dignity, and a true sense of community.

At the heart of the community is the director, Lora Benzinger, who has led the pantry for a little over a year after years and years of service. Drawing on her background in social services, she has made it her mission to ensure the pantry nourishes not only families' tables but also a sense of belonging.

Families come not just for groceries but for fellowship, encouragement, and a place to be seen and valued.

The pantry brings in volunteers from every walk of life. The North County Food Pantry stands as a powerful reminder that fighting hunger is about more than filling plates. It is about nurturing the human spirit. It reflects the compassion and resilience that define eastern Washington.

CELEBRATING 2025 WINS FOR CALIFORNIA–21

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California, Mr. COSTA, for 5 minutes.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, today, I recognize the dedicated work of my team, our efforts, and the results of the work we have done for the people of the 21st Congressional District of California, encompassing Fresno and Tulare Counties.

We call it the breadbasket of not only California but our Nation. The incredible cornucopia of over 400 commodities we grow is put on America's dinner table every night.

Though last year brought significant challenges to our country and to our valley, which I represent, my commitment and the commitment of my office never wavered to serve the people of Fresno and Tulare Counties with focus, urgency, and results.

Throughout 2025, I listened closely to the priorities of my constituents. Valley families told me the relief they needed from rising costs and affordability. Farmers and farmworkers called for a stronger agricultural economy and better labor conditions, dealing with comprehensive immigration reform.

Communities demanded access to healthcare, safe infrastructure, reliable water, and the resources necessary to thrive. In 2025, our office secured $831 million in Federal funding for communities across the San Joaquin Valley.

□ 1045

Throughout our constituent casework, which I think is the meat and potatoes of any congressional office, we returned $74 million directly to residents of the 21st Congressional District. We helped more than 1,200 constituent cases and responded to over 11,000 calls, letters, and requests for assistance from the people whom we serve. That is our job, to serve the people and to get things done.

We invested in our children and working families. That is critical. My team helped secure $35 million for Head Start programs in Fresno and Tulare Counties. We strengthened critical infrastructure, which is necessary not only in our valley but throughout the country.

We secured $31 million for Fresno Yosemite International Airport to improve infrastructure upgrades, and also deal with the growing demands for the valley and regional economic growth, and expanding the international terminal.

We secured $3.5 million for the Kaweah River Siphon Project to improve water reliability while supporting valley agriculture and local jobs. As we know, where water flows, food grows. That is critical to our valley's economy.

In addition to that, we provided $1 million to the city of Kingsburg to establish a new city hall; another $1 million to relocate the Orange Cove Police Department to make a more functional facility; and another $1 million dollars for the Parlier Police Department.

Thanks to the bipartisan infrastructure law, we secured $254 million in Federal investments to strengthen our water supply for the long term. That includes $125 million to advance the B.F. Sisk Dam Raise and Reservoir Expansion Project. We provided another 130,000 acre-feet of new water storage to the people of our valley, and $129 million to support the construction of Sites Reservoir, which will provide 1.5 million acre-feet of additional water for the people of California, which is critically important to our long-term water supply.

Mr. Speaker, the San Joaquin Valley is the breadbasket of our Nation, supporting farmers, farmworkers, ranchers, dairymen and -women. It remains, obviously, as their Representative, my highest priority to advocate on their behalf.

When the avian influenza swept the valley and the country, it threatened the livelihoods of those who put food on America's dinner tables. I introduced the Healthy Poultry Assistance and Indemnification Act to ensure growers are fairly compensated and our food supply remains strong and safe. That is what Americans want.

We also honored, separately, those who have served our country and their families. We recognized 20 men and women from the Fresno Veterans Home who served our Nation during World War II and the Korean war to ensure their contributions are never forgotten, they are remembered, and they are celebrated. We should never forget those men and women currently in harm's way serving our country or those and their families who have served.

Beyond our district, we have worked to support the United States' leadership abroad by advocating for humanitarian assistance, accountability, and diplomacy in global conflicts, while upholding America's values on the world stage, that beacon of life that President Reagan used to speak of and that other countries look for.

In closing, I will continue to work with my Democratic and Republican colleagues to deliver results and strengthen our communities for a better future. More work needs to be done.

RECOGNIZING INDIANA UNIVERSITY FOOTBALL TEAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Indiana, Ms. HOUCHIN, for 5 minutes.

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in recognition of the 15–0 Indiana University football team for their historic season, winning the Rose Bowl, then the Peach Bowl, and now advancing to the College Football Playoff National Championship.

This team rose to the occasion when few expected it. Without a roster full of five-star recruits, they were often underestimated, but they responded again and again with discipline and toughness. Week after week, they proved that hard work and preparation still matter.

Under the leadership of Coach Curt Cignetti, this team has put Indiana football on the map. A perfect regular season, a Big Ten Championship victory over Ohio State for the program's first conference title since 1967, and Indiana's first Heisman Trophy reflect what can be accomplished when a team fully commits to the standard set before them.

On behalf of Indiana's Ninth District, the home of our Indiana University Hoosiers, I commend Coach Cignetti, quarterback Fernando Mendoza, and players on the team like Charlie Becker, D'Angelo Ponds, Pat Coogan, Elijah

Sarratt, and the entire Indiana football program for the achievement that has made our State so proud.

I am rooting for the Indiana Hoosiers in the national championship this weekend. I hope they bring it home from Miami, and I have no doubt they will.

As Coach Cignetti has said himself: This would make one heck of a movie.

Good luck to the Hoosiers on Monday.

CONGRATULATING INDIANA STATE FAIR QUEEN PRESLEY HAMPTON

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Presley Hampton of Jackson County on being named the Indiana State Fair Queen.

Presley represents the very best of Indiana. She has shown dedication to agriculture, leadership in her community, and a strong work ethic that reflects the values so many young people across our State are raised with.

The Indiana State Fair is more than a tradition. It is a celebration of farming, youth leadership, and the families who work every day to feed our country. Presley's achievements highlight the importance of programs like 4–H and FFA that prepare young leaders for the future.

I know Presley will represent Indiana with integrity and pride. I congratulate her family, mentors, and everyone who helped support her along the way.

Southern Indiana is immensely proud of Presley, and we wish her all the best as she takes on this role.

RECOGNIZING STARLIGHT DISTILLERY

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Starlight Distillery, an outstanding family-owned business in southern Indiana.

Operated by the seventh generation of the Huber family, Starlight earned global recognition when its Japanese Mizunara Reserve finished bourbon was named the best overall bourbon at the San Francisco World Spirits Competition.

That is right, Kentucky, Indiana's bourbon is the world's best.

This prestigious award reflects the family's dedication to hard work and a commitment to quality that has guided their business for generations.

Starlight is more than just a distillery. It has put southern Indiana on the map. The Huber family has built a business that supports local agriculture, creates jobs, and showcases what family-run enterprises in rural Indiana can achieve on the world stage.

I am proud to represent the Huber family and the many hardworking people behind Starlight Distillery. Their success is a testament to the strength of family businesses and the communities that support them.

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 52 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. BOST) at noon.

PRAYER

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

By Your grace, O Lord, and the example of those who have gone before us as paragons of faith and righteousness, You have shown us what is true, what is noble, what is right, what is pure and lovely, what is worth admiration, what is excellent and praiseworthy.

You set a high bar for how we are to live, and we are tempted to assume that the paradigms from the past did not face the same challenges we face today. Maybe their situations were different, maybe less complex; but if we are honest with ourselves, we must admit that our predecessors faced their own trials and yet held fast to their faith in You.

Lord, be near us this day in the midst of the adversities and the asperities unique to our present circumstances. Show us again how to be gentle so that in us Your gentleness is evident to all. Assure us that You hear our prayers and petitions, our Thanksgivings and our requests, that we would have no need to be anxious, but could be a source of reassurance for those in need.

Guard our hearts and minds in all we do, that even when we do not understand why things are the way they are, we may experience Your peace which transcends our comprehension.

This day, may we put our faith in You and in the peace we have received from You into practice.

Lord, be with us, 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 gentlewoman from New York (Ms. GILLEN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. GILLEN 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.

REPUBLICANS SAVE FAMILIES MONEY

(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, to cancel tax increases, President Donald Trump signed the Working Families Tax Cuts law into effect on July 4, coordinating with Speaker MIKE JOHNSON.

The law limits government, expands freedom, and provides progrowth policies, creating jobs. As the April tax deadline approaches, the law allows Americans to keep more money, led by Secretary of the Treasury Scott Bessent of Charleston, South Carolina.

'' . . . people are going to get massive refund checks,'' said White House National Economic Director Kevin Hassett.

Chief of the IRS, Frank Bisignano, said: '' . . . 94 percent-plus of middle-class Americans. . . . '' benefit.

Working Families Tax Cuts boost refunds, providing permanency to lower tax rates from the 2017 tax cuts, no tax on tips, no tax on overtime, no tax on Social Security.

In conclusion, God bless our troops as the global war on terrorism continues. Trump is reinstituting peace through strength, revealing war criminal Putin lies, insulting Trump and mocking Trump, as Putin supports Khomeini murdering innocent protestors calling for freedom for Iran, courageously encouraged by President Donald Trump.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

IMMUNIZATION SCHEDULE

(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, I rise today to condemn Secretary Kennedy's recent assault on children's health.

Last week, against universally recommended guidelines, the Department of Health and Human Services slashed the childhood immunization schedule from 17 vaccines to 11. Among those removed are vaccines to protect against RSV, COVID–19, and hepatitis B.

Americans deserve accurate information that is based on established science to make decisions about our children's health. I am perplexed by this latest ambush on the lives and future of our children. What is the crisis that requires us to challenge settled science?

The universally recommended vaccine schedule that families have relied on and trusted for years to protect their children has saved countless lives. I shudder to think about the children who could die from preventable diseases at the hands of this administration's so-called guidance. We are simply pandering to skeptics who want to impose ideology in place of intelligent research.

Since taking office, this administration has made every effort to dismantle public health. These unacceptable and baseless challenges only deepen the growing cracks in our health system.

RECOGNIZING RELIGIOUS TOLERANCE WEEK

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

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Religious Tolerance Week and celebrate the beautiful tapestry of faith that defines the Virgin Islands of the United States.

In our homes, Christians, Hindus, Jews, Muslims, Rastafarians, and practitioners of ancestral African tradition don't just coexist. We celebrate one another. The support of Ramadan, Yom Kippur, and Good Friday are solemn occasions shared by all. We celebrate brothers and sisters as they enjoy Diwali and hold sacred spaces where African traditionalist religion is practiced. Our festivals blend the sacred traditions of multiple faiths.

This is not tolerance. It is love and an embodiment of what America promises: that our differences make us stronger, our faiths can flourish side by side, and unity does not require unanimity.

As we face growing division in our Nation, let the Virgin Islands be a model. We prove every day that respecting each other's belief enriches us all. I ask for strength in that for all of us.

HONORING MICHAEL KERR

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

Ms. GILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Michael Howard Kerr, a beloved husband, father, grandfather, and extraordinary community leader from Woodmere, New York.

Michael dedicated his life to serving his community. He served as fire commissioner in the village of Woodsburgh and later as police commissioner. He also devoted time to serve on the boards of various charitable organizations, including the Jewish Community Center of the Greater Five Towns and the UJA-Federation of Greater New York.

He didn't stop there, though. Michael was a tireless advocate for medical research, particularly in the fight against Crohn's Disease, liver disease, and organ transplantation. He supported groundbreaking research at institutions, including Mount Sinai, Cornell, Lenox Hill, and Columbia University.

Above all, Michael was devoted to his family; his wife, Susan; and his sons, Joshua and Zachary.

Michael Kerr leaves behind a legacy of leadership, generosity, and profound humanity. May his memory be a blessing and enduring inspiration to all of us.

BREAKFAST IN THE CLASSROOM

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at the end of last year, a Massachusetts-based foundation committed to ending hunger, the Eos Foundation, and released its annual school breakfast report card.

We have all heard the old adage that breakfast is the most important meal of the day. For kids experiencing hunger, it is especially true.

The Eos Foundation has put its money where its mouth is literally, by providing funding and technical assistance to schools to establish robust breakfast-in-the-classroom programs.

Springfield Public Schools is a shining example of what is possible. With support from the Eos breakfast-in-the-classroom model, 84 percent of students are now getting breakfast up from 44 percent a few years ago.

Mr. Speaker, we can and we should do more to close the breakfast gap, the difference between the number of students receiving school breakfast versus lunches. I am committed to doing my part. I have a bill that would increase the Federal meal reimbursement rates for school breakfasts and lunches.

Mr. Speaker, thanks to the incredible partners at the Eos Foundation, we are making progress one school at a time.

HONORING ROBERTO MONDRAGON

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Roberto Mondragon, a Lieutenant Governor and musician.

Roberto Mondragon was a beloved cultural figure in New Mexico whose voice, music, and lifelong work helped keep our traditions alive. He brought his resonant tenor to the cultural renaissance that made sure Nuevo Mexico did not lose its culture, its songs, its language, or its poetry. At a time when the Spanish language, music, and tradition were being pushed aside, he lifted them up, insisting that they belong not only in memory, but in classrooms, on the radio, and in the halls of power. He showed generations of young people, including my own high school choir that I sang in, the West Side Singers, that tradition is not behind us, but within us.

Roberto will be remembered every time we sing ''That's New Mexico''; ''Asi Es Nuevo Mexico,'' our State song.

''That is New Mexico, the Black, the Hispanic, the Anglo, the indigenous, all your children, all equal''; ''Asi es Nuevo Mexico. El negro, el hispano, el anglo, el indio. Todos son tus hijos, todos por igual.''

□ 1210

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2988, PROTECTING PRUDENT INVESTMENT OF RETIREMENT SAVINGS ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2262, FLEXIBILITY FOR WORKERS EDUCATION ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2270, EMPOWERING EMPLOYER CHILD AND ELDER CARE SOLUTIONS ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2312, TIPPED EMPLOYEE PROTECTION ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4366, SAVE LOCAL BUSINESS ACT

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 988 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 988

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2988) to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to specify requirements concerning the consideration of pecuniary and non-pecuniary factors, 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 Education and Workforce 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 Education and Workforce or their respective designees; (2) the further amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2262) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to exclude certain activities from hours worked, 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 Education and Workforce now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Workforce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House any bill specified in section 4 of this resolution. All points of order against consideration of each such bill are waived. The respective amendments in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Workforce now printed in each such bill 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 Education and Workforce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 4. The bills referred to in section 3 of this resolution are as follows:

(a) The bill (H.R. 2270) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to exclude child and dependent care services and payments from the rate used to compute overtime compensation.

(b) The bill (H.R. 2312) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to revise the definition of the term ''tipped employee'', and for other purposes.

(c) The bill (H.R. 4366) to clarify the treatment of 2 or more employers as joint employers under the National Labor Relations Act and the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ), 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

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

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, we are here today to debate the rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2262, the Flexibility for Workers Education Act; H.R. 2270, the Empowering Employer Child and Elder Care Solutions Act; H.R. 2312, the Tipped Employee Protection Act; H.R. 4366, the Save Local Business Act, under a closed rule; and H.R. 2988, the Protecting Prudent Investment of Retirement Savings Act, under a structured rule.

One hour of debate each for H.R. 2262, H.R. 2270, H.R. 2312, H.R. 2988, and H.R. 4366 shall be equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Education and Workforce, or their designees. The rule provides for a motion to recommit for all five bills.

Mr. Speaker, the bills before us today are about one thing: getting the Federal Government out of the way of the American worker.

For too long, outdated definitions and woke regulatory overreach have stifled opportunities and created a paperwork trap for the job creators on our Main Streets. Today, we take a stand for common sense and economic growth.

We begin with H.R. 2262, the Flexibility for Workers Education Act. Under current law, many nonexempt workers, the very people who could benefit most from upskilling, are often excluded from voluntary training because the Fair Labor Standards Act treats those sessions as hours worked. This creates massive inconvenience for employers, who ultimately choose not to offer the training at all.

This bill levels the playing field, allowing workers to pursue voluntary professional development outside of regular hours without triggering burdensome overtime costs for their employers.

In the same spirit of support, H.R. 2270, the Empowering Employer Child and Elder Care Solutions Act, addresses the childcare crunch facing so many families. By excluding childcare and eldercare benefits from the regular rate calculation for overtime, we remove a major financial barrier for some small business owners who want to help their employees balance work and family life. This is a pro-family, pro-worker solution that requires no new Federal spending.

We must also protect the flexibility that makes the service industry so vital. H.R. 2312, the Tipped Employee Protection Act, clears the regulatory fog that has long surrounded tipped workers.

The Biden administration attempted to micromanage every minute of a server's day through the unworkable 80/20 rule, a standard that is virtually impossible to monitor or enforce. This bill provides a clear and simple definition for tipped employees, an employee who receives tips plus other cash wages that meet or exceed the Federal minimum wage for a work period.

This provides stability for restaurant owners and protects the hiring potential of our servers and bartenders.

Similarly, H.R. 4366, the Save Local Business Act, restores the joint employer standard that served our economy for decades.

The Obama and Biden administrations weaponized the National Labor Relations Board to target the franchise model, creating a scheme that cost the franchising sector an estimated $33 billion annually. By codifying that an employer must exercise direct, actual, and immediate control over workers, we restore the certainty that small business owners, contractors, and franchisees need to grow and hire more.

Finally, we must protect the hard-earned savings of the American people.

□ 1220

H.R. 2988, the Protecting Prudent Investment of Retirement Savings Act, ensures that Employee Retirement Income Security Act, or ERISA, fiduciaries are focused on one thing, the financial bottom line.

We cannot allow woke fiduciaries to gamble with a worker's pension to satisfy a political agenda. This bill reinforces the duties of loyalty and ensures that investment decisions are based solely on maximizing returns for the benefit of the retiree and not a social experiment.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are tired of the regulatory noise coming out of Washington. They want a government that works for them, not against them. These five bills deliver on our promise to cut red tape, empower families, and protect the American Dream.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, America is suffering. Americans don't recognize the country we live in. Trump's tariffs have caused prices to soar. We have the highest unemployment rate in 4 years so fewer people have jobs. Those out of work can't even afford those expensive groceries, housing, and appliances.

Republicans refused to extend the health insurance tax cuts in time, so now millions of Americans have health insurance premiums that are double and sometimes even triple what they were 1 year ago. In their big, beautiful bill, Republicans took a sledgehammer to our fragile healthcare system to give permanent tax breaks to their political donors, the billionaires, and the biggest corporations.

Our President bombed boats and then the capital of a foreign country for oil, and now he says he is acting President of that country.

He wants our military to invade a NATO ally. Remember, Mr. Speaker, America and our NATO allies fought fascism together in World War II. Republicans claim we don't have money to keep healthcare costs down, yet they are going to keep spending billions of taxpayer dollars for Trump's reckless military action in Venezuela and everywhere else he decides to invade or bomb.

Trump and Kristi Noem have militarized our streets. Masked men in full military gear roam the streets of our cities. These masked men invade church properties and schools, knock down doors without warrants, ram cars, and assault pastors and people of faith. These masked, armed men have arrested hundreds of citizens just for looking Latino.

Last week, they killed a citizen. They shot a mother of three in the face three times. Her last words were: I am not mad at you. His words, after shooting her to death, are too obscene to say on this floor.

Kristi Noem and the President have now demonized this dead mother. Trump wants Americans to deny what we can see with our own eyes: the killing of a mother, Renee Nicole Good.

In the face of all this pain, chaos, and economic hardship, the American people expect Congress to do something, to ask hard questions of the administration, to be the check and balance that we were taught about in school, conduct oversight, lower prices, and protect our healthcare.

So what are Republicans doing?

Last week, following the invasion of Venezuela and the expiration of the healthcare tax credits, their priority was a bill about showerheads. This week it is worse. They are actively putting their thumb on the scale in favor of big corporations and against workers, lowering what parents get paid in overtime, reclassifying workers so they can pay them less, or make it easy for corporations, like those big meatpacking plants, to get away with hiring child labor or wage theft. They want to block financial managers from even considering environmental risks like flooding and wildfires.

Yes, Americans want Congress to do something. The problem is that Republicans control the House and the bills we consider in the Rules Committee and vote on.

However, Democrats can force votes, like we did on the healthcare tax credits and like we will soon do on the War Powers Resolution. On the floor of the people's House, we will call out Republicans who always seem to stand with the biggest corporations and against workers.

Despite what the titles of their bills say, they do the opposite.

Mr. Speaker, we will force Republicans to face the consequences of ignoring the economic struggles of everyday Americans.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to clarify a few things, one in particular about the One Big Beautiful Bill Act.

The narrative that the One Big Beautiful Bill Act only gives tax cuts to billionaires is just false. The bill cuts taxes for working-class families who need it most. As a result of the One Big Beautiful Bill Act, the top 1 percent will pay more in Federal taxes than they did before the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017.

It ends $500 billion in Biden-era tax breaks and special interest giveaways to wealthy individuals and large corporations. It stops a Biden-era $1,700 tax increase.

Working families making between $15,000 and $30,000 will have their taxes cut by 21 percent under the One Big Beautiful Bill Act. Mr. Speaker, 66 percent of the One Big Beautiful Bill Act's tax cuts benefit families making less than $500,000. Just because they keep saying it doesn't make it true. The One Big Beautiful Bill Act does help working families.

Mr. Speaker, I do have to address, because my colleague has decided to bring ICE into this debate, or this discussion, regarding small businesses and help that we may be able to give small businesses. I just want to give a few examples of what ICE is actually doing in Minnesota, because I am someone who is here from Minnesota.

They have arrested a registered sex offender from Somalia with 17 prior convictions, including domestic violence and threatening terroristic acts.

They have arrested an illegal El Salvadoran alien convicted of sexual assault on a child.

They have arrested an illegal alien from Mexico convicted of selling cocaine and methamphetamine and multiple illegal aliens from Laos convicted of rape, assault, kidnapping, and sodomy of children under the age of 13 and domestic violence.

They have arrested convicted murderers from Mexico, Sudan, Burma, Laos, Sierra Leone, Guatemala, Somalia, and El Salvador.

That is what ICE is doing in Minnesota. They are making it safer for everyday people.

I ask my colleague to simply allow the investigation to take place over what happened last week and to stop the inflammatory rhetoric that is unnecessary at this point.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, what is amazing is that on the floor of this House we heard my colleague talk about the One Big Beautiful Bill Act, and I guess they are going back to calling it that. They were trying to change its name because they know that the American people know it is not beautiful. It is only beautiful, Mr. Speaker, if you are a billionaire and you have benefited from those tax cuts for the millionaires, the billionaires, and the biggest corporations.

Remember, Mr. Speaker, that Democrats wanted to make permanent, and offered amendments, so that we could continue tax cuts for middle-class Americans. We wanted to do something more than what they did on tipped workers.

Are you kidding me, Mr. Speaker? Republicans made tipped worker tax credits temporary but gave permanent tax cuts to the billionaires. The predominant benefit of that big, beautiful bill went to the richest Americans, and there is no denying that.

There is no denying that $1.4 trillion went to the wealthiest Americans. There is no denying the fact that they keep talking about deficits, $4 trillion, that they are forcing our children and grandchildren to pay because they wanted to give those tax credits to the biggest corporations and millionaires.

□ 1230

Now, the other thing that is interesting that got raised is Minnesota. She talked about a couple of immigrants who have been arrested. We don't have any problem about enforcement and arresting people who commit crimes. In fact, we have had Democratic Presidents do that. Obama deported more people than Trump has, but he went after people with criminal records.

Mr. Speaker, 80 percent of the people in ICE custody have committed no crime. Hundreds of citizens have been arrested for no crime by ICE, which has no jurisdiction. Why were they arrested? Is it just because they look Latino? Is it just because they speak Spanish? That is not okay.

Let's talk about criminal activity. Trump pardoned the January 6 insurrectionists who beat law enforcement right outside these doors, violently beat the law enforcement officers who were protecting us.

What has happened since then? Do you want to talk about people who have been arrested? Talk about all of those violent offenders who were arrested, and what did they get? They got a pardon from this President. We have dozens who have gone on to reoffend, who have gone on to assault, who have been engaged in child pornography, in egregious crimes because this President pardoned them. When you want to talk about going after criminals, let's look at what this President has failed to do.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, not to belabor the point, but I feel like I need to repeat myself and remind others about what ICE is actually doing in Minnesota. They have arrested a registered sex offender from Somalia with 17 prior convictions, including domestic violence and threatening terrorist acts, and convicted murderers from Mexico, Sudan, Burma, Laos, Guatemala, and Somalia. I wish I didn't have to continue to repeat myself about what ICE is really doing. What ICE is about is making sure that our streets are safer.

As for the claim about the One Big Beautiful Bill Act not doing what it is supposed to and only giving tax cuts to billionaires, I had mentioned, I had explained what actually happened in the One Big Beautiful Bill Act, and I would ask the other side, I would just ponder or wonder out loud why they didn't do it in their Inflation Reduction Act. If it was that important, when they were in control and they passed the Inflation Reduction Act, why didn't they do all of these things that they talk about being so important right now?

It is a little confusing when they continue to repeat. They believe that if they just continue to say the same thing over and over and over and over, it makes it true, and it does not, if you take a look at the One Big Beautiful Bill Act and what ICE is doing in Minnesota.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I find it interesting that in response to this litany and this long list of criminal activity and the criminals who were pardoned by Trump, we heard the same thing, there was a sex offender. What about all those sex offenders that have now been pardoned?

What about all of the egregious actions that ICE is conducting in Mrs. FISCHBACH's very own State? She won't stand up for the law enforcement officers who she walks by every day and the attacks that they faced, but she will stand up in favor of ICE activity that has killed one of Minnesota's own citizens?

Let me read one of the President's latest posts: ''Do the people of Minnesota really want to live in a community . . . '' His last sentence: ''Fear not, great people of Minnesota, the day of reckoning and retribution is coming.''

Retribution? We should not live in a society where we have a President who goes after cities and States because they have Democratic leadership. There are Republicans who live in that city. There are Democrats who live in that city, Independents. It should not matter.

However, this President and Republicans who support him and refuse to condemn him seem to think it is okay to beat up law enforcement officers in our own Capitol, but it is not okay to question excessive, egregious abuses by ICE not only in Minnesota, but across this country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOYLE).

Ms. HOYLE of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule and H.R. 2312, the Tipped Employee Protection Act.

When I was a waitress in 1983, the tipped wage was exactly the same as it is now. It is $2.13 an hour. Your ability to budget, to cover rent, to buy groceries, and to pay for gas depends on how much strangers leave on the table.

What makes me angry is what little has changed since the tipped wage was frozen. Rent, food, gas, and childcare have all exploded, but tipped workers are still stuck with a base wage from decades ago. That is wrong.

However, the bigger problem is the system was never built to work. The law says that your employer has to make up the difference if your tips don't reach minimum wage, but in most States there is no real enforcement unless you catch it, document it, and risk retaliation by demanding the pay that you have earned. To put it another way, the law puts the burden of enforcement on the people with the least power.

H.R. 2312 makes this even worse. It would massively expand employers' power to treat far more workers and far more hours as tipped wages.

Oregon does this differently. Tipped workers' wages are higher. Poverty rates are lower, and the restaurant industry still thrives. For workers, that means a slow night doesn't mean that you can't pay your rent.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle rejected my amendment to ensure these workers have the bare minimum wage protections. Again, I will remind people that the minimum wage in this country has not changed in decades.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this rule. Protect workers and vote ''no'' on this bill.

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 20, the Richard L. Trumka Protecting the Right to Organize Act of 2025, a bipartisan bill that would expand workers' rights to organize and collectively bargain in the workplace, hold employers accountable for violating workers' rights, and allow for free, fair, and safe union elections.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the slate of partisan bills that Republicans want us to vote on this week, which lower overtime pay for workers, cut workers' wages, give corporations more loopholes to mistreat workers without consequence, and mess with workers' retirement savings plan to combat supposed wokeness, whatever that is, Democrats simply want to add another bill for consideration, one that actually helps workers and is cosponsored by 214 Members of Congress, including several Republicans.

The PRO Act was one of the first bills I got to cosponsor in committee and in Congress when I joined in 2021. That was back when the committee was called the Education and Labor Committee because Democrats are not afraid of saying ''labor,'' and we will always protect workers' rights. That is why when we held the majority, we passed the PRO Act to support workers.

□ 1240

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, to discuss our proposal, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the ranking member of the Committee on Education and Workforce.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, as we stand here, workers' rights are under attack, and working families are struggling to decide between paying rent and paying for groceries. Instead of lowering costs, this week, the Republicans are considering proposals that will reduce workers' wages, adversely affect their retirement savings, and give corporations and bosses loopholes to take money out of their pockets. This is untenable, and these are the proposals that Americans can least afford.

That is why we must defeat the previous question, so we can bring up and pass H.R. 20, the Protecting the Right to Organize Act, the PRO Act, to help workers organize. We know that when they organize, they will have higher pay, better benefits, and safer workplaces.

The PRO Act will be the most significant upgrade in U.S. labor law in over 80 years. For too long, workers have suffered from antiunion attacks and toothless labor laws that have undermined their right to work safely and be paid fairly.

The PRO Act will help hold lawbreaking employers accountable by imposing meaningful penalties for violating workers' rights. It will secure free, fair, and safe union elections by preventing employer interference. It will crack down on corporations that misclassify employees to stymie their right to organize.

This is a critical moment for working families. We cannot abandon our workers, the backbone of the American economy, when they are under attack from antiworker politicians and lawbreaking corporations.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in defeating the previous question so that, instead of reducing workers' wages, we can support this bicameral, bipartisan legislation to ensure that workers can earn the pay and benefits they are owed for their hard work.

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I will address something in one of the bills that is about childcare and the care economy.

We all know the care economy is what makes all other work possible. Women can go to work when they know their babies will be well taken care of. When a parent or grandparent gets ill, we know that it is women who step in to fill the gap. In fact, because it is so expensive to get care, we have seen a record number of women fall out of the workforce. It is up to about 350,000 women, I think, who have left.

This is a problem because we need women to be able to participate in our workforce, to be able to contribute to their own household's income. We know that this is something that can be fixed with governmental action.

In New Mexico, we now have universal childcare. It is something we can get done, and the reason why we do this is because it is important to allow women and parents to work. It is often men who stay home as the father. It is also important for the child because when you get good early childcare, you grow up to have more opportunities in life.

On average, though, parents spend between $6,500 and $15,000 per child for 1 year of childcare. That is eating up more and more of families' budgets. People can't afford this.

What we know that people have done is negotiate. They talk to their employers, and those employers have often provided childcare as one of the elements of compensation. This is why unions are important. They have negotiated this and fought for this as part of compensation.

For decades, when you get paid overtime, you include all of your compensation, including if you were getting assistance for care expenses.

Now, they have named their bill and added ''childcare'' to it, and they say this is to increase the availability of childcare. What it actually will do is that it is going to decrease people's overtime pay. You are no longer going to get paid overtime based on your full compensation. This is overturning decades of precedence.

Once again, they are acting in a way that makes life more expensive, that makes sure that parents who receive this benefit will get paid less if they are forced to work overtime. Guess what. If you are forced to work overtime and have to keep your kids in childcare, it is going to cost you more.

Their spiral of increased costs for American families is always looking out for the big guy, always looking out for those big corporations. That is why Democrats oppose this bill.

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

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I will clear up some of the rhetoric on H.R. 2270. It is called the Empowering Employer Child and Elder Care Solutions Act, but just to make it clear, this bill makes it easier for employers to provide childcare benefits for their employees.

It excludes childcare and eldercare benefits from the regular rate calculation for overtime, so we remove a major financial barrier for some small business owners who want to help their employees actually balance work and family life. It would be a helpful thing for those employers and employees to help provide childcare.

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I will point out that Americans know that Trump has been horrible on the handling of their economy because he has done nothing to lower the cost of living. In fact, everything he has done is the opposite.

His tariffs have increased prices. Their failure to address the healthcare crisis and extend tax credits for health insurance premiums has increased the cost of healthcare for Americans. In fact, Americans know this.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an article titled ''Americans are more dissatisfied with Trump's handling of the economy than ever, polls show,'' from Politics, dated December 17, 2025.

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

There was no objection.

[From Politics, Dec 17, 2025]

AMERICANS ARE MORE DISSATISFIED WITH TRUMP'S HANDLING OF THE ECONOMY THAN EVER, POLL SHOWS

Americans give President Donald Trump his worst approval ratings ever for his handling of the economy, as they also express concerns about the cost of living, healthcare prices, and personal finances, a new PBS News/NPR/Marist poll finds.

Fifty-seven percent of Americans disapprove of how Trump is handling the economy, once viewed as one of the president's strengths. Thirty-six percent say the president is doing a good job, the lowest this poll has found across both of his terms in office.

Sagging support Trump on the economy is likely a major factor dragging down his overall approval rating—38% of Americans think Trump is doing a good job as president, the lowest percentage since the end of his first term.

''This is a major problem for him,'' said Lee Miringoff, director of the Marist Institute for Public Opinion. ''When affordability is so front and center in people's minds, that's going to be laid at the doorstep of a chief executive.''

Seven in 10 Americans say the cost of living in their area is unaffordable, including nearly half of Republicans and three-quarters of independents, according to the latest poll. Three in 10 Americans say the cost of living is affordable, falling 25 percentage points since June.

''The longer this goes on, the harder it is to get those numbers back,'' said Amy Walter, editor of The Cook Political Report. ''It becomes sort of a self-fulfilling situation. People don't feel confident in you, and they think prices just continue to go up.''

Public frustration with the economy also plagued Trump's predecessor, Joe Biden, during his presidency. When inflation began to peak in early 2022, Biden's approval on the economy also dipped to 36% before improving slightly by the end of his term.

Trump capitalized on voters' economic dissatisfaction during the 2024 presidential election to win back the Oval Office. Now, those same feelings could be potentially perilous for Republicans in next year's midterm elections.

On the economy, registered voters were more likely to say the Democratic partly would do a better job compared to the Republican party, 40% to 35%. Independent voters gave Democrats an 11-point edge in this poll (though the margin of error for that group was 6.2).

It's a dramatic reversal from September 2022, months before the last midterm elections, when Republicans held a 15-point advantage on the economy with voters overall and a 23-point advantage with independents.

Since the Republican Party now controls the White House and both chambers of Congress, ''it's tough to point a finger at the Biden economy and say that's what's driving this situation,'' Miringoff said.

While Democrats are positioned well for the midterms right now, their support on this issue has not fully hardened, Miringoff added. Democrats made issues of affordability their top concern in off-year elections and will likely continue to do so. ''This may be where you throw a few punches, step back and hope the other side collapses,'' Miringoff said.

Americans don't see brighter days in 2026.

Economic concerns are fueling an overall sense of pessimism as 2025 comes to an end. More than half of Americans (57%) described themselves as having a more negative view of what's to come in the year ahead, while 43% say they are more optimistic. It's a reversal from a year ago when the majority felt hopeful about what would come to pass in 2025.

A year ago, people felt like 2025 might offer some relief with prices of goods stabilizing, Walter said. That didn't happen, and now people are less inclined to believe it will happen next year.

Instead, the price of goods remains the biggest economic concern for Americans in this latest poll, with 45% listing the issue as the most pressing issue for them—more than double the number who named any of the other options, including housing costs, tariffs, job security or interest rates.

Even as the president has begun to acknowledge issues of affordability and promised to bring prices under control, he has also dismissed concerns as a ''con job'' perpetrated by Democrats.

Some Republicans in Congress have broken publicly with the president over his repeated claims. ''Affordability or the lack of ability of Americans to afford the cost of living is not a Democrat hoax,'' Rep. Marjorie Taylor Greene, R–Ga., told PBS News Hour co-anchor Amna Nawaz last week. Greene, who will resign her seat in Congress next month, pointed to record credit card debt as one factor in an continuingly unstable economy.

Americans are experiencing it firsthand, Miringoff said, and Trump's continued denials about how Americans are feeling about the cost of living ''creates even a bigger issue'' for him and could risk turning gentle wind ''into a hurricane.''

HOW TRUMP VOTERS SEE THE ECONOMY RIGHT NOW

Those worries about the economy have bubbled up even among people like Roger Chester, 48, an Illinois independent who voted for the president last year. He said Trump's governing philosophy is best described as shifting winds.

''He's not conservative. He's not liberal. He is none of the above,'' Chester said. ''He literally blows with the wind to what his base wants and that is it. Which is fine. That's all I want my politicians to do.''

Chester said he's had a ''love-hate'' relationship with Trump since the president first ran for office a decade ago. He now says the president is a ''populist puppet.''

While Chester said prices of goods are ''horrendous'' and ''unbearable,'' he doesn't solely blame Trump.

''He's the only one that's actually made an effort to actually keep any of the promises that he's made, and he definitely hasn't been perfect,'' he said.

To stay afloat, Chester, who lost his job in a casino several years ago, says he works seven days a week to support his family. He also believes the United States has to go through some tough times to emerge in a better economic place, with more jobs and better pay.

''I'm willing to suffer. I'm never going to retire. That's how it is,'' he said. ''I'm doing pretty much anything to have a better life for my son.''

Hundreds of miles away in North Carolina, independent Justine Hawkins is also playing the economic long game. The health care worker and mother of three was a reluctant Trump voter last year.

She said the economy is mostly working fine for her upper middle-class family, but she disagrees with the president's assertion that affordability is a hoax.

''If you walk into any grocery store, you know everything costs more money,'' she said.

Hawkins said while everyone is feeling discomfort right now—especially in the height of holiday shopping—she is trying to prioritize essential needs over things she may want. She hopes Trump's policies like tariffs on imported goods will pay off eventually.

''If I looked at it today, I'd say, 'Oh, I'm very unhappy,' '' Hawkins said. ''I think in the long run we will, as a nation, be better off because of it.''

Others strongly disagree with that prediction, including some Republican voters. In this poll, the president's support from his own party dropped five points since last month.

Sherry Kamphaus, 61, is one Republican who has grown disillusioned with Trump.

She lives in Illinois, a solidly Democratic state, and voted for Trump last year. She likes how the president is handling some issues, such as immigration. But that approval is outweighed by economic concerns, the major area where she said the president has failed to meet her expectations.

''He was supposed to help with food prices. That was the main reason that I voted for him,'' she said. ''Food prices just keep going up.''

Her frustration has spilled over to the Republican Party.

''They promised they'd do better, but they didn't follow through,'' she said. ''They're not doing what they promised to do, especially with the economy and inflation.''

MAJORITY SAY THEY ARE WORRIED ABOUT COST OF HEALTH CARE

For millions of others. the cost of health care remains a serious concern as enhanced subsidies for the Affordable Care Act are all but certain to expire at the end of the year. Average monthly premiums are likely to double on average, and millions of Americans are expected to drop coverage altogether.

More than half of Americans are concerned that they will be unable to pay for needed health care services next year. Another 46% say they are not worried.

But perspective is sharply divided along income, race and age:

67% of people who make under $50,000 are concerned while 47% of those who make above $50,000 say the same.

47% of white respondents expressed worry compared to 69% of Black voters and 65% of Latino voters.

63% of people under 30 years old are concerned. 40% of those over 60 years old say the same.

While the poll paints a concerning picture about the overall state of the economy, there are some potential signs of hope for the Trump administration.

Two-thirds of Americans are concerned about the effect of tariffs the president is implementing, but as he has reversed course on some of them and scaled back the announcement of many, the percentage of those who are worried has dropped 14 points since June.

Additionally, half of Americans think the U.S. economy is currently in a recession, the lowest number who believe that since 2010.

The poll also found:

39% say the economy is working well for them personally.

21% say their family finances have improved in the last year; 35% say they've gotten worse; and 44% say things have mostly stayed the same.

33% expect their financial finances to improve next year—down 15 percentage points since June. Another 29% believe things will get worse, and 39% expect their situation to stay the same.

For many Americans, the cumulative effect of all the swirling economic pressures can be almost too hard to manage.

Sherry Kamphaus, the Illinois Republican, has been married for 41 years and now stays home full time to care for her disabled husband. She said they pay all their bills, stick close to their budget and try to live within their means. Every month is still a challenge.

''There's a difference between living and surviving,'' Kamphaus said. ''We're surviving.''

PBS News, NPR and Marist Poll conducted a survey from Dec. 8 through Dec. 11, 2025, that polled 1,440 U.S. adults by phone, text and online with a margin of error of 3.2 percentage points, and 1,261 registered voters with a margin of error of 3.4 percentage points.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, as we mentioned earlier, Trump's economy is a mess, and Republicans have failed to step up and do anything. They fail to step up and challenge him on any of the issues. They refuse to allow a vote on the tariffs on the floor of this House. They stopped the clock so that we wouldn't vote on the tariffs in this House.

Today's bills are another step in Republican efforts to chip away at workers' rights, their retirement, and their pay, while costs are sky-high.

House Republicans continue to uphold Trump's failing economy and broken promises. As one of his campaign promises, Trump said that, on day one of his term, he would lower the prices of all goods and make America affordable again. Yet, nearly a year into his Presidency, life for Americans is more expensive than ever.

For the first time in nearly 4 years, more Americans reported that their family's current financial situation was bad rather than good. This was in December before the craziness of this—what?—just 12 days in.

Consumers are worried about prices, inflation, and tariffs. Those were the concerns of working Americans, but none of these bills before us do anything to address that.

□ 1250

Mr. Speaker, the wallets of Americans are emptier today than they were a year ago. My colleagues refuse to call out Trump's broken promises or stand up against his tariffs or all of his policies, any of his policies. I guess they are just afraid of him.

As working-class Americans work paycheck to paycheck to paycheck, millionaires and billionaires get richer and richer. What is the response? They offer bills about showerheads and bills that tip the scales against workers. They want workers to get less money for more work. That is a lousy deal.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject these bills and to vote against the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am so happy to get back to actually addressing the rules and the bills that are before us, instead of listening to Democrat talking points over and over.

I have listened to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle during this debate. It seems that they are once again choosing to prioritize Federal bureaucracy and woke social agendas over the actual needs of the American worker.

They claim to be the party of the worker. Yet, they oppose H.R. 2262, which simply increases opportunities for hourly employees to voluntarily take training classes to better their careers. They claim to support families. Yet, they oppose H.R. 2270, a bill that makes it easier for small businesses to offer childcare benefits.

The American people are tired of a government that treats every voluntary interaction between an employer and employee as a potential crime. They are tired of the 80–20 rules that make it harder for small businesses. They are tired of joint employer standards that were designated by union lawyers in Washington to destroy the franchise model that has provided a path for the American Dream for millions.

With H.R. 4366, the Save Local Businesses Act, we are finally bringing stability back to our Main Streets. We are telling the small business owners in my district and across the country that if they do not have direct, actual control over the worker, the Federal Government is not going to pretend they do just to satisfy a political agenda.

We cannot ignore the retirement security of our constituents. H.R. 2988 is a commonsense safeguard. When an American worker hands over their hard-earned paycheck to a fiduciary, they expect that money to be invested to maximize their return and not to fund a political experiment or a green energy fantasy. This bill ensures that pecuniary factors are the only things driving retirement investments.

The legislation in this package represents a fundamental shift back to the principles that made our country and our economy strong, which are clarity, flexibility, and individual opportunity. We are removing regulatory hurdles that have stifled upward mobility for far too long.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to put the interests of the American worker, the small business owner, and the retiree ahead of the interests of Washington bureaucrats. I am proud to support this rule, and I am glad that I was able to speak about the rule and about the bills, instead of talking points. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

The material previously referred to by Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 988 OFFERED BY MS. LEGER FERNANDEZ OF NEW MEXICO

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 5. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 20) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, and the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any 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 Education and Workforce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 6. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX and clause 8 of rule XX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 20.

SEC. 7. The Clerk shall transmit to the Senate a message that the House has passed H.R. 20 no later than three calendar days after passage.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. 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.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. 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 are 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 12 o'clock and 53 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. BOST) 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 988; and

Adoption of House Resolution 988, if ordered.

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.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2988, PROTECTING PRUDENT INVESTMENT OF RETIREMENT SAVINGS ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2262, FLEXIBILITY FOR WORKERS EDUCATION ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2270, EMPOWERING EMPLOYER CHILD AND ELDER CARE SOLUTIONS ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2312, TIPPED EMPLOYEE PROTECTION ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4366, SAVE LOCAL BUSINESS ACT

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. 988) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2988) to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to specify requirements concerning the consideration of pecuniary and non-pecuniary factors, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2262) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to exclude certain activities from hours worked, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2270) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to exclude child and dependent care services and payments from the rate used to compute overtime compensation; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2312) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to revise the definition of the term ''tipped employee'', and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4366) to clarify the treatment of 2 or more employers as joint employers under the National Labor Relations Act and the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, 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 206, nays 205, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 16]

YEAS—206

Aderholt
Alford
Allen
Amodei (NV)
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Barr
Barrett
Baumgartner
Bean (FL)
Begich
Bentz
Bergman
Bice
Biggs (AZ)
Biggs (SC)
Bilirakis
Bost
Brecheen
Bresnahan
Buchanan
Burchett
Burlison
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Ciscomani
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Collins
Comer
Crane
Crank
Crawford
Crenshaw
Davidson
De La Cruz
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Downing
Edwards
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Evans (CO)
Ezell
Fallon
Fedorchak
Feenstra
Fine
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flood
Fong
Foxx
Franklin, Scott
Fry
Fulcher
Garbarino
Gill (TX)
Goldman (TX)
Gonzales, Tony
Gooden
Gosar
Graves
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hageman
Hamadeh (AZ)
Haridopolos
Harrigan
Harris (MD)
Harris (NC)
Harshbarger
Hern (OK)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Hinson
Hudson
Huizenga
Hurd (CO)
Issa
Jack
Jackson (TX)
James
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kean
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy (UT)
Kiley (CA)
Kim
Knott
Kustoff
LaHood
LaLota
Langworthy
Latta
Lawler
Lee (FL)
Letlow
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luttrell
Mace
Mackenzie
Malliotakis
Maloy
Mann
Massie
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McCormick
McDowell
McGuire
Messmer
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (OH)
Miller-Meeks
Mills
Moore (AL)
Moore (NC)
Moore (UT)
Moore (WV)
Moran
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Nunn (IA)
Obernolte
Ogles
Onder
Owens
Palmer
Patronis
Perry
Pfluger
Reschenthaler
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rouzer
Roy
Rulli
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Self
Sessions
Shreve
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Strong
Stutzman
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner (OH)
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Van Epps
Wagner
Walberg
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westerman
Wied
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NAYS—205

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

McDonald Rivet
McGarvey
McGovern
McIver
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Mfume
Min
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Morrison
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Nadler
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Ocasio-Cortez
Olszewski
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pelosi
Perez
Peters
Pettersen
Pingree
Pocan
Pou
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Randall
Raskin
Riley (NY)
Rivas
Ross
Ruiz
Ryan
Salinas
Sánchez
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Simon
Smith (WA)
Sorensen
Soto
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Subramanyam
Suozzi
Takano
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Tran
Underwood
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Velázquez
Vindman
Walkinshaw
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Whitesides
Williams (GA)

NOT VOTING—20

Boebert
Casar
Dunn (FL)
Gimenez
Gray
Houchin
Houlahan
Hunt
Kiggans (VA)
Luna
Mast
Miller (WV)
Moolenaar
Murphy
Sherman
Stansbury
Swalwell
Sykes
Van Orden
Wilson (FL)

□ 1355

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Messrs. LANDSMAN, CUELLAR, BERA, GOTTHEIMER, and MOSKOWITZ changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 16.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 214, noes 207, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 17]

AYES—214

Aderholt
Alford
Allen
Amodei (NV)
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Barr
Barrett
Baumgartner
Bean (FL)
Begich
Bentz
Bergman
Bice
Biggs (AZ)
Biggs (SC)
Bilirakis
Boebert
Bost
Brecheen
Bresnahan
Buchanan
Burchett
Burlison
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Ciscomani
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Collins
Comer
Crane
Crank
Crawford
Crenshaw
Davidson
De La Cruz
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Downing
Edwards
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Evans (CO)
Ezell
Fallon
Fedorchak
Feenstra
Fine
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flood
Fong
Foxx
Franklin, Scott
Fry
Fulcher
Garbarino
Gill (TX)
Gimenez
Goldman (TX)
Gonzales, Tony
Gooden
Gosar
Graves
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hageman
Hamadeh (AZ)
Haridopolos
Harrigan
Harris (MD)
Harris (NC)
Harshbarger
Hern (OK)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Hinson
Houchin
Hudson
Huizenga
Hurd (CO)
Issa
Jack
Jackson (TX)
James
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kean
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy (UT)
Kiggans (VA)
Kiley (CA)
Kim
Knott
Kustoff
LaHood
LaLota
Langworthy
Latta
Lawler
Lee (FL)
Letlow
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luna
Luttrell
Mace
Mackenzie
Malliotakis
Maloy
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McCormick
McDowell
McGuire
Messmer
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Mills
Moolenaar
Moore (AL)
Moore (NC)
Moore (UT)
Moore (WV)
Moran
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Nunn (IA)
Obernolte
Ogles
Onder
Owens
Palmer
Patronis
Perry
Pfluger
Reschenthaler
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rouzer
Roy
Rulli
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Self
Sessions
Shreve
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Strong
Stutzman
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner (OH)
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Van Epps
Wagner
Walberg
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westerman
Wied
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NOES—207

Adams
Aguilar
Amo
Ansari
Auchincloss
Balint
Barragán
Beatty
Bell
Bera
Beyer
Bishop
Bonamici
Boyle (PA)
Brown
Brownley
Budzinski
Bynum
Carbajal
Carson
Carter (LA)
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cherfilus-McCormick
Chu
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conaway
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crockett
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Davis (NC)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Dexter
Dingell
Doggett
Elfreth
Escobar
Espaillat
Evans (PA)
Fields
Figures
Fletcher
Foster
Foushee
Frankel, Lois
Friedman
Frost
Garamendi
Garcia (CA)
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gillen
Golden (ME)
Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Gonzalez, V.
Goodlander
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Himes
Horsford
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jacobs
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy (NY)
Khanna
Krishnamoorthi
Landsman
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latimer
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Levin
Liccardo
Lieu
Lofgren
Lynch
Magaziner
Mannion
Matsui
McBath
McBride
McClain Delaney
McClellan
McCollum
McDonald Rivet
McGarvey
McGovern
McIver
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Mfume
Min
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Morrison
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Nadler
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Ocasio-Cortez
Olszewski
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pelosi
Perez
Peters
Pettersen
Pingree
Pocan
Pou
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Randall
Raskin
Riley (NY)
Rivas
Ross
Ruiz
Ryan
Salinas
Sánchez
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Simon
Smith (WA)
Sorensen
Soto
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Subramanyam
Suozzi
Takano
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Tran
Underwood
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Velázquez
Vindman
Walkinshaw
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Whitesides
Williams (GA)

NOT VOTING—10

Casar
Dunn (FL)
Gray
Houlahan
Hunt
Murphy
Swalwell
Sykes
Van Orden
Wilson (FL)

□ 1403

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1410

FLEXIBILITY FOR WORKERS EDUCATION ACT

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 988, I call up the bill (H.R. 2262) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to exclude certain activities from hours worked, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MEUSER). Pursuant to House Resolution 988, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Workforce, printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part B of House Report 119–440, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 2262

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 ''Flexibility for Workers Education Act''.

SEC. 2. TREATMENT OF ATTENDANCE OR PARTICIPATION IN CERTAIN ACTIVITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3(o) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 203(o)) is amended to read as follows:

''(o) HOURS WORKED.—In determining for the purposes of sections 6 and 7 the hours for which an employee is employed—

''(1) there shall be excluded—

''(A) any time spent in changing clothes or washing at the beginning or end of each workday which was excluded from measured working time during the week involved by the express terms of or by custom or practice under a bona fide collective-bargaining agreement applicable to the particular employee; and

(B) except as provided in paragraph (2), any time spent attending or participating in an education or training program or a similar activity

(such as a lecture), regardless of whether the program or activity is offered or facilitated by the employer, provided that—

''(i) such attendance or participation occurs outside of the employee's regular working hours;

''(ii) such attendance or participation is voluntary, and the employer does not take adverse action against the employee on the basis that such employee does not so attend or participate; and

''(iii) the employee does not perform any work for the employer during such attendance or participation; and

''(2) there may be excluded, in accordance with section 785.32 of title 29, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of the Flexibility for Workers Education Act), any time spent in an organized program of related, supplemental instruction working under a bona fide apprenticeship program.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to hours worked on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

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

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2262.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, hardworking Americans should never be barred from voluntarily pursuing professional development or training opportunities. In fact, we should be giving workers more opportunities to get the skills they need to thrive in a rapidly changing economy.

Unfortunately, current Federal law makes it harder for employers to provide voluntary training and upscaling opportunities. Oftentimes that means workers must take time out of their busy lives to look beyond the workplace for programs that they should be able to get at work.

Needless to say, this makes absolutely no sense. Employers understand their employees and whether skills gaps exist in their own workforces. If a business knows how to train its employees to succeed in a role, then it should be allowed to teach those skills and invest in the employees' professional development. There simply is no need for arbitrary roadblocks that make it harder for businesses to offer voluntary trainings to their own employees.

Republicans are already promoting upscaling and training opportunities to help strengthen the American workforce. Last summer, we passed a Working Families Tax Cuts Act, which expanded opportunities for young Americans to access short-term, high-quality credentialing and training opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2262 builds on that success by simply allowing employers to offer voluntary education and upscaling opportunities to nonexempt employees so that workers can easily take control of their own professional development. This doesn't just help the business grow. It provides new, tangible skills that help employees do better in their own careers and sets them up for success on their own.

Mr. Speaker, let's make one thing clear: H.R. 2262 expands voluntary—voluntary—employer-led training opportunities. Businesses would still be required to compensate workers who receive mandatory job training. This bill simply makes it easier for ambitious employees to pursue additional professional development opportunities on their own terms, whether or not it is directly tied to their current job. If a bartender wants to take a course in restaurant management, he or she should be able to do so, and the employer would welcome that dedication.

Let's look at the bigger picture. Our workforce still has millions of unfilled jobs caused, in part, by a widening skills gap. As our own economy grows, thanks to the progrowth policies of Republicans and the Trump administration, many growing businesses are likely to face skills shortages of their own.

That is why we need commonsense legislation like the Flexibility for Workers Education Act, which makes it easier for workers to get the skills that they need to succeed and for businesses to find the right person for the job.

Throughout my time in Congress and now as chairman of the Education and Workforce Committee, I have consistently fought to expand opportunities to help workers thrive and grow. That is why I am proud to support H.R. 2262, the Flexibility for Workers Education Act, to remove obstacles and give workers more controls over their own careers.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2262, the so-called Flexibility for Workers Education Act.

We have heard about these roadblocks and obstacles. Mr. Speaker, the roadblocks and obstacles are a requirement that people get paid for their time.

Too many Americans still work too hard but can't afford the basics, such as groceries, rent, or utilities. Even more, they are struggling to afford the little extras that give you a slice of the American Dream, like owning a home, taking your family on vacation, or even occasionally going out to a restaurant.

Yet, simply put, the economy just isn't working for everybody. According to Moody's Analytics, the top 10 percent of earners account for nearly 50 percent of all of the United States' consumer spending, so obviously something is out of whack. Despite this reality, House Republicans are attempting to pass three bills this afternoon that would cut workers' wages.

This bill, H.R. 2262, would relieve employers of the obligation to pay employees for training outside of their regular working hours.

Under the Fair Labor Standards Act, employees must be compensated for employer-mandated education and training outside the regular work hours. Essentially, the FLSA protects workers from being compelled to volunteer their time for job-related training without wage and hour protections.

However, this bill significantly weakens the protections because it would permit employers to provide job-related training after hours but off the clock so long as they do not state that it is technically required.

However, employers can still lead workers to believe that the training is needed. You can just imply that if you want a raise or promotion, it would be nice to get the training. That is not really required. The legislation is based on the flawed premise that if you provide workers with certain opportunities or benefits, employers must be able to pay them less. That doesn't make sense.

We should not let employers get away with failing to pay workers for their time while claiming that it is in the workers' best interests. These workers, if they are working on an employer-provided training, should not be required to work off the clock without any compensation.

For that reason, I recommend a ''no'' vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. HINSON), the sponsor of this legislation, to present her bill.

Mrs. HINSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership in committee on this piece of legislation that is designed to empower the American worker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, H.R. 2262, the Flexibility for Workers Education Act.

For too long, we know that Washington, D.C., has pursued policies that left American workers behind. Republicans continue to advance progrowth, proworker policies that expand opportunity, reward hard work, and help Americans to get ahead.

No matter where I go out in Iowa—Main Street businesses, farm shops, manufacturing facilities, healthcare facilities—I meet the hardworking men and women of Iowa who want to take that next step in their careers. They want to build skills. They want to earn more money for their families, and they want to provide a better future for their kids and for other Iowans.

However, outdated regulatory red tape prevents skilled workers from being able to take advantage of voluntary—I repeat—voluntary professional development opportunities offered by employers. My bill, the Flexibility for Workers Education Act, would cut this red tape, expanding access to these voluntary education programs that allow workers to reach their full potential on their terms.

Mr. Speaker, imagine a facilities associate, ready for advancement, who can take evening training courses sponsored by their employer to become an appliance technician. That kind of flexibility opens the door to higher pay and that long-term career growth that they need to see.

I am also very proud to have the support of the chairman of the Education and Workforce Committee, so I thank Representative WALBERG for his support. The gentleman understands how much this will impact workers' bottom lines, being able to take more money home to provide for their families, and so I thank the gentleman for this practical approach that benefits everyone.

□ 1420

Again, we know workers gain skills. They gain opportunity. Employers retain these talented employees in the workforce. There is stronger morale, and communities are building a stronger, more resilient workforce.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and continue to expand opportunities for American workers and families. I look forward to continuing to deliver more commonsense solutions to help Iowans and Americans comfortably work and raise their families.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. NORCROSS), a distinguished member of the Committee on Education and Workforce.

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and ranking member for what they have done to try to make it better for those who we represent, but I am here to speak out against the flexibility for workers not to be paid education act. Yes, I said that.

This disastrous bill would be a blueprint to commit wage theft on a silver platter.

I know what it is like to be cheated out of wages. That happened to me, unfortunately, when I was a younger man. The rules that are set up are there to protect those who had the least ability to protect themselves.

A fair day's pay for a hard day's work. This is not a slogan. It is a principle of who we are in this country. It is those values that hold this country together.

This bill is pushing corporations to create a loophole. I want to take just a moment, ''voluntary for good causes'' is something we all do in America, and we have the ability to do it now. This bill would create more gray areas and, for those who want to exploit workers, give them a roadmap to do it.

Allowing companies to require worker attendance—and you call it voluntary and it is not job-related—without pay, this is what fundamentally is going to change here. If your boss requires it and if you work, you have to be paid. It is the system that is not broken now. This would create ambiguity for those workers saying they are voluntary.

That is not good. In fact, we call those captive meetings now when they come in to preach why worker unions are bad, but they have to pay them now. This would give them the ability to call it a training and not pay them. This is a loophole.

I urge those who introduced this to come up with language that would not allow that to happen. If you truly believe that, then the language that we offered would be something that we could both stand together on.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this bill. As I say, if it is not broke, you don't have to fix it. We have a system where people pay to go to college, to go to trade school. I went through an apprenticeship. There are ways we can do this that benefits workers while not creating an opportunity for those who want to exploit them.

Mr. Speaker, at the appropriate time, I want to offer a motion to recommit the bill back to committee. If the House rules permitted, I would have offered this motion with an important amendment to this bill. My amendment, Raise the Wage Act, would ensure all workers receive a long-overdue raise. $7.25 an hour is minimum wage. That is incredible. Mr. Speaker, 2009 was the last time we touched this. It is unbelievable that 16 years have gone by and that we haven't found it within ourselves the values we hold dear in America to give those who have the least a raise.

We gave billion dollar giveaways to those in the top tax bracket, and we can't raise the minimum wage from $7.25 an hour. We should hang our heads in shame that we don't think about those who can't make it.

I have heard all of the excuses. We used to regularly have increases on a bipartisan basis since minimum wage started almost a half century ago. Both Democrat and Republican Presidents, Congress, we all understood it. Well, amnesia is something that has hit us. Please, Mr. Speaker, we need to raise the minimum wage. Our policy decisions cannot undercut workers and their families. Raising the minimum wage is not only good for the worker, but for their families.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of this amendment into the RECORD immediately prior to the motion to recommit.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in voting for this motion to recommit.

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

Mr. Speaker, I certainly applaud my friend and colleague on the other side of the aisle for the commitment to making sure that workers are cared for, employees, but also I want employers to be cared for as well, and the two working together ends up to be the best.

Employers, generally speaking, care about their employees. I know my Democrat colleagues often disagree with that statement, but it is almost always the case in a successful business, especially in a time of intense competition for the workforce.

My Democrat colleagues have suggested that employers will attempt to use H.R. 2262 to commit wage theft. However, the bill clearly states that the educational activity must occur outside of an employee's regular working hours. The attendance is voluntary. The employer cannot take adverse action against an employee for attending the training or not, and the employee cannot perform any work for the employer during their attendance at the training.

I am not sure that it can be any more clear. H.R. 2262 gives employees more options to pursue success, not just in their current role, but in roles they may be interested in and would like to upskill and pursue. Employers recognize that investing in their workers is essential if they are to be successful.

This legislation offers a win for employees wanting to upskill and a win for employers who wish to develop their existing talent.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I was just looking over the internet and found a Reddit discussion board and found one entry that said: ''I am bothered by unpaid 2-day training, which is going to be 9 hours each day.'' This kind of crosses the line, and they just wanted to know if that was legal in New York.

In reference to the motion to recommit, I hope we would support the motion to recommit. It would give us an opportunity to vote on an increase in the minimum wage which hasn't been increased in over a decade.

A few years ago, it was noted that a full-time minimum wage worker could not afford a modest two-bedroom apartment in any county in the United States. Since then, housing costs have gone up, but the minimum wage has stayed the same.

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time and am ready to close.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, according to last week's Bureau of Labor statistics, 2025 was the worst year for job growth in this country since the last Trump administration. 2025 had 3 months of job losses. Meanwhile, President Biden had 48 consecutive months without a single loss. At this point in President Biden's term, he had already created millions of jobs. At the end of the first year, President Trump has only created a few hundred thousand.

Yet, despite this reality, the House Republicans are attempting to advance this bill which would allow employers to get away without paying workers for job-related training outside of regular hours so long as it is technically not required.

It will do nothing to lower the costs of living or give working families a leg up. For this reason, I hope we will defeat the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1430

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

Republicans are committed to expanding opportunities for American workers. H.R. 2262, the Flexibility for Workers Education Act, is a commonsense bill that makes it easier for a business to offer voluntary upskilling opportunities to its employees.

As our Nation faces a widening skills gap and millions of unfilled jobs, H.R. 2262 would provide additional pathways for workers to pursue training and fill a growing number of jobs that require skilled workers.

As chairman of the Education and Workforce Committee, I am committed to cutting red tape and removing roadblocks that make it harder for workers and businesses to succeed. The Flexibility for Workers Education Act is another strong step, Mr. Speaker, toward ensuring Washington doesn't put up roadblocks that hinder progress in our workforce.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 988, 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.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Norcross moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2262 to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

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

Mr. Norcross moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2262 to the Committee on Education and the Workforce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 3. MINIMUM WAGE INCREASES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6(a)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(a)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

''(1) except as otherwise provided in this section, not less than—

''(A) $9.50 an hour, beginning on the effective date under section 8 of the Flexibility for Workers Education Act;

''(B) $11.00 an hour, beginning 1 year after such effective date;

''(C) $12.50 an hour, beginning 2 years after such effective date;

''(D) $14.00 an hour, beginning 3 years after such effective date;

''(E) $15.50 an hour, beginning 4 years after such effective date;

''(F) $17.00 an hour, beginning 5 years after such effective date; and

''(G) beginning on the date that is 6 years after such effective date, and annually thereafter, the amount determined by the Secretary under subsection (h);''.

(b) DETERMINATION BASED ON INCREASE IN THE MEDIAN HOURLY WAGE OF ALL EMPLOYEES.—Section 6 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(h)(1) Not later than each date that is 90 days before a new minimum wage determined under subsection (a)(1)(G) is to take effect, the Secretary shall determine the minimum wage to be in effect under this subsection for each period described in subsection (a)(1)(G). The wage determined under this subsection for a year shall be—

''(A) not less than the amount in effect under subsection (a)(1) on the date of such determination;

''(B) increased from such amount by the annual percentage increase, if any, in the median hourly wage of all employees as determined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics; and

''(C) rounded up to the nearest multiple of $0.05, if the amount after applying subparagraphs (A) and (B) is not a multiple of $0.05.

''(2) In calculating the annual percentage increase in the median hourly wage of all employees for purposes of paragraph (1)(B), the Secretary, through the Bureau of Labor Statistics, shall compile data on the hourly wages of all employees to determine such a median hourly wage and compare such median hourly wage for the most recent year for which data are available with the median hourly wage determined for the preceding year.''.

SEC. 4. TIPPED EMPLOYEES.

(a) BASE MINIMUM WAGE FOR TIPPED EMPLOYEES AND TIPS RETAINED BY EMPLOYEES.—Section 3(m)(2)(A)(i) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 203(m)(2)(A)(i)) is amended to read as follows:

''(i) the cash wage paid such employee, which for purposes of such determination shall be not less than—

''(I) for the 1-year period beginning on the effective date under section 8 of the Flexibility for Workers Education Act, $6.00 an hour;

''(II) $8.00 an hour, beginning 1 year after such effective date;

''(III) $10.00 an hour, beginning 2 years after such effective date;

''(IV) $12.00 an hour, beginning 3 years after such effective date;

''(V) $13.50 an hour, beginning 4 years after such effective date;

''(VI) $15.00 an hour, beginning 5 years after such effective date;

''(VII) $17.00 an hour, beginning 6 years after such effective date; and

''(VIII) for each succeeding 1-year period after the increase made pursuant to subclause (VII), the minimum wage in effect under section 6(a)(1); and''.

(b) TIPS RETAINED BY EMPLOYEES.—Section 3(m)(2)(A) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 203(m)(2)(A)) is amended—

(1) in the second sentence of the matter following clause (ii), by striking ''of this subsection, and all tips received by such employee have been retained by the employee'' and inserting ''of this subsection. Any employee shall have the right to retain any tips received by such employee''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following: ''An employer shall inform each employee of the right and exception provided under the preceding sentence.''.

(c) SCHEDULED REPEAL OF SEPARATE MINIMUM WAGE FOR TIPPED EMPLOYEES.—

(1) TIPPED EMPLOYEES.—Section 3(m)(2)(A) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 203(m)(2)(A)), as amended by subsections (a) and (b), is further amended by striking the sentence beginning with ''In determining the wage an employer is required to pay a tipped employee,'' and all that follows through ''of this subsection.'' and inserting ''The wage required to be paid to a tipped employee shall be the wage set forth in section 6(a)(1).''.

(2) PUBLICATION OF NOTICE.—Subsection (i) of section 6 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206), as added by section 6 and amended by section 7(b)(1), is further amended by striking ''or in accordance with subclause (II) or (III) of section 3(m)(2)(A)(i),''.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by paragraphs (1) and (2) shall take effect on the date that is 1 day after the date on which the hourly wage under subclause (VIII) of section 3(m)(2)(A)(i) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 203(m)(2)(A)(i)), as amended by subsection (a), takes effect.

(d) PENALTIES.—Section 16 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 216) is amended—

(1) in the third sentence of subsection (b), by inserting ''or used'' after ''kept''; and

(2) in the second sentence of subsection (e)(2), by inserting ''or used'' after ''kept''.

SEC. 5. NEWLY HIRED EMPLOYEES WHO ARE LESS THAN 20 YEARS OLD.

(a) BASE MINIMUM WAGE FOR NEWLY HIRED EMPLOYEES WHO ARE LESS THAN 20 YEARS OLD.—Section 6(g)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(g)(1)) is amended by striking ''a wage which is not less than $4.25 an hour.'' and inserting the following: ''a wage at a rate that is not less than—

''(A) for the 1-year period beginning on the effective date under section 8 of the Flexibility for Workers Education Act, $6.00 an hour;

''(B) for each succeeding 1-year period until the hourly wage under this paragraph equals the wage in effect under section 6(a)(1) for such period, an hourly wage equal to the amount determined under this paragraph for the preceding year, increased by the lesser of—

''(i) $1.75; or

''(ii) the amount necessary for the wage in effect under this paragraph to equal the wage in effect under section 6(a)(1) for such period; and

''(C) for each succeeding 1-year period after the increase made pursuant to subparagraph (B)(ii), the minimum wage in effect under section 6(a)(1).''.

(b) SCHEDULED REPEAL OF SEPARATE MINIMUM WAGE FOR NEWLY HIRED EMPLOYEES WHO ARE LESS THAN 20 YEARS OLD.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 6(g) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(g)), as amended by subsection (a), shall be repealed.

(2) PUBLICATION OF NOTICE.—Subsection (i) of section 6 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206), as added by section 6 and amended by sections 7(b)(1) and 4(c)(2), is further amended by striking ''or subparagraph (B) or (C) of subsection (g)(1)''.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The repeal and amendment made by paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively, shall take effect on the date that is 1 day after the date on which the hourly wage under subparagraph (C) of section 6(g)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(g)(1)), as amended by subsection (a), takes effect.

SEC. 6. PUBLICATION OF NOTICE.

Section 6 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206), as amended by section 3(b), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(i) Not later than 60 days prior to the effective date of any increase in the required wage determined under subsection (a)(1) or subparagraph (B) or (C) of subsection (g)(1), or in accordance with subclause (II) or (III) of section 3(m)(2)(A)(i) or section 14(c)(1)(A), the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register and on the website of the Department of Labor a notice announcing each increase in such required wage.''.

SEC. 7. PROMOTING ECONOMIC SELF-SUFFICIENCY FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES.

(a) WAGES.—

(1) TRANSITION TO FAIR WAGES FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES.—Subparagraph (A) of section 14(c)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 214(c)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

''(A) at a rate that equals or exceeds, for each year, the greater of—

''(i)(I) $5.00 an hour, beginning on the effective date under section 8 of the Flexibility for Workers Education Act;

''(II) $7.50 an hour, beginning 1 year after such effective date;

''(III) $10.00 an hour, beginning 2 years after such effective date;

''(IV) $12.50 an hour, beginning 3 years after such effective date;

''(V) $15.50 an hour, beginning 4 years after such effective date; and

''(VI) the wage rate in effect under section 6(a)(1), beginning 5 years after such effective date; or

''(ii) if applicable, the wage rate in effect on the day before the date of enactment of the Flexibility for Workers Education Act for the employment, under a special certificate issued under this paragraph, of the individual for whom the wage rate is being determined under this subparagraph,''.

(2) PROHIBITION ON NEW SPECIAL CERTIFICATES; TRANSITION ASSISTANCE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 14(c) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 214(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(6) PROHIBITION ON NEW SPECIAL CERTIFICATES.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the Secretary shall not issue a special certificate under this subsection to an employer that was not issued a special certificate under this subsection before the date of enactment of the Flexibility for Workers Education Act.

''(7) TRANSITION ASSISTANCE.—Upon request, the Secretary shall provide—

''(A) technical assistance and information to employers issued a special certificate under this subsection for the purposes of—

''(i) assisting such employers to comply with this subsection, as amended by the Flexibility for Workers Education Act; and

''(ii) ensuring continuing employment opportunities for individuals with disabilities receiving a special minimum wage rate under this subsection; and

''(B) information to individuals employed at a special minimum wage rate under this subsection, which may include referrals to Federal or State entities with expertise in competitive integrated employment.''.

(B) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this paragraph shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) SUNSET.—Section 14(c) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 214(c)), as amended by paragraph (2), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(8) SUNSET.—Beginning on the day after the date on which the wage rate described in paragraph (1)(A)(i)(VI) takes effect, the authority to issue special certificates under paragraph (1) shall expire, and no special certificates issued under paragraph (1) shall have any legal effect.''.

(b) PUBLICATION OF NOTICE.—

(1) AMENDMENT.—Subsection (i) of section 6 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206), as added by section 6, is amended by striking ''or section 14(c)(1)(A)''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect on the day after the date on which the wage rate described in paragraph (1)(A)(i)(VI) of section 14(c) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 214(c)), as amended by subsection (a)(1), takes effect.

SEC. 8. GENERAL EFFECTIVE DATE.

Except as otherwise provided in this Act, this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the first day of the third month that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. NORCROSS. 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.

EMPOWERING EMPLOYER CHILD AND ELDER CARE SOLUTIONS ACT

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, Pursuant to House Resolution 988, I call up the bill (H.R. 2270) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to exclude child and dependent care services and payments from the rate used to compute overtime compensation, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 988, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Workforce, printed in the bill, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 2270

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Empowering Employer Child and Elder Care Solutions Act''.

SEC. 2. EXCLUSION OF CHILD AND DEPENDENT CARE IN COMPUTING OVERTIME COMPENSATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7(e) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 207(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by inserting ''payments or reimbursements for child or dependent care services;'' after ''by the employer;'';

(2) in paragraph (7), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(3) in paragraph (8)(D)(ii), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(9) the value of any child or dependent care services provided by an employer.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to overtime compensation required to be paid for workweeks beginning on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

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

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on H.R. 2270.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Empowering Employer Child and Elder Care Solutions Act, a bipartisan proposal that meets working families where they are and strengthens our economy at the same time.

Across this country, millions of Americans are doing two full-time jobs at once. They are employees striving to be productive and dependable at work, and they are caregivers—parents of young children, sons and daughters caring for aging parents, or both. These responsibilities do not disappear when the workday begins. They shape whether a worker can show up on time, stay focused, or remain in the workforce at all.

Along with many other affordability challenges, the increasing cost of child and dependent care is a serious issue facing our country. Parents leave jobs they want to keep. Caregivers turn down promotions or reduce hours. Businesses lose skilled workers, productivity declines, and the entire economy pays the price.

Many employers want to provide child and elder care for their employees, but the law discourages them from doing so by asserting that routinely provided childcare must be included in an hourly employee's regular pay rates.

The Empowering Employer Child and Elder Care Solutions Act removes this longstanding obstacle for employers wishing to provide these highly valued accommodations to their workforce and aligns the treatment of these pro-family benefits with other employer-provided benefits.

For workers, employer-supported care can be the difference between staying in the job or being forced out of the workforce. It reduces stress, improves mental health, and allows parents and caregivers to focus on their work, knowing their loved ones are safe and supported.

Supporting caregivers should not be a partisan issue. Every one of us represents constituents who are struggling and juggling with the work that they have and the care that they give.

Every district in every State has employers struggling to attract and retain workers because care options are limited or unaffordable.

The Empowering Employer Child and Elder Care Solutions Act sends a clear message: We value work. We value family. We understand that the two are deeply connected.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, not only because it is good policy but because it reflects the lived reality of millions of Americans who are doing their very best every day to care for their families and contribute to our economy.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2270, the Empowering Employer Child and Elder Care Solutions Act. Unfortunately, it doesn't solve anything. It doesn't provide any additional child or elder care.

What it does is take money out of people's pockets because, under current law, employers must pay hourly workers time and a half for hours worked over 40 hours in a week. That overtime rate is based on a worker's regular rate of pay, which includes not only the cash payment but also non-wage compensation and presently includes the value of child or dependent care services when employers decide to provide them as part of the benefit package.

Existing law already provides incentives for these benefits, allowing employers to deduct them as a cost of doing business and offering tax preferences for certain child and dependent care assistance.

This bill would change the Fair Labor Standards Act to exclude the value of these services from the regular rate used to calculate overtime.

Despite its name, the bill does not require employers to provide any child or elder care. Instead, it just reduces the cost of overtime if they provide it. That is the problem. In practice, this bill encourages employers to keep workers on the job longer rather than expanding access to affordable care. It increases the time away from families while offering no assurance that any support for childcare will be provided. Workers who already receive these benefits will see their overtime pay reduced.

There is no evidence that these workers who do not receive this benefit are likely to get the benefit. The only group we know for certain will be affected is those who already have it, and they will lose money on overtime. That makes no sense. I don't know how that solves anything.

I would hope that we would not reduce workers' pay. To do that, we have to oppose the legislation.

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

□ 1440

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I would make mention that for gym memberships offered by an employer and other benefits, health insurance benefits, they aren't calculated in overtime either.

This brings us together on those issues. In fact, I believe it makes certain that there is more opportunity for small businesses especially to have the ability to have dollars that could be put toward the childcare.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSMER), who is the sponsor of this bill. He is also a member of the Subcommittee on Workforce Protections.

Mr. MESSMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address an issue affecting both families and businesses in Indiana and across the United States, which is the expensive, but essential, financial support workers need to provide care for their young children and elderly parents.

Current law discourages employers from helping their workers pay for onsite childcare or elderly dependent care because of the unreasonable pay calculations that increase costs and burdensome regulations for the company.

This guidance is so outdated. It was enacted in 1938, and we all know things have come a long way since then when families did not use daycare services for their little ones and elderly parents lived with their adult children until death.

The current mandates of the Fair Labor Standards Act related to dependent care drive up costs for businesses through unreasonable pay calculations.

These expensive requirements naturally remove the incentive for many companies to provide this important coverage for their employees. It is high time we eradicate this unwarranted red tape and let businesses invest in the needs of their employees without punishing the company for doing just that.

That is why I introduced the Empowering Employer Child and Elder Care Solutions Act. Hoosiers and all Americans must not be forced to choose between caring for a loved one and working outside of the home.

Businesses deserve to be profitable but are also entitled to have the most qualified workers to support their company's growth. A company must be rewarded and not penalized for making critical benefits available to their employees, which, in turn, helps the company recruit the best and the brightest to their workforce.

The Empowering Employer Child and Elder Care Solutions Act lowers costs, cuts red tape, and better serves American companies by making profamily benefits achievable. Passing this legislation contributes to our goal of returning affordability to the American people and the U.S. workforce.

The American taxpayer needs our help now more than ever to get our economy back on track, and this bill will be one small step in making that dream a reality.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his support on H.R. 2270.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO), who is a distinguished member of the Education and Workforce Committee and the ranking member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is yet another effort to chip away at the protections guaranteed at the Federal level and take money out of the American worker's pocket.

The concept of overtime is very simple. If you work more than your traditional 40 hours a week, then you make more money, and you get to take home what you earn.

Now, instead of protecting that very basic principle, my Republican colleagues are trying to make it easier for employers to pay their workers less for working more. They want to pay workers less for working more. This bill would exclude child and dependent care from the rate of pay used to calculate a worker's overtime pay. In other words, this bill makes it permissible to pay workers less than their regular rate if they picked up an extra shift.

Taking on extra work doesn't mean you don't need someone to watch your kids, and it shouldn't cost you a benefit that you are entitled to.

Despite the misleading title, this bill cheapens the value of an employee's overtime labor. The overtime salary threshold is already far too low. When the first Trump administration set the current threshold, 8.2 million Americans saw their overtime protections just vanish, and even those eligible employees earning $36,000 a year were making too much money to qualify for overtime pay.

Mr. Speaker, imagine making $36,000 a year and that would disqualify you from being able to get overtime pay. You have no right to it.

Childcare and dependent care assistance should be more accessible and far more affordable for working families, but this Republican proposal merely incentivizing employers to provide assistance will not solve that issue and cutting down already low levels of overtime pay will not do that either.

Right now, working families are watching their access to basic support services shrink before their eyes. Head Start has seen five of their regional offices across the country abruptly closed. Medicaid could face over $800 billion in cuts over the next 10 years. These lifelines that working families depend on for affordable support services are rapidly diminishing, largely due to this administration and this majority's attack on these lifelines as ''waste.''

The resources that working families need are not waste. The tools for economic survival are not waste. Americans deserve better.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this bill, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it as well.

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

My colleague on the other side of the aisle has said this bill is an assault on working families. That could not be further from the truth.

H.R. 2270 is a narrowly tailored solution to the growing challenge working families are facing when it comes to childcare. I fail to see, again, how excluding the value of an employer-sponsored childcare subsidy in the calculation of an employee's regular rate will result in lower take-home pay as my colleagues have said on the other side.

The issue this legislation attempts to fix is that in many cases, employers are currently unable to offer childcare to employees due to the prohibitively high overtime cost.

H.R. 2270 rights that wrong by excluding child and dependent care from regular rate calculations as has been done several times, as I mentioned earlier, for other benefits and bonuses because Congress rightly saw that, without exclusion, employers would not be able to do more for their employees even as they want to.

This bill enhances the opportunity for the care that we need for childcare as well as dependent care.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. LEE), who is a distinguished member of the Committee on Education and Workforce.

Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, we have a childcare crisis in this country. In my home State of Pennsylvania, infant and toddler care costs on average $14,000 per year. That is almost one-half of the average annual salary of the childcare workers in my district.

Childcare, if folks can even find it, is pushing families into poverty as they are forced to make impossible choices between paying the rent or paying for care, between staying employed or staying home.

Republicans are doing everything in their power to undermine investments in childcare, including with this bill, which will allow employers to exclude childcare benefits from overtime pay.

Employees working overtime are the ones who need childcare the most and the bill undermines workers' ability to pay for that care.

For this reason, at the appropriate time I will offer a motion to recommit this bill back to committee. If the House rules permitted, I would have offered the motion with an important amendment to this bill.

My amendment would replace the text of this bill with the Child Care for Working Families Act.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD the text of this amendment immediately prior to the motion to recommit.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, my legislation with Ranking Member BOBBY SCOTT would make sure families actually have access to childcare slots, that no family spends more than 7 percent of their income on childcare, and that all early childhood educators make a livable wage.

If Republicans actually care about children and families, then I encourage them to pass the Child Care for Working Families Act. I hope my colleagues will join me in voting for the motion to recommit.

□ 1450

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage people to support the motion to recommit, which would actually create childcare availability.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the AFL–CIO which says, in part: '' . . . there is no evidence that reducing the overtime rate for employees will spur a widespread willingness of employers to offer reimbursement for child or elder care.''

AFL–CIO, LEGISLATIVE ALERT,
January 12, 2026.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 15 million workers and 64 affiliate unions represented by the AFL–CIO, I urge you to oppose the following anti-worker bills scheduled for consideration on the House floor this week: the *Flexibility for Workers Education Act* (H.R. 2262), the *Empowering Employer Child and Elder Care Solutions Act* (H.R. 2270), and the *Tipped Employee Protection Act* (H.R. 2312).

H.R. 2262, Flexibility for Workers Education Act, would let employers require workers to attend job-related training without paying them for that time. The bill allows employers to label training as ''voluntary,'' even when workers feel pressured to attend to keep their jobs or advance, and removes current protections that ensure training closely tied to a worker's job is paid. As a result, employers could push essential training outside of regular work hours and off the clock, increasing unpaid work for low-wage workers.

H.R. 2270, Empowering Employer Child and Elder Care Solutions Act, would exclude from the calculation of an employee's regular wage rate any employer reimbursement for child or elder care when calculating an employee's overtime rate of pay. Under this bill, employees who receive these reimbursements would see their overtime wage rate cut. Reducing a worker's overtime earnings will not help them afford the cost of child or elder care. Instead, it will make life harder. And there is no evidence that reducing the overtime rate for employees will spur a widespread willingness of employers to offer reimbursement for child or elder care. Workers need both decent wages and access to affordable child and elder care. There are ways to achieve the latter without attacking the former.

H.R. 2312, the Tipped Employee Protection Act, would change federal wage law in a way that makes pay more unstable for many low-wage workers by allowing employers to treat almost any worker as a ''tipped employee'' if they receive even small or occasional tips over a time period the employer chooses, whether that is a single day or an entire month. This could allow employers to pay the tipped subminimum wage to workers such as baristas, hotel staff, delivery drivers, salon workers, stadium staff, and other service workers who do not regularly earn tips. For example, a worker who waits tables would be paid the full minimum wage for non-tipped cooking shifts, but under this bill the employer could average tips earned earlier in the week and use them to justify paying $2.13 an hour for cooking shifts as well, which would cut weekly pay. By weakening existing rules that limit when the tip credit can be used, the bill would result in reduced take-home pay for workers, give employers greater control over how workers are classified and paid, make it harder for workers to know if they are being paid correctly, and increase the risk of wage theft in industries where it is already common.

Collectively, these bills nickel and dime workers' pay at a time when so many struggle to afford the basics. Wages should be raised, not cut. Please vote no on H.R. 2262, H.R. 2270, and H.R. 2312.

Sincerely,

JODY CALEMINE,
Director, Government Affairs.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this bill does nothing to solve, as I said, the elder or childcare crisis in this country. It does not create affordable care, and it does not guarantee a single new benefit for working families.

What it does do is reduce overtime pay for workers who already receive these benefits while encouraging employers to keep people at work longer without fully paid compensation. That means more time away from loved ones, less money in workers' pockets, and probably more need for childcare.

If we are serious about supporting families, then Congress should be expanding access to affordable care, not cutting wages under the guise of helping workers. We could really do some help by supporting the motion to recommit and passing the Child Care for Working Families Act. That would actually lower costs for families and create childcare opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we would support the motion to recommit, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I know I spent my opening remarks discussing how the Empowering Employer Child and Elder Care Solutions Act helps empower working families. In closing, I would like to highlight how access to affordable childcare benefits job creators and our Nation's economy.

For employers, the return on investment is well documented. Companies that offer care solutions see lower turnover, reduced absenteeism, and higher employer/employee engagement. In a competitive labor market, the ability to offer these benefits is vital to attracting and retaining talent and ensuring American businesses remain competitive at home and abroad.

For our economy, the stakes could not be higher. Labor force participation, particularly among women, continues to be constrained by caregiving responsibilities. When caregivers are sidelined, we lose talent, experience, and economic growth potential. This bill helps remove one of the biggest barriers to keeping willing workers on the sidelines and strengthens our overall economic resilience.

This legislation also recognizes that caregiving does not end with childhood. As our population ages, more workers are caring for elderly parents or relatives. Eldercare challenges can be just as disruptive and unpredictable as childcare needs, and yet they are often overlooked in policy decisions.

This bill addresses both, reflecting the real-life responsibilities families face. This is a smart use of policy to align incentives with outcomes we all support: stronger families, a more resilient workforce, and a healthier economy. Let's give employers the tools to help give workers the support they need and move our country forward.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative MESSMER for bringing this bill before us. I encourage my colleagues to support it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 988, 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.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Lee of Pennsylvania moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2270 to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

The material previously referred to by Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania is as follows:

Ms. Lee of Pennsylvania moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2270 to the Committee on Education and the Workforce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following:

TITLE I—CHILD CARE AND EARLY LEARNING PROGRAM

SEC. 101. BIRTH THROUGH FIVE CHILD CARE AND EARLY LEARNING PROGRAM.

(a) CHILD CARE DEFINITIONS.—The definitions in section 658P of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858n) shall apply to this section, except as provided in subsection (b) and as otherwise specified.

(b) ADDITIONAL DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPRENTICESHIP.—The term ''apprenticeship'' means an apprenticeship registered under the Act of August 16, 1937 (commonly known as the ''National Apprenticeship Act''; 50 Stat. 664, chapter 663; 29 U.S.C. 50 et seq.).

(2) CHILD CARE CERTIFICATE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''child care certificate'' means a certificate (that may be a check or other disbursement) that is issued by a State, Tribal, territorial, or local government under this section directly to a parent who shall use such certificate only as payment for child care services or as a deposit for child care services if such a deposit is required of other children being cared for by the provider.

(B) RULE.—Nothing in this section shall preclude the use of such certificates for sectarian child care services if freely chosen by the parent. For the purposes of this section, child care certificates shall be considered indirect Federal financial assistance to the provider.

(3) CHILD EXPERIENCING HOMELESSNESS.—The term ''child experiencing homelessness'' means an individual who is a homeless child or youth under section 725 of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11434a).

(4) ELIGIBLE ACTIVITY.—The term ''eligible activity'', with respect to a parent, shall include, at minimum, activities consisting of—

(A) full-time or part-time employment;

(B) self-employment;

(C) job search activities;

(D) secondary, postsecondary, or adult education, including education through a program of high school classes, a course of study at an institution of higher education, classes towards an equivalent of a high school diploma recognized by State law, or English as a second language classes;

(E) health treatment (including mental health and substance use treatment) for a condition that prevents the parent from participating in other eligible activities;

(F) activities to prevent child abuse and neglect, or family violence prevention or intervention activities;

(G) employment and training activities, including job training, under the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3101 et seq.); and

(H) taking leave under the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 (29 U.S.C. 2601 et seq.) (or equivalent provisions for Federal employees), a State or local paid or unpaid leave law, or a program of employer-provided leave.

(5) ELIGIBLE CHILD.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''eligible child'' means an individual—

(i) who is less than 6 years of age;

(ii) who is not yet in kindergarten; and

(iii) who—

(I) resides with a parent or parents who are participating in an eligible activity;

(II) is included in a population of vulnerable children identified by the lead agency involved, which at a minimum shall include children with disabilities, infants and toddlers with disabilities, children experiencing homelessness, children in foster care, children in kinship care, children in a family that is eligible for assistance through the special supplemental nutrition assistance program for women, infants, and children established by section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786), a household that is eligible to receive assistance through the supplemental nutrition assistance program established under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.), or a family that is eligible to receive assistance through the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families established under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.), and children who are receiving, or need to receive, child protective services; or

(III) resides with—

(aa) a parent who is more than 65 years of age;

(bb) a parent who is employed by an eligible child care provider; or

(cc) a parent who is enrolled in high school and has not exceeded the maximum age of enrollment in high school.

(B) LONGER-TERM PERIOD ELIGIBILITY.—An individual who is determined to be an eligible child shall not be required to reverify eligibility for purposes of this title during the period after the determination and before the individual becomes 6 years of age or enters kindergarten, whichever occurs earlier.

(6) ELIGIBLE CHILD CARE PROVIDER.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''eligible child care provider'' means a center-based child care provider, a family child care provider, or other provider of child care services for compensation that—

(i) is licensed to provide child care services under State law applicable to the child care services it provides or, in the case of an Indian Tribe or Tribal organization, meets the rules set by the Secretary;

(ii) participates in the State's tiered system for recognizing and supporting the quality of child care services described in subsection (f)(3)(B), or, in the case of an Indian Tribe or Tribal organization, meets the rules set by the Secretary—

(I) not later than 4 years after the State first receives funds under this section; and

(II) for the remainder of the period for which the provider receives funds under this section; and

(iii) satisfies the State and local requirements, including those requirements described in section 658E(c)(2)(I) of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858c(c)(2)(I)), applicable to the child care services it provides.

(B) SPECIAL RULE.—A child care provider who is eligible to provide child care services in a State for children receiving assistance under the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9857 et seq.) on the date the State submits an application for funds under this section, and remains in compliance with any licensing or registration standards, or regulations, of the State, shall be deemed to be an eligible child care provider under this section for 3.5 years after the State first receives funding under this section.

(7) FMAP.—The term ''FMAP'' has the meaning given the term ''Federal medical assistance percentage'' in the first sentence of section 1905(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d(b)).

(8) FAMILY CHILD CARE PROVIDER.—The term ''family child care provider'' means one or more individuals who provide child care services, in a private residence other than the residences of the children involved, for less than 24 hours per day per child, or for 24

hours per day per child due to the nature of the work of the parent involved.

(9) INCLUSIVE CARE.—The term ''inclusive'', with respect to care (including child care), means care provided by an eligible child care provider—

(A) for whom the percentage of children served by the provider who are children with disabilities or infants or toddlers with disabilities reflects the prevalence of children with disabilities and infants and toddlers with disabilities (whichever the provider serves) among children within the State involved; and

(B) that provides care and full participation for children with disabilities and infants and toddlers with disabilities (whichever the provider serves) alongside children who are—

(i) not children with disabilities; and

(ii) not infants and toddlers with disabilities.

(10) INFANT OR TODDLER.—The term ''infant or toddler'' means an individual who is less than 3 years of age.

(11) INFANT OR TODDLER WITH A DISABILITY.—The term ''infant or toddler with a disability'' has the meaning given the term in section 632 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1432).

(12) LEAD AGENCY.—The term ''lead agency'' means the agency designated under subsection (e).

(13) PROVIDER TYPE.—The term ''provider type'' means a type that is—

(A) a center-based child care provider;

(B) a family child care provider; or

(C) another non-center-based child care provider.

(14) RECOGNIZED POSTSECONDARY CREDENTIAL.—The term ''recognized postsecondary credential'' has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3102).

(15) STAFFED FAMILY CHILD CARE NETWORK.—The term ''staffed family child care network'' means a nonprofit organization or nonprofit cooperative—

(A) that may be a component of a child care resource and referral organization;

(B) that has at least one paid staff member; and

(C) that offers evidence-based professional development, quality improvement support, business support, and technical assistance, including on achieving licensure as a child care provider, to family child care providers.

(16) STATE.—The term ''State'' means any of the 50 States and the District of Columbia.

(17) TERRITORY.—The term ''territory'' means the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands of the United States, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

[For full text please see H.R. 2743, Raise the Wage Act.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania. 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 are postponed.

TIPPED EMPLOYEE PROTECTION ACT

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 988, I call up the bill (H.R. 2312) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to revise the definition of the term ''tipped employee'', and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 988, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Workforce, printed in the bill, is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 2312

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 ''Tipped Employee Protection Act''.

SEC. 2. TIPPED EMPLOYEES.

Section 3(t) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 203(t)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(t)'' and inserting ''(t)(1)'';

(2) by striking ''engaged in an occupation in which he customarily and regularly receives more than $30 a month in tips.'' and inserting '', without regard to the duties of the employee, who receives tips and other cash wages for a work period described in paragraph (2) at a rate that, when combined with the cash wage required under subsection (m)(2)(A)(i), is not less than the wage in effect under section 6(a)(1).''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) A work period described in this paragraph is a work period that is determined by the employer of the employee, such as a work period of 1 day, 1 week, every 2 weeks, every 28 days, or every pay period.''.

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 Education and Workforce or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 2312.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2312, the Tipped Employee Protection Act.

Mr. Speaker, America's labor law hasn't kept up with the times. The Fair Labor Standards Act, which governs much of our modern workforce policy and regulations, was written in 1938 and has never been updated to meaningfully protect tipped workers.

As a result, tipped workers are not clearly defined or protected under the law. This leaves their jobs vulnerable to the whims of administrative regulations, court rulings, and too often unclear guidance written by unelected bureaucrats that inconsistently interpret the rights of tipped workers. That creates chaos for millions of workers.

The Biden-Harris administration was perhaps the most striking example of government overreach and the harm it can do to working families' bottom lines. Its disastrous 80/20 rule required that no more than 20 percent of the work performed by tipped employees could be categorized as untipped work, and those untipped tasks could only be performed for 30 minutes at a time.

Basically, this required minute-by-minute manager supervision to ensure workers were complying with the rule. Anyone in the service industry would tell you in a high-paced environment like a restaurant or bar that is next to impossible, but because tipped workers had no clear definition or proper protections under the FLSA, the Biden-Harris administration was free to try and impose overly complex timekeeping requirements that were impossible to enforce.

For several years, this created an enormous headache for small businesses like restaurants that heavily relied on tipped workers. Even worse, such convoluted timekeeping requirements directly impact how much pay Americans take home.

Like many of my colleagues, I want to see Americans rewarded for their hard work and ensure they are paid what they earn. That is why I am proud to rise in support of H.R. 2312, the Tipped Employee Protection Act, which creates stability for tipped workers and preserves opportunities for them to earn a good wage.

The bill creates a clear, commonsense definition of a tipped worker and prevents future attempts by misguided activist judges and bureaucrats seeking to implement policies that hurt workers' bottom lines.

□ 1500

The Tipped Employee Protection Act also ensures workers earn at least the minimum wage, and the bill respects States' authority to set higher wage levels. This creates even more opportunities for tipped workers to earn more, often far above the minimum wage.

As we have discussed at length in the Education and Workforce Committee, Federal policy far too often treats a State like California the same as Michigan or Arkansas. One-size-fits-all rarely works.

The bill also preserves the current tip credit system, which workers across the country overwhelmingly support—90 percent. This is just one of the ways Republicans are helping tipped workers earn more.

As part of the working families tax cuts, Republicans enacted landmark policies like no tax on tips and no tax on overtime, which put more money back into the working family's pockets.

Republicans are working hard to deliver solutions that help Americans thrive. H.R. 2312 puts more money back in workers' pockets and eases the burden on employers by removing needless Federal regulations.

I am proud to support the Tipped Employee Protection Act. Congress should make it clear that we are working to help put more money back in tipped workers' pockets.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill and the millions of workers who will benefit from it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2312, the Tipped Employee Protection Act. It is actually the tipped employer protection act.

Today, we are discussing one of several bills that House Republicans claim will benefit workers but ultimately falls short of what workers need.

H.R. 2312 would redefine the Fair Labor Standards Act, the FLSA, to make workers more vulnerable to wage theft and give employers an excuse not to pay workers what they are otherwise owed.

Under present law, the FLSA allows employers to take a tip credit only if employees are in jobs where they regularly and customarily earn at least $30 a month in tips. If workers split their time between jobs that regularly earn tips and jobs that don't, such as one shift as a restaurant server and another as a restaurant line cook, the employer can apply the tip credit today only to the tip-earning shifts.

This bill would tear down that distinction.

Ultimately, the bill seeks to expand the pool of workers that employers can pay a subminimum wage rather than the full wage. This is problematic because tipped workers are paid less per hour and have less access to benefits such as sick leave, healthcare, short-term disability, and life insurance.

In fact, the Federal tipped minimum wage is only $2.13 an hour. Instead of giving workers a leg up, this bill offers bad actors an opportunity to cut corners and shortchange their workers.

Mr. Speaker, for that reason, I oppose the bill and urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK), the sponsor of this good bill.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman WALBERG for this opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my legislation, the Tipped Employee Protection Act, which clarifies the definition of a tipped employee, providing long-term certainty for the service industry and, ultimately, protecting tipped employees' right to earn a living, a good living.

Mr. Speaker, our local service industry businesses, like the family-owned restaurant down the street, both reflect and shape the culture in each of our communities.

These establishments aren't just places to enjoy a good meal. They are where we foster and grow relationships. From catching up with friends to shaking hands on new business to marking some of life's biggest accomplishments—birthdays, anniversaries, graduations, and promotions. Where do we do this? We do this down at the local restaurant.

Many eateries like the ones I just described make their home in my own area of northwest Arkansas. Some of my favorites include Neal's Cafe in Springdale. By the way, I should give credit to its owner, Micah Neal, for helping provide the inspiration for the legislation that we are talking about here today. Another place is Herman's, an iconic rib house in Fayetteville.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on, naming some of my area's most popular restaurants. What do they have in common? To begin with they have great food, but it is the hardworking people behind the counter or taking your table order who truly make these businesses landmarks in our communities. We all have them.

The bill I stand here in support of today, Mr. Speaker, is about protecting these workers. Restaurants, most of which are small businesses, operate on very thin margins. The tip credit system is the foundation on which these small businesses operate.

The tip credit, or the tipped wage, has been part of the Fair Labor Standards Act for decades. It allows employers to pay tipped workers a base wage with tips—handsome tips, in many cases—making up the rest of those workers' earnings.

This system empowers tipped employees to maximize their earning potential. In fact, research shows that servers at full-service restaurants earn over twice—let me say it again, earn over twice—the Federal minimum wage. According to the National Restaurant Association, tipped servers nationally make a median income of $27 an hour, with the highest paid workers in the $41 an hour range.

The tip credit also offers flexibility for operators to invest in their businesses and staff. Without it, restaurant operators would be forced to make some very tough decisions, such as raising prices on their customers or reducing workers' hours, maybe even cutting jobs altogether.

Unfortunately, regulatory overreach has put the tipped credit system at risk, creating uncertainty for restaurant operators. Different administrations have issued conflicting rules and guidance, producing a regulatory roller coaster for restaurant owners and their staff. This instability makes it difficult for owners and operators to make long-term business plans. Antiworker efforts that chip away at the tipped wage altogether interfere with employees' hard-earned paychecks and livelihoods.

My bill, Mr. Speaker, the Tipped Employee Protection Act, provides a commonsense solution. It puts an end to hurtful regulatory confusion and litigation. It preserves the tipped wage and protections in the Fair Labor Standards Act. It provides clarity and simplicity in categorizing workers as tipped employees. It seeks to maintain a consistent regulatory environment.

To put it simply, my legislation will protect the hard-earned paychecks of tipped employees across the country and right at home in my Third District of Arkansas, the people who work day in and day out to put food on the tables of your favorite restaurant, as well as on their own kitchen tables at home.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, is how we deliver bigger paychecks to our constituents back home.

One other thing, Mr. Speaker. If you ever find yourself in Springdale, Arkansas, at Neal's Cafe, order some apple salad. You will thank me later.

Mr. Speaker, I support this bill, and I urge its passage.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO), a distinguished member of the Committee on Education and Workforce and the ranking member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, once again, my Republican colleagues are selling Americans on a bill with a flashy title and hoping that they don't read the fine print.

The so-called Tipped Employee Protection Act implies that something in this bill might actually benefit workers who work for tips. In reality, this bill manipulates labor law to decrease employees' earning power and allow employers to skirt minimum wage requirements.

Mr. Speaker, I was a high school English teacher, and I taught my students about irony. This bill is more aptly titled the Republican invent new ways to pay workers less bill.

Here is a closer look at the bill. For jobs like waiting tables, which regularly generate a large proportion of pay from tips, employers may pay their employees a small portion of the minimum wage, a mere $2.13 an hour, as long as what they normally make in tips makes up the rest.

□ 1510

Mr. Speaker, this bill, however, opens the opportunity for employers to manipulate FLSA definitions and classify other workers who receive tips only sometimes to also be paid a subminimum wage.

Under this bill, hotel housekeepers, valets, manicurists, and other workers could see their tips used to offset what their employers owe them, rather than serving as an occasional boost in take-home pay for a job well done.

In short, it expands the subminimum wage and offers more opportunities to pay workers less. As I said, we should really call this bill the Republican invent new ways to pay workers less bill.

No responsible policymaker should be arguing that Americans should be making less. People in this country are feeling serious financial strain as the cost of living soars and wages remain stagnant.

Everything is more expensive, and here we are, debating a proposal that would allow employers to pay people less than what they earned so employers can save a few dollars on the hour. Shame on this majority.

Once again, this Republican proposal to stimulate the economy relies on Americans in the lowest income brackets getting squeezed the most.

Mr. Speaker, we need to eliminate the subminimum wage entirely and make sure that Americans make enough money to live with dignity and not invent new ways to pay Americans less. I encourage my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this bill.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAUMGARTNER), a great member of the Education and Workforce Committee.

Mr. BAUMGARTNER. Mr. Speaker, my voters and my constituents sent me here to help solve problems, to help small business, to help employees, and to help grow the economy. As such, I am proud to support the Tipped Employee Protection Act. This important bill will help codify changes we are making in Congress to help tip the scales in favor of our service workers and waitresses.

Current Fair Labor Standards Act rules define tipped work as someone who customarily and regularly receives more than $30 a month in tips. It also considers a standard known as the 80/20 rule, which stipulates that tipped workers can spend no more than 20 percent of their time, or 30 minutes at a stretch, doing tasks that don't directly earn tips. If that sounds arbitrary, that is because it is.

Restaurants and similar businesses already run on thin margins. Keeping track of that kind of detail adds unnecessary red tape and stress. We all know how tough it is out there right now for small businesses.

That is why Representative STEVE WOMACK and I introduced the Tipped Employee Protection Act. This bill replaces the outdated definition of tipped employees with a simpler and more realistic definition. The bill defines a tipped worker as anyone who receives tips and other cash wages that together add up to the Federal minimum wage, without worrying about how much time they spend on this or that.

This change gives businesses more flexibility and protects them from unfair and crippling penalties for small recordkeeping mistakes they might make.

This bill resolves a longstanding issue that has been the subject of expensive litigation and ensures that the Federal Government does not set a standard that it cannot reasonably expect to enforce. It also helps the Department of Labor focus on real wage violations instead of technical paperwork issues.

Let's help small business. Let's help employers. Let's do the right thing. Let's not work for the people that just want to have endless lawsuits, endless litigation, and red tape.

Mr. Speaker, I urge everyone to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 2312 because businesses don't need Federal bureaucrats micromanaging their timekeeping.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS).

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice opposition to this bill, the Tipped Employee Protection Act.

Don't be fooled by the name of it. There is nothing proworker in this bill. It is like calling increased air pollution the blue sky initiative. This is just another attempt from my Republican colleagues to create loopholes that allow employers to get away with wage theft.

Anyone who has visited my district in downtown Las Vegas and the strip will know that our world-class hospitality workers are the magic behind the glitz and glamour. With the power of organized labor, casino workers, servers, line cooks, housekeepers, and others put Las Vegas on the map as a world-renowned hospitality center.

The tourism, gaming, and entertainment industries account for more than 315,000 jobs in our State. We have proven in Nevada that if you pay workers what they deserve, everybody wins.

I am especially proud that our State bans subminimum wages for tipped employees. That means, whether an employee has a good or a bad tipping month, an employee can still earn an honest living.

More needs to be done to support our workers. This is especially true as the Trump slump threatens our tourism economy and the Trump administration cuts vital safety nets like SNAP.

That is why I introduced the LIFT Act last year. It would raise the minimum wage and all subminimum wages to $17 an hour over the next 3 years with annual increases after that. In contrast, the bill before us today would change the definition of tipped employee in a manner that would allow employers to undercut wages.

Anybody in the service industry knows that tips vary from shift to shift. Under the current law, the definition of tipped employee accounts for those realities by stipulating that an employee must customarily and regularly—customarily and regularly—receive more than $30 a month in tips.

Yet, the bill we are considering today would allow employers to measure a worker's tips over just a single day of work. Employers could manipulate schedules and purposely choose to count days where workers get more tips in order to pay them less.

In 15 States, that means even more workers will be making just $2.13 an hour. That can't even buy a carton of eggs in Trump's economy, much less pay the rent. A more accurate name for this would be the employer profits protection act.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with my colleagues on this side of the aisle and urge everyone to stand up for workers and vote ''no'' on this bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, let's talk facts again. The Fair Labor Standards Act sets the Federal minimum wage, as well as a separate minimum wage, for tipped workers. This recognizes the reality that tipped workers have a higher earning ceiling when tips are combined with base wages, representing an employee's total compensation.

There is no limit to the amount one can earn as a tipped worker, so long as the employer is not forced to cut jobs or close businesses. That is the reality.

If small restaurants were all required to pay the full Federal minimum wage to all tipped workers, as my Democrat colleagues suggest, on top of a complete elimination of the overall tip credit system, which has also been supported by my Democrat colleagues, there wouldn't be very many small restaurants remaining at the end of it all.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government should not micromanage businesses by setting requirements that cannot be enforced such as the Biden-Harris administration's 80/20 rule. This required employers to monitor tasks of tipped workers minute by minute. It sure gives incentive to have less employees.

I can think of many better ways to utilize a Wage and Hour inspector's valuable time than harassing restaurants about their bartenders helping out cooks, hosts, and other non-tipped employees, all who often work in a fast-paced environment.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD).

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, this debate comes down to one simple question: What is fair for tipped workers?

All across America, and especially in my home State of Nevada, tipped workers show up every day, serving food and cleaning rooms. They keep our restaurants, hotels, and casinos running. They work hard. They deserve to be paid fairly for every hour that they work.

Under current law, there is a commonsense protection in place. A worker can only be paid a tipped wage if their job actually depends on tips. That is why the law says workers must regularly earn tips before an employer can pay a subminimum wage.

□ 1520

That rule exists to prevent abuse. H.R. 2312, the so-called Tipped Employee Protection Act, tears down that protection. Under this bill, an employer could say that you earned a tip once this week, so every hour you work now counts as tipped work.

A worker could wait tables one night, earn a few tips, and then spend the rest of the week cooking, cleaning, or washing dishes and still be paid as little as $2.13 an hour for that work. That is not tip work. That is a pay cut.

That is why we need to pass my TIPS Act, which would raise the wages for tipped workers—which has not been raised since 1991, the year I graduated from high school—not cut them.

This GOP bill lets employers average tips however they want over whatever time period they choose and use that as an excuse to lower wages for hours when workers are not earning tips at all.

Mr. Speaker, let's be honest: Tips aren't guaranteed. They depend on the customer, the shift, the economy, and pure luck. That is why tips are gifts, not a guarantee and not wages. No worker should have to gamble with their paycheck just to make rent or to put food on the table.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to stand with working people, stand with tipped workers, and vote ''no'' on H.R. 2312.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. MCBATH), a member of the Committee on Education and Workforce.

Mrs. MCBATH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to fight for some of the most overworked and underpaid people in our country to ensure that the money that they work so hard for goes to them and their families, not to someone who didn't work for it.

The true purpose of this bill is not to protect tipped employees. The true purpose is to make it easier to pay people less for their work and to pay them less than $7.25 an hour.

This bill allows employers to classify anyone who may receive a seasonal or random tip as a tipped employee, meaning they can now be paid below minimum wage by their employer. Those tips should be in addition to a worker's wage.

Employers should not be able to pay their workers less because that worker happened to receive a Christmas bonus or an occasional tip from a customer, but that is exactly what this bill would do.

This bill flies directly in the face of President Trump's campaign promise to help tipped workers. What good is no tax on tips if you have to give those tips directly to your boss so that they can take it out of your base pay?

When someone pays taxes, they at least get something in return. Like many Americans, I do not think that the average person sees the benefit that they really should for what they pay in taxes. That is because the Republican majority chooses to spend the American people's money on tax breaks for billionaires instead of spending it on our kids, and instead of spending it on childcare, housing, healthcare, on things that really make people's lives far more affordable.

What is the worker getting in return in this situation? It is just the opportunity to work. I think the American people agree that their employers should be paying them to work and not the other way around.

No worker in this country should be paid this low. I don't care who they are. Many States have raised their minimum wages. Unfortunately, my State of Georgia has not. Without the Federal floor of $7.25, workers in Georgia could legally be paid just over $5 an hour because our State minimum wage is just $5.15. Who can live on that?

Instead of trying to find ways to pay people as little as possible, this body, Congress, should be raising the wages and helping Americans keep more of their hard-earned dollars in their pocket, the money that they worked so hard for.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BABIN). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Georgia.

Mrs. MCBATH. Mr. Speaker, before I came to this body, I was a flight attendant for a national air carrier. The money that I am making today is far more than I ever made as a contract employee for an airline.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you that during the hard, 16-hour days that I had, much like what I have here, we weren't allowed to receive any tips. We weren't allowed to receive any of those kinds of benefits. Basically, if we did, if someone really, really pushed a tip on us, we would spread it among our crew. It was the right thing to do because in the airline industry, there is a cap on what you can make. There is a cap on your salary.

Mr. Speaker, having been a contract employee and having done all of that before I came here, I am so grateful every time I come across an individual in the customer service industry who has really done a good job. Paying them tips is the least that we can do to make sure that they are honored for their service.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. BUDZINSKI).

Ms. BUDZINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this legislation. This bill, deceptively named the Tipped Employee Protection Act, would change Federal wage law to allow employers to treat almost any worker as a tipped employee, even if they receive small or occasional tips. This means lower wages for everyday Americans who are struggling daily with higher costs.

Mr. Speaker, think of a restaurant worker who both waits tables and covers with some back-of-the-house shifts. This legislation would allow her employer to average her tipped wage from waiting tables with the standard minimum wage she earned during her back-of-the-house hours.

By doing this, the employer could justify paying her a subminimum wage for all hours worked. If this bill were to become law, the employer could classify her as a tipped employee and could legally pay her as little as $2.13 an hour.

In a time of rising costs and an uncertain economy and working families all across my district struggling to make ends meet, this bill to reduce take-home pay for workers is tone-deaf, at best. At worst, it is a handout to corporations at a time when workers can least afford it.

For this reason, at the appropriate time, I will offer a motion to recommit this bill back to the committee. If the House rules permitted, I would have offered the motion with an important amendment to this bill.

My amendment would attach the Wage Theft Prevention and Wage Recovery Act to this bill, which would establish new and increased penalties for violations of overtime and minimum wage requirements, a real commonsense solution for working people.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment into the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the motion to recommit.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. BUDZINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in voting for the motion to recommit.

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

□ 1530

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

Mr. Speaker, we received a letter from the Union SEIU, which says in part that this bill, the so-called Tipped Employee Protection Act, would amend Federal minimum wage and overtime law by broadening the definition of tipped employee and increasing the employer's power to move workers in and out of tipped employee status, including allowing employers to decide on a daily or weekly basis whether a worker counts as a tipped worker.

This is a harmful and ill-conceived bill in every possible way. Most tipped workers already struggle to make ends meet. We should be doing away with the subminimum wage for tipped workers, not incentivizing and expanding tipped work.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a January 13, 2026, letter from SEIU.

JANUARY 13, 2026.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of SEIU's 2 million members and worker leaders, I write to urge you to vote NO on a slate of "labor" bills expected to come to the floor for a vote this week. The bills Republicans are bringing to the floor do not represent serious attempts by Speaker JOHNSON or the GOP to help working people or working families. This is the party that just this last week stripped five states of $10 billion in childcare funding and funding to needy families. This is the party that shut the government down because they were unwilling to save 22 million people from having their health care costs dramatically rise or are lost. These pieces of legislation do not represent any serious effort at curbing costs or making life better for everyday people.

The bills are as follows: H.R. 2988—Protecting Prudent Investment of Retirement Savings, H.R. 2270—Empowering Child and Elder Care Solutions Act, H.R. 4366 Save Local Business Act, H.R. 2312—Tipped Employee Protection Act, H.R. 2262—Flexibility for Workers Education Act. Far from making conditions better for working people, these bills weaken existing protections and further stack the deck in favor of employers and against workers.

H.R. 2988, the Protecting Prudent Investment of Retirement Savings Act, amends the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA) to codify Trump Administration rules that undermine workers' retirement security by, among other things, chilling fiduciaries' consideration of a set of important financial risks and I opportunities. This bill misguidedly attacks Environmental, Social, and Governance ("ESG") considerations in fiduciary decision-making as "woke" rather than legitimate and important factors to be considered in decision-making.

H.R. 2270, the Empowering Employer Child and Elder Care Solutions Act, would allow employers to pay their workers less overtime than they are owed by excluding child and dependent care services and payments from the rate used to compute overtime compensation. Rather than incentivize employers to subsidize care, this bill could encourage excessive work without fairly compensating the workers or doing anything to make childcare or elder care more affordable or accessible.

H.R. 4366, the Save Local Business Act, would limit workers' protections under labor and employment laws by adopting a single, weak, joint employer test for both the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (FLSA) and the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA). Joint employer tests are used to determine who is responsible for wrongdoing when there are multiple entities with the power to determine employment conditions. An improperly narrow FLSA or NLRA standard would make it harder for workers to hold the right entities responsible for abuse. Further, a narrow NLRA joint employer standard effectively extinguishes the collective bargaining rights of millions of workers by permitting companies that control their jobs to escape the bargaining table. SEIU represents tens of thousands of workers, including janitors, security guards, and healthcare workers, who would have their rights weakened if this bill passes.

H.R. 2312, the Tipped Employee Protection Act, would amend federal minimum wage and overtime law by broadening the definition of tipped employee and increasing employers' power to move workers in and out of tipped employee status, including allowing employers to decide on a daily or weekly basis whether a worker counts as a tipped worker already struggle to make ends meet. We should be doing away with the subminimum wage for tipped workers, not incentivizing and expanding tipped work.

H.R. 2262, the Flexibility for Workers Education Act, would carve out time spent participating in education or training related to employment from the calculation of a worker's paid time. This bill would undercut the longstanding principle that FLSA requires minimum wage and overtime protections for all time that employees spend working for the benefit of the employer, and would enable employers to steal time from employees by scheduling unpaid—but essential to the job—training.

As stated above, these bills would hurt working people by chipping away at existing legal protections meant to protect workers from harm. They are unnecessary and burdensome new legal requirements that do nothing to improve working conditions. We strongly urge you to vote NO on all the above bills.

If you have any questions, please contact Sarah Heydemann.

Thank you,

JOHN GRAY,
Director, Legislation, Service Employees International Union.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I also include in the RECORD a January 13, 2026, letter from the Economic Policy Institute to Speaker JOHNSON.

JANUARY 13, 2026.

Re Opposition to H.R. 2988, Protecting Prudent Investment of Retirement Savings Act; H.R. 2270, Empowering Child and Elder Care Solutions Act; H.R. 4366, Save Local Business Act; H.R. 2312, Tipped Employee Protection Act; and H.R. 2262, Flexibility for Workers Education Act.

Hon. MIKE JOHNSON,
Hon. HAKEEM JEFFRIES,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: The undersigned organizations dedicated to worker rights and building a just and inclusive economy write in opposition to H.R. 2988, Protecting Prudent Investment of Retirement Savings Act; H.R. 2270, Empowering Child and Elder Care Solutions Act; H.R. 4366, Save Local Business Act; H.R. 2312, Tipped Employee Protection Act; and H.R. 2262, Flexibility for Workers Education Act. If enacted, these bills would harm workers by weakening longstanding labor and employment laws, leading to lower pay, reduced employer accountability, and more precarity.

H.R. 2988, Protecting Prudent Investment of Retirement Savings Act

The Protecting Prudent Investment of Retirement Savings Act would amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA) to block retirement plan fiduciaries from considering climate change and other environmental, social, and governance factors when they select retirement investments. The bill would constrain plan fiduciaries' ability to account long-term financial risks in their investment decisions, which would undermine workers' retirement security.

H.R 2270, Empowering Employer Child and Elder Care Solutions Act

The Empowering Employer Child and Elder Care Solutions Act would exclude child, dependent, and elder care payments from the rate used to compute overtime compensation for eligible workers. This would result in workers receiving less overtime than they are owed under current law, which would in turn incentivize employers to impose longer workweeks on already over-worked employees. Further, workers who face longer workweeks as a consequence of H.R. 2270 would likely experience higher childcare costs as childcare providers who operate during non-traditional hours (including evenings and weekends) tend to cost more. H.R. 2270 would contradict the basic premise, going back to 1938. that employers should be deterred from requiring employees to work excessive and burdensome hours.

H.R. 2262, The Flexibility for Workers Education Act

The Flexibility for Workers Education Act would amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to excuse employers of their responsibility to pay workers for trainings or other professional development opportunities that are outside of regular work hours. Despite the bill's generous-sounding title, this bill would not give workers any more flexibility. Instead, it allows employers to hold trainings and professional development opportunities after work hours and not pay workers who attend—as long as the employer does not say it's required. However, employers can still lead workers to believe these trainings and professional development opportunities are required, which would result in workers not being paid for their time.

H.R 2312, Tipped Employee Protection Act

This bill amends the FLSA's definition of "tipped employee", by allowing employers to classify workers as tipped employees—and thus allow employers to take a tip credit—if workers receive (1) any amount of tips (2) over a period of time selected by the employer, (3) regardless of the employees' duties. Eliminating the requirement that workers must be "engaged in an occupation in which he customarily and regularly receives more than $30 a month in tips." And allowing employers to choose any time period would give employers nearly unfettered discretion to re-classify almost any worker receiving any amount of tips for any amount of time as tipped employees and pay them a subminimum wage of $2.13 an hour, including for time spent doing non-tipped duties. This goes well beyond reversing the 80/20 rule challenged by the restaurant industry and would only further exacerbate the precarity of workers in an industry that already includes many of the nation's lowest-paid occupations and suffers from already high rates of wage theft. If Congress truly wants to protect tipped workers, it should pass the Raise the Wage Act, which would raise the federal minimum wage floor and gradually phase out the subminimum wage for tipped workers.

H.R. 4366, Save Local Business Act

The "Save Local Business Act" would ensure that trillion-dollar corporations like Amazon can use subcontracting and outsourcing arrangements to escape accountability to their workers. Businesses have long relied on subcontracting arrangements—such as hiring workers through temporary staffing agencies—to avoid their responsibility to comply with the FLSA and NLRA, even though they maintain power to control working conditions and that the workers are integral to their business. These contracting work-arounds were present when the FLSA and NLRA were passed in the 1930's, and versions of this outsourcing are used today by companies. Indeed, businesses across the economy—including in labor-intensive and low-paid sectors like construction, home and health care, janitorial and building services, hotels and hospitality, and warehousing and logistics—use similar contracting arrangements to insulate themselves from accountability. Limiting employer accountability and enabling corporations to avoid responsibility for violations of workers' rights under the FLSA and the NLRA will hasten race-to-the-bottom on labor standards, with businesses that treat their workers fairly finding it harder to compete.

Should H.R. 2988, Protecting Prudent Investment of Retirement Savings Act; H.R. 2270, Empowering Child and Elder Care Solutions Act; H.R. 4366, Save Local Business Act; H.R. 2312, Tipped Employee Protection Act; and H.R. 2262, Flexibility for Workers Education Act be brought to the floor, we strongly urge all Members of Congress to vote No.

With any questions, please reach out to Charlotte Dodge, National Employment Law Project; Sam Sanders, Economic Policy Institute or Michelle Feit, National Partnership for Women & Families.

Sincerely,

ECONOMIC POLICY INSTITUTE.
NATIONAL EMPLOYMENT LAW PROJECT.
NATIONAL PARTNERSHIP FOR WOMEN & FAMILIES.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this is an open invitation for employers, particularly those involving restaurants and hotels, to lower their employees' wages by combining traditionally tipped occupations with nontipped occupations. For example, they will be able to put a line cook on the floor for a few hours a day and then apply the tip credit to all of the hours that the employee works.

Tipped workers already are paid less per hour and have less access to benefits such as paid sick leave, healthcare, short-term disability and life insurance, and under this bill employers would be given a pass to not pay workers what they otherwise would have been owed.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to reject the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, we can all agree that our Nation's workers deserve to be compensated fairly. H.R. 2312, the Tipped Employee Protection Act, meaningfully updates the Fair Labor Standards Act to ensure tipped workers can take home what they earn, and small businesses are not micromanaged by Federal regulators.

Too often, the political whims of Washington have hurt tipped workers. Their earnings have been hurt instead of boosting them. H.R. 2312 puts an end to this and shields workers from the misguided actions of unelected bureaucrats.

I am proud of the work my Republican colleagues and I have done this Congress to implement policies like no tax on tips that let working Americans and tipped workers keep more of what they make.

I urge my colleagues to support the Tipped Employee Protection Act and help put more money back into American families' pockets.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 988, 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.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. BUDZINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Budzinski of Illinois moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2312 to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

The material previously referred to by Ms. BUDZINSKI is as follows:

Ms. Budzinski moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2312 to the Committee on Education and Workforce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 3. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Wage theft occurs when an employer does not pay an employee for work that the employee has performed, depriving the worker of wages and earnings to which the worker is legally entitled. This theft occurs in many forms, including by employers violating minimum wage requirements, failing to pay overtime compensation, requiring off-the-clock work, failing to provide final payments, misclassifying employees as being exempt from overtime compensation or as independent contractors rather than as employees, and improperly withholding tips.

(2) Wage theft poses a serious and growing problem across industries for working individuals of the United States. Wage theft is widespread and is estimated to cost workers more than $15,000,000,000 per year. In certain industries, compliance with Federal wage and hour laws is less than 50 percent.

(3) Wage theft is closely associated with employment discrimination, with women, immigrants, and racial and ethnic minorities being disproportionately affected. Women are significantly more likely to experience minimum wage violations than men, foreign-born workers are nearly 2 times as likely to experience minimum wage violations as their counterparts born in the United States, and African Americans are 3 times more likely to experience minimum wage violations than their White counterparts.

(4) Wage theft is closely associated with unsafe working conditions.

(5) Wage theft—

(A) depresses the wages of working families who are already struggling to make ends meet;

(B) strains social services funds;

(C) diminishes consumer spending power and hurts local economies;

(D) reduces vital State and Federal tax revenues;

(E) places law-abiding employers at a competitive disadvantage with noncompliant employers;

(F) burdens commerce and the free flow of goods; and

(G) lowers labor standards throughout labor markets.

(6) Low-wage workers are at the greatest risk of suffering from wage theft. A survey of 4,387 low-wage workers in New York, Los Angeles, and Chicago found that 68 percent of the workers surveyed had experienced some form of wage theft in the workweek immediately before the survey was conducted. These workers experienced a range of wage and hour violations: 26 percent of such workers were not paid minimum wage; 76 percent of such workers who worked more than 40 hours in the workweek immediately before the survey was conducted were not paid at the overtime rate; and, in the year before the survey was conducted, 43 percent of the workers who attempted to address such issues by filing a complaint with their employer or who attempted to form a labor organization experienced retaliation by their employers, including by being fired, suspended, or receiving threats of reductions in their hours or pay.

(7) In 2012, State and Federal authorities as well as private attorneys recovered at least $933,000,000 in wage theft enforcement actions, which was nearly 3 times the value of all bank robberies, residential robberies, convenience store and gas station robberies, and street robberies in the United States during that year.

(8) A Department of Labor study of wage theft in California and New York found that wage theft deprived workers of 37 percent to 49 percent of their income, pushing at least 15,000 families below the poverty line and driving another 50,000 to 100,000 families deeper into poverty.

(9) A study analyzing wage theft claims in the State of Washington from 2009 to 2013 estimated that the total economic cost of wage theft to the State totaled more than $64,000,000 resulting from the lower economic activity and spending of low-wage workers due to their lost wages.

(10) A Department of Labor study of wage violations in California and New York found that wage theft deprived families of $5,600,000 in possible earned income tax credits and resulted in a $22,000,000 loss in State tax revenue, a $238,000,000 loss in payroll tax revenue, and a $113,000,000 loss in Federal income tax revenue.

(11) Barriers to addressing wage theft continue to exist decades after the enactment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 201 et seq.). These barriers have resulted, in significant part, because enforcement of such Act has not worked as Congress originally intended and because many of the provisions of such Act do not include sufficient penalties to discourage violations. Improvements to enforcement and amendments to such Act are necessary to ensure that such Act provides effective protection to individuals subject to wage theft.

(12) The lack of a Federal right for employees to receive full compensation at the agreed upon wage rate for all work performed by the employee has resulted in workers being able to recover only the applicable minimum wage, or the overtime rate if applicable, when employers engage in wage theft.

(13) The lack of a Federal requirement to provide employees with paystubs indicating how their pay is calculated or to allow employees to inspect their employers' payroll records significantly impedes efforts to identify and challenge wage theft.

(14) The lack of a Federal requirement to pay employees their final payments in a timely manner upon termination of the employment relationship between the employer and employee has led to unreasonable, and sometimes indefinite, delays in compensation after an employment relationship ends.

(15) While the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Labor, as in effect on the day

before the date of enactment of this Act, require employers to compensate employees at the minimum wage rate and to provide overtime compensation when appropriate, the lack of civil penalties for most violations of these requirements has dampened their effectiveness.

(16) While the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 and regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Labor, as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, provide employees who are subject to wage theft with the right to unpaid minimum wages or unpaid overtime compensation plus an additional equal amount as liquidated damages, this low level of damages has proved insufficient to deter employers from stealing the wages of their employees.

(17) While the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 and regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Labor, as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, require employers to keep records of employees' pay, the lack of remedies beyond injunctive relief for this requirement diminishes the effectiveness of the requirement.

(18) While the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 and regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Labor, as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, provide for limited criminal penalties when employers violate the provisions of such Act, the Secretary of Labor rarely resorts to these penalties, causing them to serve as a hollow threat.

(19) The statute of limitations under section 6 of the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947 (29 U.S.C. 255), as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, precludes employees from commencing a claim for wage theft more than 2 years after the cause of action accrued, or more than 3 years after the cause of action accrued if the claim is with respect to a willful violation by the employer. Additionally, the statute of limitations is not automatically suspended while the Secretary of Labor investigates a complaint. These strict confines of the statute of limitations sometimes result in employees being deprived of their ability to institute a private lawsuit against their employer in order to recover their stolen wages.

(20) Section 16(b) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 216(b)), as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, requires employees to affirmatively ''opt-in'' in order to be a party plaintiff in a collective action brought by another aggrieved employee seeking to recover stolen wages in court. This provision limits the ability of employees to unite and pursue private lawsuits against employers.

(21) Under the penalty structure of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, many employers who are caught violating such Act continue to violate the Act. A Department of Labor investigation found that one-third of employers who had previously engaged in wage theft continued to do so.

(22) The Government Accountability Office and the Department of Labor have recognized that when employers are assessed civil penalties, they are more likely to comply with the law in the future and other employers in the same region—regardless of industry—are also more likely to comply with the law.

(23) States that have enacted legislation to address wage theft by increasing the damages to which employees are entitled following violations of wage and hour laws have positively impacted the workers in such States. However, many States have not enacted such legislation and, worse still, some States do not have any laws protecting workers from wage theft or even agencies to enforce workers' rights to compensation for work. This discrepancy in State laws has resulted in a fragmentation of workers' rights across the United States, with some workers having a measure of protection from wage theft and other workers being left extremely vulnerable to wage theft.

(24) Effective enforcement of wage and hour laws is critical to increasing compliance. Given the limited resources available for enforcement, enhanced strategic enforcement of Federal wage and hour laws is crucial.

(25) For enhanced strategic enforcement to be effective, government regulators must work with community stakeholders who have direct knowledge of ongoing violations of Federal wage and hour requirements and who are in a position to prevent such violations.

(26) Partnerships between regulators, workers, nonprofit organizations, and businesses can increase compliance by educating workers about their rights, collecting evidence, reporting violations, identifying noncompliant employers, and modeling good practices.

(27) Partnerships between regulators, workers, nonprofit organizations, and businesses have been successful in combating wage theft. In 2006, the Division of Labor Standards Enforcement of the State of California created a janitorial enforcement team to work closely with a local janitorial watchdog organization. As of 2015, the partnership had resulted in countless administrative, civil, and criminal actions against employers and in the collection of more than $68,000,000 in back pay for janitorial workers.

(28) The Comptroller General of the United States has recommended that the Department of Labor identify ways to leverage its resources to better combat wage theft by improving services provided through partnerships.

[For full text, please see H.R. 5402 from the 118th Congress.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Ms. BUDZINSKI. 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.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCIES WITH RESPECT TO THE SOUTHERN BORDER OF THE UNITED STATES AND CARTELS AND OTHER TRANSNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 119–126)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Judiciary, Ways and Means, Armed Services, and Transportation and Infrastructure and ordered to be printed:

To The Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergencies declared or expanded in Proclamation 10886 of January 20, 2025, Executive Order 14157 of January 20, 2025, Executive Order 14193 of February 1, 2025, Executive Order 14194 of February 1, 2025, and Executive Order 14195 of February 1, 2025, are to continue in effect beyond their applicable anniversary date(s).

The circumstances related to these emergencies continue to pose unusual and extraordinary threats to the national security, foreign policy, or economy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergencies declared or expanded in Proclamation 10886, Executive Order 14157, Executive Order 14193, Executive Order 14194, and Executive Order 14195.

DONALD J. TRUMP.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 12, 2026*.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO ENERGY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 119–127)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committees on Armed Services, Energy and Commerce, Financial Services, Natural Resources, and Transportation and Infrastructure and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to energy declared in Executive Order 14156 of January 20, 2025, is to continue in effect beyond January 20, 2026.

The United States continues to need a reliable, diversified, and affordable supply of energy to drive our Nation's manufacturing, transportation, agriculture, and defense industries, and to sustain the basics of modern life and military preparedness. However, our Nation faces inadequate energy supply and infrastructure, due not only to the harmful and shortsighted policies of the previous administration, but also to many harmful State and local policies, especially in our Nation's Northeast and West Coast. These policies worsened high energy prices that devastate Americans and undermined grid reliability with insufficient development of our Nation's domestic supply of energy. Without robust development of domestic energy resources, we further risk leaving our Nation vulnerable to hostile foreign actors, jeopardizing our Nation's core national defense and security needs, stalling technological innovation, and deteriorating grid reliability.

The circumstances related to this emergency continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 14156 with respect to energy.

DONALD J. TRUMP.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 12, 2026*.

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 3 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1631

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DESJARLAIS) at 4 o'clock and 31 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:

The Motion to Recommit H.R. 2262;

Passage of H.R. 2262, if ordered;

The Motion to Recommit H.R. 2270;

Passage of H.R. 2270, if ordered;

The Motion to Recommit H.R. 2312;

Passage of H.R. 2312, if ordered;

The Motion to Recommit H.R. 4593, if offered; and

Passage of H.R. 4593, if ordered.

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

FLEXIBILITY FOR WORKERS EDUCATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 2262) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to exclude certain activities from hours worked, and for other purposes, offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. NORCROSS), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 209, nays 213, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 18]

YEAS—209

Adams
Aguilar
Amo
Ansari
Auchincloss
Balint
Barragán
Beatty
Bell
Bera
Beyer
Bishop
Bonamici
Boyle (PA)
Brown
Brownley
Budzinski
Bynum
Carbajal
Carson
Carter (LA)
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cherfilus-McCormick
Chu
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conaway
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crockett
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Davis (NC)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Dexter
Dingell
Doggett
Elfreth
Escobar
Espaillat
Evans (PA)
Fields
Figures
Fletcher
Foster
Foushee
Frankel, Lois
Friedman
Frost
Garamendi
Garcia (CA)
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gillen
Golden (ME)
Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Gonzalez, V.
Goodlander
Gottheimer
Gray
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jacobs
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy (NY)
Khanna
Krishnamoorthi
Landsman
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latimer
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Levin
Liccardo
Lieu
Lofgren
Lynch
Magaziner
Mannion
Matsui
McBath
McBride
McClain Delaney
McClellan
McCollum
McDonald Rivet
McGarvey
McGovern
McIver
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Mfume
Min
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Morrison
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Nadler
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Ocasio-Cortez
Olszewski
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pelosi
Perez
Peters
Pettersen
Pingree
Pocan
Pou
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Randall
Raskin
Riley (NY)
Rivas
Ross
Ruiz
Ryan
Salinas
Sánchez
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Simon
Smith (WA)
Sorensen
Soto
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Subramanyam
Suozzi
Takano
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Tran
Underwood
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Velázquez
Vindman
Walkinshaw
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Whitesides
Williams (GA)

NAYS—213

Aderholt
Alford
Allen
Amodei (NV)
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Barr
Barrett
Baumgartner
Bean (FL)
Begich
Bentz
Bergman
Bice
Biggs (AZ)
Biggs (SC)
Bilirakis
Boebert
Bost
Brecheen
Bresnahan
Buchanan
Burchett
Burlison
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Ciscomani
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Collins
Comer
Crane
Crank
Crawford
Crenshaw
Davidson
De La Cruz
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Downing
Edwards
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Evans (CO)
Ezell
Fallon
Fedorchak
Feenstra
Fine
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flood
Fong
Foxx
Franklin, Scott
Fry
Fulcher
Garbarino
Gill (TX)
Gimenez
Goldman (TX)
Gonzales, Tony
Gooden
Gosar
Graves
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hageman
Hamadeh (AZ)
Haridopolos
Harrigan
Harris (MD)
Harris (NC)
Harshbarger
Hern (OK)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Hinson
Houchin
Hudson
Huizenga
Hurd (CO)
Issa
Jack
Jackson (TX)
James
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kean
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy (UT)
Kiggans (VA)
Kiley (CA)
Kim
Knott
Kustoff
LaHood
LaLota
Langworthy
Latta
Lawler
Lee (FL)
Letlow
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luna
Luttrell
Mace
Mackenzie
Malliotakis
Maloy
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McCormick
McDowell
McGuire
Messmer
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Mills
Moolenaar
Moore (AL)
Moore (NC)
Moore (UT)
Moore (WV)
Moran
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Nunn (IA)
Obernolte
Ogles
Onder
Owens
Palmer
Patronis
Perry
Pfluger
Reschenthaler
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rouzer
Roy
Rulli
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Self
Sessions
Shreve
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Strong
Stutzman
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner (OH)
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Van Epps
Wagner
Walberg
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westerman
Wied
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NOT VOTING—9

Casar
Dunn (FL)
Hunt
Murphy
Rogers (AL)
Swalwell
Sykes
Van Orden
Wilson (FL)

□ 1659

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

Messrs. PATRONIS, HARRIS of North Carolina, ONDER, GROTHMAN, GUEST, BAUMGARTNER, MAST, DIAZ-BALART, SHREVE, PERRY, and NEWHOUSE changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. THOMPSON of Mississippi, HIMES, GARCÍA of Illinois, COSTA, PETERS, and Ms. KAPTUR changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 209, nays 215, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 19]

YEAS—209

Aderholt
Alford
Allen
Amodei (NV)
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Barr
Barrett
Baumgartner
Bean (FL)
Begich
Bentz
Bergman
Bice
Biggs (AZ)
Biggs (SC)
Bilirakis
Boebert
Bost
Brecheen
Buchanan
Burchett
Burlison
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Ciscomani
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Collins
Comer
Crane
Crank
Crawford
Crenshaw
Davidson
De La Cruz
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Downing
Dunn (FL)
Edwards
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Evans (CO)
Ezell
Fallon
Fedorchak
Feenstra
Fine
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fleischmann
Flood
Fong
Foxx
Franklin, Scott
Fry
Fulcher
Garbarino
Gill (TX)
Gimenez
Goldman (TX)
Gonzales, Tony
Gooden
Gosar
Graves
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hageman
Hamadeh (AZ)
Haridopolos
Harrigan
Harris (MD)
Harris (NC)
Harshbarger
Hern (OK)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Hinson
Houchin
Hudson
Huizenga
Hurd (CO)
Issa
Jack
Jackson (TX)
James
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kean
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy (UT)
Kiggans (VA)
Kiley (CA)
Kim
Knott
Kustoff
LaHood
Langworthy
Latta
Lawler
Lee (FL)
Letlow
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luna
Luttrell
Mace
Mackenzie
Malliotakis
Maloy
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McCormick
McDowell
McGuire
Messmer
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Mills
Moolenaar
Moore (AL)
Moore (NC)
Moore (UT)
Moran
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Nunn (IA)
Obernolte
Ogles
Onder
Owens
Palmer
Patronis
Perry
Pfluger
Reschenthaler
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rouzer
Roy
Rulli
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Self
Sessions
Shreve
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Strong
Stutzman
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner (OH)
Valadao
Van Duyne
Van Epps
Wagner
Walberg
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westerman
Wied
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NAYS—215

Adams
Aguilar
Amo
Ansari
Auchincloss
Balint
Barragán
Beatty
Bell
Bera
Beyer
Bishop
Bonamici
Boyle (PA)
Bresnahan
Brown
Brownley
Budzinski
Bynum
Carbajal
Carson
Carter (LA)
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cherfilus-McCormick
Chu
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conaway
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crockett
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Davis (NC)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Dexter
Dingell
Doggett
Elfreth
Escobar
Espaillat
Evans (PA)
Fields
Figures
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Foster
Foushee
Frankel, Lois
Friedman
Frost
Garamendi
Garcia (CA)
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gillen
Golden (ME)
Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Gonzalez, V.
Goodlander
Gottheimer
Gray
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jacobs
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy (NY)
Khanna
Krishnamoorthi
LaLota
Landsman
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latimer
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Levin
Liccardo
Lieu
Lofgren
Lynch
Magaziner
Mannion
Matsui
McBath
McBride
McClain Delaney
McClellan
McCollum
McDonald Rivet
McGarvey
McGovern
McIver
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Mfume
Min
Moore (WI)
Moore (WV)
Morelle
Morrison
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Nadler
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Ocasio-Cortez
Olszewski
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pelosi
Perez
Peters
Pettersen
Pingree
Pocan
Pou
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Randall
Raskin
Riley (NY)
Rivas
Ross
Ruiz
Ryan
Salinas
Sánchez
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Simon
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Sorensen
Soto
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Subramanyam
Suozzi
Takano
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Tran
Underwood
Van Drew
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Velázquez
Vindman
Walkinshaw
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Whitesides
Williams (GA)

NOT VOTING—7

Casar
Hunt
Murphy
Swalwell
Sykes
Van Orden
Wilson (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1751

Mr. BRESNAHAN changed his vote from ‘‘yea’’ to ‘‘nay.’’

Mr. OGLES changed his vote from ‘‘nay’’ to ‘‘yea.’’

So the bill was not passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EMPOWERING EMPLOYER CHILD AND ELDER CARE SOLUTIONS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 2270) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to exclude child and dependent care services and payments from the rate used to compute overtime compensation, offered by the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. LEE), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 209, nays 213, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 20]

YEAS—209

Adams
Aguilar
Amo
Ansari
Auchincloss
Balint
Barragán
Beatty
Bell
Bera
Beyer
Bishop
Bonamici
Boyle (PA)
Brown
Brownley
Budzinski
Bynum
Carbajal
Carson
Carter (LA)
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cherfilus-McCormick
Chu
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conaway
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crockett
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Davis (NC)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Dexter
Dingell
Doggett
Elfreth
Escobar
Espaillat
Evans (PA)
Fields
Figures
Fletcher
Foster
Foushee
Frankel, Lois
Friedman
Frost
Garamendi
Garcia (CA)
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gillen
Golden (ME)
Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Gonzalez, V.
Goodlander
Gottheimer
Gray
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jacobs
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy (NY)
Khanna
Krishnamoorthi
Landsman
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latimer
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Levin
Liccardo
Lieu
Lofgren
Lynch
Magaziner
Mannion
Matsui
McBath
McBride
McClain Delaney
McClellan
McCollum
McDonald Rivet
McGarvey
McGovern
McIver
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Mfume
Min
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Morrison
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Nadler
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Ocasio-Cortez
Olszewski
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pelosi
Perez
Peters
Pettersen
Pingree
Pocan
Pou
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Randall
Raskin
Riley (NY)
Rivas
Ross
Ruiz
Ryan
Salinas
Sánchez
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Simon
Smith (WA)
Sorensen
Soto
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Subramanyam
Suozzi
Takano
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Tran
Underwood
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Velázquez
Vindman
Walkinshaw
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Whitesides
Williams (GA)

NAYS—213

Aderholt
Alford
Allen
Amodei (NV)
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Barr
Barrett
Baumgartner
Bean (FL)
Begich
Bentz
Bergman
Bice
Biggs (AZ)
Biggs (SC)
Bilirakis
Boebert
Bost
Brecheen
Bresnahan
Buchanan
Burchett
Burlison
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Ciscomani
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Collins
Comer
Crane
Crank
Crawford
Crenshaw
Davidson
De La Cruz
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Downing
Dunn (FL)
Edwards
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Evans (CO)
Ezell
Fallon
Feenstra
Fine
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flood
Fong
Foxx
Franklin, Scott
Fry
Garbarino
Gill (TX)
Gimenez
Goldman (TX)
Gonzales, Tony
Gooden
Gosar
Graves
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hageman
Hamadeh (AZ)
Haridopolos
Harrigan
Harris (MD)
Harris (NC)
Harshbarger
Hern (OK)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Hinson
Houchin
Hudson
Huizenga
Hurd (CO)
Issa
Jack
Jackson (TX)
James
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kean
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy (UT)
Kiggans (VA)
Kiley (CA)
Kim
Knott
Kustoff
LaHood
LaLota
Langworthy
Latta
Lawler
Lee (FL)
Letlow
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luna
Luttrell
Mace
Mackenzie
Malliotakis
Maloy
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McCormick
McDowell
McGuire
Messmer
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Mills
Moolenaar
Moore (AL)
Moore (NC)
Moore (UT)
Moore (WV)
Moran
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Nunn (IA)
Obernolte
Ogles
Onder
Owens
Palmer
Patronis
Perry
Pfluger
Reschenthaler
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rouzer
Roy
Rulli
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Self
Sessions
Shreve
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Strong
Stutzman
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner (OH)
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Van Epps
Wagner
Walberg
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westerman
Wied
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NOT VOTING—9

Casar
Fedorchak
Fulcher
Hunt
Murphy
Swalwell
Sykes
Van Orden
Wilson (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

☐ 1757

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 2270 is postponed.

TIPPED EMPLOYEE PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 2312) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to revise the definition of the term ''tipped employee'', and for other purposes, offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. BUDZINSKI), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 209, nays 215, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 21]

YEAS—209

Adams
Aguilar
Amo
Ansari
Auchincloss
Balint
Barragán
Beatty
Bell
Bera
Beyer
Bishop
Bonamici
Boyle (PA)
Brown
Brownley
Budzinski
Bynum
Carbajal
Carson
Carter (LA)
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cherfilus-McCormick
Chu
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conaway
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crockett
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Davis (NC)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Dexter
Dingell
Doggett
Elfreth
Escobar
Espaillat
Evans (PA)
Fields
Figures
Fletcher
Foster
Foushee
Frankel, Lois
Friedman
Frost
Garamendi
Garcia (CA)
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gillen
Golden (ME)
Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Gonzalez, V.
Goodlander
Gottheimer
Gray
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jacobs
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy (NY)
Khanna
Krishnamoorthi
Landsman
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latimer
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Levin
Liccardo
Lieu
Lofgren
Lynch
Magaziner
Mannion
Matsui
McBath
McBride
McClain Delaney
McClellan
McCollum
McDonald Rivet
McGarvey
McGovern
McIver
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Mfume
Min
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Morrison
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Nadler
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Ocasio-Cortez
Olszewski
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pelosi
Perez
Peters
Pettersen
Pingree
Pocan
Pou
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Randall
Raskin
Riley (NY)
Rivas
Ross
Ruiz
Ryan
Salinas
Sánchez
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Simon
Smith (WA)
Sorensen
Soto
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Subramanyam
Suozzi
Takano
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Tran
Underwood
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Velázquez
Vindman
Walkinshaw
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Whitesides
Williams (GA)

NAYS—215

Aderholt
Alford
Allen
Amodei (NV)
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Barr
Barrett
Baumgartner
Bean (FL)
Begich
Bentz
Bergman
Bice
Biggs (AZ)
Biggs (SC)
Bilirakis
Boebert
Bost
Brecheen
Bresnahan
Buchanan
Burchett
Burlison
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Ciscomani
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Collins
Comer
Crane
Crank
Crawford
Crenshaw
Davidson
De La Cruz
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Downing
Dunn (FL)
Edwards
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Evans (CO)
Ezell
Fallon
Fedorchak
Feenstra
Fine
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flood
Fong
Foxx
Franklin, Scott
Fry
Fulcher
Garbarino
Gill (TX)
Gimenez
Goldman (TX)
Gonzales, Tony
Gooden
Gosar
Graves
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hageman
Hamadeh (AZ)
Haridopolos
Harrigan
Harris (MD)
Harris (NC)
Harshbarger
Hern (OK)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Hinson
Houchin
Hudson
Huizenga
Hurd (CO)
Issa
Jack
Jackson (TX)
James
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kean
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy (UT)
Kiggans (VA)
Kiley (CA)
Kim
Knott
Kustoff
LaHood
LaLota
Langworthy
Latta
Lawler
Lee (FL)
Letlow
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luna
Luttrell
Mace
Mackenzie
Malliotakis
Maloy
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McCormick
McDowell
McGuire
Messmer
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Mills
Moolenaar
Moore (AL)
Moore (NC)
Moore (UT)
Moore (WV)
Moran
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Nunn (IA)
Obernolte
Ogles
Onder
Owens
Palmer
Patronis
Perry
Pfluger
Reschenthaler
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rouzer
Roy
Rulli
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Self
Sessions
Shreve
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Strong
Stutzman
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner (OH)
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Van Epps
Wagner
Walberg
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westerman
Wied
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NOT VOTING—7

Casar
Hunt
Murphy
Swalwell
Sykes
Van Orden
Wilson (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

☐ 1804

Mr. CLEAVER changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 2312 is postponed.

SAVING HOMEOWNERS FROM OVERREGULATION WITH EXCEPTIONAL RINSING ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4593) to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to revise the definition of showerhead will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. RILEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Riley of New York moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4593 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The material previously referred to by Mr. RILEY of New York is as follows:

Mr. Riley of New York moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4593 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Page 3, line 21, insert "In revising such regulations, the Secretary of Energy may only establish or amend standards under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act for any type or class of showerhead if such standards do not result in increased costs for consumers." after "section.".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. RILEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 209, nays 215, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 22]

YEAS—209

Adams
Aguilar
Amo
Ansari
Auchincloss
Balint
Barragán
Beatty
Bell
Bera
Beyer
Bishop
Bonamici
Boyle (PA)
Brown
Brownley
Budzinski
Bynum
Carbajal
Carson
Carter (LA)
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cherfilus-McCormick
Chu
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conaway
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crockett
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Davis (NC)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Dexter
Dingell
Doggett
Elfreth
Escobar
Espaillat
Evans (PA)
Fields
Figures
Fletcher
Foster
Foushee
Frankel, Lois
Friedman
Frost
Garamendi
Garcia (CA)
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gillen
Golden (ME)
Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Gonzalez, V.
Goodlander
Gottheimer
Gray
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jacobs
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy (NY)
Khanna
Krishnamoorthi
Landsman
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latimer
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Levin
Liccardo
Lieu
Lofgren
Lynch
Magaziner
Mannion
Matsui
McBath
McBride
McClain Delaney
McClellan
McCollum
McDonald Rivet
McGarvey
McGovern
McIver
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Mfume
Min
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Morrison
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Nadler
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Ocasio-Cortez
Olszewski
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pelosi
Perez
Peters
Pettersen
Pingree
Pocan
Pou
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Randall
Raskin
Riley (NY)
Rivas
Ross
Ruiz
Ryan
Salinas
Sánchez
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Simon
Smith (WA)
Sorensen
Soto
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Subramanyam
Suozzi
Takano
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Tran
Underwood
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Velázquez
Vindman
Walkinshaw
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Whitesides
Williams (GA)

NAYS—215

Aderholt
Alford
Allen
Amodei (NV)
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Barr
Barrett
Baumgartner
Bean (FL)
Begich
Bentz
Bergman
Bice
Biggs (AZ)
Biggs (SC)
Bilirakis
Boebert
Bost
Brecheen
Bresnahan
Buchanan
Burchett
Burlison
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Ciscomani
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Collins
Comer
Crane
Crank
Crawford
Crenshaw
Davidson
De La Cruz
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Downing
Dunn (FL)
Edwards
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Evans (CO)
Ezell
Fallon
Fedorchak
Feenstra
Fine
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flood
Fong
Foxx
Franklin, Scott
Fry
Fulcher
Garbarino
Gill (TX)
Gimenez
Goldman (TX)
Gonzales, Tony
Gooden
Gosar
Graves
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hageman
Hamadeh (AZ)
Haridopolos
Harrigan
Harris (MD)
Harris (NC)
Harshbarger
Hern (OK)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Hinson
Houchin
Hudson
Huizenga
Hurd (CO)
Issa
Jack
Jackson (TX)
James
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kean
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy (UT)
Kiggans (VA)
Kiley (CA)
Kim
Knott
Kustoff
LaHood
LaLota
Langworthy
Latta
Lawler
Lee (FL)
Letlow
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luna
Luttrell
Mace
Mackenzie
Malliotakis
Maloy
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McCormick
McDowell
McGuire
Messmer
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Mills
Moolenaar
Moore (AL)
Moore (NC)
Moore (UT)
Moore (WV)
Moran
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Nunn (IA)
Obernolte
Ogles
Onder
Owens
Palmer
Patronis
Perry
Pfluger
Reschenthaler
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rouzer
Roy
Rulli
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Self
Sessions
Shreve
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Strong
Stutzman
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner (OH)
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Van Epps
Wagner
Walberg
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westerman
Wied
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NOT VOTING—7

Casar
Hunt
Murphy
Swalwell
Sykes
Van Orden
Wilson (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

☐ 1811

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 197, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 23]

YEAS—226

Aderholt
Alford
Allen
Amodei (NV)
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Barr
Barrett
Baumgartner
Bean (FL)
Begich
Bentz
Bergman
Bice
Biggs (AZ)
Biggs (SC)
Bilirakis
Boebert
Bost
Brecheen
Bresnahan
Buchanan
Burchett
Burlison
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Ciscomani
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Collins
Comer
Crane
Crank
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Davidson
Davis (NC)
De La Cruz
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Downing
Dunn (FL)
Edwards
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Evans (CO)
Ezell
Fallon
Fedorchak
Feenstra
Fine
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flood
Fong
Foxx
Franklin, Scott
Fry
Fulcher
Garbarino
Gill (TX)
Gillen
Gimenez
Golden (ME)
Goldman (TX)
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez, V.
Gooden
Gosar
Gottheimer
Graves
Gray
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hageman
Hamadeh (AZ)
Haridopolos
Harrigan
Harris (MD)
Harris (NC)
Harshbarger
Hern (OK)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Hinson
Houchin
Houlahan
Hudson
Huizenga
Hurd (CO)
Issa
Jack
Jackson (TX)
James
Johnson (LA)

Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kean
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy (UT)
Kiggans (VA)
Kiley (CA)
Kim
Knott
Kustoff
LaHood
LaLota
Langworthy
Latta
Lawler
Lee (FL)
Letlow
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luna
Luttrell
Mace
Mackenzie
Malliotakis
Maloy
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McCormick
McDowell
McGuire
Messmer
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Mills
Moolenaar
Moore (AL)
Moore (NC)
Moore (UT)
Moore (WV)
Moran
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Nunn (IA)
Obernolte
Ogles
Onder
Owens
Palmer
Patronis
Perez
Perry
Pfluger
Reschenthaler
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rouzer
Roy
Rulli
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Self
Sessions
Shreve
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Strong
Stutzman
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Torres (CA)
Tran
Turner (OH)
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Van Epps
Wagner
Walberg
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westerman
Wied
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NAYS—197

Adams
Aguilar
Amo
Ansari
Auchincloss
Balint
Barragán
Beatty
Bell
Bera
Beyer
Bishop
Bonamici
Boyle (PA)
Brown
Brownley
Budzinski
Bynum
Carbajal
Carson
Carter (LA)
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cherfilus-McCormick
Chu
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conaway
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crockett
Crow
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Dexter
Dingell
Doggett
Elfreth
Escobar
Espaillat
Evans (PA)
Fields
Figures
Fletcher
Foster
Foushee
Frankel, Lois
Friedman
Frost
Garamendi
Garcia (CA)
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Goodlander
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Himes
Horsford
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jacobs
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy (NY)
Khanna
Krishnamoorthi
Landsman
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latimer
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Levin
Liccardo
Lieu
Lofgren
Lynch
Magaziner
Mannion
Matsui
McBath
McBride
McClain Delaney
McClellan
McCollum
McDonald Rivet
McGarvey
McGovern
McIver
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Mfume
Min
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Morrison
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Nadler
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Ocasio-Cortez
Olszewski
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pelosi
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Pou
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Randall
Raskin
Riley (NY)
Rivas
Ross
Ruiz
Ryan
Salinas
Sánchez
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Simon
Smith (WA)
Sorensen
Soto
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Subramanyam
Suozzi
Takano
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Underwood
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Velázquez
Vindman
Walkinshaw
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Whitesides
Williams (GA)

NOT VOTING—8

Casar
Hunt
Murphy
Pettersen
Swalwell
Sykes
Van Orden
Wilson (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1817

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1820

CONGRATULATING KENDRA AUCKER

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Kendra Aucker, president and CEO of the WellSpan Evangelical Community Hospital in Lewisburg, Pennsylvania. Kendra retired earlier this month after 30 years of dedicated service.

Kendra began her career at Evangelical Community Hospital in the early 1990s. Kendra left the hospital for a position at Capital Blue Cross, but returned in 1999, and stayed there ever since. She was appointed president and CEO of the hospital in 2015.

Throughout her career, Kendra has worked to grow Evangelical Community Hospital. Some of her achievements include the opening of the ambulatory surgical center and urgent care, the expansion of specialty care units, and a cardiovascular expansion project.

Kendra is the fourth president and CEO in the hospital's 100 years. Throughout her career, she has seen many changes and was pivotal in helping the hospital successfully navigate the COVID–19 virus.

Mr. Speaker, Kendra has dedicated her career to growing the WellSpan Evangelical Community Hospital and helping others. I wish Kendra the best and thank her for her years of service.

MESSAGE FROM THE STATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Lasky, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1837. An act to improve rights to relief for individuals affected by non-consensual activities involving intimate digital forgeries, and for other purposes.

INVESTING IN EASTERN NORTH CAROLINA

(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, we must continue to focus on strengthening our local economy and keeping the American Dream within reach for eastern North Carolina families.

Back in October 2024, Johnson & Johnson announced a $2 billion commitment to build a pharmaceutical manufacturing facility for innovative biologics in Wilson, North Carolina, a move that will create 420 good-paying jobs. Most recently, they have announced a second investment: a new drug product manufacturing facility.

In addition, Electrolux is investing $23 million to expand its production facility in Kinston, North Carolina, adding 74 new positions to the local workforce.

These announcements prove that when we prioritize economic revitalization, we can bring real opportunity back to rural communities that need it most.

Together, we are building a brighter future where families can thrive.

HONORING COLORADO STATE SENATOR LEWIS H. ENTZ

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

Mr. HURD of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and celebrate the life of former Colorado State Senator Lewis H. Entz, who passed away on December 10 at the remarkable age of 94.

Senator Entz was a deeply respected member of the San Luis Valley and a steadfast advocate for Colorado communities. Before serving as Colorado senator from 2001 to 2006, he dedicated 16 years to the Colorado House of Representatives. His lifetime of service also includes fighting in the Korean war as a member of the Marine Corps, serving as an Alamosa County Commissioner, and as a member of the Colorado Water Conservation Board.

During his time in public office, Senator Entz carried 70 water bills and earned recognition as a national leader in water conservation.

Those who knew him remember him as a mentor, a conservationist, a farmer, and a friend. He touched countless lives, and his legacy will continue to live on through his four children and through the many Coloradans he served.

DELTA SIGMA THETA FOUNDERS DAY

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

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise as a proud member of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Incorporated, to honor our Founders Day. Mr. Speaker, 113 years ago, 22 Black, courageous young women at Howard University founded our sorority.

Delta women have always met the moment with purpose and courage, from demanding the right to vote to leading the global fight for equitable education and opportunity.

I carry that legacy alongside my sorors—Congresswomen YVETTE CLARKE, VALERIE FOUSHEE, STACEY PLASKETT, LUCY MCBATH, JASMINE CROCKETT, SUMMER LEE, JENNIFER MCCLELLAN, and Senator ANGELA ALSOBROOKS—leading in social action, protecting voting rights, education, economic justice, and housing.

Mr. Speaker, to Deltas across the world, I say Happy Founders Day.

DR. TIM CONNELLY RECEIVES 2025 GEORGIA PHYSICIAN HERO AWARD

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Tim Connelly, an internal medicine physician at Memorial Health University Medical Center, who has been named the 2025 Physician Hero Award recipient by the Georgia Hospital Association.

This award honors physicians who give their time and expertise to strengthen their institutions and improve lives. Dr. Connelly embodies that calling through his commitment to patient care and medical education.

In addition to serving patients, he plays a vital role as the associate program director for Memorial's internal medicine residency program, helping train the next generation of physicians. Dr. Connelly's leadership shapes young doctors who will serve communities across Georgia for years to come. His dedication reflects the highest standards of medicine and service.

This recognition speaks not only to his skill as a physician but to the trust and respect that he has earned from colleagues and patients alike.

We thank Dr. Connelly for his compassion, his professionalism, and his unwavering commitment to healing others.

HISTORY IS WATCHING

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

Ms. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, we have a President who is corrupt, criminal, and craven to the core, a President who has declared war on American cities and flooded the streets with untrained, unqualified, and unidentified agents.

When agents show up in unmarked vehicles wearing masks without warrants, without body cams, targeting people based on their race or the sound of their voice, and detaining people without cause, that is not law enforcement. That is lawlessness.

The result is a tragedy. Renee Good is dead.

In the days since, there has been no remorse and no accountability from the White House. Instead, the President doubled down with more agents and more confrontation. It is violence they want to happen, with no apologies and no shame; far from it. In fact, they want more.

This is not normal, and it is not right. We must stand united against this illegal and immoral agenda. History is watching.

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

INDUSTRIAL HEMP IN KENTUCKY

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

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address an issue very near and dear to my heart—industrial hemp.

As Kentucky's Commissioner of Agriculture, I led the charge to make Kentucky the very first State to legally grow hemp. Fast forward to today, hemp is a major crop for our Kentucky farmers, and nearly every farmer I know who grew hemp last year was a former tobacco farmer.

Hemp is doing exactly today what I predicted in 2015. It has become an alternative crop to tobacco for Kentucky farmers.

The Senate recently added language to a continuing resolution that would put our Kentucky hemp farmers out of business. I will be working to add language to the continuing resolution next week to fix it. I certainly hope all my colleagues will join with me in supporting this language to help our Kentucky farmers as well as the hundreds of jobs that have been created because of industrial hemp in Kentucky.

□ 1830

STOP BODY CAMERA PAYWALLS

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

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, we all know the public deserves full transparency when it comes to holding police accountable for misconduct. Instead, States and cities all across our country have started adopting new laws to charge the public hundreds of dollars in fees to view or access police body camera footage.

These videos are public records and are essential for accountability and justice for victims of police violence. Putting this footage that should be publicly available behind a paywall makes achieving accountability much more difficult for our residents, especially those who won't be able to afford it, and they tend to be the ones more frequently abused by police.

That is why I am introducing the Stop Body Camera Paywalls Act to prevent any State or unit of local government that creates a paywall for access to these public records from receiving Federal law enforcement grants.

Again, we must make sure that we have transparency, especially when it comes to Federal law enforcement grants. This bill is a necessary step in a wider effort to end police impunity for abuses and ensure the utmost transparency, accountability, and justice for our communities.

HONORING CHIEF WARRANT OFFICER FIVE BERNARD AGUON

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

Mr. MOYLAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Chief Warrant Officer Five Bernard Aguon of the District of Columbia National Guard, a native of Guam, as he concludes a lifetime of extraordinary service to our Nation.

With more than 34 years of service across all three components of the United States Army, CW5 Aguon represents the very best of what it means to serve. Most recently, he served as the command chief warrant officer of the District of Columbia National Guard, where he was a trusted adviser to senior leaders and a steady voice in guiding complex decisions that affected the force.

Throughout his career, he served in an extraordinary range of roles, from engineer and personnel commands to senior advisory positions, bringing clarity, professionalism, and technical mastery wherever he was called.

Born and raised on Guam, CW5 Aguon's journey from our island in the Pacific to the highest levels of the National Guard is a source of great pride. He has strengthened our Army, supported countless soldiers, and brought honor to his family and his island.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of a grateful nation, I thank CW5 Aguon for his service, his sacrifice, and his enduring legacy.

REQUESTING THE SENATE TO RETURN TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES H.R. 1834

Mr. LALOTA. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 991

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives request the Senate to return to the House the bill (H.R. 1834) entitled ''To advance policy priorities that will break the gridlock.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution was agreed to.

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RUSSIAN AIR ATTACK ON KYIV

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to speak of a grave act that took place last week in the capital of Ukraine, Kyiv. The Putin dictatorship continues its illegal war with a double crime—a double-tap strike attack.

A double tap is a merciless attack when a target is struck, but then struck again within minutes in an attempt to kill survivors and first responders. I repeat: A double tap is a war crime.

Sadly, dictator Vladimir Putin's criminality against a free nation is nothing new, and Ukraine has repeatedly seen double-tap strikes specifically targeting first responders over the past 4 years, with over 500 killed.

Yesterday, 3 days after that attack, Sergiy Smolyak, a 56-year-old responder, was laid to rest. This champion of healing and compassion served as a medic for 25 years and had relocated to Kyiv when Russia invaded his hometown in the southern Kherson region nearly 4 years ago.

A nurse who worked with Smolyak said, before his funeral, that he was very kind, always calm, and even-tempered. He saved so many people.

Mr. Speaker, we must do more to deter illegal Russian aggression, inspire more healers, or innocent Ukrainians will continue to be laid to rest in a nation that longs to be free.

PREVENTING FUTURE RENAMING OF ANY NATIONAL MONUMENT OR MEMORIAL AFTER A SITTING PRESIDENT

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

Mrs. MCCLAIN DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with words spoken 65 years ago this month by President John F. Kennedy: ''Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country.''

Sadly, President Trump focuses more on what our country can do for him. We saw this last month when he unlawfully branded the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

The Kennedy Center is a national treasure of the arts and a memorial to a fallen President. That is why, in December, I introduced legislation that would remove all Trump signage.

Today, I am proud to announce a third bill. Senator SANDERS and I will jointly introduce the Stop Executive Renaming for Vanity and Ego (SERVE) Act. The bill will prevent the future renaming of any national monument or memorial after a sitting President.

Trump's branding of our Federal landmarks must end, and we must bring back common sense and an ethos of public service over self.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF BARRY DEL BUONO

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

Mr. LICCARDO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and contributions of Barry Del Buono, a longtime community leader in San Jose, California, who we lost this last December. With his passing, I lost a childhood hero, and our community lost a champion.

Barry's quiet strength and deep faith propelled a life of extraordinary service for our most vulnerable neighbors. He began his life of public service as a Catholic priest in San Jose, where he cofounded Loaves & Fishes Family Kitchen, a nonprofit that last year provided nearly 2 million meals to families in need.

Barry would eventually leave the priesthood to marry, but his commitment only deepened. In 1980, he founded the Emergency Housing Consortium, now known as HomeFirst, where he pioneered a groundbreaking continuum of care model that extended beyond emergency shelter to include transitional and permanent supportive housing.

Decades later, Barry launched his third act in life in education. He and his dedicated wife, Maile, inspired a new generation of adults with a passion for service through their teaching at San Jose City College and Evergreen Valley College.

Barry was most at home with his family, with Maile, their five children, and seven grandchildren. With grateful hearts, we remember Barry not only for what he built but also for what he believed and what he inspired all of us to believe in and build with him.

□ 1840

CONGRATULATING MONROE RED JACKETS

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

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the Monroe Red Jackets high school football team, led by Coach Terrell Cunningham and New York State Gatorade Player of the Year Messiah Hampton, who made history as the first-ever Rochester City School District Class B State champions.

This team showed what is possible when talent meets determination, when hard work rises above the challenges we face, and when young people refuse to be defined by the obstacles in front of them.

They believed in each other. They believed in themselves. They showed New York State what Rochester pride looks like.

This championship brings hope. It brings hope for the students who have proven their dreams are within reach, for a school that showed excellence thrives here, and for a community that has so much to be proud of.

We thank the players, coaches, families, and fans for reminding us that greatness lives right here in Rochester. I cannot wait to see what all these young people go on to do. We congratulate the Monroe Red Jackets.

CONDEMNING THE JANUARY 6 PARDONS

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

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my outrage and ask my colleagues to join me in condemning the actions of the President when he pardoned so many of the individuals convicted after January 6.

At least 13 individuals who have been pardoned by President Trump have gone on to commit additional crimes, including sexual assault against a minor and a fatal DUI.

Instead of promoting accountability and rehabilitation, when possible, in our justice system, shouldn't the President and the majority look at these pardons and make sure that they accept the consequences of his actions and their actions by not ignoring them?

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in condemning the President's unvetted and ill-advised pardons that are leading to repeat offenses. Congress should be here to protect innocent Americans and not look away from the consequences of the President's actions.

PROTECTING EDUCATION FOR CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES

(Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, Mrs. HAYES of Connecticut was recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.)

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to lead this Special Order hour and to speak about a matter of great importance to millions of American children. With everything going on, it is easy to overlook what is happening at the Department of Education.

Today, I would like to highlight the concerns of parents who have children living with disabilities. They are scared, concerned, and confused.

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, or IDEA, is the Federal law that ensures children with disabilities receive a free and appropriate public education tailored to their unique learning needs.

IDEA provides services to children from birth to age 21. Since its enactment in 1975, IDEA focused on providing children with disabilities the same educational opportunities as all other students. It allows the 7.5 million children living with disabilities who rely on services to receive early intervention and remain in the least restrictive environments alongside their nondisabled peers.

It provides grants and helps parents with their rights and to know what is legally required of schools to develop individualized educational plans, detailing specific goals, services, and support for students.

IDEA requires that teachers be highly qualified with ongoing training, ensuring they meet the unique needs of students with disabilities. These services are there to provide students with postsecondary education, employment, and independent living.

IDEA addresses past failures to educate students with disabilities. I am old enough to remember a time when students with special needs were educated in the basement of schools or outright denied entry. Before IDEA, millions of children with disabilities were denied an education and often refused admission to schools or even programs.

Today, children with disabilities are able to attend any public school and receive services at no cost to their parents. They have legal and civil rights protections for their children under this landmark law.

On March 20, 2025, the President signed an executive order directing the Secretary of Education, Linda McMahon, to facilitate the dismantling of the Department of Education, which raises significant questions about the future of IDEA and the impact on the education of these 7.5 million children.

The students who would be hurt the most by weakening the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act are the children who are the most vulnerable. In nearly every State, public schools are primarily funded by State and local governments with local property taxes playing a crucial role.

Without IDEA and Federal resources, these students could end up in underfunded schools that lack resources, expertise, or accountability to provide the special education services and supports they require.

IDEA is Federal law, which means that even without funding from the Department of Education, State and local districts will have to figure out how they will make up this deficit. They will still have to provide services and likely have to cut other programs.

This could mean a student with dyslexia would no longer receive daily reading interventions. A student who was deaf or hard of hearing would not have a sign language interpreter. A student who just needed a little bit of speech therapy in order to be a part of the class would not have that, making it nearly impossible to follow daily lessons or participate in discussions.

Weakening IDEA would not only cut funding or reduce services, but it would threaten the future of these students who with just the right amount of support and accommodations could thrive.

The stakes are too high. We must protect the Department of Education, and we must protect IDEA. This administration has yet to lay out any detailed plan for the future of IDEA.

I have serious concerns about moving services for students with disabilities to HHS because then they are only being viewed through a medical lens. They would only be diagnosed and would not be seen as students first and given the resources they needed to survive.

Today, I would like to elevate the stories of my colleagues who have children and families living in their district who rely so heavily on the services that the Federal Government provides.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS), a member of the Committee on Education and Workforce.

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. HAYES) for yielding time. I thank her for her unwavering support of children and for having been the National Teacher of the Year. I thank her so much.

Mr. Speaker, I rise because dismantling the Department of Education is not just bad policy. It is dangerous for North Carolina's children. In my State, more than 60 percent of students rely on Pell grants and Federal aid to afford college. Nearly 1.5 million K–12 students depend on title I IDEA school nutrition and other Federal supports.

In Charlotte-Mecklenburg, over 70 percent of students benefit directly from programs administered through the Department. When the Department is gutted, when staff are fired, grants are frozen, and financial aid systems break, it is our most vulnerable young people who feel it first. These are low-income students, first-generation students, students with disabilities, and families who cannot afford disruptions.

This isn't efficiency. It is an educational disarmament. I am proud to defend the Department of Education because protecting the Department means protecting opportunity.

Mrs. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative ADAMS for her remarks. As she noted, I was a classroom teacher for over 15 years. I know exactly how important these resources and supports are. I had students who had severe learning disabilities but who were able to thrive with the appropriate accommodations and the resources and support in the classroom.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to note that in my State of Connecticut, in 2025, we received approximately $160 million from the Federal Government in order to facilitate services for students with exceptionalities. A State like Connecticut would have to fill that gap in order to make sure these students continue to receive services. What is happening with the Department of Education is of grave concern to me.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BYNUM).

Ms. BYNUM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. HAYES) for bringing us together to stand up for children with disabilities.

Mr. Speaker, if I were to not pay something I owed for 50 years, the consequences would be tremendous. That is exactly what the Federal Government has done with the IDEA, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

□ 1850

In 1976, just a year after I was born, Congress promised to pay for 40 percent of the cost of public education for children with disabilities. Yet, here we are in 2026. I am 50, almost 51, but the Federal Government is paying less than 12 percent. In my home State of Oregon, that means a $315 million gap between the funding that our students are getting and the amount that these schools are owed.

On top of that, it has been credibly reported that the Trump administration has started dismantling the Department of Education, including the staff who oversee these IDEA programs. Now the program is both underfunded and there is no one there to send the money out.

That is why earlier this Congress, I introduced the IDEA Full Funding Act. I urge my colleagues to join me in finally giving our students with disabilities exactly what they are owed.

Mrs. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Oregon for her support.

To the gentlewoman's point, the IDEA has never been fully funded as the Federal Government promised. In the State of Oregon, they received $162 million in 2025, which is just a fraction of what it costs to educate students with special needs.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MANNION).

Mr. MANNION. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share what is at stake for students with disabilities as this administration continues its attacks on the Department of Education.

Last year, one of our Nation's most fundamental laws, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, or IDEA, reached its 50th anniversary. IDEA opened the doors to opportunities and protected the rights of millions of students with disabilities and their families. It guaranteed a free, appropriate public education where students with disabilities could learn in the least restrictive environment and with the proper support.

Before this landmark piece of legislation, generations of students with disabilities were routinely denied equal access to education. As a teacher for almost 30 years and the founding chairman of the New York State Senate Disabilities Committee, I have seen firsthand how IDEA has transformed lives and what it means to families.

Yet, for all of the progress that we have made, much work still remains, and IDEA is still more at risk today than it has ever been. This administration has recklessly conducted mass layoffs across the Department of Education, with no regard for the impacts on programs, school districts, students, and families whom they serve.

Sadly, these firings have reached the Office of Special Education Programs, which administers IDEA, as well as the Office for Civil Rights, which investigates cases of disability discrimination. Without these agencies and their dedicated employees, parents would have little recourse when schools fail to protect their students and provide appropriate accommodations.

From day one, it was obvious that this administration wanted to transfer IDEA oversight out of the Department of Education entirely by moving it to HHS, an agency with no expertise or legal authority over special education.

Countless disability advocates have sounded the alarm on this proposal. We cannot let these attacks continue, and we must also continue to call out the vile rhetoric and misinformation about disabilities in this country and around the world that this administration has spread.

Parents of students with disabilities fight hard every single day for their children, and there is no reason that they should have to fight harder. I came to Congress to be a voice for those families and to ensure that our country lives up to its promises and our values.

That is why my very first bill was the Protecting Students With Disabilities Act, which would protect IDEA programs from the illegal dismantling of the Department of Education. This should be a bipartisan cause, as it has long been, and we should be talking more about fully funding IDEA and strengthening it. Instead, we are left defending it from political attacks.

I thank my colleague, Representative HAYES, for organizing this discussion. I also thank my fellow members of the Education and Workforce Committee for their commitment to maintaining IDEA. As a fellow educator, I am proud to stand with Representative HAYES in this fight.

Mrs. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, as our colleague on the committee from Oregon makes her way to the podium, I will just read an excerpt from an email that I got from a parent in my district:

> As a special needs mom, the current news of the cuts happening in the special education department are frightening to me. I am not well-versed in politics or government, and I don't know how or if this will affect us in Connecticut, but I am my child's only advocate, and I can tell you that our special education system is strained.
>
> Please put yourself in the shoes of a special needs parent who relies on the staff to tell them what happened at school because their child cannot. I ask that you place yourself in the shoes of a parent who cannot afford out-of-pocket services and relies on the public school system to provide speech, occupational, and behavioral services.
>
> Please advocate for my child. I don't even know how to. I need you to do this for them.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative HAYES for leading this important conversation and bringing her expertise as National Teacher of the Year to the Congress and to the Education Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I have been an education advocate for decades, and I speak with students, parents, and educators in Congress and at home in Oregon, and I can't count the number of times where parents have said to me: Please, please fully fund IDEA.

According to the Department of Education, Secretary McMahon is now exploring additional partnerships to move the administration of special education programs under IDEA, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, to other Federal agencies. The most likely choice for this unconstitutional and illegal transfer? It is to the Department of Health and Human Services.

Mr. Speaker, this means that Secretary Robert F. Kennedy, Jr., would be in charge of administering IDEA. This is the man who disregarded established science to advance policies based on conspiracy theories, including claiming that Tylenol and vaccines cause autism and that autism destroys families.

This agency should not be administering funding or providing guidance to schools on educating students with disabilities, especially with its current Secretary.

IDEA is an education program, not a medical program. It is designed to provide students with disabilities access to a free and appropriate public education, often through individualized education programs, or IEPs.

Those with the expertise and data to best administer the program are already at the Department of Education, or at least they were until Secretary McMahon fired them.

A special education teacher in Beaverton, Oregon, recently wrote to my office. She is extremely concerned, as are so many, about the Trump administration's plans for special education, and this is what she said: ''When I tell you that schools are in dire straits already, I mean it—and yet I know it can get worse.

I am terrified for my students. The mass layoffs and restructuring within the Department of Education's Office of Special Education have left only a fraction of the staff to manage billions in IDEA funds and ensure States follow the law.''

She continued: ''Without Federal oversight, States will have less accountability, fewer resources, and more leeway to deny or reduce services. Families will be left without recourse, and the promise of a free and appropriate public education will be broken.''

These are challenging enough times for students, families, and schools. In Portland, the public school district recently redirected an additional $25 million from their general fund to fill the gap to help provide students with disabilities the resources that they need that State and Federal funding aren't covering, and it is still not enough.

The Trump administration's proposals to disrupt the administration on such an important program risks further harming the people we represent. A mother in Portland wrote to me and said that she is a full-time caregiver, has two sons with disabilities, and that she has only been able to work 2 of the last 8 years because of the lack of reliable care.

Unfortunately, she was just laid off again from her most recent job.

She told me: ''We are exhausted and doing everything we can, but the system leaves too much on families.''

She begged us to protect access to services for students with disabilities and to continue advocating for these children and their caregivers. In her words: ''We need policies that recognize the reality we're living, not ones that make it harder.''

These are the families, teachers, and the people who will be affected by decisions we make about IDEA. What we should be doing is fully funding IDEA, not disrupting the support that already exists by forcing schools and families to work with multiple Federal agencies instead of one.

□ 1900

HHS is not equipped to manage this critical program. I will keep fighting. I will keep fighting the Trump administration's efforts to abandon and dismantle the Department of Education and its core responsibility, especially its core responsibility to students with disabilities.

I thank Representative HAYES for her leadership.

Mrs. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio, Representative BROWN.

Ms. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, Congresswoman HAYES, for hosting this Special Order Hour and for her leadership on this critical issue.

Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago Congress passed the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act, or IDEA, because America rejected exclusion and finally recognized a simple truth: Every child, regardless of ability, deserves to learn, grow, and succeed.

Yet, today, that promise is under attack. Disabled students are more vulnerable than ever, facing threats to their funding, their services, and the Federal protections that make equal education possible.

At the same time, this administration is laying off the very civil servants whose job it is to protect those children and enforce the law. When you cut special education funding, cut the Department of Education, and cut the staff, no one can speak out for the children who need these programs the most—children like my nephew RJ, who was born premature and has dealt with developmental delays all his life. His condition requires special care and attention. He didn't choose to be disabled or to have additional needs, but he is made in God's image, and he deserves every opportunity to reach his full potential.

Because of programs established by IDEA, children like RJ can access the same educational assistance and support that other students enjoy. I think that is a good thing. I think that is what should make America America, but this White House disagrees.

The Trump administration believes that the rights and opportunities available to students like RJ can and should be limited. They have spun abandoning programs as efficiency and told us that they are cutting waste and saving you money.

What it really is and what it really costs is paid for by underserved students and their families, because without the protections and funding provided by IDEA, more students are left behind. Without federally supported services that help with early detection, children are less able to navigate a world that wasn't built for them.

IDEA doesn't provide special treatment. It provides children with fair and inclusive treatment, and it doesn't waste Federal resources. It breaks through the barriers that children with disabilities face and levels the playing field.

Today, that lifeline for children with disabilities is under threat. In my own State, nearly one in five students have disabilities. That is more than a quarter million children in Ohio who rely on IDEA programs to get the education they need and deserve.

I have one question today: How exactly does gutting special education programs and staffing make America great? It doesn't. We should be strengthening IDEA, not weakening it. We should be protecting civil rights, not gutting them. We should be recommitting our promise to every child, not pulling out the rug.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, a true champion in the education space, for the leadership she has demonstrated on this critical and, yes, personal issue to me.

Mrs. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative BROWN. I think she knows I will always fight for RJ and all the kids like him.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Arizona and the newest member of our committee, Representative GRIJALVA.

Mrs. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman HAYES for her leadership and advocacy.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in defense of one of the most important civil rights laws Congress has ever passed, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and to oppose the dangerous and unlawful efforts to dismantle the Department of Education.

IDEA is not a suggestion. It is not discretionary. It is the law of the land, and for more than four decades, it has represented a bipartisan commitment that children with disabilities have the right to a free, appropriate public education, one that meets their individual needs and recognizes their full potential.

Before IDEA, millions of children with disabilities were excluded from classrooms, denied services, or told they did not belong in public school at all. IDEA changed that. It affirmed that a disability does not diminish a child's worth and that access to education is a civil right, not a privilege reserved for a few.

Today, more than 7 million students across the country rely on IDEA for individualized education plans, services, and due process protections. These are real students whose ability to learn, communicate, and thrive depends on fulfilling the promises made in Federal law.

Those promises are enforced, overseen, and protected by the Department of Education.

The Department plays an essential role in ensuring that IDEA is implemented fairly and consistently across all States. It provides guidance, oversight, enforcement, and accountability. Without it, IDEA becomes words on paper with no meaningful guarantee.

Let us be clear. People cannot claim to support students with disabilities while dismantling the very agency responsible for protecting their rights. Efforts to hollow out or get rid of the Department of Education without congressional authorization are not only reckless, they are illegal. Congress created IDEA. Congress assigned its enforcement. Attempting to undermine that structure violates the law and the Constitution's separation of powers.

Without Federal oversight, enforcement of IDEA will vary widely from State to State. A child's access to services will depend on their ZIP Code. Families will face confusion, delays, and costly legal battles just to secure what the law already guarantees their children. States and school districts will be left without clear guidance or support, increasing litigation, and diverting resources away from classrooms. Families, especially those without financial or legal resources, will pay the highest price.

The measure of our commitment to public education is how the students who need us the most are treated, and today, those students are watching.

I urge my colleagues to reject the efforts to weaken IDEA or dismantle the Department of Education. Congress has a legal obligation, a moral responsibility, and a constitutional duty to protect students with disabilities and ensure they receive the education they deserve.

I will continue to stand with students, families, educators, and advocates, and I call on this body to do the same.

Mrs. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California, another member of the Committee on Education and Workforce, Representative TAKANO.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, it is always an honor and a pleasure to work with the gentlewoman from Connecticut, a distinguished National Teacher of the Year and an amazing educator who, like myself, went from the classroom to the Halls of Congress to advocate for our students nationally.

The promise of a free and quality education is a vital part of the American Dream. The embodiment of that promise came in 1975 when Congress passed the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to ensure that children with disabilities could receive a free, fair, and equal education.

This landmark legislation changed the lives of millions of Americans. The disabled children's right to an education would not only be recognized, but it would be funded and enforced nationwide.

Today, 7.5 million students rely on IDEA funding, and that is nearly one in seven students whose specialized education is funded in part by the Department of Education.

Every school district in the country has families that have benefited from the IDEA, and its 50 years of enactment have improved public education for all students. That is why the Trump administration's actions to gut staffing at the Department of Education and move the Office of Special Education programs to the Department of Health and Human Services is so devastating. HHS does not have the structure, nor the staff, to administer the $15 billion a year that this office is responsible for.

The administration also gutted the Office of Civil Rights, which is responsible for investigating civil rights abuses in schools. The OCR was responsible for ensuring that students with disabilities got the quality education they are entitled to and that cases of neglect and abuse were duly prosecuted.

□ 1910

With the Department of Education fragmented, teachers and administrators won't be able to access the resources they need; parents will be unable to get the proper support; and the students will be the ones who pay the price.

What is clear is that the Department of Education is the only Department equipped to be charged with the education of all students, including students with disabilities, not HHS, not the Department of Labor, not the Department of Justice.

Creating more hoops for schools to jump through and shattering known systems and protocol will, at the end of the day, hurt the students this administration claims they are protecting.

Republicans have not allowed IDEA to be fully funded. Republicans are looking to defund public schools, leaving parents with fewer choices and options in educating their children. Republicans' obsession with dismantling the Department of Education appears to be the only education policy they really have.

Our students need more. Our teachers deserve more. Our schools require more to fulfill the American promise of a free and quality education for every American child.

Mrs. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say as a teacher, when students with disabilities enter public schools, they can't be turned away. You have to figure out what their needs are. You have to meet with parents and the team to come up with a plan and teach those students.

Unlike charter schools, for-profit schools, or even some private schools, which can decide that a student doesn't belong in their environment, at public schools, all kids belong there. We just have to figure out how to teach them.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut for yielding. It is so good to be here with her.

I want to focus a little bit on the importance of bringing this to the floor and perhaps even entering into a sort of dialogue with Mrs. HAYES about it.

I am thinking that the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act came around 50 years ago. Long before that time, people recognized that education was a game changer for anyone.

Frederick Douglass said that knowledge is the ''pathway from slavery to freedom,'' and, ''Once you learn to read, you will be forever free.''

We found that Brown v. Board of Education really challenged the Equal Protection Clause under the 14th Amendment and made sure that little Black children would be able to get an education. Even before the Department of Education was established, even before that, the IDEA was written into law.

I bring all of that background up to say that the Department of Education was critical because when you think of all the various laws that need to be administered to make sure that there is equal protection, the IDEA just being one of those laws, it is very disturbing to see that the Department of Education has been stripped down to its bare bones.

I would like the member of the Committee on Education and Workforce to help me walk through it.

Am I right about this, that the administration has tried to illegally move the IDEA office and funding from the Department of Education to the Department of Health and Human Services?

I yield to the gentlewoman for a colloquy.

Mrs. HAYES. It has been floated, but we haven't seen any concrete plans, which is part of the problem.

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. In the middle of the shutdown, was it true that the Trump administration tried to fire nearly everyone in the Department of Education's Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services?

Mrs. HAYES. Yes. Many employees were RIF'd at the Department of Education. I think even more concerning is the Office of Civil Rights in the Department of Education, the number of staff who were fired.

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. The Office of Civil Rights was put in there through the Civil Rights Act of 1964. This office is responsible for investigating thousands of allegations of discrimination each year, which includes enforcing Federal laws, ensuring equal educational access, and preventing discrimination.

Gentlewoman from Connecticut, am I wrong about this? I think it is very important because what we have seen is that so-called disabled people or differently abled people have made such tremendous contributions to our culture and to our society. I am thinking of very famous people like Thomas Edison, Franklin Roosevelt, and Fannie Lou Hamer, people who have had polio, who have been in wheelchairs, and physicists who have contributed.

It is important to leave nobody behind because the education of everybody is important to our national security interests and our economic interests.

I am so happy that Mrs. HAYES has raised this in this Special Order hour, and I thank her for allowing me to participate.

Mrs. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her remarks.

I will say that I am uniquely positioned to speak about some of the things that were brought up about what happened to children before IDEA was passed.

Before becoming a teacher, and, actually, while I was a teacher, I worked at the Southbury Training School in Connecticut, which is a facility, an institution, that was established in the 1930s for children with developmental and mental disabilities.

Many of those people, who are now adults, became institutionalized because they were placed in this facility. With their disabilities, had a law like this been in place, they could have been able to thrive and live in their community, but we put them behind walls in institutions. We can never go back to a time when that happens again.

I thank Ms. MOORE for joining us tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. MCIVER).

Mrs. MCIVER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. HAYES) so much for leading this Special Order hour.

Mr. Speaker, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and the Department of Education are vital to all communities, including the one I represent.

Nearly one in five students in New Jersey is served under IDEA. Without this support, almost a quarter-million students would be denied an adequate education.

My district, New Jersey's 10th Congressional District, receives $98 million in title I and special education grants. How will our schools support these students without these funds?

As a former education administrator, I know firsthand the impact IDEA funding makes on students who need it the most. Without Federal funding, States and local communities would have to cover the costs, but your ZIP Code should not determine if you deserve to have your children's educational needs met.

As a public school mom, this is deeply personal for me. People in my community and communities across the Nation are scared.

My office recently received a letter from Alexander, a special education and social studies teacher in my district. Alexander is worried about what funding cuts would mean for his students, who are among the most vulnerable and underserved.

Too often, the most vulnerable among us are forced to suffer from bad policy decisions. In this country, the richest one, we are supposed to find solutions for those who need our support, not leave them behind.

This administration came to office saying it was going to put Americans first. These attacks on public education show they are putting children last.

Mrs. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me thank Representative HAYES for her leadership in hosting this Special Order hour.

This past November, we celebrated the 50th anniversary of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, an incredible milestone that serves as a reminder of the promise we make to our Nation's children that every student, no matter who they are or how they learn, deserves equal access to a quality education.

□ 1920

Yet, this anniversary comes at a time when the Trump administration continues its systematic efforts to eliminate the Department of Education, gut the Office of Special Education Programs, and undermine IDEA, a landmark law that fundamentally changed how we educate children with disabilities.

Since 1975, IDEA has provided immeasurable support to children with disabilities, particularly for those in their earliest and most formative years. IDEA part C, a Federal program closely intertwined the Medicaid, provides early intervention from birth to age 3, oftentimes the difference between a child meeting developmental milestones or falling behind.

These Federal dollars change millions of lives across the country every single year. However, Trump and congressional Republicans have told American families that these investments don't matter, that their child's future does not count, and that Federal dollars are better spent elsewhere.

I am here to remind the American people that the President's shameless assault on early intervention and Medicaid paints a grim picture for the future of special education and for the future of millions of children.

As an occupational therapist myself, I have worked with children with developmental disabilities in their earliest years, and I have seen what happens when we make good on our promise to invest in special education and early intervention. Early intervention care alters the course of a child's life for the better, dramatically improves health and educational outcomes, and gives working families the support they desperately need.

Republicans in this body need to remember the sacred promise made to children with disabilities 50 years ago and stand by it rather than turn a blind eye. Democrats will not sit idly by as this administration jeopardizes our children's futures and undermines the fundamental right to an education.

These aren't budget cuts. These are broken promises to children with disabilities. We cannot build a stronger nation by cutting off critical support for those who need it most. We must fully fund and support the essential mission and fulfill the commitment of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Mrs. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB), who is a champion for children.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I thank my sister in service, Congresswoman HAYES, who has been leading this fight to protect our children, especially making sure that we have access to public education and quality education for all of our children.

Alongside millions of children, including children with disabilities and their families, we are demanding that Congress fulfill its promise.

Nearly 50 years ago, Congress passed the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, IDEA, with a commitment that every child, including students with disabilities, meet their full potential in every classroom and to ensure also that every family has the services they need for their children to succeed.

We didn't say educate children with disabilities if it is convenient. We didn't say protect their rights unless the budgets are too tight or we don't have enough money. We made a promise. We made a promise to fund 40 percent of the cost of IDEA. That promise was never kept. The Federal share is now less than 12 percent.

According to the Autism Alliance of Michigan, Michigan ranks among the lowest in the Nation for special education outcomes, due to massive underfunding by our Federal Government. Students with disabilities in Michigan are twice as likely to drop out of school as their peers. Only 60 percent graduate high school in 4 years, compared to 85 percent among their other peers.

Right now, we are seeing special education under direct and deliberate attack. We have seen repeated efforts to slash education funding, weaken civil rights enforcement and chip away at the protections IDEA guarantees to our students with disabilities.

Every dollar we fail to invest in IDEA is a cost shifted onto our schools, our local communities, our families, and our children, who are already feeling financial strain.

Our families are counting on us. Congress cannot continue to fall short on our students and families regarding funding when so much is at stake. We must fulfill our promise and fund IDEA.

Mrs. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SIMON), to speak on this very important issue.

Ms. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman HAYES for bringing us here tonight.

Mr. Speaker, America, this country, has long promised that every child has a right to learn. That promise exists because parents, not just this Chamber, parents, refused to give up on their children's future.

Mr. Speaker, one of those parents was my mother, Vicki Simon. I was born with congenital blindness, and my mother in the early seventies was on the phone consistently, day after day to ensure that I entered a school that would be there for me, that would ensure that I had assistance and support, and that I would read large print with power.

I am thankful for teachers and educators, like the gentlewoman, who brought children like me in front of the board. I was so happy to cosponsor the See the Board Act. It should be in this Chamber, and we should be voting to ensure that while the Republicans take away healthcare from families and disabled children, those deaf and those blind, that they get education and screening at their schools of choice.

We are also here because advocates refused to be silent because Congress recognized that an equal education is the foundation of any democratic society.

Before these protections, young people with disabilities around the country were not only silenced, they were institutionalized. Families were told to stay quiet while bright and brilliant minds were dismissed, and today that door is closing again, eerily quickly because of the Trump administration's reckless and cruel agenda.

Mr. Speaker, if you would ask any parent of a disabled child in this country regardless how they vote, red or blue, if you ask them if they knew that the Department of Education—yes, we want to trim it down—but the very department, the Office of Civil Rights, was all but being severed, and you let them know what the Office of Civil Rights did: The Office of Civil Rights in the Department of Education ensures that every rape on a college campus in this country is investigated. If the city decides not to investigate, then the Office of Civil Rights comes in.

The Office of Civil Rights investigates for the mother and the child who uses the wheelchair when the school says they don't need a ramp.

The Office of Civil Rights literally provides constant oversight over every school district in this country so that a child in Alabama has the same rights to an education as their disabled peer in California.

Let's make it clear: We are not talking about any progressive agenda here. We are talking about letting it be known in this country that the Trump administration is literally taking away investigators who will oversee the educational progress of disabled children.

Tens of thousands of families are waiting for justice and their cases to be investigated. These are not statistics; these are real families that we serve.

Did Congress ever intend this?

Did the administration ever intend to block away rights and responsibilities of folks who are supposed to oversee the rightful education of disabled children?

The American people will not accept this.

□ 1930

Mrs. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California and again thank her for cosponsoring that piece of legislation with me. I understand that if a child can't see the board, they can't learn. Her enthusiasm when I brought it to her is exactly why we need people from diverse perspectives in this Chamber.

I now yield to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. TOKUDA). I thank her so much for the work that she does on behalf of children in her home State.

Ms. TOKUDA. Mr. Speaker, only 50 years ago, we made a promise as a nation. When Congress passed the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, we affirmed a simple and profound truth: Every child, no matter their disability or ability, has the right to a free and appropriate public education; not as charity, not as an afterthought, but as a civil right.

Let's be honest. That promise has never been self-executing. Making IDEA real has required vigorous Federal oversight, strong civil rights enforcement, litigation when necessary, strong parents who demand only the best for their child, and a willingness to demand more—not less—resources and accountability.

That is why the Trump administration's dismantling of the Department of Education, the decimation of special education enforcement, and the hollowing out of the Office for Civil Rights is so dangerous. This is not reform. This is retreat. It will set public education back more than 50 years.

In Hawaii, we know what happens when FAPE is treated as optional. The Felix Consent Decree raised the alarm more than 30 years ago that we were failing our children. We are the tenth largest school district in the Nation. One in ten of our students have an IEP. Many live on our neighbor islands in rural and remote communities, where even access to services or reliable internet is a challenge. Federal enforcement is not abstract to us. It is the difference between support and neglect.

The reality is, IDEA has also been an unfunded mandate. You have heard it here today from my colleagues. The Federal Government once promised to cover 40 percent of the cost. It has never met that promise, never rising above 10 or 12 percent at best. Now, instead of finally doing what we owe our children, our families, our communities, this administration wants to walk away altogether.

I am a proud product of our public schools. I am a proud parent of public school students, and I believe deeply that an injury to one is an injury and insult to all.

The dismantling, defunding, destaffing, restructuring of the Department of Education is death by a thousand cuts. If we allow this to continue, if we walk back all the gains we have made as a result of IDEA, it will leave all our children behind.

We must not, cannot let this happen, and I assure you, all of us here today on this floor will stand in the way of the destruction of the Department of Education and the demise of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Mrs. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. STANSBURY), a fearless advocate for children and her constituents.

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today first in thanks to our fearless leader, Representative HAYES, today, but Mr. Speaker, I rise today to sound the alarm on what is happening at the U.S. Department of Education or at least what is left of it.

For millions of students with disabilities, the IDEA, or Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, is a landmark civil rights law that guarantees a free and inclusive public education for all students.

However, under the Trump administration, IDEA is under attack, with the administration announcing at the height of the government shutdown in October that it would fire nearly all of the staff responsible for ensuring that students with disabilities have access to resources and support services.

Can you imagine? It is not just reckless, it is not just illegal. It is heartless, and it is disgusting.

Piled onto continuing cuts and threats to other programs of vulnerable families, the President and the GOP have continued to cut healthcare, education, food assistance, housing, and childcare to millions of American families, attacking the very families who need it most while giving billionaires tax breaks on the backs of hardworking Americans. It is shameful.

Mr. Speaker, I want to address the administration's attacks on education and what these actions mean for all students, but especially students with disabilities, their educators, and their families. The Department of Education exists to ensure that every student has access to opportunity, to protect their civil rights, to ensure that every student has a fair shot at success.

However, since day one, this administration has systematically dismantled the department, with budget cuts, cutting programs, delaying grants, and firing staff. Over the course of the last year, my office has heard from hundreds of parents, teachers, and students who are scared about what is happening and wondering what will come next: from teachers and counselors who are stretched thin and uncertain about whether or not resources will be there next year, from schools who don't know if their funding will be cut, and from young people, the very children that these programs serve, who are afraid because this administration is terrorizing the children of this country by attacking education and schools and their families, attacking the most vulnerable families.

I have to say this, Mr. Speaker, there is no demand for this. There is no one out there in the American public who is demanding that we cut programs for students and young people with disabilities because it is cruel, wrong, and illegal. It must stop.

That is why Democrats are standing here tonight: to stand up for our students, to stand up for our young people, to fight back against these attacks, and to take a stand against the dismantling of these vital programs.

Let me just say this: In New Mexico, we understand that our young people are our future. That is why we are the first State in the Nation to pass universal free childcare and education for every single student in our State.

I, for one, as a public school kid, was deeply proud to carry the Federal enabling legislation. It is why I fought for funding to build new schools at To'hajiilee, Sandia Pueblo, and Mescalero Apache. It is why I am carrying legislation to increase teacher pay, to protect BIE in Tribal schools, to create a postsecondary pathway of success for students with disabilities, veterans, and first-generation students. It is why I have supported New Mexico also becoming the first State in the country to guarantee free trade school and free college for every single New Mexican. That is how you should be transforming education, that is how you deliver for communities, and that is how you care for the children that we have been blessed to take care of in our role and prepare the next generation of leaders.

I will say this to Mr. Trump: While he and his colleagues may not believe in the power of public education or civil rights or the need to protect children—because their actions speak as loud as their words—we do. We believe in investing in education from early childhood education to higher education, and everything in between, and we will continue to use every tool at our disposal to fight back at every turn and honor our commitment to the students of this country. I, for one, and all of us will not stand by and allow this to happen.

Mrs. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New Mexico and all my colleagues who showed up tonight. I really thought I would be standing here for an hour reading emails from my constituents and telling the stories of the hundreds of students with disabilities that I have taught in my classroom, telling the stories of how we met them where they were and made accommodations so that they could thrive and really learn.

I can't express to you what it feels like as a teacher when you have a student who is struggling or has a disability and you see the moment where they get it, the moment where the lesson breaks through and they are receiving the information in the same way as the other students in the classroom.

I want to make sure that those students can continue to be educated alongside their nondisabled peers and not put in a basement or behind a wall at an institution. I also want to make sure that even if a child doesn't have a strong parent advocate or a strong family at home that they, too, will have people in their public schools fighting for them, that they, too, will still have the services that they need and deserve.

The Secretary of Education has often said that her final mission is to close the Department. I would like to put her and everyone else on notice that I, too, am on a mission, on a mission to make sure that not only the kids that were in my classroom and in my State of Connecticut, but kids all across the country know that they have the right to a high-quality public education, know that it is our responsibility to make sure that they thrive and are prepared for life and being self-sufficient.

Again, I thank all of my colleagues for showing up tonight, and I will continue to fight not only for these children and these families, but for all of the educators who stand in front of them and pour their heart out so that they can meet their needs.

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

□ 1940

ICE UNDER ATTACK

(Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, Mr. ROY of Texas was recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from South Carolina (Mrs. BIGGS).

RECOGNIZING THE SOUTH CAROLINA NATIONAL GUARD

Mrs. BIGGS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and thank the brave men and women of the South Carolina National Guard who are currently deployed here in Washington, D.C.

I have been fortunate to spend time with these young men and women on several occasions during their mission. I have shared a meal with the guardsmen. I visited as they prepared for patrol. I have seen them in action while on duty.

I also thank the families, spouses, and loved ones back home who carry the weight while their Guard members serve here in D.C. The families' sacrifice and strength are a vital part of a successful mission. Their dedication reflects the values we hold dear in South Carolina. I am grateful to Governor McMaster for standing firmly behind them on this important mission.

Mr. Speaker, in the coming days, I will be introducing legislation to ensure our guardsmen are better protected and supported, both during deployments like this and beyond.

God bless our military. South Carolina stands with you, and so do I.

SUICIDE IS AT CRISIS LEVELS IN THE COUNTRY

Mrs. BIGGS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, suicide is at crisis levels in the country, and this year it is hitting heartbreaking highs in my own district.

As a psychiatric mental health nurse practitioner, I have met with families in the hardest moments of their lives, and I have seen what happens when the system fails to connect with someone in a crisis to get the help that they may need.

That is why I have introduced the Hope Heals Act. When an individual is in crisis, they don't need a maze of red tape. They need intervention, a professional to see them, to listen, and to act.

My bill is about making sure families don't get left in the dark. It is about giving communities better tools to recognize when something is wrong and the confidence to respond before it is too late.

No one should have to fight the system to save a life. The Hope Heals Act is about honoring the God-given value of every life and making sure help is there when it is needed most.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in this mission.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from South Carolina, particularly for her shout-out to the National Guard from her own State that has been deployed to the District of Columbia.

Unfortunately, that has been necessary, and I am proud of the President for trying to make sure that we secure the Nation's Capital. They are one of the many National Guard units that have been deployed to do the job that the people of D.C. should be doing if they were competent and if they were doing what they are supposed to do as the Nation's Capital. The President is taking charge, and he is leading to ensure that our Nation's Capital is safe for the American people to come visit.

I will note that, relatedly, when we are talking about the state of law enforcement and the state of the security of the American people, we have heard a lot of criticisms from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, both in the House and Senate and generally around the country, directed at the great men and women of ICE, the law enforcement agency that is dedicated to the task of removing illegal aliens and, in particular, dangerous illegal aliens from the streets of the United States of America according to the law.

They are particularly focusing on and targeting those individuals—I believe the number is around 1.5 million people who are currently in the United States under orders of removal. That is, they have gone through the process. Judges in this country have ordered the removal of 1.5 million people, and ICE is tasked with removing them. Hundreds of thousands of them are dangerous individuals who have committed crimes in their home countries, who are trafficking narcotics, and who have been engaging in criminal behavior in the United States of America.

What do my Democratic colleagues do? They stand up in defense of criminals, of criminal illegal aliens, and are in constant attack on the men and women of ICE.

Let's just go through some recent criticisms of the great men and women who are working for ICE:

Minnesota Governor Tim Walz smeared ICE officers as a ''threat'' to the public, called ICE reckless, suggested the State is at war with Federal officers and under attack by ICE, and smeared ICE as the ''modern-day Gestapo.''

California Governor Gavin Newsom likened ICE to ''secret police,'' calling them authoritarian, and calling on the people to push back.

Illinois Governor JB Pritzker claimed ICE is turning the country into Nazi Germany.

New York Governor Kathy Hochul accused ICE of ''terrorizing people.''

Pennsylvania Governor Josh Shapiro claimed ICE officers ''make our neighborhoods less safe.''

Minnesota Lieutenant Governor Peggy Flanagan said ICE officers caused ''chaos and terror.''

Senator CHUCK SCHUMER declared that ICE does not belong in our neighborhoods.

Senator TINA SMITH called ICE ''a clear and present threat.''

Senator JOHN HICKENLOOPER smeared ICE as a ''reign of terror.''

Senator JEFF MERKLEY likened ICE operations to ''fascism'' and claimed officers are doing nothing but ''terrorizing our communities.''

Senator BERNIE SANDERS asked people to ''stop ICE from what they are doing as soon as possible.''

Senator ELIZABETH WARREN claimed ICE is ''intentionally stok[ing] fear and tear[ing] communities apart.''

Senator RUBEN GALLEGO said ICE exists ''to scare the American public.''

Senator MARK WARNER equated ICE officers to a brutal dictator.

Senator DICK BLUMENTHAL accused ICE of spreading ''lawlessness and recklessness.''

Senator ALEX PADILLA accused ICE of ''indiscriminate violence.''

Senator DICK DURBIN accused ICE's officers of committing ''atrocities.''

Representative ILHAN OMAR said ICE is ''state violence,'' called officers ''vile and beyond cruel,'' and stated ''abolishing ICE is not enough.''

Representative PRAMILA JAYAPAL called ICE officers ''deranged,'' accused them of ''kidnapping,'' said ''resistance'' to ICE is ''inspiring,'' and claimed ICE officers will ''shoot at you and kill you.''

Representative ERIC SWALWELL smeared ICE officers as ''masked thugs,'' called them ''terrorizing bandit[s],'' said it was his ''priority'' to ensure officers are ''no longer faceless,'' compared them to the KGB, and demanded they ''stay the f— out of California.''

Representative JASMINE CROCKETT compared ICE to ''slave patrols'' and called them thugs.

Representative DELIA RAMIREZ said DHS ''is the single biggest threat to public safety right now.'' I will repeat: She said DHS ''is the single biggest threat to public safety right now'' and attacked ICE as a ''terror force.''

Representative SUMMER LEE said ICE is ''out of control'' and ''a police state.''

Representative AYANNA PRESSLEY called ICE ''a rogue, violent agency'' that ''has no business in our communities'' and ''must be abolished,'' and accused ICE of ''terrorizing our communities.''

Representative APRIL MCCLAIN DELANEY called ICE ''lawless.''

Representative ALEXANDRIA OCASIO-CORTEZ called ICE ''an anticivilian force'' and said they ''should not exist.''

Representative RASHIDA TLAIB said ICE is ''terrorizing our communities'' and ''turning our country into a fascist police state,'' called it a ''rogue agency,'' and called for it to be abolished.

Representative JULIE JOHNSON excused violence against ICE as people ''channeling that frustration.''

Representative LAURA FRIEDMAN said ICE officers are ''terrorizing our friends and neighbors . . . and bringing chaos and violence to our streets.''

I have dozens more of these. I could continue to fill time on the House floor by going through the absolute vitriolic attacks on the people of ICE, literally another 30 in the list that I could read off. That is what is occurring on a daily basis and is directed at the people of ICE.

Now, I will give you a tale of two choices. I want you to look at and make a decision here about who you want to focus on. Over here, we have victims of dangerous illegal aliens that were in the United States of America. Over here, we have five Americans who are no longer with us.

We have Kayla Hamilton, a 20-year-old woman with autism living in Aberdeen, Maryland, who was savagely strangled to death by an illegal alien, an MS–13 gang member released by Biden at the border.

□ 1950

Mr. Speaker, we have Sergeant Brandon Mendoza from Arizona, a 13-year Mesa Police Department veteran, who was struck by a previously convicted illegal alien who was drunk when he struck Brandon.

Somewhat probably most infamously, we have Laken Hope Riley. Riley was a 22-year-old nursing student who attended Augusta University. She was killed by a Tren de Aragua gang member illegally paroled into the country under Joe Biden.

We have Rachel Morin, a 37-year-old Maryland mother of five. While going out for a walk, she was raped and murdered by an illegal alien who snuck across the border under Biden.

We have Jocelyn Nungaray, a woman whose mother I have gotten to know, a woman whose mother I invited to join us at the inauguration of President Trump a year ago because of her courage for standing up and calling out the lawlessness of the people who have been released on the streets of this country and that resulted in the death of her daughter, Jocelyn.

Jocelyn was a 12-year-old girl in Houston, who was out for a walk, when two Venezuelan illegal aliens released under Biden forced her under a bridge and forced her to take off her clothes before she was savagely killed in Houston, Texas, my home State.

Do you want to know what? Their lives mattered. Those individuals' lives mattered. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle, whether they are in this Chamber or in the other Chamber or in State houses across this country, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to ignore what has happened to these five Americans.

By the way, they are simply the faces of hundreds of thousands of Americans who have lost their lives violently through narcotics, through fentanyl, through drunk drivers, through murder, through rape, and through intimidation.

They represent a large block of Americans suffering at the hands of people who have been released on our streets purposely for crass political purposes by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. The fact is that has left us with a current situation that is even worse.

I will go through a few more. Then I want to bring my colleagues into this conversation.

Here behind me, after all of the eruption over what has occurred in Minnesota, where there has been a lot of vitriol directed at ICE in Minnesota, let us look at these individuals right here. These represent about eighteen individuals who are the people that ICE has been arresting in Minnesota. There has been a lot of news over one incident in Minnesota.

What we have here is a Somalian illegal alien convicted of homicide.

We have a Salvadorian illegal alien convicted of three counts of homicide with a deportation order since June of 2025.

We have a Mexican illegal convicted of homicide, who was previously deported in 2002.

We have a Sudanese illegal alien convicted of homicide.

We have a Laotian illegal alien convicted of two counts of homicide with a deportation order since 2009.

We have an illegal alien from Sierra Leon convicted of two counts of homicide with a deportation order since 2022.

We have a Mexican illegal alien convicted of homicide with a deportation order since 2015.

We have a Somalian illegal alien convicted of manslaughter with a deportation order since 2022.

We have a Sudanese illegal alien convicted of attempt to commit homicide, weapons possession, and DUI.

We have a Guatemalan illegal alien convicted of negligent homicide with a vehicle and a DUI with a deportation order since 2022.

We have a Burmese illegal alien convicted of negligent homicide.

We have another Laotian illegal alien convicted of the strong-arm rape of a 12-year-old girl and kidnapping a child with intent to sexually assault her with a deportation order since 2024.

We have a Laotian illegal alien convicted of strong-arm rape, aggravated assault with a weapon, and strangulation with a deportation order since 2012.

We have a Laotian illegal alien convicted of rape and child fondling with a deportation order since 2003.

We have a Laotian illegal alien convicted of rape, rape with a weapon, and sexual assault with a deportation order since 1996.

We have a Mexican illegal alien convicted of sexual assault of a child and DUI with a deportation order since 2016.

We have a Laotian illegal alien convicted of a strong-arm sodomy of a boy and a strong-arm sodomy of a girl with a deportation order since 2018.

We have a Laotian illegal alien convicted of sexual assault and sodomy of a girl under age 13 and procuring a child for prostitution with a deportation order since 2006.

These are the individuals in Minnesota that ICE—who is being attacked, criticized, and demonized by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle—went out, risked their lives, and put their lives on the line to remove these people from our streets so that our children and our families might be safe.

No, I am not going to apologize for ICE. No, I am not going to join in the bandwagon of criticism against ICE. Yes, you review procedures. Yes, you make sure you do things by the book and that people have due process.

When we are talking about people who are on our streets, as guests of our country, and they are committing violence against the people of our country, let's remember we have a duty to remove them, deport them, and do it immediately and swiftly.

Let's flip the page real quick. I have a couple more. Let's look beyond just Minnesota. Remember that when you have dangerous people in places like Minnesota and lawless States like California and New York, where you have sanctuary cities, then there are dangerous people throughout our country, too.

This is just the worst of the worst from yesterday, just yesterday.

In Virginia, a 20-year-old citizen of Guatemala was convicted for possessing obscene material of a minor and filming child porn.

In my home State of Texas, a criminal illegal alien from Mexico was convicted for aggravated assault of a family member in Harris County.

In New York, a criminal illegal alien from Jamaica was convicted for burglary.

A criminal illegal alien from Mexico was convicted for burglary.

A criminal illegal alien from El Salvador was convicted for false imprisonment and battery.

That was just yesterday. Let's look real quick at the worst of the worst from 2025 generally, not just yesterday.

In Louisiana, we have a sexual predator, an illegal alien from Honduras, whose criminal history includes active warrants for 394 counts of pornography involving juveniles and two counts of sexual abuse of an animal.

In Kansas, a violent criminal illegal alien from Mexico was sentenced to 20 years in prison for one count of forcible assault on a Federal officer after he violently punched an ICE officer and attempted to strangle the officer with his own badge cord.

In Virginia, an Afghan national who entered the United States under Joe Biden's ''Operation Allies Welcome,'' provided support to the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria and his father is a commander of a militia group in Afghanistan.

In Nebraska, an illegal alien from Honduras and a leader of MS–13, also known as Fantasma, was wanted in his home country for a quadruple homicide. After being charged with firearms charges in Honduras, he allegedly bribed his way out of jail and illegally entered the United States.

In Houston, the criminal history of an illegal alien from El Salvador included convictions for sexual assault of a child under 17, multiple DUIs, child fondling, and illegally reentering the United States previously. When ICE conducted an enforcement operation in November to arrest him, he brutally beat an ICE officer with a metal coffee cup. He caused a severe laceration of the officer's mouth and burns to the officer's face.

Where are my Democratic colleagues' concern about the ICE officer who put his life on the line and gets mauled and has a laceration across his face because he is trying to stop murderers, rapists, and child pornographers from being on American streets?

In my home State of Texas, Jose Alfredo Uzeta, a criminal illegal alien from Mexico, operated a dental clinic and performed dental procedures on patients, despite not having a license for more than 20 years. His clinic was uncovered after one of his former patients reported he was convicted of a dentistry act violation and indecent assault.

Another criminal illegal alien and his family members ran a sex trafficking operation where they would approach women and girls, some as young as 14, and lure them to the United States under promises of jobs.

That is all these people right here. That is these people right here.

We have a criminal illegal alien from Vietnam who has been convicted 25 times for crimes including possession of a controlled substance; second-degree robbery; cruelty toward the elderly; arson property; taking vehicle without consent; and theft.

□ 2000

I could go on and on. Those are the people who ICE is trying to get off of our streets.

Here is the question. This is how I want to open up a conversation with my good friend from Pennsylvania, SCOTT PERRY—a great American and somebody I am proud to serve with here in this Congress and proud to serve with in the House Freedom Caucus.

I will yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania in colloquy about how he views whose side we are on. That is what I want to know: Whose side are we on?

Are we on the side of American citizens—Americans, including some immigrants and immigrant families, like beautiful Jocelyn Nungaray—are we on their side or Officer Mendoza? Or are we on the side of violent criminals whom ICE is trying to remove from our streets?

It sure seems like my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are on their side. They are on the bad guys' side. There really are white hats and black hats, and you have to choose. They are on the bad guys' side.

They are not standing with ICE, not standing with law enforcement, not standing up to defend the law enforcement officers who are putting their lives on the line to keep these guys off of our streets so that these Americans aren't killed.

I just wonder if my friend from Pennsylvania has a similar view that it ought to be easy to choose sides, and if my friend from Pennsylvania, like me, chooses to side with Border Patrol and ICE and law enforcement and local law enforcement to protect Americans against violent thugs and criminals on our streets?

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas, and I surely appreciate his passion. It is well-deserved.

I am so heartbroken for our country. In the past, Democrats and Republicans might not have agreed on maybe the path to get to where we were going, how we were going to do it, sometimes not even where we were going. Yet we loved our country, and we understood what our job was here: to support and represent America.

How can it be that we live in a society—people will say—I am sure they say it to you, CHIP: You are so divided. Why can't you people in Washington, D.C., get along?

They will say to me: Representative, why can't you work with your colleagues on the other side of the aisle?

I want to. We look for every opportunity to, and I am just going to tell you: Look, I am going to call it the way I see it because my eyes aren't lying.

My friends on the other side of the aisle will tell you, will tell everybody, will try and get pictures: We stand with law enforcement. We stand with the police. We support them. Whatever they need, we are there.

They want to convince you of that because, of course, as law-abiding American citizens, it is the right thing to do.

Representative ROY, when I was growing up, if there was a criminal running down the street and an officer was chasing him, somebody would be a Good Samaritan and stick their leg out or say: He went that way and help out.

But we are literally living in some dystopia where they say that somehow it is different because it is ICE. It is different because we can say ICE; Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

It is no different. These officers are no different than your local township police; the State police; Alcohol, Tobacco & Firearms; the U.S. marshals. The good guys, that is who they are.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle literally are defending these people who came here to murder, rape, and rob. That is who they are defending. They are literally defending—there is no other way to cut it.

Rachel Morin died about 30 miles from my house. I don't live close to the Texas border. This is everywhere. Representative ROY and I both have daughters, 12 years old. Jocelyn Nungaray was 12 years old and was heinously murdered by two people allowed to come and stay here illegally. These are animals who did this.

Mr. ROY. Gang members. Tren de Aragua gang members who took her under a bridge in Houston, Texas, for the last moments of her life, raping her and killing her, and her beautiful mother today is standing up and saying: Enough. Enough.

We should enforce our laws. We should stand with law enforcement against the thugs and the gang members who are killing Americans, including Jocelyn, Officer Mendoza, Laken Riley, Rachel Morin, and Kayla Hamilton.

Why do I know their names? It is because I met their families, and I have talked to them, and they are human beings. They were Americans who were living their lives and going to college and going to school and serving their country, and they are dead because people decided, for political purposes, that they wanted to flood our streets with gang members from Venezuela and criminals instead of protecting Americans.

Mr. PERRY. You are right, CHIP. There are the good guys, and, unfortunately, there are the bad guys; there just are.

No one would think—I will just try to put it in any context I can. If I am driving down the highway and I see a police officer who has pulled somebody over for a traffic infraction, I don't stop and get involved and say: Whoa, whoa, whoa, what is going on here, Officer? How do you know—what do you think you are doing?

I don't understand why people who are getting involved in law enforcement activities don't understand that they are obstructing justice. Pulling in front of Immigration and Customs Enforcement officials who are trying to remove people from our country, who are here illegally and have had their due process, is not acceptable in any manner, shape, or form.

There is no one here who will do more to defend your First Amendment liberties to protest and seek redress from your government.

Mr. ROY. That is right.

Mr. PERRY. But protesting does not mean impeding law enforcement. It does not mean blocking streets. It does not mean getting on an app on your phone—that is supported by George Soros—to track Immigration and Customs Enforcement, law enforcement officers, the law enforcement police, and track them down and impede their work to keep everybody else in the community safe.

Do you know what that is, Representative ROY? I have the definition right here. That is sedition is what that is. That is exactly what it is. No one wants to say it, but we are seeing it happen.

This is among Americans in our country. These are our neighbors. These are people right here in every town who somehow think that, suddenly, it is okay. Now, there unfortunately has been a death.

The death that happened recently is so tragic and unfortunate. Ms. Good, who lost her life, she could have protested peacefully and sought redress for the things that she thought were wrong about her government that should be changed. But she made a decision to inject herself into law enforcement, impede law enforcement, and make it a dangerous circumstance where an officer of the law had to make a split-moment decision about his life and also the lives of other people in his community.

Madam Speaker, Representative ROY, Immigration and Customs Enforcement officials live in your town. They are just like the township cop that you know who stands by your school in the morning when your kids are getting off the bus. They are the same people. They are the same people.

How is it that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle can somehow make book and tell you that you must support violent murderers, rapists, robbers, gang members, drug traffickers, and human traffickers? It couldn't be more black and white, and it is so disappointing.

Mr. ROY. And what we are talking about, again, at the risk of repetition: A Somali illegal alien convicted of homicide, a Salvadoran illegal alien convicted of three counts of homicide, a Mexican illegal alien convicted of homicide, a Sudanese illegal alien convicted of homicide, a Laotian illegal alien convicted of two counts of homicide, and I could go through all 18 again.

These are violent individuals. These were all on the streets of Minnesota. Minnesota ICE was on the streets trying to track down these people, and the radical left, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, want to side with these guys.

Mr. PERRY. I just have to ask you in this colloquy, Representative ROY from Texas: You say, ''the radical left,'' but I listened to you rattle off the statements of elected officials.

Mr. ROY. Yes.

Mr. PERRY. Not just Members of Congress, but Members of the United States Senate.

Mr. ROY. Yes.

Mr. PERRY. Governors of States, including the one that I come from. Is this the radical left, or are they our Democratic colleagues on the other side of the aisle?

□ 2010

Which one of our Democrat colleagues from the other side of the aisle, whether at the Federal level, the State, or the local level has come out to denounce the treatment by law enforcement at the hands of these people that are trying to thwart them and put their lives in danger for the sake of murderers? Which ones? Do you know of any?

Mr. ROY. I have not heard one, but I have heard—and I read 30 of them before. How about Boston Mayor Michelle Wu comparing ICE officers to a Neo-Nazi group.

Chicago Mayor Brandon Johnson accusing ICE of being ''secret police'' who are ''terrorizing our communities'' and a lawless, racist force.

New York City's Zohran Mamdani said: ICE enforcement is ''an attack on us all.''

New Jersey State Senator Britnee Timberlake threatened that ICE officers '' . . . will find themselves in the same position as those who carried out the illegal acts in Nazi Germany. . . . ''

Mr. PERRY. It is so outrageous.

Mr. ROY. Minneapolis City Council member Robin Wonsley claimed ICE is carrying out ''terrorist attacks.'' I could go on and on. They have been calling on people to go out and attack ICE.

By the way, the man that was engaged in that incident in Minnesota—and they will review all of that—he was dragged by a previous protester down the street by a car.

I read a minute ago about the ICE officer who was lacerated across his face when one of these thugs attacked him with a steel coffee mug. I talked about another guy that had this cord wrapped around his neck, and they tried to get him. One of these guys did that to an ICE officer.

Where is the concern for our law enforcement? My grandfather was the chief of police of a small town in West Texas back in the 1940s. Where is the concern for them? My great-great-grandfather was a Texas Ranger. I was proud to be in the U.S. Attorney's Office, proud to be the first assistant attorney general, and proud to work with law enforcement.

Does every member of law enforcement always get it right? No. They are human beings. Do we have ways to go through and punish, rectify, review, and ensure due process and that rights are protected? Yes. Should we? Yes.

I want to remind people these are not American citizens. These are guests in our home who are abusing that invitation—or noninvitation to the extent that they were legally here—invitation to the extent they overstayed a visa, invitation to the extent they were abusing a visa that they were issued. For whatever reason that they are here, they are violating that trust and engaging in illegal activity and carrying out the sickest and most heinous crimes.

It cannot be allowed to proceed, and we cannot allow people to side against our law enforcement that are trying to keep our streets safe so that we don't lose Rachel Morin, and we don't lose Laken Riley, and we don't lose Kayla Hamilton, and we don't lose Officer Mendoza, and we don't lose Jocelyn Nungaray.

Mr. PERRY. Representative ROY, you and I have stood in this Chamber countless times, for countless hours, having the same discussion over the same people, the same people in this picture, over and over. There are countless others that aren't here who died from drunk driving incidents, died from drug overdose, human trafficked, lives destroyed forever. If only they got to stay alive, if they even had that opportunity to stay alive.

There is so much outrage from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Yet, I can't remember, and so I am going to ask you, Representative ROY from Texas. I can't remember one time my colleagues on the other side of the aisle came to talk about Laken Riley, Rachel Morin, Jocelyn Nungaray, the officer, the young lady, not one.

Mr. ROY. Totally objectively—I have been to this floor, I come to this floor a lot, and I watch the House floor—I do not remember a single incident, a single time in my 7 years of being in the United States House of Representatives, not once have I seen it. In fairness, I might have missed one. Maybe somebody will find it in the RECORD. I have been down here countless times when it is an attack on law enforcement, countless times when it is an attack on President Trump and this administration.

I think this really matters. I am going to ask you another question that I think is important. Why are these people here? Why are these gang and thug members here? Why? Was it President Trump?

Mr. PERRY. No.

Mr. ROY. Did President Trump put them on our streets?

Mr. PERRY. President Trump did not. President Trump is credited with having the most secure border in history.

Mr. ROY. And, today, we have a flow of basically statistically zero at our border.

Do you remember when we were in this House Chamber, do you remember when we were debating legislation last year, and we were debating bills, and what did they say? They said: Well, we have got to pass comprehensive immigration reform in order to solve the problem and secure the border, when it was Joe Biden as the President and Alejandro Mayorkas as the Secretary of Homeland Security. Now it turns out, somehow magically, without that being signed into law, magically President Trump is able to stop the flow at the border.

Do you think that is an accident?

Mr. PERRY. No. As I recall, about 10,000 people a week were coming across the border illegally.

Mr. ROY. Correct. A day. We had as many as 15,000 in a day, okay, and now we are getting far fewer than 10,000 in a month.

Mr. PERRY. Secretary Mayorkas told us, President Biden told us he could not solve that problem unless we passed legislation. We needed to—this Chamber was delinquent. There was nothing that could be done until we took action. As it has been said, we didn't need to take action. We needed a different President.

Mr. ROY. And was it not, in fact, true that under President Biden and under Alejandro Mayorkas' regime at the Department of Homeland Security, was it not true that these individuals—and you saw me reading off, by the way, a lot of the years when they had deportation orders, 2022 or previously. Was it not true that these individuals that were released into the United States were either released under parole. In an abuse of law that allows for isolated cases of parole, they released thousands en bloc.

Mr. PERRY. Tens of thousands.

Mr. ROY. Hundreds of thousands en bloc under parole, an abuse of the law, an illegal act, abuse of asylum to release people in our country, and then wide-open borders where people were flooding across the river.

Did that in totality, coupled with people overstaying their visas, coupled with, frankly, a far more liberal immigration system than we should have, result in all of these individuals being on the streets? None of my constituents asked for that.

Mr. PERRY. None of mine.

Mr. ROY. None of my constituents wanted illegal aliens who were violent and committing crimes on the streets of our country. President Trump is stopping it. Tom Homan is stopping it. Stephen Miller, Secretary Noem, all of the great men and women in Border Patrol and ICE, they are stopping it.

Now, my question is: Why? Why do our colleagues on the other side of the aisle not want to stop it? Could it be for political reasons? Could it be that they want non-Americans to be in the United States to try to transform America and to politically motivate and to politically put Democrats in power? Could that be?

I don't want to be so cynical as to speculate here on the House floor, but what other motives would there be to allow dangerous individuals to pour into our communities and carry out what has been carried out?

Mr. PERRY. I don't want to speculate either. I will leave that to people that are listening and people that are thinking through the situation.

You talked about things that are untrue. I want to let you know that, of course, I represent 760,000 great people, hardworking, tax-paying, America-loving individuals in south central Pennsylvania, and I have gotten some complaints. There is some rhetoric and some claims being made about Immigration and Customs Enforcement in central Pennsylvania.

I talked to Immigration and Customs Enforcement today and asked them, because there were claims that enforcement officers were chasing people down the street, demanding their papers, going door to door looking for people, staking out certain activities, business activities, or recreational activities to just see who would come in and ask for their papers.

Representative ROY, I am proud to report what I knew inherently that that is all a lie. That is all propaganda meant to scare people and meant to stop law enforcement from doing its job.

I am so disgusted by the names that our men and women that wear the uniform, that make a commitment to put their lives in danger to keep everybody else safe that they are characterized by elected officials and leaders in our community the way that you have described to me this evening. It is outrageous. Not only is it outrageous, it is dangerous, and it is irresponsible. It is leading to not only the division of our country and our communities, but it is leading to people suffering injuries and worse. That, Representative ROY, is on them.

☐ 2020

Mr. ROY. The impact of illegal aliens being in our country or, frankly, those that were wrongly put in our country through parole, asylum, overstaying their visas, or expansive abuse of legal immigration, has a consequence, right?

Mr. PERRY. Sure.

Mr. ROY. It has a consequence in the form of lost lives. It has a consequence in the form of hospitals that are overflowing with individuals, particularly in Texas, but around the country, jail cells that are overflowing, and schools that are overflowing. All of that is a consequence in terms of costs and continued problems.

Just last week, two illegal aliens suspected of being members of the Venezuelan gang Tren de Aragua were charged with allegedly weaponizing their vehicle against a Border Patrol agent in Portland. Both suspects originally crossed the southern border under Biden and were released into the interior. The driver wound up with a rap sheet, including DUI, while the passenger is linked to a shooting and a prostitution ring in Portland. That is what is happening.

Now, why do I mention that here? Because we just said that President Trump was able to use current law and current authority to secure the border and stop the flow. He is currently using current law, current authority, to remove illegal aliens, including the 1.5 million people here under an order of removal.

I want to remind everybody of that. We just blow past that little detail. There are 1.5 million people running around this country who have an order of removal from a judge. They have gone through all the processes. They have had all the fricking lawyers that are paid by the NGOs to try to keep them out of court and keep them in the country, and 1.5 million of them have an order of deportation, of removal.

What do we do about it? This is what I want to say. We, Congress, owe it to the President and to the great men and women of Border Patrol and ICE, to our constituents, and to future Americans, who could be endangered by a future administration with open borders, to codify that which President Trump has been carrying out to defend our country.

We owe it to all of them to pass a new and updated version of H.R. 2 that we passed in the previous Congress. We stood on this floor as conservatives and united this Conference behind a singular mission of passing laws to prevent the abuses that were being carried out by Biden and Mayorkas.

I promise you—remember, we had a President Trump in 2020. We had a secure border in January 2021, with low numbers of border crossings and enforcement of the law. What happened? Biden took over; Mayorkas took over; and we had an explosion. Then, we had dead Americans and dangerous, lawless people on our streets.

We, Congress, have a duty to lay it all on the line and to make sure that, this year, under this Congress, with the Republican majority in the House and a Republican majority in the Senate, we deliver to the President's desk the equivalent of H.R. 2 from the previous Congress, which would codify the changes to parole, codify the changes to asylum, codify the changes in catch and release, codify the permanent and continued development of the wall, all the tools necessary to stop the flow at the border that the current administration has put into action. We should demand it. We should change the law so that no future Biden and Mayorkas can endanger the American people.

Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania agree?

Mr. PERRY. Of course, I agree. As you bring it up, I think to myself how heartbreaking it is knowing—I look at these pictures here of these wonderful young people with their whole lives ahead of them. If we had been able to do that during the first administration, these five people would be alive, likely would be alive, right?

Mr. ROY. Right.

Mr. PERRY. Because we have failed here—not because CHIP has failed, not because I am not willing to vote for it. We have to get it on the floor. Let's face it, Representative ROY, the great

Representative ROY from Texas, how many votes are you going to count on for Laken Riley, for Jocelyn Nungaray, for any of these people? How many votes are you going to count on to keep them alive from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle?

Mr. ROY. Zero. Now, if we are lucky—if we are lucky—we might get a handful if pushed to the brink. Remember, we got four or five of them to vote for, I think, the SAVE Act.

Let's bring that up for a second. Should we not—in addition to guaranteeing that we secure the border and codify the great work of President Trump to prevent the death and destruction of the American people, should we not also guarantee the integrity of our elections by passing yet again the SAVE Act, pushing our Senate colleagues to pass the SAVE Act, and send it to the President's desk, which would simply guarantee that only American citizens vote in American elections?

It is that simple. Shouldn't be controversial. Shouldn't be a really difficult concept. We have passed it in the House. The Senate is blocking it. The question is whether Republicans have the nerve to put it on must-pass legislation, to fight for it, to break the filibuster in the Senate, to move the bill and get it to the President's desk, along with some other good changes, like voter ID and other things we should do.

Does the gentleman agree that we should, in addition to codifying H.R. 2, secure American elections with these requirements under the SAVE Act to save America, as President Trump rightly said, as President Trump told us in our Conference meeting a week and a half ago, to get it to his desk? Do you agree?

Mr. PERRY. Of course. We passed it in the House, but that is not enough. That doesn't change anything. We can pass everything we want to in the House, with or without our friends on the other side of the aisle, but if we can't get a vote and passage in the Senate, it doesn't get to the President's desk.

I would just say this: What I think would be interesting to see, when we talk about—look, quite honestly, it is a travesty to me that we should have to pass such a bill that only American citizens vote in American elections. That should be obvious.

You don't invite some person from some other State or some other town into your home to ask them about your important family decisions. Yet, somehow in America, my friends on the other side of the aisle, my colleagues over there, think that that is what we should do.

They should put a vote up in the Senate to show the American people who stands with them and who stands with letting those people in our country illegally, killing, raping, robbing, and giving them the vote. If they can't get the vote, then they need to find a way to break the filibuster and make sure that we stand up for Americans.

Madam Speaker, to my friend from Texas, we weren't elected by people from other countries. We weren't elected by Tren de Aragua or the Cartel of the Suns. We were elected by the American citizens. That is who we are here to represent.

If somebody wants to represent them, well, God bless them, but they should let the American people know by their votes and go out and decry it to everybody. Amazingly, in some cases, some of our colleagues actually are.

Mr. ROY. I have one final question, one final point. In addition to protecting Americans with H.R. 2 to codify the President's actions, in addition to ensuring that American elections are secure and that you can trust the integrity of elections by passing the SAVE Act, voter ID, and what is necessary to guarantee the sanctity of our elections, should we not also consider something like the PAUSE Act to pause and take a break on immigration when, in fact, we legally have 1.1 million green cards, 1 million guest workers, and north of 1 million foreign students each year?

We have more immigrants than every other country in the world combined. We have a foreign-born population of 51.9 million, almost 16 percent, a record high. This is the important part. We have social welfare and social safety nets that are being used by noncitizens that are blowing out the rolls and driving up the cost of all of these goods.

My point here is that we have had massive amounts of immigration over our history. All of us love the actual melting pot that America represents, but here is the key issue: You actually have to be willing to assimilate for it to be a melting pot. It is not a melting pot if you are coming here and waving a Palestinian flag or waving the flag of Honduras or Guatemala instead of saying I am coming here to be American, to embrace Western civilization, and to embrace the greatest country the world has ever known that has bled around the world not for conquest but to liberate people, that has died for people around the globe to make it a safer and secure place.

People want to come here to be a part of that, God bless them, but the people who come here who want to change it, who want to turn it into an Islamic state, who want to undermine it and who want advance sharia law, who want to bring their flags of their country here instead of adopting and becoming an American—shouldn't we not take a total review of our immigration system, from top to bottom, in addition to codifying security of our border and ensuring the integrity of our election, that only citizens vote and that only citizens are counted for purposes of representation and how we apportion our Members of Congress?

□ 2030

All of these things that I am talking about are common sense to ensure a simple principle that American citizens are able to run this country.

Mr. PERRY. It is their country. Of course, the United States of America is the most generous country ever in history. Certainly with immigration it is more generous than every other nation and more generous than all nations combined.

However, what no one ever envisioned was tens of thousands, daily or weekly, in the amount of tens of millions of people pouring into our country illegally with no interest in being American but being in America.

Now what do we do about it?

We have a President who has vowed to solve that and who has vowed to fix that. He got elected on that promise, and now my colleagues on the other side of the aisle reject following the law if it means following the law.

So I think that it is the height of disrespect, quite honestly, for people to come to our country illegally, tell us that we are awful people, try and change our country into the country they came from, have us pay for it, and then disrespect us while they are doing it by killing our citizens and while sending our tax dollars to the terrorist organizations in the country that they left.

It is unacceptable at any and every single level.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Pennsylvania for joining me tonight. I appreciate his commentary, I appreciate his leadership, and I appreciate his service in the United States military. I appreciate his service to his constituents, and I appreciate his great family.

It is a sacrifice for all of us. It is tough when you have young kids, Madam Speaker. Our kids are about the same age. We leave them at home, and we come here, but we are doing it because we want to save this country for our kids and our grandkids. That is why I am in public service.

I know when I had a diagnosis of cancer about 14 years ago, Hodgkin's lymphoma, I didn't know if I would be around days or weeks, and 14 years later, I am sure some of my colleagues, maybe they are happy to see me, maybe they are not.

I know that when I leave my kids, I know God gave me some more breath and some more time on this planet to try to make sure that we save this, the last great hope for mankind as President Reagan called it.

Madam Speaker, I will close with this, and I will turn it over, so my friend from North Carolina can take the floor.

We are here to represent the American people. The American people did not send us here as Representatives to give away our country. They did not send us here as Representatives to allow our friends on the other side of the aisle to empower dangerous tax cuts, thugs, gang members, and people who are killing Americans. They did not send us here for that.

Every time we vote on appropriations bills and every time we are putting forward legislation, we ought to be thinking about these Americans who lost their lives at the hands of these non-Americans. We ought to be thankful we have a President who recognizes that these non-Americans needn't be on our streets, that we should be siding with ICE and Border Patrol, and that we should be defending the men and women in our law enforcement across the country so we can protect these Americans. So that we can choose to side with the American citizens, not the non-Americans who are dangerous, and we can side with law enforcement to protect these.

We can act. This is my message to my Republican colleagues: We have a choice this year. We can retreat and get into the mode of elections. Or we can lead, we can work, and we can roll our sleeves up and right now codify the rules, the laws, and the actions of the President to secure our border and ensure that no future President can abuse them.

We can do that right now. We can pass H.R. 2. We can send it to the Senate. We can force the Senate to act if we just have the will to do it.

We can send the SAVE Act again. We can add voter ID. We can send it to the Senate. We can dare them to break the filibuster by forcing a talking filibuster instead of the fake filibuster of a forced 60-vote threshold.

Make them work. Make 51 Senators sit on the floor and have a quorum. Make them speak. Make them do their job so that we can defend our country and defend our people. Pass the SAVE Act, pass voter ID, and secure American elections. Secure our border permanently instead of just having it depend on the current President. Reform our immigration system. Pause it. We have done it before. Pause it, review it, and stop people from overstaying their visas. Fix the system.

Make sure we are not importing people who are adherent to sharia law and want to undermine Western civilization and create mayhem and be against our way of life.

Choose the path of leadership. Come here as a Congress and bind together. Don't sit around complaining about having a two- or three- or four-seat majority.

Lead, act, and go.

That is why we are here. That is why that flag exists. Madam Speaker, put your trust in God, and put the armor of God around you. Stand up and lead for this country.

If we do it, then the American people will send us back here in a bigger majority.

If we do it, then President Trump will be able to accomplish even more in the next 2 years than in these 2 years.

If we act now, then we can actually save this country.

If we act now, then we can secure the border.

If we act now, then we can secure our elections.

If we act now, then we can guarantee an immigration system that no longer imports people into our country who want to undermine it.

We can provide healthcare freedom, and we can balance the budget if we act and we lead. Right now, let's secure our country. We can do it this year. That is our calling.

We are not here to get re-elected. We are here to deliver for the American people.

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

MANDATE OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

(Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, Mr. HARRIS of North Carolina was recognized for 30 minutes.)

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HARRIS of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the topic of the Special Order into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, in November of 2024, the American people didn't just cast votes. They issued a thunderous mandate. It was loud, it was clear, and it was unmistakable. They rose up, and they declared: Enough is enough. Enough of the reckless spending that mortgages our children's future. Enough of open-borders flooding our communities with chaos and danger. Enough of unelected bureaucrats and activist judges lording over a free people, and enough of weakness abroad and surrendering to our enemies while our adversaries laugh.

The voters didn't send House Republicans back to Washington to warm chairs, cut ribbons, and play defense. They sent us here to fight. They sent us here to do government differently, to reverse the damage, and to restore what made America great.

Now the moment of truth has arrived.

What must the House Republican majority do in 2026, and why must we act boldly without apology and without hesitation?

In 2026 the American people expect a Republican-led Congress to deliver results. Alongside President Trump, we must leverage our House and Senate majorities to advance a bold agenda fulfilling more of our promises. We must act urgently in the first quarter of 2026, using every tool available to compel the Senate to deliver now. The stakes extend beyond the next election. America's future depends on it.

This evening I want to take a few moments to lay out that answer, four priorities, four commitments, and four reasons the future of the Republic depends on what we do next.

□ 2040

First of all, there must be a priority to cut spending because a nation that can't balance its books can't defend its future. The most fundamental duty of any government worthy of the name is stewardship of the taxpayers' hard-earned dollar.

Families balance their checkbooks every month. Small businesses live within their means or they fail. Yet, for too long, Washington has acted as if math, morality, and accountability simply don't apply here.

Today, right now, in January of 2026, our national debt stands at more than $38.4 trillion. Madam Speaker, that is not just statistics, it is a theft from our children. It is bondage for our grandchildren. It is a crushing burden that grows by billions every single day, while interest payments alone devour more than a trillion dollars a year.

Please, let's be crystal clear with America. We do not have a revenue problem. We have a spending problem and a massive fraud problem in this country. Just look at the scandals exploding across this country right now. In Minnesota, Democrats allowed millions of taxpayer dollars to flow to fraudulent daycare centers, fake operations with misspelled signs, empty buildings, no children in sight. Yet, they pocketed huge sums from programs meant to help the vulnerable children.

A viral investigation by independent journalist Nick Shirley has triggered Federal probes, payment freezes, and demands for accountability. Money that was intended for children, stolen by criminals exploiting government incompetence.

Back home in my own State of North Carolina, a fresh Federal audit just revealed that 54 percent—more than half—of the State's nondomiciled commercial drivers' licenses were issued illegally, often to foreign nationals whose driver licenses were valid long after their lawful presence in the United States had expired.

I submit to you, this isn't a clerical glitch. It is a systemic failure that is putting the lives of Americans at risk on our highways, wastes taxpayer resources, and, yes, threatens millions in Federal funding.

Mr. Speaker, fraud is never victimless. It robs seniors of the benefits they earned. It shortchanges our veterans who sacrificed for this country. It burdens working families already struggling to get ahead, and it saddles future generations with debts they never agreed to carry.

In 2026, I believe House Republicans must do what Washington has refused to do for decades: hunt down waste, fraud, and abuse, and shut it off at its source. That means oversight with real teeth, audits that trigger prosecutions, not just reports, and zero tolerance. Cut funding to any agency that refuses to clean house and deal with the situation.

Only a year ago, several in my party were hyping up DOGE, the Department of Government Efficiency. I must ask, where is the enthusiasm now? Why are we not continuing to slash the waste, fraud, and abuse? We did it with USAID, NPR, and PBS, but, listen, we can't stop there.

While we are wielding the budget ax, let's be unequivocal about what should never receive another dime of taxpayer money—no taxpayer-funded abortions, period. Full stop. The Federal Government must never force Americans of faith, or any Americans for that matter, to bankroll the destruction of innocent life. Life begins in the womb, and America must never apologize for defending the most vulnerable among us.

There is one more pipeline that I believe must be severed: no funding for lawless jurisdictions. Cities and States that are defying Federal immigration law, harboring criminals instead of enforcing the law should receive not one more cent of Federal grants. We cannot, we must not continue rewarding sanctuary politicians who put American lives in the crosshairs.

This past Saturday, on what would have been Laken Riley's 24th birthday, we paused to remember a bright, compassionate nursing student whose life was stolen far, far too soon. Laken was jogging on a college trail, doing what young Americans do every day, full of promise, full of faith, full of the future. She never made it home. My colleague talked about her killer tonight: an illegal alien with ties to the Venezuelan gang Tren de Aragua who crossed our border, was released, and then brutally ended her life.

Don't forget Laken, don't forget Rachel Morin, don't forget Joycelyn Nungaray, don't forget the countless American victims—daughters, sons, mothers, and fathers—who have been lost to the chaos of reckless open-border policies that have been pushed by the radical progressive Democrats.

These same Democrats remain unashamed. They fight harder, they fight louder for violent criminal aliens than they ever do for the American families that have been left shattered. They shield sanctuary cities that harbor lawbreakers, defund enforcement, and turn their backs on our people. However, we remember, and because we remember, we must act.

In 2026, House Republicans must keep fighting. No more Federal dollars for sanctuary jurisdictions that defy the law, and I mean no more excuses, no more American blood on the hands of politicians who choose criminals over citizens. Laken's memory demands it. America's safety requires it. We will not rest until justice is restored for Laken, for every victim, and for every family that deserves to feel safe in their own country.

If a city wants our taxpayers' money, it must follow Federal law. If it chooses to act as a sanctuary for lawbreakers, let it do so on its own dime, not ours. Cut the waste. Cut the fraud. Cut the funding to lawlessness. That is how we will restore fiscal sanity. That is how we will restore public safety. That is how we will restore moral clarity to Washington, and I mean starting today.

There is a second priority: to conserve our way of life, because a Republic only survives if its foundations are defended. The Bible says in Psalms 11:3 that if the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?

The second mission of the House Republican majority in 2026 is clear and nonnegotiable: We must conserve the American way of life. What good is economic prosperity if our freedoms, the very soul of our Nation, are eroded day by day?

Let's start with the foundation of self-government. Yes, I am talking about our elections. Only American citizens should vote in American elections. This is not controversial. This is common sense. The House has already acted decisively. We passed the SAVE Act requiring documentary proof of U.S. citizenship to register for Federal elections.

The need for the SAVE Act couldn't be clearer. Just in my own State of North Carolina last fall, the DMV admitted to registering an unknown number of noncitizens, and this is just the tip of the iceberg. Americans, I believe, demand that we have secure elections, and yet the SAVE Act has been sitting in the Senate gathering dust. The question is clear: When will the Senate pass it?

A nation that cannot secure its elections cannot preserve its liberty, and election integrity is not voter suppression, it is the bedrock of a representative government.

□ 2050

Now, let's talk about justice. We are witnessing a dangerous trend: rogue, unelected district judges legislating from the bench—you know it—issuing sweeping nationwide injunctions that overrule the will of the people, the President, and the Congress.

That is not how our Constitution works. That is why the House passed the No Rogue Rulings Act, limiting injunction to the parties in a case, not the entire country.

Yes, once again, it awaits Senate action. The question I raise, once again: When will the Senate pass it? Courts interpret the law; they do not make it. They do not govern the Nation. We must also defend the rule of law itself. American law is grounded in one Constitution, not foreign legal systems.

Let me say it clearly: Sharia law has no place superseding Federal or State law in the United States of America. We must protect our Nation from violence and ideologies that are antithetical to the Constitution. We are one Nation, one Constitution, and one rule of law, period.

Finally, while we are talking, think about free speech, the First Amendment right our Founders placed first for a reason. Yet, today, as a pastor, I understand that pastors are being muzzled and churches intimidated. The IRS has been weaponized as a tool of censorship, threatening tax-exempt status for daring to speak Biblical truth on the moral issues of today.

That is why I introduced the Free Speech Fairness Act, to repeal the remnants of the Johnson amendment and restore pastors' God-given right to preach freely from the pulpits across this land.

I am sorry, but no government bureaucrat should dictate what a pastor can say about life, about marriage, or about liberty. No politician should decide which moral truths are acceptable. Free speech is not a privilege bestowed by Washington. It is a right that is endowed by our creator.

Sadly, America has been drifting away from basic common sense, and nowhere is this more painfully evident than in the world of sports. Our daughters are being forced to compete against males. Our sisters are being forced to share locker rooms and changing spaces with boys.

Today, the highest Court in our land is grappling with this very issue. This very day, the Supreme Court heard oral arguments in two critical cases, Little v. Hecox and West Virginia v. BPJ, to decide whether State laws that protect girls' and women's sports by basing eligibility on biological sex at birth violate Title IX or the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment.

I submit to you tonight that the American people have already spoken clearly. It was a January 2025 New York Times poll that found that 79 percent of Americans, including a majority of Democrats, believed athletes who were male at birth but pretend to be female should not be eligible to compete in women's sports.

That is exactly why the House passed the Protection of Women and Girls in Sports Act of 2025, which restores fairness by clarifying that Title IX protects biological females in federally funded athletic programs. Yet, Senate Democrats blocked it last year, standing against the overwhelming will of the American people.

When will Democrats stop rejecting common sense and start listening to the American families they claim to represent?

In 2026, House Republicans will keep pushing these bills forward, demanding Senate action, defending our elections, our courts, our laws, and our voices because if we don't conserve the American way of life right now, who will? Who will?

We will not apologize. We will not back down. We will defend it for our children, for our faith, and for our future.

The third priority that I think is critical, and let me move quickly, is that we codify our border wins because a nation without borders is not a nation.

The third task before the House Republican majority is urgent and nonnegotiable. We must codify our border wins into law.

President Trump has delivered on his promise to secure the border. Customs and Border Protection has achieved 7 straight months of—get this—zero releases of apprehended illegal immigrants into the United States from the border.

In 2025, DHS enforcement operations resulted in more than 605,000 deportations, but I submit to you tonight that executive action is not enough. Temporary enforcement is not enough. America needs permanent border security. We must ensure the security of our Nation is not undone by the stroke of a pen of a future administration.

That means passing H.R. 2, the Secure the Border Act. This legislation, as you will recall, finishes the wall, ends catch and release, restores interior enforcement, and puts American sovereignty back where it belongs, in American hands.

For years, we were told securing the border was impossible, and then President Trump proved it was possible simply when the law is enforced.

Now, it is time to lock those victories into statute. No more open borders. No more fentanyl flooding our streets. No more surrender to cartels and traffickers. A sovereign nation controls who enters its territory, and the House Republican majority must ensure Americans exactly that.

The fourth and final priority: celebrate freedom. Celebrate freedom because America's greatness flows from liberty, not government control.

In 2026, House Republicans must do what the radical left despises most: We must celebrate and defend freedom. Yes, that starts with healthcare, where Big Insurance and Big Government have trapped Americans into a broken, unaffordable system they don't control.

Just last month, a bombshell GAO report exposed the truth. The ObamaCare marketplace rubberstamped approvals for 96 percent of fake applications. Fictitious identities, stolen Social Security numbers, dead people, yet billions in taxpayer subsidies flowed straight to the insurance companies. Your hard-earned dollars were wasted on fraud while families faced skyrocketing premiums.

Democrats are fighting tooth and nail. Do you know what they are fighting tooth and nail to do? To keep funneling subsidies to Big Insurance giants, to let wealthy individuals continue to access government-funded healthcare, to allow some Americans to pay zero for coverage while the rest of us foot the bill.

Madam Speaker, I am glad to say tonight that Republicans are fighting for you, the American people, by expanding real choices for families, increasing competition to drive down prices, and putting patients and doctors first, not lining the pockets of Big Insurance.

Something has to change, and we must put healthcare back in the hands of individuals, not bureaucrats in Washington. A powerful first step? Expand health savings accounts, HSAs.

□ 2100

Madam Speaker, HSAs empower families to make their own decisions. Yes, they lower costs. Yes, they increase choice. Yes, they restore freedom to control your own care. Healthcare should serve patients, not bureaucrats or corporate cronies.

We must confront another growing threat most Americans don't yet see, and that is malign foreign influence, especially from Communist China.

Our colleges and universities have taken hundreds of millions—estimates now actually exceed $426 million in recent years—from foreign adversaries like China. They are selling access, influence, and sensitive research to the highest bidder. This is unacceptable.

That is why the House passed the DETERRENT Act, which includes language from my No Contracts for Foreign Adversaries Act, to force transparency, block shady deals, and stop our institutions from taking money from enemies who wish to harm us.

Once again, that bill is now in the Senate. The question arises once more: When will the Senate pass it?

America's intellectual capital, the minds of our next generation, should never be auctioned off to those who seek to undermine us. Freedom is worth defending economically, culturally, and morally.

In 2026, our House Republican majority will keep leading the charge to reform healthcare to empower individuals, to secure our campuses from foreign threats, and to celebrate the American way of life without apology. We understand that freedom isn't free. That is why we will fight to keep it for our families, for our future, and for our Nation.

In conclusion, I want you to hear my heart because it is a call to courage. This is our moment. As we stand on the threshold of America's 250th birthday—250 years since 56 brave signers pledged their lives, fortunes, and sacred honor to the Declaration of Independence—we are all called to renew the covenant our Founders made.

The House Republican majority was not sent here to manage decline. We were elected to reverse it, to cut reckless spending, to conserve our God-given way of life, to secure our sovereign borders, and to celebrate and defend the freedoms they fought to secure. History will not judge how cautious we were. It will judge how courageous we were.

As General George Washington declared to his troops, in 1776, on the heels of the Continental Congress' decision for independence, he said: "The fate of unborn millions will now depend, under God, on the courage and the conduct of this Army."

Madam Speaker, today the fate of unborn millions—our children, our grandchildren, and generations yet to come—depends on us, on our courage, on our conviction, and on our unwavering faith in the exceptional Nation that our Founders envisioned.

I implore my colleagues: Let us act with conviction. Let us lead with faith. Let us govern with courage.

America's best days are not behind us. They are still ahead. If we are bold enough, faithful enough, and courageous enough to fight for them, we will see it through.

Madam Speaker, in this year of America 250, let us recommit to the principles of liberty, self-government, and moral clarity that launched the greatest experiment in human freedom that the world has ever known.

We will not shrink. We will not surrender. We will fight. We will win for what our Founders built and that we are called to preserve.

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

GROWING THE GDP

(Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, Mr. SCHWEIKERT of Arizona was recognized for 30 minutes.)

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, as a mercy to the poor staff here, I am not going to use the whole half an hour. I am just going to try to run through a couple of concepts.

I did a little tripping up of some details last week, where we were trying to explain some of the things we see going on in the math. I want to walk through a concept.

We actually, right now, as a country, are remarkably blessed. The GDP growth, the economic growth, is actually well beyond almost any of what even my economists were predicting over the last year.

We are seeing some data right now—if you actually look at the Atlanta Fed, GDPNow, nowcasts, some of these—we could hit a five-handle this quarter, which is remarkable.

Looking at some of the data from the third quarter of 2025, it looks like the number of a 4.3 percent GDP growth is going to hold up.

These numbers are actually remarkable, and I want to make a point here for the annualized 2025 GDP number. I know this is geeky. There is a point I am going to come to, and that is the irony that tax collections don't look as robust as the economy. We are going to try to explain what is going on. This is why getting policy right is going to become so critical.

The first quarter of last year, so 1 year ago this quarter, we actually had negative GDP. The first quarter, when the Trump administration started, when our new Congress started, we actually had to go through 3 months of slower growth. Then, it wasn't until the second quarter, third quarter, and now we believe the fourth quarter—we don't have that final number in yet—we finally hit the acceleration pedal.

What is going on out there? We had this irony happening where we have really actually stable and much broader economic growth than we expected. We are actually seeing some odd things.

Actually, the labor force participation is pretty flat. We had a small tick up in some of the last unemployment data. Also, if you look at this chart here, we are trying to explain the difference. Here is the number of folks who are entering the labor force. They are working. Here is the number of folks who are available for work.

When we start to get to 4 percent or 4.6 percent unemployment, we are actually, if we look at our historic average, even the last 25 years, that is almost full employment.

Do you see this curve here? It is basically starting to demonstrate the demographics of America. It is also sort of the demographics of the entire industrialized world. You have a situation where today we functionally have the same number of 18-year-olds as we had 20 years ago. Today, we also have almost double the number of our brothers and sisters who are 65 and up than 25 years ago. That is creating an interesting irony.

We actually take a look here at what we call tax receipts. Most people like to call them tax collections. If you are on Ways and Means, they are tax receipts. Look at this interesting spike here. That is actually tax receipts. That is good.

Almost every dime we see on this chart of the real growth is actually capital gains. It is those who have had assets. It is those who have sold real estate. It is those who have sold stocks.

The tax receipts really coming in from labor are good. They are stable, but they are not growing nearly in sympathy—if you can play economist words—in sympathy to the GDP growth. This is an important part of what I wanted to share. I am trying—I hate this term—to socialize the concept.

□ 2110

What happens when you are producing growth because we have a lot of growth policies that are right? Last summer, earlier in the year, where investment is going into plant, equipment, data centers, AI, and all of these things are happening, wage growth is actually okay. It is actually outpacing inflation now, finally, thank Heaven. Yet the real GDP growth is coming from that capital spend and not from wage and new employment and the demand for labor.

Understand why this is a problem. We are an income-tax-base country. There are income taxes on businesses, but mostly the income tax base is on working—and also FICA, Social Security tax, Medicare tax, and unemployment tax; those are taxed on your wages.

We are starting to see this irony where we are actually doing some data where we ask what happens when you hit this type of GDP growth and, at the same time, the amount of borrowing and debt in the country is still going to stay remarkably high.

We still have a model that we think will be a bit less, but we could still be approaching $2 trillion of borrowing this year. I hope we are wrong, but you have to understand that the first quarter of this fiscal year, I think we were borrowing about $90,000 a second.

So far this fiscal year—so we are, what, 3 months and 10 or 11 days into it—I think we have now borrowed $800 billion. Sometime. Maybe before this month is over, we are going to have borrowed another $1 trillion. This time, it wasn't 3 months. It might be coming in at 4 months. We shouldn't be seeing those types of borrowing with this type of economic growth.

The point I am going to make is: Why is the borrowing going up? Look at the spending data. I didn't bring all of those charts because they are exhausting, but if you take a look at interest, remember that we have to refinance $10 trillion or maybe $11 trillion this year. That means that the bonds that were sold in the past have to come back to market, refinance, and they are being refinanced, for many of them, at much higher interest rates.

The other thing is healthcare, but it is healthcare, Medicare. We have a model that says that now, in less than 6½ to 7 years, Medicare will go from $1 trillion to $2 trillion. Also, in 7 years, Medicare is gone.

Excuse me. Let me rephrase that. The Medicare trust fund is gone, and that will result in around an 11 percent cut, particularly to hospitals.

It is demographics. Baby boomers are moving into their peak utilization years of these benefits. We are functioning, I think in the last 3 years or 4 years of baby boomers moving into the age of 65 and getting their earned benefits, so you see the shift in the labor market.

What happens if the formulas that I had come behind these microphones for years and said: That if we could grow another point of GDP, it is this many hundreds of billions of dollars of tax receipts, and now it isn't.

I know this is geeky, but it is really, really important because it means many of the budget documents that the brain trust around here talk about, we may be getting wrong—many of the solutions we have had for taking on debt and deficits.

There is a piece of legislation. I am absolutely elated. I am trying to get on it. It basically says: Look, let's do a debt and deficit commission, like we did BRAC many, many years ago to close excess military bases, and let's go for 3 percent of GDP growth.

Madam Speaker, there is a problem with that number. Just our interest coverage is over 3 percent of our economy. So we are going to take spending and get it down to 3 percent. Great. So we are going to stop borrowing so much, except just the interest we pay is bigger than that.

Does anyone see the math problem? So this is actually the punch line I have been trying to head toward. This is a chart that sort of shows labor as a percentage of income.

I am sorry, but this is actually really important when you are trying to design how you finance your government. We are hitting a time way down here. This is 2024 because that is the last sort of good data point that I have. We actually believe it has actually fallen further. For years, 64 percent, and there may have been times when we crossed over to 66 percent of our income basically came from labor that financed the government.

Today, we are down to touching—actually, we may be as low as 53 percent. That is a huge difference, and it is going to force us—those who care about the economics, those of us on the Ways and Means Committee who actually have to do tax policy, those who actually are paying attention to our bonds and our promise to pay back $30 trillion-plus of publicly sold debt, and another $8.5 trillion that we have borrowed internally. How do we pay it back?

We are going to have to start thinking about the taxation on labor. It is going to become a problem. I want to bounce around a little bit because, a couple of days ago, we got some of the inflation data, but with that also came some of the State and localized inflation data. I thought this one was interesting. I am going to be a little caustic on it, but I haven't had as much coffee today, so I am not wound up as tight, so at least I am not speaking like a machine gun.

We thought this was interesting. Increase in monthly costs in Arizona, and we thought we would do a snapshot. I am blessed that I represent the Phoenix, Scottsdale area. So between January 2021 to September 2021, so we are actually doing the same snapshot of time, if you lived in the Phoenix area, you functionally lost $1,597 to inflation. That is for the average family.

Now we come here to 2025. It is still not as good as we demand that we get it to, but it is now $944, a $653 savings.

That is 1 year of the success of Republicans lowering inflation. We have to get it further, but we actually see how bad it was before because this was the inflation that was handed to this country during Biden's first year, and then we start to take a look at the progress. We are making progress. It is not as good as I want, but understand this is the reality of the math.

Madam Speaker, I have a fixation that we tell the truth and sort of get an understanding of some of the math. One of the most difficult things is that we have been trying to figure out how do we make sure we preserve our promises.

We owe a promise for Medicare. We owe a promise for Social Security. We have to deal with the reality that, in less than 3 years, over half of everything that this Congress will spend—so over half of everything that the Federal Government will spend—will go to people who are 65 and up.

Why that is just an amazing thing to think about. In the 1970s, for every dollar that went to those who were 65 and up, there were $6 to $7 spent for those who were 18 and younger. Today, that is flipped.

It is just demographics. It is not some evil plot. It is a combination of the baby boomers, a big population bubble, and healthcare got dramatically more expensive.

Last week, I did a presentation here and basically showed where Democrats are turning healthcare into financial engineering instead of the incentives to do it better, faster, and cheaper.

We have turned healthcare into—remember the whole debate here on subsidies on top of subsidies? When you turn healthcare into financing instead of helping people be healthier, you have screwed up the economics and the incentives, and we start to look at charts like this.

Now, this is Medicare Advantage. I am actually a big fan of what you call Medicare part C, Medicare Advantage. The chart is a little bit distorted because it doesn't really give you the population statistics, but we believe that this year, 55 percent of the population of this country that are in Medicare is going to choose a Medicare Advantage plan.

□ 2120

Okay. But we aren't telling the truth about the math. There is this thing that is called the MedPAC reports. They are big orange reports like this, hundreds and hundreds of pages. If we go through them, there will be this section in there that says that it turns out Medicare Advantage is coming in, according to the MedPAC report—and this is the roomful of people that specialize in this and, I hate to say, my own joint economic economist, the CMS data and HHS data, and The Wall Street Journal, everyone else looks into this—it is coming in at 120 percent of fee for service.

Why this is a big deal is when Medicare Advantage was designed—it really came into effect in 2005—Senator Frist, who is a doctor—they put together a plan with this idea that we are going to do managed care. The insurance companies, which are going to be basically the gatekeeper, are going to make profit by helping our brothers and sisters on the program be healthier. The model was it was going to come in at 95 percent of fee for service.

Today, it comes in at 120 percent of fee for service. That 25 percent, Madam Speaker, over 10 years is $2 trillion. When we show a chart like this of the transition that has been happening for traditional fee for service Medicare to now Medicare Advantage, fine, but we are going to have to have the honest discussion of how do we get the incentives lined up.

I saw what Senator GRASSLEY published yesterday—and I was going to bring the report out here and use it as a prop and show it to you, but it is like this. It basically talks about hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of billions of dollars.

Look, the report, I am only a third through it, but it is example after example of Medicare Advantage insurers signing either having companies or their own folks go out and knock on grandma's door and score them as sicker and, therefore, getting bonuses for having a sicker population.

The Wall Street Journal almost 2 years ago did a major expose on a person. I think they were in Sun City, Arizona, and the insurance company had scored them I think as having HIV, except the problem is this person didn't have that. They had never been tested for it. However, the insurance company was getting a bonus for that. It is called risk scoring.

We are going to have to consider moving to a model that says we are not going to let you go and score people differently. We want to create a model where it is put in the initial pricing of the program, and then you make money by helping the senior population be healthier.

There are so many miracles right now, the technology can be worn, the ways you can keep track, the ways of telehealth, digital health, all these other things. We want a system that incentivizes investing in people's health instead of profiting from claiming they are sicker.

People have got to understand, there is actually a piece of legislation to do this. Preliminary scores, $1.84 trillion of savings. We are going to fight, knife fight, complain, cry, and fuss at each other over things that are absolutely tiny.

We have been told this piece of legislation actually is the biggest savings bill in U.S. history. I beg of anyone that actually cares about these subjects of taking on debt and deficits, help us. Help us explain it to our brothers and sisters. Help us take on what will be, let's be honest, a barrage of hate from the brokers, from the insurance companies that don't want a system that lines up the incentives properly.

These were the incentives of the original design of Medicare Advantage, and it got perverse by ObamaCare. They changed parts of the quality ratings that created another bonus system that could be manipulated.

Congress can fix things like this, but are we allowed to actually say: We are going to fix something on Medicare. So often, that sets off fear.

Did I mention in the beginning here, you have got less than 7 years and the Medicare trust fund is gone. If we are going to preserve these earned entitlements—these are earned programs. You worked for years. You earned this. This was part of the societal contract. People like me here, we have got to figure out how to finance this, keep it going. Yet it is almost a sin around here to talk about the problems, the fact we are hemorrhaging cash, we are borrowing. This year, for every dollar we take in in tax receipts, we are going to spend $1.43. The Moody's model says in 8 years interest will consume 30 percent of all of our tax receipts.

This isn't a game. We have got to stop the juvenile discussions we have around here and start facing the really big, difficult things ahead of us.

This is us. It may look like a chart with a handful of different blues on it, but this is actually us as a people. What this chart is telling us is that in less than 3 years, over half of all of our spending in this government will go to our brothers and sisters who are 65 and up.

If that is the societal deal we made, we made it; but we have an obligation as Members of Congress to make it work. If we know there is hundreds of billions of dollars—let's not use the word ''fraud''—being misallocated—let's get fancy on the language, we will call it misallocated—why wouldn't everyone line up with us?

I would argue the army of lobbyists outside our doors here who lose their mind every time I talk about this, who scare the crap out of us, we have still got to do the right thing. Someone running for the United States Senate today, in your first term—if you are blessed enough to win—you are going to have to deal with the fact the Social Security trust fund is gone, the Medicare trust fund is gone. Our preliminary math says in 2033, the first year that those trust funds are gone, it is $638 billion just to make up that shortfall.

This isn't a game. These are numbers that should terrify you. Yet for anyone who is crazy enough to be watching C–SPAN, how many times have you seen this week, last week, the week before that Members come behind these mikes and talk to you about the real issues that will change this Republic, or have we just decided we are going to let the bond market basically run this country, and we are going to just keep pretending we can keep spending like this?

Much of that spending is not Democrat policy, Republican policy. Look, I think much of the Democrat policy is absolutely absurd, but much of it is demographics. In the early 1990s, and even going back further, we have had dramatically fewer children.

Remember, Madam Speaker pro tempore, we model—the United States will be close to almost zero population growth this year. If you have a Pay-As-You-Go system, it is really hard to make that math work. Do you still let the scams, the misalignments, the taking advantage of these systems, the fraud go on? It means we are going to have to talk about it. We are going to have to dive into it. We are going to have to take on an army of lobbyists. They are probably going to run nasty ads against all of us because it is so much money.

Let's step up and do the hard things. Let's step up and do the right things.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 14, 2026, 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–2638. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of War, transmitting a letter authorizing Major General Brett G. Sylvia, United States Army, to wear the insignia of the grade of lieutenant general, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777a(b)(4); Public Law 111-383, Sec. 505(a)(1); (124 Stat. 4209); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2639. A letter from the Senior Vice President, Chief of Staff, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a statement with respect the following transaction involving exports to Türkiye, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3); July 31, 1945, ch. 341, Sec. 2 (as added by Public Law 102-266, Sec. 102); (106 Stat. 95); to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC–2640. A letter from the Senior Vice President, Chief of Staff, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a statement with respect to the following transaction involving financing to support U.S. supply chain resiliency projects, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3); July 31, 1945, ch. 341, Sec. 2 (as added by Public Law 102-266, Sec. 102); (106 Stat. 95); to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC–2641. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Fiscal Year 2025 Annual Progress Report to Congress on the C.W. Bill Young Cell Transplantation Program and National Cord Blood Inventory Program, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 274k(a)(6); July 1, 1944, ch. 373, title III, Sec. 379 (as amended by Public Law 109-129, Sec. 3(a)); (119 Stat. 2554); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC–2642. A letter from the Acting Branch Supervisor, Regulatory Management Branch, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Indiana; Huntington County 2010 Sulfur Dioxide Redesignation and Maintenance Plan [EPA-R05-OAR-2024-0378; FRL-12933-02-R5] received January 8, 2026, 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–2643. A letter from the Acting Branch Supervisor, Regulatory Management Branch, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; New Hampshire; Updates to Materials Incorporated by Reference [EPA-R01-OAR-2025-3027; FRL-13094-01-R1] received January 8, 2026, 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–2644. A letter from the Acting Branch Supervisor, Regulatory Management Branch, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Delegation of Authority for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Ohio; Delegation of Authority [EPA-R05-OAR-2025-0355; FRL-13131-01-R5] received January 8, 2026, 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–2645. A letter from the Acting Branch Supervisor, Regulatory Management Branch, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; California; Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District; Definition of Terms [EPA-R09-OAR-2022-0858; FRL-10563-02-R9] received January 8, 2026, 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–2646. A letter from the Acting Branch Supervisor, Regulatory Management Branch, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; California; Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District; Replacing Outdated Requirements [EPA-R09-OAR-2024-0210; FRL-11949-02-R9] received January 8, 2026, 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–2647. A letter from the Acting Branch Supervisor, Regulatory Management Branch, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's withdrawal of direct final rule — Technical Amendments to the EPCRA Hazardous Chemical Inventory Reporting Requirements To Conform to the 2024 OSHA Hazard Communication Standard; Withdrawal [EPA-HQ-OLEM-2025-0299; FRL-12698-05-OLEM] (RIN: 2050-AH40) received January 8, 2026, 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–2648. A letter from the Acting Branch Supervisor, Regulatory Management Branch, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Kentucky; Emissions Inventory and Nonattainment New Source Review for the Henderson-Webster Sulfur Dioxide Nonattainment Area [EPA-R04-OAR-2025-0023; FRL-12899-02-R4] received January 8, 2026, 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–2649. A letter from the Office Manager, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled, ''Twenty Years of D.C. Agency Overspending'', pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 455(d); (87 Stat. 803); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

EC–2650. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel for Housing Programs and Alternate Designated Agency Ethics Official, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting six notifications of an action on nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, Sec. 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

EC–2651. A letter from the Director, Federal Election Commission, transmitting the Commission's report stating that it did not complete or initiate competitive sourcing for conversion of an agency activity to contractors for the prior fiscal year, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 501 note; Public Law 108-199, Sec. 647(b); (118 Stat. 361); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

EC–2652. A letter from the Commissioners, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting the Commission's Performance and Accountability Report for Fiscal Year 2025, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3515(a)(1); Public Law 101-576, Sec. 303(a)(1) (as amended by Public Law 107-289, Sec. 2(a)); (116 Stat. 2049); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

EC–2653. A letter from the Treasurer, National Gallery of Art, transmitting the Gallery's Performance and Accountability Report for the year ended September 30, 2025, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3515(a)(1); Public Law 101-576, Sec. 303(a)(1) (as amended by Public Law 107-289, Sec. 2(a)); (116 Stat. 2049); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

EC–2654. A letter from the Director, United States Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's FY 2025 Agency Financial Report, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3515(a)(1); Public Law 101-576, Sec. 303(a)(1) (as amended by Public Law 107-289, Sec. 2(a)); (116 Stat. 2049); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

EC–2655. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; DAHER AEROSPACE (Type Certificate Previously Held by SOCATA) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2025-2265; Project Identifier MCAI-2024-00714-A; Amendment 39-23224; AD 2025-26-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 9, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–2656. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Diamond Aircraft Industries GmbH Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2025-2263; Project Identifier MCAI-2024-00729-A; Amendment 39-23204; AD 2025-24-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 9, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–2657. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Colored Federal Airway Green 8, Jet Route J-115, United States Area Navigation (RNAV) Route T-227 and Establishment of RNAV Route Q-188 in Alaska; Correction [Docket No.: FAA-2025-0372; Airspace Docket No.: 24-AAL-126] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received January 9, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALBERG: Committee on Education and Workforce. H.R. 2616. A bill to require public elementary and middle schools that receive funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to obtain parental consent before changing a minor's gender markers, pronouns, or preferred name on any school form or sex-based accommodations, including locker rooms or bathrooms, with an amendment (Rept. 119–441). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALBERG: Committee on Education and Workforce. H.R. 2617. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to prevent the use of funds under such Act to teach or advance concepts related to gender ideology, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 119–442). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALBERG: Committee on Education and Workforce. H.R. 3453. A bill to modify the program of grants to support high-quality charter schools, with an amendment

(Rept. 119–443). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALBERG: Committee on Education and Workforce H.R. 2516. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to prohibit political litmus tests in accreditation of institutions of higher education, and for other purposes, with an amendment (Rept. 119–444). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Ms. FOXX: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 992. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7006) making further consolidated appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes (Rept. 119–445). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COMER: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 580. A bill to amend the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 to provide for regulatory impact analyses for certain rules, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 119–446 Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committees on Rules, the Budget, and the Judiciary discharged from further consideration. H.R. 580 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

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. BAIRD (for himself, Mr. COMER, Mr. EVANS of Colorado, Mr. MOORE of North Carolina, and Ms. CRAIG):

H.R. 7024. A bill to amend the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agency Appropriations Act, 2026, to delay the implementation of amendments made by such Act to the hemp production provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. YAKYM (for himself, Mr. BACON, Ms. PETTERSEN, Mr. TIMMONS, Ms. ROSS, and Mr. MOORE of Utah):

H.R. 7025. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to require the implementation of evidence-based practices with respect to certain Federal grants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BARR (for himself and Mr. PETERS):

H.R. 7026. A bill providing for a joint hearing of the Committees on the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Senate to receive a presentation from the Comptroller General of the United States regarding the audited financial statement of the executive branch; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself and Mr. LEVIN):

H.R. 7027. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to eliminate the recoupment of separation pay, special separation benefits, and voluntary separation incentive payments from members of the Armed Forces who subsequently receive disability compensation under laws administered by the Department of Veterans Affairs and to impose limitations on the authority of the Secretary of Defense to recoup such pay from members who subsequently receive military retired or retainer pay; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BURCHETT:

H.R. 7028. A bill to require the Secretary of State to submit a notification to Congress prior to obligating funds for certain art-related purchases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. DINGELL (for herself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. PANETTA, and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 7029. A bill to ensure that older adults and individuals with disabilities are prepared for disasters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Workforce, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. EMMER (for himself and Mr. TORRES of New York):

H.R. 7030. A bill to amend section 242 of the National Housing Act to provide parity with respect to access to the mortgage insurance for hospitals program for licensed hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. FULCHER:

H.R. 7031. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to upgrade existing emergency communications centers in units of the National Park System to Next Generation 9-1-1 systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois (for himself, Mrs. HAYES, Mrs. GRIJALVA, Mr. CASAR, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. LANDSMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. BUDZINSKI, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. GARCIA of California, Mr. CARSON, Ms. CHU, Ms. TOKUDA, Ms. TITUS, Mr. EVANS of Pennsylvania, Ms. NORTON, Ms. STANSBURY, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Mr. THANEDAR, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 7032. A bill to ensure that paraprofessionals and education support staff are paid a living wage; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Mr. GOLDMAN of New York (for himself, Ms. GOODLANDER, Mr. BRESNAHAN, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. BACON, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. LALOTA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CISCOMANI, Mr. DELUZIO, Mr. LAWLER, Mr. RILEY of New York, Mr. MACKENZIE, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. STANTON, and Ms. GILLEN):

H.R. 7033. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to improve recruitment and retention of Federal correctional officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. GOLDMAN of Texas:

H.R. 7034. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to eliminate the dollar limitations on the exclusion of gain from sales of principal residences, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOODEN (for himself and Ms. LOFGREN):

H.R. 7035. A bill to amend the Electronic Fund Transfer Act to require the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve system to prescribe regulations relating to network competition in credit card transactions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HUIZENGA:

H.R. 7036. A bill to increase collaboration within the Department of State between the Office of Opinion Research of the Bureau of Intelligence and Research and the Bureau of Global Public Affairs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. KIM (for herself, Mr. BERA, Mr. MAST, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. OLSZEWSKI, Mr. SHREVE, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. STANTON, Mr. LAWLER, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. TITUS, Mr. MOORE of North Carolina, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, and Mrs. RADEWAGEN):

H.R. 7037. A bill to promote United States and allied energy and mineral security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. CASTEN, Mr. STANTON, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. MIN, Ms. FRIEDMAN, Mr. LICCARDO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. FOUSHEE, and Mr. RUIZ):

H.R. 7038. A bill to prohibit the United States Government from funding Venezuela's oil infrastructure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. MCCLAIN DELANEY (for herself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. IVEY, Ms. ELFRETH, Mr. WALKINSHAW, Mr. THANEDAR, and Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 7039. A bill to prohibit the naming, renaming, designating, or redesignating of any Federal building, land, or other asset in the name of a sitting President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MOORE of Utah (for himself, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. DUNN of Florida, Mr. MORAN, Mr. GOSAR, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mr. MCCORMICK, Mr. RULLI, Mr. MCDOWELL, Mr. KENNEDY of Utah, Mr. MCGUIRE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHREVE, Mr. ROSE, and Mr. OWENS):

H.R. 7040. A bill to prevent citizens of foreign adversarial nations from entering into or enforcing surrogacy contracts in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORMAN (for himself and Mr. CLYDE):

H.R. 7041. A bill to prohibit the consideration in the House of Representatives of any legislation containing an earmark; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PAPPAS:

H.R. 7042. A bill to expand the Weatherization Assistance Program for activities related to active duty and reserve military households, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PAPPAS (for himself and Mr. MOYLAN):

H.R. 7043. A bill to amend the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act to reauthorize the transmission facilitation program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PAPPAS (for himself and Mr. LAWLER):

H.R. 7044. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish the energy burden credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATRONIS:

H.R. 7045. A bill to repeal section 230 of the Communications Act of 1934, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. PRESSLEY (for herself, Ms. OMAR, and Ms. SIMON):

H.R. 7046. A bill to amend the Revised Statutes to remove the defense of qualified immunity in the case of any action under section 1979, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 7047. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand eligibility for, and make permanent, certain programs for homeless veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TAKANO (for himself, Mr. AMODEI of Nevada, and Mr. MAGAZINER):

H.R. 7048. A bill to increase consumer protection with respect to negative options in all media, including on the internet, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. VALADAO:

H.R. 7049. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide certain assessments of veterans needing homeless program services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania (for herself, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. BROWN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. CROCKETT, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FIGURES, Mrs. FOUSHEE, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MFUME, and Ms. PLASKETT):

H. Res. 990. A resolution recognizing the 113th anniversary of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Incorporated; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Mr. LALOTA:

H. Res. 991. A resolution requesting return of official papers on H.R. 1834; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. ANSARI (for herself, Ms. FOXX, Ms. ROSS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. HIMES, Mrs. BICE, Mr. SCHNEIDER, and Mr. CAREY):

H. Res. 993. A resolution recognizing and expressing support for the Iranian people protesting for a free and democratic Iran; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself, Ms. TITUS, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. VEASEY, and Mr. CORREA):

H. Res. 994. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Secretary of Defense should review section 504 of title 10, United States Code, for purposes related to enlisting certain aliens in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GOMEZ (for himself, Mrs. KIM, Ms. MENG, Mr. BELL, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. CARSON, Mr. CASE, Ms. CHU, Mr. CORREA, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. DINGELL, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Mr. LIEU, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. MCIVER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MIN, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PETERS, Ms. ROSS, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. STANSBURY, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. SUBRAMANYAM, Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. TONKO, Mr. TRAN, Mr. VARGAS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mr. SWALWELL, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. COSTA, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCLELLAN, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. LATIMER, Mrs. MCCLAIN DELANEY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. TORRES of California, and Ms. GARCIA of Texas):

H. Res. 995. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Korean American Day; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

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. BAIRD:

H.R. 7024.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 (Commerce Clause)

By Mr. YAKYM:

H.R. 7025.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 7026.

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

Congress has the authority to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution, including its powers over the federal budget, oversight of the executive branch, and the authority to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out those powers.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 7027.

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

The Constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BURCHETT:

H.R. 7028.

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

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mrs. DINGELL:

H.R. 7029.

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

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. EMMER:

H.R. 7030.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. FULCHER:

H.R. 7031.

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

clause 18 of section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution

By Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois:

H.R. 7032.

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

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article 1, Section 8, of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. GOLDMAN of New York:

H.R. 7033.

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

Under Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution, Congress has the power "to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into the Execution for the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. GOLDMAN of Texas:

H.R. 7034.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. GOODEN:

H.R. 7035.

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

The Constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises to pay the debts and provide for the common Defefense and general welfare of the United States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1. Thus, Congress has the authority not only to increase taxes, but also, to reduce taxes to promote the general welfare of the United States of America and her citizens. Additionally, Congress has the

By Mr. HUIZENGA:

H.R. 7036.

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

Article 1, section 8.

By Mrs. KIM:

H.R. 7037.

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

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. LEVIN:

H.R. 7038.

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

Article 1 Section 8.

By Mrs. MCCLAIN DELANEY:

H.R. 7039.

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

Article IV, Section 3, clause 2 (Property Clause)

By Mr. MOORE of Utah:

H.R. 7040.

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

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. NORMAN:

H.R. 7041.

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

Article I

By Mr. PAPPAS:

H.R. 7042.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. PAPPAS:

H.R. 7043.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. PAPPAS:

H.R. 7044.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. PATRONIS:

H.R. 7045.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. PRESSLEY:

H.R. 7046.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 7047.

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

Article I, section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution, to provide for the general welfare and make all laws necessary and proper to carry out the powers of Congress.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 7048.

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

Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. VALADAO:

H.R. 7049.

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. 231: Ms. BOEBERT.
H.R. 485: Ms. SALAZAR.
H.R. 576: Mr. EVANS of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 645: Mr. GROTHMAN.
H.R. 991: Mr. MOORE of Utah.
H.R. 1061: Mr. LATIMER and Mr. STANTON.
H.R. 1065: Mr. HURD of Colorado.
H.R. 1197: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI.
H.R. 1227: Mr. LAWLER.
H.R. 1229: Mr. WALKINSHAW.
H.R. 1232: Ms. VAN DUYNE.
H.R. 1254: Mr. LAWLER.
H.R. 1291: Mrs. FOUSHEE.
H.R. 1330: Mr. TORRES of New York.
H.R. 1380: Mr. LAWLER.
H.R. 1415: Mr. BERGMAN.
H.R. 1422: Mr. NUNN of Iowa.
H.R. 1477: Mr. CISNEROS.
H.R. 1530: Mr. HAMADEH of Arizona.
H.R. 1628: Mr. JACK, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. COLE, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. HURD of Colorado, and Mr. VAN ORDEN.
H.R. 1672: Mr. LAWLER.
H.R. 1868: Mr. DUNN of Florida and Mr. HAMADEH of Arizona.
H.R. 1941: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 1958: Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, and Mr. TIFFANY.
H.R. 2048: Mr. RUTHERFORD.
H.R. 2089: Mr. SMUCKER and Mr. RUTHERFORD.
H.R. 2149: Ms. SALAZAR.
H.R. 2166: Mr. MOORE of Alabama.
H.R. 2402: Mr. BERA.
H.R. 2531: Mr. GOLDMAN of New York and Mr. VINDMAN.
H.R. 2598: Mrs. MCCLAIN DELANEY.
H.R. 2727: Mrs. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 2741: Mrs. TRAHAN.
H.R. 2756: Mr. MOYLAN.
H.R. 2784: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.
H.R. 2837: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 2902: Mr. MOORE of Utah.
H.R. 2949: Ms. CROCKETT.
H.R. 3046: Ms. CROCKETT.
H.R. 3178: Mr. RUTHERFORD.
H.R. 3184: Ms. DEXTER.
H.R. 3277: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 3497: Mr. MOORE of North Carolina.
H.R. 3526: Mr. LIEU.
H.R. 3562: Mr. CAREY and Mr. HARDER of California.
H.R. 3593: Mr. LAWLER.
H.R. 3604: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 3644: Mrs. TRAHAN.
H.R. 3683: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI.
H.R. 3699: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.
H.R. 3773: Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 3779: Mr. TRAN.
H.R. 3789: Mrs. HINSON.
H.R. 3930: Mr. BERA and Ms. BROWN.
H.R. 4093: Mr. PFLUGER.
H.R. 4176: Mr. MFUME.
H.R. 4206: Mrs. GRIJALVA and Ms. POU.
H.R. 4443: Ms. CROCKETT.
H.R. 4664: Ms. JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 4708: Mr. KEAN.
H.R. 4740: Mr. WALKINSHAW.
H.R. 4793: Mr. MOORE of Utah.
H.R. 5064: Mrs. KIM.
H.R. 5106: Ms. STRICKLAND.
H.R. 5221: Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas.
H.R. 5267: Mr. KEAN.
H.R. 5269: Mr. LAWLER and Ms. VAN DUYNE.
H.R. 5351: Mr. KENNEDY of Utah and Mr. MCCORMICK.
H.R. 5403: Ms. BYNUM.
H.R. 5415: Mr. LICCARDO and Ms. LEE of Nevada.
H.R. 5434: Ms. BROWN.
H.R. 5438: Mr. CRANE, Mr. MILLS, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Mr. LAWLER, Mr. MOSKOWITZ, Ms. BOEBERT, Mrs. HOUCHIN, Mr. FONG, and Mr. GIMENEZ.
H.R. 5461: Mr. GROTHMAN.
H.R. 5486: Ms. RIVAS.
H.R. 5509: Mr. LAWLER.
H.R. 5527: Mr. BELL.
H.R. 5548: Mr. HARIDOPOLOS.
H.R. 5622: Mr. GOLDMAN of New York.
H.R. 5634: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.
H.R. 5653: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 5705: Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 5811: Mrs. LUNA.
H.R. 5815: Mr. ROSE.
H.R. 5862: Mr. VINDMAN and Mr. PAPPAS.
H.R. 5906: Mr. VINDMAN.
H.R. 5939: Ms. STRICKLAND.
H.R. 5973: Mr. WALKINSHAW, Mr. POCAN, Mrs. DINGELL, and Ms. BARRAGÁN.
H.R. 6069: Mr. SWALWELL.
H.R. 6164: Mr. KILEY of California.
H.R. 6170: Mr. SHREVE.
H.R. 6176: Mr. MAGAZINER.
H.R. 6260: Mr. MOORE of North Carolina.
H.R. 6280: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.
H.R. 6307: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
H.R. 6366: Mr. HARIDOPOLOS and Ms. SALINAS.
H.R. 6372: Mr. OGLES.
H.R. 6390: Ms. TOKUDA, Ms. JAYAPAL, and Ms. STANSBURY.
H.R. 6440: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 6448: Mr. WIED.
H.R. 6469: Mrs. KIM and Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H.R. 6520: Mr. HARIDOPOLOS.
H.R. 6566: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 6574: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas and Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 6694: Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. MANNION, and Mr. KENNEDY of New York.
H.R. 6709: Mr. LAWLER.
H.R. 6725: Ms. GARCIA of Texas.
H.R. 6731: Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. MCBRIDE, Mr. LATIMER, Ms. CRAIG, and Ms. SALINAS.
H.R. 6760: Mrs. MCCLAIN DELANEY.
H.R. 6766: Mr. POCAN, Ms. SIMON, Mr. LANGWORTHY, Mr. RUTHERFORD, and Mrs. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 6771: Mr. GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 6780: Ms. BUDZINSKI.
H.R. 6797: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. WALKINSHAW.
H.R. 6806: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H.R. 6816: Mrs. MCBATH.
H.R. 6821: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 6867: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
H.R. 6891: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 6945: Mr. HARRIS of Maryland.
H.R. 6960: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MCGARVEY, and Mr. KENNEDY of Utah.
H.R. 6973: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 6980: Ms. TLAIB, Ms. TOKUDA, and Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 6989: Ms. OMAR.
H.R. 6990: Ms. ROSS.
H.R. 6998: Mr. CAREY and Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.
H.R. 7004: Mr. GOTTHEIMER and Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 7008: Mr. BEGICH, Mr. CRANE, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. MAST, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. FALLON, Mr. LANGWORTHY, Mr. DOWNING, and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
H.R. 7016: Mr. LATIMER, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. COHEN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. PETTERSEN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. VARGAS.
H.J. Res. 80: Mrs. GRIJALVA.
H.J. Res. 122: Mr. GOLDEN of Maine.
H.J. Res. 139: Mr. BRECHEEN.
H. Con. Res. 68: Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. ROSS, Ms. CRAIG, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. MCGARVEY, Mr. LYNCH, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H. Res. 578: Mr. EVANS of Pennsylvania.
H. Res. 927: Mr. BERA.
H. Res. 984: Mr. RUTHERFORD.

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. ARRINGTON

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on the Budget in H.R. 7006, the Financial Services and General Government and National Security, Department of State, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2026, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.