

the basis of race and gender in university admissions. Actually, the public debate should go beyond that because in this country not only do we have a policy in which we try to have certain groups jump ahead of other people based on test scores or grade point average, we also have preferences, or encourage, as a practical matter, preferences in hiring for government jobs as well as hiring in jobs working for a private organization, if that private organization has at least 50 employees and does business with the Federal Government. There are also preferences with regard to government contracting.

As a practical matter, we have had these preferences since 1965. We are talking about things that are 67 years old.

I will point out that sometimes with regard to government contracting, it encourages lying. I have talked to people in my district who talk about their colleagues putting businesses in the name of their wives so they can get the preference for a woman-owned business even though the guy continues to run the business.

My friend doesn't like it because he is an honest person and he refuses to lie. He doesn't like the fact that people who are lying move ahead of him. He is in the construction field.

There are two ideas put forth as to why we need these preferences: One is to undo past injustices from years ago, going all the way back to slavery in the 1860s; and, secondly, the idea that somehow we should ask businesses or government to have a more diverse task force. I am going to deal with each of one of these separately.

First of all, with regard to past injustices, the benefits in universities and the benefit in government affirmative action goes to people who were never even in this country. We have to ask ourselves, why, if my ancestors came here from Peru in the 1990s and never experienced a period in this country, assuming there was such a period in which there was a lot of prejudice, why would we be giving preferences to people who moved here in the 1990s?

Also, Madam Speaker, Black people who moved here from Jamaica or the Bahamas in the 1990s, well past the era of Jim Crow, much less well past slavery times, why would we be giving them preferences?

The Biden administration, most recently, is trying to add another group to get preferences, people from the Middle East or northern Africa. Why, if someone moves here from Algeria or Syria today, they may not even be citizens, why would they be given preferences? What is the underlying rationale?

The other thing to point out here is that we are hypothetically giving preferences to people who are doing better than the native-born population. This is something people should remember before they advocate for this or if they have children or grandchildren making the pitch for this.

Right now the ethnic group in America that is doing the best financially—and money is not the most important thing in life, but nevertheless, that is frequently what we look to when we determine these programs—are Indian Americans who are the most successful group in America today. Behind that, we have people from China. I think the number two group right now is from the Philippines. People from Cuba are doing better than the native born.

According to Thomas Sowell—this is a book somewhat dated—according to Thomas Sowell, the second generation after people move here from the West Indies, Jamaica, and the Bahamas do better than the average American.

Given that, like I said, we are dealing with people who came here well past the time of prejudice. Why in the world would we be giving preferences to these people?

The next thing I will point out is that some people fall back on the idea that we need a diverse group of students or a diverse workforce. This is kind of a bizarre argument, and it is something people should have to defend.

Let's say I am one-quarter Peruvian—I am not, but let's say for the sake of argument I am one-quarter Peruvian. I have never been to Peru. I don't know a word of Spanish. I have never been to a Spanish-speaking country. Why in the world would we be giving me preferences to bring the Peruvian viewpoint to an engineering firm, let's say?

It makes no sense at all. I have no connection other than DNA with people that are Peruvian.

These are some of the ideas that I think people should have to respond to before they are critical of that decision, or people who want this sort of policy to continue.

THE THREAT OF THE CHINESE COMMUNIST PARTY

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

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, one of the biggest threats we face today as a Nation is the threat of the Chinese Communist Party at home and abroad.

The fiscal year 2024 National Defense Authorization Act includes funding that protects the citizens of the United States from the imminent threat of the Chinese Communist Party. It requires the DOD to notify Congress of collaborative nuclear efforts between China and Russia and assess the cooperation between China and Iran on ICBM technology.

This year's NDAA counters aggression from the Chinese Communist Party on every front. It promotes processes for our small businesses to enter the market to work with the DOD in an effort to continue to grow the American small business economy and on-

shore manufacturing capacity to the United States.

Additionally, the NDAA recognizes the growing threat of the Chinese Communist Party to Taiwan, reaffirming U.S. support of the defense of Taiwan to allow Taiwan to defend itself and fully funds military exercises with our allies and partners in the Pacific to counter China's growing military expansion.

Further, the NDAA protects us at home by building up our cybersecurity capabilities and developing new emerging technologies in AI to help our soldiers defend against threats against our Nation and the largest pay raise in over 20 years of 5.2 percent, barely keeping pace with inflation, to help our enlisted and lower-paid servicemembers.

Supporting the NDAA is essential in making sure our soldiers and interests abroad are supported and defended to the highest standard, while also making sure that all of us at home in the United States are protected from threats, as well.

Mr. Speaker, according to the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, it is estimated that 6 out of 100 people will have PTSD at some point in their lives. Sadly, the incidence of PTSD is higher in veterans and Active Duty servicemembers.

As a doctor, former director of the Iowa Department of Health, and a 24-year U.S. Army veteran, the mental, emotional, and physical health of my constituents and fellow veterans is one of my top priorities in Congress. For too long, PTSD and other mental or physical ailments have had devastating effects, and far too often, they go untreated.

The new FDA guidance that presents considerations for designing clinical trials for psychedelic drugs will give patients and their doctors increased access to effective treatments rather than alternatives such as opioids.

That is why I introduced the Veterans CARE Act to allow the VA to research the effectiveness of using medical cannabis for chronic mental and physical pain and why we have held roundtables on emerging breakthrough therapies.

I hope others will join me in supporting these novel forms of research that will benefit our heroic veterans.

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 58 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

Sovereign Lord, whose great strength and outstretched arm made the Earth and all who live thereon, look out upon Your creation and grant us Your divine compassion. You show mercy to those You want to, and You harden the hearts of those You choose to harden. Show mercy to the victims of the war in Ukraine, but we ask that You soften the hearts of those in whose power it is to bring peace, once again, into this war-torn region.

How long, O Lord, will You allow innocents to remain subject to needless violence and ruthless aggression? Are not 500 days long enough, 9,000 deaths enough, for the Ukrainian people to suffer? How long, O Lord, will You hide from us the just and righteous pathway to peace in the region?

Yet, O Lord, You have revealed to us in this interminable war what it means to reach to the depths of faith in the face of hopelessness. No wisdom, no understanding, and not even the most brilliant battle plan can succeed against You, our Lord, for in these promises have the Ukrainians found the font of their strength. You are their strength and shield, the source of their unwavering resilience.

Reward them, O God, for their faithfulness in the face of the indiscriminate hostility of their adversary. In their struggle not just against flesh and blood, not only against powers and principalities of this world, but in the spiritual conflict against the forces of evil rampant in this world, may all who believe in You take up the full armor You provide and find our deliverance in You.

In the power of Your name, we are bold to pray.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. MCGOVERN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

REMEMBERING THE LIFE AND
LEGACY OF DR. DON BEACH

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Dr. Don Beach, who left a lasting impression on everyone that had the privilege to know him.

Dr. Beach dedicated his life to education. His love for the classroom began with teaching science and biology to high school and elementary school students. In 1981, after 8 years at UT Arlington, Dr. Beach joined Tarleton State University as the dean of the School of Education and Fine Arts, but he could not be kept out of the classroom, later returning to full-time teaching as the professor of educational leadership.

Today, we are joined by doctoral students from Tarleton State University here on their annual education doctoral trip, originally created by Dr. Beach. His dedication and guidance have inspired the students sitting here today who deeply mourn his absence.

Dr. Beach is remembered by many of us as one of the most impactful faculty members in Tarleton history. His contributions to Tarleton, both as a faculty member and as a mentor, will never be forgotten.

In God we trust.

TRUE NATIONAL SECURITY MEANS
EVERY AMERICAN HAS ENOUGH
TO EAT

(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, this week, in the name of "national security," Congress will likely approve a nearly \$1 trillion National Defense Authorization Act, but the 35 million Americans who don't know where their next meal is coming from won't feel any more security because for struggling families in this country, Republicans are cutting food benefits.

I find it unconscionable that Members of Congress are okay cutting programs that help hungry kids, like SNAP and WIC, supposedly in the name of deficit reduction. Meanwhile, they are fine sending almost a trillion dollars to an agency that can't pass an audit and to defense contractors who pad their pockets by fleecing America's taxpayers.

Let's broaden our definition of national security to include more than bullets and bombs. Let's include the security of our people, their health, well-being, and economic stability.

True national security ought to mean that every American has enough to eat.

No more blank checks to the Pentagon. Let's reinvest in our people to end hunger now.

REINING IN EXECUTIVE
OVERREACH

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

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, House Republicans are following through on our commitment to hold government accountable. Whether it be passing the REINS Act or the Separation of Powers Restoration Act or compelling many Biden administration officials to testify for the first time in over a year, the American people can see we are hard at work.

There is still work to do. Since the President took office, he has finalized 644 new regulations, which come with a \$376 billion price tag that negatively impacts our economy and requires more than 230 million additional hours of paperwork.

Instead of burdening our job creators, House Republicans want to get government out of their way through legislation like the CHOICE Arrangement Act. We are also working to get government out of our kitchens, which is why we passed the Save Our Gas Stoves Act.

This administration has never met a regulation it didn't like, but rest assured, the House will continue reining in the Biden administration's executive overreach.

SUPPORTING DOMESTIC SHIP-
BUILDING AND OFFSHORE WIND
INDUSTRY

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

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to a provision in the Coast Guard reauthorization that would decimate the offshore wind industry and prevent the United States from reaching President Biden's clean energy goals.

If passed, all offshore wind installation vessels will be required to be U.S.-flagged and crewed, but there aren't any existing vessels that meet these requirements. We must support our domestic shipbuilding and mariner capacity, but this provision would constrict offshore wind construction in the short term and would sacrifice union jobs and energy independence in the long term.

We will not reach the President's goal of 30 gigawatts of offshore wind by 2030 if this provision passes, and halting offshore wind production would jeopardize the creation of up to 83,000 domestic jobs by 2030.

In committee, I offered a solution that would ensure offshore wind can thrive in the short term and create a pathway to more American offshore wind jobs. A prevailing wage requirement ensures that American mariners are not being passed up for jobs that we have the ships and workforce to perform ourselves.