

Mrs. Diane Fields Reed, the entire Reed family, and the staff of Representative BISHOP.

Mr. Speaker, I will say this one last thing about Michael Reed. It didn't matter if you were a Democrat or Republican, especially a Democrat or Republican member of the staff. When you had a question about appropriations, it was Michael Reed that you called to get the straight answer. If he could help you, he would. He was one of the most dependable people I have met in my life.

□ 1100

CLOSURE OF THE ST. CROIX AVIS

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

Ms. PLASKETT. Today, I honor the St. Croix Avis, our cherished newspaper, as it has concluded a remarkable 180-year journey leaving a legacy that is both historic and deeply rooted in our community.

Established in 1844, the St. Croix Avis was a beacon of enlightenment. It laid the foundation for a literate Black population. The paper was Black owned and Black run, and symbolized not only the dissemination of information but also the affirmation of the dignity of voicing an opinion.

Over the decades, the Avis has been more than a witness to history, it has been its scribe. From the era of chattel slavery to modern challenges, it has chronicled our evolution as a people and served as an invaluable source of information and engagement in our community.

Let us remember the St. Croix Avis for the history it helped write and for the critical role it played in our community's growth and development.

I thank Rena and her Dad, Mr. Brodhurst, and the previous owners. It will forever remain a cherished chapter in the story of the Virgin Islands and an enduring symbol of our Virgin Islands dignity and pride.

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

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of rule IX, I seek recognition to give notice of my intent to raise a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of the resolution is as follows:

Censuring Representative ILHAN OMAR of Minnesota.

Whereas, elected Members of Congress take an oath to "bear true faith and allegiance" to the United States, "without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion";

Whereas, Representative ILHAN OMAR took an oath of allegiance to the United States upon becoming a citizen,

declaring, "I absolutely and entirely renounce and abjure all allegiance and fidelity to any foreign prince, potentate, state, or sovereignty, of whom or which I have heretofore been a subject or citizen";

Whereas, on January 27, 2024, Representative OMAR gave remarks at an event in Minneapolis in which she made treasonous statements;

Whereas, Representative OMAR said she has spoken to many Somalians who asked her to intercede for the Somali Government by pressuring the United States Government into certain actions;

Whereas, Representative OMAR assured the Somalians she spoke to, "the U.S. Government will only do what Somalians in the U.S. tell them to do. They will do what we want and nothing else. They must follow our orders and that is how we will safeguard the interest of Somalia.";

Whereas, Representative OMAR continued, "for as long as I am in the U.S. Congress, Somalia will never be in danger, its waters will not be stolen by Ethiopia or others. Sleep in comfort knowing I am here to protect the interests of Somalia from inside the U.S. system.";

Whereas, George Washington warned in his Farewell Address of 1796 to "Guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism", and further declared, "Citizens, by birth or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism more than any appellation derived from local discriminations";

Whereas, these statements by Representative OMAR clearly violate the oath she took as an elected Member of Congress to defend and protect the United States Constitution;

Whereas, Representative OMAR has exhibited the treasonous tendencies George Washington warned about, and her actions must be condemned by all Members of Congress who adhere to the oath they took upon assuming office; and

Whereas, by openly admitting her efforts to advance Somalia's interests using her position as a United States Representative, Representative OMAR has revealed herself to be a foreign agent acting on behalf of a foreign government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that—

One, Representative ILHAN OMAR of Minnesota be censured;

Two, Representative ILHAN OMAR forthwith present herself in the well of the House of Representatives for the pronouncement of censure;

Three, Representative ILHAN OMAR be censured with the public reading of this resolution by the Speaker; and

Four, Representative ILHAN OMAR be, and is hereby, removed from the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

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

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

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

WHY I OPPOSED THE TAX BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to say that I was saddened to have to oppose the tax bill that the House of Representatives passed last evening. I could not, in good conscience, vote for a deal that so lopsidedly benefits big corporations while failing to ensure a substantial tax cut to middle and working-class families.

I believe this deal is deeply inequitable, and at a time when we have seen the greatest rise in inequality when big corporations made super profits at the expense of the consumer, it is a mockery of whom representative government works for.

This bill delivers massive tax cuts for the biggest corporations while denying middle-class families the economic security they had under the expanded monthly child tax credit that was passed in 2021.

Let me be unequivocal. This is a reversal of the largest middle class tax cut in the history of the United States. This bill provides billions of dollars in tax relief for the wealthy and pennies for the poor. This expanded and improved child tax credit which we passed in 2021 returns \$8 for every dollar spent.

How?

Because the child tax credit helps children learn more, earn more, and grow up healthier, which is why I find it upsetting and appalling that we would condition a limited extension of this life-altering program with a vast giveaway to billionaires and corporations who are already well practiced in paying no taxes.

DISH Network, FedEx, Salesforce, T-Mobile, and dozens of others—and I will later give you the list of the others, Mr. Speaker—these corporations and dozens of others paid no Federal income tax from 2018 to 2020 under the Trump tax law.

At a time when big corporations are richer than ever, the idea that we must evenly split the pot with working and

middle-class families is absurd, but there is no even split in this bill. It is \$5 for the corporations and \$1 to our children.

Understand, Mr. Speaker, people are calling this an expansion of the child tax credit. It is no expansion of the child tax credit. It is a step backward. That needs to be understood.

When groceries and other costs like childcare have skyrocketed driving record corporate profits of \$3 trillion in 2023, it was families bearing the brunt of inflation and high interest rates.

The expanded monthly child tax credit is an antidote to child poverty, it is an antidote to inflation, and it is a successful tool that lifted millions and millions of children out of poverty virtually overnight. One-half of children in the United States were lifted out of poverty—4 million.

Today, families live paycheck to paycheck. Their wages have not kept up with rising costs, the economy is not working for them, and to our great shame, it is children who will suffer the most.

This bill fails to sufficiently improve the child tax credit. It leaves millions of middle-class families without a tax cut like they received in 2021. It keeps millions of children in preventable poverty because of a policy choice. This bill strips working-class families of the true economic security that was achieved with the expanded monthly child tax credit under the American Rescue Plan.

I understand that no bill that can become law, especially in a divided government like we have today, is going to be perfect or have everything that we want.

I am grateful for the hard work of Representatives NEAL and PELOSI, Senators BENNET, BRAUN, BOOKER, and WYDEN on the bill, and for the Members who spoke out and offered amendments to improve it, Representatives DELBENE, SANCHEZ, and MOORE—Congresswoman MOORE is here today and will speak in short order—and Representative SEWELL and Representative DOGGETT.

An extension of the expanded monthly child tax credit is what our constituents need and deserve. It worked. It worked better than any other Federal program that we have seen. As I said, it lifted one-half of our children out of poverty and lowered the hunger rate in the United States by 26 percent.

We lowered the child poverty rate, and today the rate has gone from 5.2 percent to 12.4 percent, and, yes, working families, middle-class families, and vulnerable families have seen their wages decline as a result of pulling the rug out from under them with the expiration of the child tax credit.

It is the one best thing we can do to improve economic well-being and secure the most vulnerable American families and to bring back the largest middle class tax cut in history. This was a lost opportunity. It leads the way to in 2025 making the Trump tax

credits which benefited the richest one-tenth of 1 percent of the people in this country and the biggest corporations in this country, it leads the way to moving in that direction. It can't go there. We have to stop that, and we have to make sure that we will.

I look forward to continuing that fight to have an expanded and an improved child tax credit that we delivered for all families in 2021.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), who will become the chair of the Education and Labor Committee come 2025.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her longtime commitment to the child tax credit. We know it works, and she has been the most dedicated advocate for the child tax credit that we have in the United States Congress today. I thank ROSA DELAURO.

When congressional Democrats and President Biden enacted the American Rescue Plan in 2021 without a single Republican vote, we prioritized the economic well-being of working families with the expanded monthly child tax credit. The expanded child tax credit under the American Rescue Plan reached 61 million children and reduced child poverty by nearly one-half, lifting nearly 3 or 4 million children out of poverty.

In contrast, this bill is expected to lift only 500,000 children out of poverty when it is fully phased in. So this is not an extension of the child tax credit that we passed in the American Rescue Plan. It is not as generous, it does not help the lowest income families, and unlike the ARP plan, there are no monthly checks. People do not pay their bills once a year. They pay them monthly. So the impact of this program will not nearly be as strong as the former child tax credit that we passed in the American Rescue Plan.

So this deal fails to reinstate the economic gains made for working families, and it fails to come anywhere close to the reduction of child poverty achieved under the American Rescue Plan. While providing only \$33 billion in benefits for children, this bill prioritizes \$185 million in tax cuts for corporations that were included in the 2017 Trump tax scam.

□ 1115

It is overwhelmingly lopsided in favor of big corporations that are already paying historically low tax rates as a result of the Trump tax scam. What is even more egregious is that the bill makes the tax breaks for corporations and businesses retroactive and immediate, while not doing the same for working families. This doesn't make sense from either a budgetary or a public policy perspective, and is a bold display of misplaced priorities.

It is notable that congressional Republicans sanctimoniously complain about the national debt and budget deficits.

Earlier this month, Republicans on the House Budget Committee even passed the so-called Fiscal Commission Act because they were seemingly so concerned about the national debt and claim to want to do something about it, and yet, they consistently abandon all sense of fiscal responsibility when it comes to enacting corporate tax cuts.

In fact, before the bill has even come to the floor, we just passed the tax cut last night costing about \$200 billion that, when fully phased in over 10 years, will cost about \$700 billion over the 10-year period.

Mr. Speaker, ultimately, I voted "no" because this fiscally irresponsible tax deal is too lopsided in favor of corporations and special interests, while failing to provide equivalent support for working families.

Mr. Speaker, I thank ROSA DELAURO for her advocacy for the child tax credit and for families.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia because he is someone who has been an emphatic champion for education and for working people in this country, and as someone who is always at the forefront of what makes sense in terms of providing for the economic security of people in this country, and particularly in children.

Mr. Speaker, he just hit the nail on the head that this is a question of just such gross inequity that is going to be foisted on our families and our children. The people who are standing up and talking about the expansion are just fooling themselves about what this bill is about. They need to take a look at who the beneficiaries are.

Mr. Speaker, I, again, thank Congressman SCOTT for his work now and what he has done in the past and what he will continue to do in the future in this body. I thank him so much for being here.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin, Congresswoman GWEN MOORE, who sits on the Ways and Means Committee. She will talk about her amendment, which was defeated on a party-line vote, but she is someone who is never afraid to stand up and to speak out, and she did so last night on this floor in opposition to this lopsided tax deal.

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ms. DELAURO for putting together this Special Order.

Mr. Speaker, I felt really compelled to come to the floor because 1 minute last night during the tax debate did not seem to be an adequate amount of time to explain why I adamantly opposed the tax bill in its current iteration.

Mr. Speaker, what I have been told is that a half a loaf is just better than no loaf at all; that this tax bill was a compromise, and that somehow as a legislative body and as legislators, we ought to be used to compromising, but I just didn't want to capitulate.

I didn't mind compromising, but I didn't want to capitulate. It wasn't

just that we passed this tax bill that supposedly was an improvement for the child tax credit, but we passed \$600 billion of tax breaks for businesses, which is the job of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know what Members of this body have against poor children. Are we in some sort of Dickensian reality here, like in a novel by Charles Dickens, where 5-year-olds have to go to work to take care of themselves?

Part of what is flawed about the so-called improvement in the child tax credit is that it relegates children's well-being and their ability to get a supplemental income based on their parent's income.

If you are married and you are a stay-at-home mom and your husband makes \$399,000 a year, I am happy that we provide you the full credit because, even at that income level, we ought to recognize the tremendous expense that it is to raise children. We ought to consider the benefits of providing shelter and good food and good nutrition for children, but why is it that those children in that home are more deserving of a supplement than a child who lives in a household where a parent makes less than \$22,000 a year?

Why?

Why is it that this body perceives that the lowest income children living in those households, that their parents need to put in a greater work effort?

Well, I asked the Joint Committee on Taxation to do a little arithmetic for me, so that I could sort of understand the thinking behind what my colleagues were saying. They said people need to work. Children need to see their parents going to work before they just get this welfare money and this free money.

Well, under current law, if a single mom gets out there and gets herself a minimum wage job, doing her part, she is only required under our welfare policy to work 20 hours a week, but if she gets out there and finds herself two minimum wage jobs paying 7.25 an hour and she goes and does Uber or Instacart after she finishes her two part-time jobs, then and only then will she be eligible for the tax credit.

I don't know who takes care of her kids while she is working more than 40 hours per week in order to qualify for the child tax credit. I mean, that is just criminal.

As my colleagues have pointed out, in this same package, we have corporations that are getting stuff like research expensing. I think R&D is a legitimate tax break, but there is research expensing that can hardly be called "research."

We also provide billions of dollars for bonus depreciation, which is really quite wasteful in our economy for companies to be able to buy new equipment year after year after year because they can expense it and write it off. And while they are able to write off their business expenses, we are writing off

millions of children whose parents don't have tax liability.

So companies can have no tax liability, pay no taxes, and get \$600 billion and parents, who have no tax liability, get nothing.

Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin for the purpose of a colloquy.

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. As a refundable tax credit, there are about 61 million children who are able to benefit from this provision, and yet I see through all of the talking points and literature and analyses of this proposal, that we are just supposed to be happy with this half loaf because now 16 million kids and 400,000 more are going to benefit from this proposal.

Is this correct?

Ms. DELAURO. First of all, the point that you have made and that Congressman SCOTT made, these tax breaks for the richest corporations, they are immediate. They are immediate.

The child tax credit, this has to be phased in over a 3-year period of time, and it is a lower number than they had with the original expanded monthly child tax credit, which was \$3,000 for kids between 6 and 17, \$3,600 for kids who are under 6.

It is a lower credit, and then they phase it in in terms of refundability, and the most vulnerable kids are excluded altogether. It is astounding the inequity of all of that.

Now, what we did with the child tax credit, which was in the American Rescue Plan, the monthly credit reached 61 million children.

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Sixty-one million children?

Ms. DELAURO. Yes. There was about 4 million kids lifted out of poverty, almost half the kids in the U.S. lifted out of poverty.

Now, what we are talking about in this tax deal is 400,000 kids they talk about being lifted out of poverty versus 4 million. Plus, the 60 million that is made reference to is some piece of it at some portion in some time during this phase-in, et cetera, will be the beneficiary of a much lower tax credit. In addition to that, what people are saying is that we have expanded the child tax credit.

Folks out there are going to believe that they are going to be getting what they got in 2021, and it is misinformation. It is just about trying to put a veneer on what has been done here in giving the biggest corporations, as Congressman SCOTT pointed out in this 3-year period, \$185 billion versus \$33 billion for the child tax credit.

Give me the facts, and that is what we try to do. That is what we have tried to do in the last weeks since this proposal came out is give people the information, the accurate information about what is here. They are hiding it. They are hiding it. And you know what, as I said, it is an unbelievable missed opportunity.

I have to say this: I was told when we first went forward on the child tax

credit, I wanted it to be permanent. They said we can't do it. We can't afford permanence. I said 5 years. Can't do it. Can't afford it, 5 years. I said 3 years. Can't afford it. I said 1 year, and then they asked me would you support 1 year of expanded monthly child tax credit, and I said yes.

As I mentioned earlier, the most successful Federal program that we have seen coming down the pike that met its mission in lifting kids out of poverty and providing families with economic security, helping them to deal with the cost-of-living effort.

I was also told at that time: Rosa, we do it for a year, it is not going to go away. It is not going to go away. It went away. And the first opportunity that we had to restore the child tax credit, we failed.

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. We pushed more kids into poverty.

Ms. DELAURO. That is right. The kids have gone back into poverty, and it is preventable, as you pointed out. This is preventable poverty. We know the answer and we have refused to take that answer and move forward on it. That is what happened here last night.

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin for the purpose of a colloquy.

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. As you mentioned, I had a proposal, a compromise.

Ms. DELAURO. Your amendment. Go for it.

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. It was a compromise. It was not what I wanted. I wanted a fully refundable tax credit, but I was looking at our current work requirements for this tax credit and I said to myself—even though a work requirement really defies the whole purpose of a child supplement—if we were to compromise and had a work requirement, why would someone, who through no-fault of their own, finds themselves working for \$7.25 an hour; they are subject to rules under our welfare reform protocols, under our TANF legislation, to work 20 hours a week when they have young children.

I had the Joint Committee on Taxation do an analysis and if a woman with two kids worked 20 hours a week, did everything that was expected of her, she still would not qualify for this tax credit.

And if she wanted to get a fully refundable tax credit, she would have to neglect her children in order to do it. She would have to work more than 40 hours, Mr. Speaker, in order to qualify.

That is slavery, you all. I mean, why are we continuing to cling to these old models of financing our economy and deciding that women, who by definition are typically single parents struggling to raise their kids, must work more than 40 hours in order to receive a benefit from their government?

Why is that?

What do they have against these poor children?

Ms. DELAURO. You ask a very relevant question. We have seen Congressman CASAR, Congressman SCOTT, yourself, we have seen it on this floor, the denigration of working families in this country. It is that they don't work. When we talked about the child tax credit, they said: Well, they are not going to go to work, that they are going to spend the money on drugs.

And when we got the data of what happened in that 1 year, we found that women used the money for childcare so that they could go to work; that the money was used to buy food, to pay rent, to buy school supplies, to pay for healthcare, for a mortgage payment.

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. For childcare.

Ms. DELAURO. Childcare was one of the biggest issues, because then it allowed people to go to work.

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. And it incentivized them to work.

Ms. DELAURO. That is right. It is because they wanted to denigrate working folks. They say these corporations and these folks are the richest one-tenth of 1 percent who cut coupons, that is the work. They exercise their fingers with scissors and cut coupons, or the corporations who deal with stock buybacks, that is okay. They are not held accountable, but by God, we are going to put it to people who are trying to make ends meet, trying to deal with the cost of living and inflation today. And that child tax credit helps them do that and we pulled the rug out from under them.

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, my only proposal was to have a more generous phase-in.

If you are going to require people to work, why not allow them to have 40 percent of the credit after the first \$2,500 of income. That way, someone who was working and trying to meet all of the program requirements, a TANF recipient, could go to work and feel some dignity—as they claim that you get—some dignity going to work, making work pay.

They go and do their 20 hours, and they are able to have time to deal with their children and help them with their homework.

□ 1130

They get the earned income tax credit. They are playing by the rules, and all we do is just move the goal post further and further away. Under this bill you cannot work your way out of poverty, and we are going to make sure you stay there.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her comments. You hit all of the points on this. Look, you just said it, children and families with zero to \$2,500 in earnings get nothing—get nothing. Corporations who have avoided any kind of a tax liability get everything that they ask for, and the business community and the corporations put the red lines down, and when we had our red lines, they got blurred, and we walked backward, and

we gave them everything they wanted. We made it retroactive. We said go for it, take it—laying the groundwork for next year. We said we are going to skimp on this child tax credit and make sure that it doesn't reach all of those who need to be reached in order for us to turn poverty around in this country, which we proved that we could do.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASAR), who stood up yesterday on this floor and voted “no” on this tax deal last night. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his interest, for his progressive nature on this stuff, and for all of the issues that face working and middle-class families in this country and make this a more equitable society.

Mr. CASAR. Mr. Speaker, I opposed the tax bill last night. To me it was pretty simple, because whether I am in Austin, Texas, or San Antonio, Texas, whether I am in a group of seniors or with young people, in front of more liberal constituents or conservative ones, one of the most common questions I get asked is: Why is it that I and everyday Americans pay such a higher effective tax rate than some of the biggest corporations in this country?

How is it that FedEx and T-Mobile would pay none, zero, in Federal income tax at all?

And the answer is: Look no further than the bill that we voted to pass last night, which provided tens of billions, if not hundreds of billions, in giveaways in corporate tax breaks.

Importantly, as folks have noted, packaged into the bill is a watered down partial return of the child tax credit, which thankfully, will help thousands of families. But for every dollar going to kids in the bill, \$5 goes to corporations.

So in short, instead of helping thousands of kids, we could have helped millions of kids. We have the money to pull kids out of poverty, to ensure that people in this country are housed, fed, and educated. The money is there. In this case, the money was sitting right there in this bill—just in the wrong people's pockets.

We have to be willing to move the money from corporate pockets over to kids and families. We could provide working-class and middle-class tax cuts. We just have to be willing to fight and negotiate harder to end the giveaways to billionaires.

Mr. Speaker, just like the ranking member, I am open to compromise, but instead of a deal where corporations get \$5 for every \$1 that kids get, what about a compromise where kids get \$5 for every dollar that corporations get?

I oppose this bill because we can do so much better. It is such a missed opportunity. We have to be willing to say no to deals that are so lopsided that workers get crumbs while corporate executives get a full steak dinner.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has made such very good points. It is a missed opportunity. That is the regret in all of this.

Again, I was told that you get it for a year, it is not going to go away. Well, not only did it go away, but it came back as a much watered down proposal. What is equally troubling is the number of people who are out there saying that this is an expansion. It really is doublespeak to the American people. It isn't an expansion. It is moving backward.

The notion that half a loaf is better than none, something is better than nothing; we cannot afford that kind of a philosophy going forward. That is not our job. Our job is to advocate for the American people, for those working families, those middle-class families, those vulnerable families, for children. That is what we should do here. We have that obligation.

When corporate profits have skyrocketed \$3 trillion in 2023, how do we in good conscience say, amen, you get millions and millions of dollars in tax breaks? Your goal is to get to \$600 billion. We cannot draw that line in the sand and say no.

I believe in research and development—we all do—but the inequity that is built into this tax package is stunning. To use the words of my colleague from Wisconsin, it is a capitulation of saying amen, it is okay, and that we will fight another day. No, we had a moment to fight, and we missed that moment.

We are not stopping. We are not stopping.

I heard a lot of people last night say that: well, we will get to it next year, and we will get the child tax credit to where it was. You know, it was not just a mental note. I made a list of the folks who talked about getting us to where we need to be. Time flies. We are going to hold people to their words here.

We heard that it is not ever going to be permanent. Well, we are going to hold you to that, as well. If we are going to make anything permanent, it has to be the child tax credit. It is the antidote to inflation. It allowed families to be able to achieve economic security that they had not seen in a generation because their wages haven't gone up in generations.

That is what is on the minds of people today, how they are going to economically survive. We had that opportunity to give them that help.

I don't put aside helping 400,000 kids, but we could have helped many millions of kids in what we call preventable poverty.

We don't understand what our values are, who we are, why we are privileged to serve in this institution. We can look at public policy in a way that makes a difference for people.

The great Joseph Stiglitz, who is a Nobel laureate in economics, said that inequality is not because of globalization or modernization, but it is the public policy choices that we make.

Last night, this body made a public policy choice to continue the inequality and inequitable advantage that corporations have over their lives, their families' lives, their kids' lives.

That is not the direction we are going in. We will continue the fight that we have started here. This now goes to the United States Senate, and let's just see how we can influence the process there. We will continue until there is a permanent child tax credit.

What is important that has come out of this debate in the last several days is that we have raised the decibel level on a child tax credit, its success, and its future and its future as permanent for this country. We are going to keep it on that front burner, and we are not going to let it go.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman SCOTT of Virginia, Congresswoman GWEN MOORE, and Congressman CASAR for being here this afternoon, and, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1145

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK).

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the service of someone who I believe is one of the best staff members in this institution—Mr. Tim Monahan.

I first met Tim a few years ago during his tenure with the Committee on House Administration. As with me, Tim has left a lasting impression on many here in Congress.

Anyone who has ever met Tim probably remembers their first impression of the Gettysburg neighbor who some refer to as a grizzly with a Philly charm.

As you get to know Tim, you learn just how steadfast, generous, and kind he really is. He is the kind of person who can handle anything that is thrown his way, whether it be big feelings, awkward moments, and even the most outlandish member requests.

Tim first started on the Hill at the Office of the CAO during Speaker Boehner's years where he learned the nuts and bolts of our institution.

Later serving on the Legislative Branch Appropriations Subcommittee, Tim deepened his institutional relationship while ensuring his work was for the greater benefit of the House.

He joined ranking member Rodney Davis at the Committee on House Administration at the beginning of the 116th Congress where his natural leadership skills quickly stood out, and he was soon appointed staff director for the committee.

In 2023, Tim took over the House operations for Speaker Kevin McCarthy where he remained a steady hand during several unprecedented moments, including staying on through the transitions of Speaker pro tempore MCHENRY and now-Speaker MIKE JOHNSON.

So much could be said about Tim's dedication to our institution and the people working here. I could talk about his vital role in reopening the House post-pandemic, his conflict resolution skills, his role in the first House filibuster, his helping Congressman DAVIS carry Representative Wright to safety on January 6, 2021, staffing a historic 15 rounds of votes for the Speaker of the House, his mentorship and leadership for the past 15 years, or his deep, resolute patriotism.

Tim possesses an honor and respect for the halls of Congress that is admired by many. He gets to know and cares about all of those who work within its walls and works hard to ensure that our Capitol remains a functional beacon of our constitutional Republic. Tim's legacy in the House will be his strong character and his servant leadership.

Everyone who knows Tim is better for it. As he prepares to leave the House, our institution is better, thanks to his service.

Tim, we wish you all the best in this next chapter of your life. Hopefully your departure from the House will allow more time with your lovely wife, Marissa; your baby daughter, Marian; and your puppy, Bella.

Some of the staffers you have worked with have had some parting wishes for you. We hope the soup is plentiful in the next cafeteria, the nuts are absent, and that you have more time to listen to JLo and dream of Tiger Woods' comebacks.

Please, they said, if you ever try the grocery store sushi, Pringles, and kombucha combo again, please don't share.

To me, Tim has been not only a great member of the House staff, but he has been a close confidante and a good friend.

He has been instrumental in helping me with some of the greatest moments in my tenure as a Member of Congress, but he has also helped me through some of the most difficult times. Tim Monahan is the gold standard of this institution, and more should aspire to be like him.

Tim, we will miss you. God bless you.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am going to comment on a variety of things. Like always, I like to use this time to bring the Chair's attention to stories that I don't feel our mainstream media is doing an adequate job of covering.

A couple comments before I delve into these five stories. First of all, Congressman LOUDERMILK gave a shout-out to one of his staffers who is leaving.

This will be the final week that Kyle Amato of my office will be working for

me, and I thank him publicly for the great job he does, particularly putting out the newsletters that everyone around the 6th Congressional District of Wisconsin likes.

The second thing I would like to do is I really didn't care for the form of the child tax credit that has been discussed so much today, but I thank the people for putting it together for this one reason.

Normally around here when we pass legislation designed to benefit the children, we leave out the children of what I will call the working middle class.

In other words, if you are hardly working at all, certainly if there is not a man in the house, this institution gives more and more benefits to people of that demographic.

We did something the other day, which is almost unheard of. We extended those benefits to the middle class.

While there are certainly problems with the way it is laid out, if you are a married couple making 120 grand a year and have a couple kids, you are going to get the child credits just as you would if you weren't working at all. Small favors, but I would like to point that out.

Now, the first issue that I don't think has been adequately addressed around here is there has been, I think, misinformation spread on the conflict between Israel and Hamas or Israel and Gaza.

We are supposed to be very sensitive and say Hamas is one group and Gaza is another group; but, in fact, Hamas—at least the polls show—is wildly popular in the West Bank and also, of course, popular in Gaza; and Gaza elected Hamas.

I think too many people feel it is a historical conflict, and, in a way, we heard this in a speech from a prominent American earlier today.

They are kind of treated as two sides of the same coin. In fact, that is not true, and I would like to talk a little bit more about how the people in Gaza should be so lucky, so grateful—realize how lucky and grateful they are that they are living so close to Israel.

There are far too many Americans in general, and congressmen in particular, who define this conflict as between two sides apparently equal or close to equal.

In fact, Gaza has been treated incredibly fairly and generously by Israel. When Gaza was set up as kind of an independent—I don't know what you would call it—principality a while ago, the Israelis removed the Jewish temples from the area despite the fact that in Israel proper, there are 400 Muslim mosques.

In Gaza, Israel felt, well, okay, if they don't want them, they shouldn't have to put up with temples in that area.

Not only that, they physically removed Israelis who were living in Gaza. Maybe you remember this. They physically grabbed and removed them from Gaza to the rest of Israel.