

charity in my role as co-chair along with MIKE MCCAUL of the Congressional Childhood Cancer Caucus.

Every time a Hyundai is sold, \$22 of each new vehicle goes toward Hyundai Hope on Wheels to fund pediatric cancer research. Since 1998, this organization has raised over \$225 million. It truly makes Hyundai not only a great company but a good company.

Now, I work with dealers Tom O'Brien and Don Reilly, and these are the men who started this incredible charity. It has played a crucial role in creating hope and saving lives in the battle against childhood cancer, fueling nearly 1,300 research studies at more than 175 medical institutions.

They are dedicated to supporting pediatric cancer research that finds innovative approaches, creates discovery, and improves care for children fighting cancer.

Their milestone came during an important week last month. As they held their annual event here on Capitol Hill, the Congressional Childhood Cancer Caucus held its annual Childhood Cancer Summit simultaneously.

Here in Congress and through the work of our caucus, we have made great legislative strides that have turned bills into laws and hope into action.

Last year, we passed the Childhood Cancer STAR Reauthorization Act. Since it was first passed in 2018, this bill has expanded opportunities for childhood research, improved efforts to identify and track childhood cancer incidences, and enhanced the quality of life for childhood survivors.

Since its inception, the Congressional Childhood Cancer Caucus has had four landmark pieces of legislation signed into law: The Childhood Cancer STAR Act, the Creating Hope Act, the RACE for Children Act, and the Global Hope Act. Our work is not done.

Thanks to their work, and thanks to our partnership in Congress, we have made great strides in funding childhood cancer research. Most importantly, I believe we are getting closer to the day when no parent, no family, will ever again have to hear the words: "Your child has cancer."

I also will take a moment to share a success story from the Hyundai Hope on Wheels program. Each year, Hyundai Hope on Wheels has a youth ambassador, and a few years ago, we met Hannah Adams. She was several years removed from battling cancer herself, and she shared with us some incredible and impactful stories.

Hannah is now 13 years cancer-free, and this summer, she was an intern in our Washington, D.C., office. She is now a junior at the University of Alabama, double majoring in political science and public relations, and we know she will accomplish so much.

It is my honor to have worked alongside Hannah and all of our youth ambassadors over the years.

You can understand why we have a youth ambassador. If you or I were to

go into a cancer hospital and try to talk to a child, it looks like, in my case, their grandfather came in. Hannah was their age. The youth ambassadors are their age, and they connect with children in a way that says to them: Look, I was once in the same position you were in. You can beat this. You can beat this, and we will work with you to do it.

Mr. Speaker, I acknowledge that October is Breast Cancer Awareness Month. As co-chair of the House Cancer Caucus, I also make a commitment to those who are currently living with or who have lived with breast cancer. Congress will continue to fight for you by providing the necessary funding for research and support in the hope that someday we can find a cure.

CONGRATULATING LAPHONZA BUTLER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. KILEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KILEY. Mr. Speaker, first, I extend my wishes and prayers to the family of Senator Feinstein. Dianne Feinstein dedicated her life to public service, and her passing is a profound loss for our State and country.

I also congratulate LAPHONZA BUTLER on her appointment to the Senate by Governor Newsom, and I say that with all sincerity. I harbor no ill will in any form against Ms. BUTLER. She apparently wasn't even expecting this appointment and only learned about it when she got a call from the Governor, and she agreed to serve. She should be commended for that.

I should say that there has been raised a question concerning whether she meets the requirements to hold this office and to represent California, given that apparently she is a registered voter in Maryland. I trust that the Senate, which is responsible for judging the qualifications of its Members, is taking that inquiry seriously.

I will say, however, that we need to, at this point, kind of pause to reflect on the fact that if Ms. BUTLER is sworn in, which I believe she is supposed to be sworn in today, California will now have two Senators who gained their office not by the authority of voters but, rather, by the whim of a single individual, Governor Gavin Newsom. We will have two Senators who gained their office via appointment.

□ 1100

We also, by the way, have a Senator from New Jersey whose own conference is calling on him to resign, which could create another appointed Senator in the United States Senate.

This is very much contrary to the spirit of the 17th Amendment, which calls for the direct election of Senators. When this amendment was adopted, it was put in place, according to one scholarly article, to replace a distrusted aristocratic regime of appointed Senators with one of popular enfranchisement.

Indeed, since the 17th Amendment, which provided for the direct election of Senators but allowed that governors could appoint Senators still to fill vacancies, these appointments have been subject to all manner of abuses. You have had instances of nepotism. Governors have appointed their children. They have appointed their spouses. Some have even appointed themselves to the U.S. Senate. Indeed, the appointment that Governor Newsom has just made demonstrates the risks that are inherent in an appointment system.

As one headline in today's San Francisco Chronicle reads: "Newsom's handling of Feinstein's replacement was a highlight reel of his political flaws." The writer says that he twisted himself into rhetorical pretzels over the last 2 years because he looked at this appointment through the lens of what is going to help his Presidential aspirations as opposed to what is going to be best for the State of California.

As long as 2 years ago, Governor Newsom made statements about who he might appoint in the event of a vacancy. Then just a few weeks ago, he said he was going to appoint an interim Senator. Then a couple days ago, he walked back that statement and said, no, the person would be free to run for reelection.

This is just not the sort of dynamic that ought to influence who is going to hold a position as important as being the United States Senator from California.

I should also add that it is quite unfair to the candidates who have been running to hold this position in 2024, three of whom currently serve in the House, who have been very actively campaigning and now face the prospect of running against an incumbent who didn't actually have to get to that office and face voters in order to get there.

For this House, the House of Representatives, every single person who walks onto the floor of this House is there by the authority of voters, is there having been elected. There is no reason why it shouldn't be the same in the United States Senate.

I have introduced H. Res. 57. This is a constitutional amendment that will simply say that in order to be a United States Senator, just as to be a United States Representative, you have to get there by an election of the people. If this really is a government of, by, and for the people, as Lincoln put it, then we should make sure that those who are here at this Capitol making important decisions on behalf of the people are there because the people chose them to be so.

THE STATE OF FOOD PRODUCTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, we are in perilous times as a Nation due to the

weakness we have been projecting in the last 2½ years from our leadership.

What do we see? When you have a vacuum like that—we know the terminology “nature abhors a vacuum”—China is all too eager to step in and move in and replace us in that regard. We are seeing that with the undermining of our currency around the world. We see it with the BRICS group trying to go on its own where the American currency for many, many years has been the standard.

Now, we don't have a birthright to that. We don't have a birthright as the United States for being number one in anything, but I think we can agree that we would be stronger as a country, as well as with our good intentions as a people, that the United States is well positioned to continue to be the light of the world that it is capable of being.

With bad leadership, with poor leadership, we allow others to come in and replace us in that role. China is seeking to do so on so many things, like manufacturing and food. That is what I would like to talk about today: food production.

At the same time as western countries are saying we need to blame agriculture for climate change, which basically means CO₂ production, I would remind you once again, carbon dioxide is only .04 percent of our atmosphere. All the hysteria over that is that it is somehow going to be the end of us as a people, the end of the Earth; it has only grown a minute amount.

They would have us cut one-third of agriculture in this country. John Kerry, the so-called czar, as he flies in his private jet to yet another fancy event in Davos to talk about climate change, along with hundreds of other private jets, would have us cut one-third of our agriculture in this country.

You see that happening in Europe. You see the Dutch farmers valiantly fighting back against their oppressive government where they are wanting to put a bunch of their land out of business. Holland reclaimed a bunch of land from the ocean via those polders, via those levees they used to push back the ocean and made prime farmland out of that. You have extremists trying to push them out. You see Ireland a while back deciding they need to cull about 30 percent, maybe a third of their dairy herd because dairies make CO₂ and methane gas and such.

There was a time in this country where we had way, way more buffalo on the plains than we do have currently with beef and dairy cattle. That is an interesting stat. It isn't about the animals burping or whatever.

As we see the U.S., due to bad policy, to poor leadership, being displaced in that area, do we really want to become dependent even more so on China and a cartel they might be in with Russia and other alliances they have with Iran, to be more and more dependent on them? We are already dependent on them for 90 percent of our pharma-

ceuticals, and so much of our manufactured products. Do you want to do that to agriculture, too? It makes no sense.

You see what is happening in my home State of California, where California produces so many of these great crops here. Ninety-plus percent that Americans rely on comes from California. We saw just last year, in 2022, that due to the decisions made by the Bureau of Reclamation and others, and the environmental groups, the water got cut off from Shasta Dam and other Federal project water to much of agriculture.

We saw just an example of rice, for example. Normally, about half a million acres of rice are grown in California. They cut that number in half to 250,000. Do you know how devastating that is to communities when you have that and other crops just wiped away because of mismanagement of our water supply during a drought period?

There is still plenty of water that hits California, plenty of snowpack. We were certainly blessed with a lot this year that made things good for the 2023 crops. We are still having a decent carryover, it looks like. As we watch, they are going to fritter the water away at this time of year, as they have to lower the lakes to have a flood control level, conservation level. Indeed, the water that could be used for other things is just now going out to the ocean as so much of it is. It is a water-management issue. It is a leadership issue.

Where is this food going to come from? They want to continue to take dams out. I heard a colleague here yesterday say, well, these dams haven't been maintained over the years. Well, that is purposeful. If the government doesn't put forward the dollars and the effort and the permitting process to maintain and keep dams upgraded, yeah, after 40 years they can deteriorate. Then someone decides, well, it is going to be too expensive to revamp the dam, to bring it up to spec, so let's go ahead and tear it out. That is what they want to begin with.

Where is our food going to come from if we don't have the dams, the water storage, our hydroelectric power, all of those things? It makes no sense what we are doing.

THE PRESS NEEDS TO WAKE UP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I will address some of the votes that took place on the floor last week, in particular the vote regarding a continuing resolution designed to keep the government open that was taken here last Friday.

The effort to keep the government open failed 232-198. Every Democrat voted against that resolution to close the government. What I am going to address is the fact that 21 Republicans voted against keeping the government

open at that time. The press, particularly The New York Times, probably other organizations as well, referred to those 21 people as hardcore conservatives.

As our country goes under, some people are going to blame the executive, some people will blame Congress, some people will blame the courts, but a lot of it has to fall on the utterly incompetent press corps of this country. Hard-line conservatives?

Let's look at the bill that we wanted to have to keep the government open last Friday. First of all, a continuing resolution is primarily about spending, and that spending bill cut spending, discretionary spending, on all but veterans, the border, and defense, by 30 percent. In other words, across-the-board, you put everything else together, discretionary spending on the Department of Education, the Department of Commerce, the Department of the Interior, the State Department, energy, the legislature itself, a 30 percent reduction in spending.

How in the world can you say the people who voted for the 30 percent reduction in spending are not conservative? How in the world can the press corps refer to the people who voted against a 30 percent reduction in spending as the hard-line conservatives?

We all know part of that bill was not just focused on government spending. Probably the biggest crisis facing America today is the massive group of people coming across the southern border, over 200,000 a month. In addition to that, we have all the unaccompanied minors, 8,000 to 10,000 children, coming across the southern border with no adult accompanying them at all.

In that bill, we also tried to add 22,000 new border agents, end catch and release, so people showing up at the southern border would be kept in Mexico, and the policy of inviting unaccompanied minors into our country. In other words, we were dealing with the immigration crisis.

We had two parts of the bill: A 30 percent reduction in discretionary spending on so much of the budget and, in essence, closing down the border to prevent all of these people coming here illegally, as well as to prevent the drugs coming across that kill over 100,000 Americans a year. The press corps in this country has the nerve to say that the people who sided with the Democrats to kill this bill are hard-line conservatives.

I call upon the slumbering press to wake up and pay attention to what is in these bills and tell us exactly what you mean by hardcore conservatives if they vote against the bill.

There may be a variety of motivations to vote against a bill. There may be personalities. Maybe you want to fancy yourself a hardcore conservative and you count on utter incompetence in the news media.

I beg the press corps in the future to pay attention to what is in these bills