

Appointment:
Congressional Award Board
With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

KEVIN F. MCCUMBER,
Clerk.

APPOINTMENT OF INDIVIDUAL TO LIBRARY OF CONGRESS TRUST FUND BOARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to section 1 of the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board Act (2 U.S.C. 154), and the order of the House of January 3, 2025, of the following individual on the part of the House to the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board for a 5-year term:

Mr. Steven L. Swig, San Francisco, California

APPOINTMENT OF INDIVIDUAL TO COORDINATING COUNCIL ON JU- VENILE JUSTICE AND DELIN- QUENCY PREVENTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to section 206 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (34 U.S.C. 11116), and the order of the House of January 3, 2025, of the following individual on the part of the House to the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention for a 2-year term:

Mr. Julian Whittington, Benton, Louisiana

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 24, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY RELATING TO "ENERGY CON- SERVATION PROGRAM: ENERGY CONSERVATION STANDARDS FOR WALK-IN COOLERS AND WALK-IN FREEZERS"; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 75, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE OFFICE OF ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RE- NEWABLE ENERGY, DEPART- MENT OF ENERGY RELATING TO "ENERGY CONSERVATION PRO- GRAM: ENERGY CONSERVATION STANDARDS FOR COMMERCIAL REFRIGERATORS, FREEZERS, AND REFRIGERATOR-FREEZERS"; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1048, DEFENDING EDU- CATION TRANSPARENCY AND ENDING ROGUE REGIMES EN- GAGING IN NEFARIOUS TRANS- ACTIONS ACT

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, by the direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 242 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 242

Resolved. That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the

House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 24) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Energy relating to "Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Walk-In Coolers and Walk-In Freezers". All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution 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 Energy and Commerce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 75) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy relating to "Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Commercial Refrigerators, Freezers, and Refrigerator-Freezers". All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution 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 Energy and Commerce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1048) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to strengthen disclosure requirements relating to foreign gifts and contracts, to prohibit contracts between institutions of higher education and certain foreign entities and countries of concern, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Workforce or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Workforce now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 119-1 shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and con-

trolled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. 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 one motion to recommit.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE), 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

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, last night the Rules Committee met and produced a rule, House Resolution 242, providing for the House's consideration of several pieces of legislation: H.R. 1048, H.J. Res. 24, and H.J. Res. 75.

The rule provides for consideration of H.J. Res. 24 and H.J. Res. 75 under closed rules. The rule provides each with 1 hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, or their designees. Additionally, the rule provides each a motion to recommit.

Additionally, the rule provides for consideration of H.R. 1048 under a structured rule. The rule provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Education and Workforce or their designees. The rule also provides for one motion to recommit.

The rule before us today provides Congress with another opportunity to take a stand for consumer choice in America and take a stand against our Nation's foreign adversaries who continue to infiltrate colleges and universities across the Nation.

The DETERRENT Act, one of the bills considered under this rule, offers a necessary injection of transparency, accountability, and clarity to foreign gift reporting requirements for colleges and universities. It offers legislative prescriptions that are long overdue.

Under current law, section 117 of the Higher Education Act, colleges and universities must adhere to reporting requirements related to foreign donations. However, many fail to do so because of how weak the current law actually is.

A 2019 Senate report found that up to 70 percent of colleges and universities fail to comply with reporting requirements outlined in section 117 of the Higher Education Act. You heard that right. Up to 70 percent of colleges and universities fail to comply.

The DETERRENT Act updates section 117 to provide the very clarity and guidance that colleges and universities need to ensure they properly disclose foreign sources of funding and remain in compliance. It also adds a set of razor-sharp teeth to current law to hold colleges and universities accountable for failing to comply with section 117. Again, the DETERRENT Act offers legislative prescriptions that are long overdue.

The other two pieces of legislation under consideration via today's rule are two separate Congressional Review Act resolutions: H.J. Res. 24 and H.J. Res. 75. These two CRAs will strike down separate rules from the Department of Energy that were finalized under the Biden administration.

H.J. Res. 24 overturns a wrongheaded midnight rule from the Department of Energy relating to conservation standards for walk-in coolers and walk-in freezers. The Department of Energy issued this final rule a mere 2 days before Christmas last year. This is yet another gift from the Biden administration that nobody asked for.

This midnight rule piles on additional costs to the shoulders of Main Street businesses, while at the very same time takes a hatchet to consumer choice.

□ 1230

H.J. Res. 75 will overturn yet another wrongheaded rule from the Department of Energy related to conservation standards for commercial refrigerators, freezers, and refrigerator-freezers.

Like the previous rule from the Department of Energy that was just discussed, this rule is yet another example of the regulatory barrage that the Biden administration launched against Main Street as well as consumers. Thankfully, the regulatory warfare of the past 4 years is over. Republicans are back in charge.

Mr. Speaker, regulating this country into the ground benefits absolutely no one. It does not benefit Americans and their families. It does not benefit free enterprise and entrepreneurs. It does not benefit small businesses. Nobody wins when the Federal Government goes hog wild with regulations.

These two CRAs that the House will consider under this rule will help us break out the shovels and bury the Department of Energy's rules in the grave. They won't be missed.

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

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina, Chairwoman FOXX, for the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today yet again to expose to the American public the mis-

placed priorities of the House Republican Conference and the Republican majority here in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican majority gaveled us out of session 11 days ago. Here we are back in Washington, D.C. Of course, for us, it feels a lot like "Groundhog Day" because, notwithstanding all the economic turmoil, the conflicts across the globe, the various ways in which this administration is making life harder for the people of Colorado, for folks across our country, notwithstanding all the challenges that our country is grappling with, House Republicans have decided to spend this week debating what? Three bills: walk-in freezers, commercial refrigerators, and giving new responsibilities to a Department, the Department of Education, that they are seeking to dismantle, that they want to abolish. That is what we are debating here today, Mr. Speaker.

I listened to every word of the chairwoman's address outlining every component of the bills that we are considering, but for folks who are watching, for those who have graced us with their presence in the gallery, please understand the three bills: one regulating commercial refrigerators; another regulating walk-in refrigerators; and the third, a bill to give new responsibilities to an agency that they are seeking to destroy. That is it. That is what we are debating this week in Washington, D.C.

If folks in the gallery stay here through the week, that is what you will hear. You will hear a debate today, a debate tomorrow, and a debate on Thursday on those three bills.

I suspect that the folks who are watching this debate, Mr. Speaker, would agree with me that there are better things for us to spend our time on here in Washington, D.C., than debating walk-in refrigerators. Seriously? I don't know, maybe for Madam Chairwoman it is really important to the people of North Carolina. She may have a lot of constituents who have walk-in refrigerators. I don't know.

For me, I can tell you I just spent a week in Colorado, in the rural communities that I represent, hosting townhalls, visiting with folks in my community, constituents, ranchers, farmers, teachers, working families, packed townhalls. At those townhalls, do you know the one subject that no one brought up? Commercial refrigerators. It never came up.

At a townhall that we held 3 days ago with over a thousand people in my community, no one at that townhall approached me and said: "Congressman, can you please go back to Washington and pass legislation on commercial refrigerators? It is really important." Nobody said that.

They are really concerned about the Republicans' plan to gut Medicaid. They are pretty concerned about the Republican plans to dismantle Social Security offices across the country. They are deeply concerned about re-

ports that this administration is going to end phone line customer service for senior citizens who are relying on Social Security. They are pretty concerned about a Secretary of Defense who apparently is sending out war plans on unencrypted messaging apps, putting our national security at risk.

Those are the topics that my constituents care about. Commercial refrigerators is not one of them.

You can tell the frustration, I suppose, Mr. Speaker, in my voice. It is the frustration borne from having to come to the floor every week and debate appliances. Can the Republicans just put all the appliance bills in for consideration for 1 week? We can just do them all and then be done with it, and we can move on to having a debate about defending Medicaid, defending healthcare for the millions of Americans who rely on it. Is that too much to ask?

I just would beg of the chairwoman, I understand this is an important priority to her. It is important to the Republican Conference. We get it. They are obsessed with appliance regulation. After this week, can we please just be done with these appliance resolutions and get back to debating the issues that the American people expect us to debate?

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds Members that the rules do not allow references to persons in the gallery.

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

Mr. Speaker, I spent time last week in my district, too, talking to people. I spend time every weekend talking to the people in my district. Do you know what they complain about the most? Unnecessary rules and regulations.

I met today with folks from the homebuilding industry. They can document that 25 percent of the rules related to homebuilding are unnecessary and drive up the costs of doing business for homes. We need new homes everywhere.

My colleagues are trying to make it look like what we are doing is frivolous. Mr. Speaker, this is far from frivolous. We in Congress are taking back our authority from unnamed, unaccountable bureaucrats who, in the dark of night, write unnecessary rules and regulations that burden the American people and drive up the cost of business and drive up the cost of products.

It is important for us to have further discussion on this critical Congressional Review Act that we are operating under. The Congressional Review Act agenda as a whole is important. My Democratic colleagues are falling into a repeated trap of copying and pasting comments these days. It is true of remarks for rule debate, as well. Every week, they come before this body to complain that we are undoing this or that regulation and that our collective time could be better spent

elsewhere. Well, Republicans beg to differ.

The Congressional Review Act provides the American people the greatest possible say over the endless tide of regulations that always stem from Democratic administrations, and it is one of the greatest keepers of Congress' Article I authority. It is also upsetting in many ways that the Democrats complain we are doing these individual rules when they opposed the Midnight Rules Relief Act, where we could have taken care of these all in one fell swoop.

Let's not forget it was a Democrat, President Clinton, who signed the Congressional Review Act into law on a bipartisan basis, but our colleagues have obviously fallen far from those past overtures of consensus and common sense.

Republicans and President Trump are constantly emphasizing common sense, which is not very common from the other side of the aisle. Many Members of Congress provide lipservice to excessive rules and regulations, but the Congressional Review Act provides Congress the ability to put our money where our mouth is.

The Competitive Enterprise Institute has tabulated that Federal regulations impose a cost of \$1.9 trillion on the economy. This averages out to more than \$14,000 imposed on every American household, a hidden regulatory tax that is eating up American paychecks.

The amount of rules far exceeds statutes by Congress. In 2022 alone, there were more than 3,100 rules issued by agencies compared to 247 laws passed by Congress. Yet, despite these figures, my Democratic colleagues can't seem to muster the courage to find one regulation that they believe is worthy of repeal.

The fact is that we have a very limited window under the Congressional Review Act to expunge these harmful rules, again, written by unnamed, unaccountable bureaucrats. These rules continue to drive up costs for American families and take away consumer choices.

I am so glad that we are taking up these CRA resolutions, ones that would protect consumer choice and competitive prices for freezers, refrigerators, and walk-in coolers.

To my colleagues on the other side, these may seem like small issues to you, but driving up the cost of appliances is a regressive approach that will hurt low-and middle-income Americans the most. Regulating every possible square inch of the economy in the name of your zealous green radicalism may give the coastal elites a sense of accomplishment, but it is doing real harm to Americans.

When the Congressional Review Act window is completed, we are going to be tabulating the cost of these regulations, as well as the votes to repeal them. It may seem like a little bit of cost here and there, but wait until you

see the cumulative price. I hope my colleagues can heed the warning, but if the past is prologue, I won't be holding my breath.

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

□ 1245

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

Mr. Speaker, just to be clear, I am not trying to make their legislation on commercial freezers look frivolous. It is frivolous. The American people understand that. They get it. Maybe there are a lot of people in the chairwoman's district buying commercial freezers. Again, Mr. Speaker, I can assure you it is not the top priority of the people whom I represent in northern Colorado and in western Colorado. It is far from it.

Now, I must say, I did hear with interest the chairwoman reference visiting with her constituents. I would simply say that my understanding was that the chairwoman doesn't do townhalls. I think she recently said in an interview that she doesn't do townhalls because they are an opportunity for constituents to yell at their Congressperson. So I find it of great interest.

I would just encourage the chairwoman and every member of the Republican caucus to do a townhall. They are nothing to be afraid of. It is a great opportunity to visit with our constituents. Perhaps if the gentlewoman would do that, she would come away with the same conclusion that I did, which is that the legislation we are considering today is a waste of time and grossly disproportionate to the priorities of the American people. It is simple.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), who is the ranking member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, today House Republicans are wasting time talking about walk-in freezers and refrigerators. That is what Republicans think is urgent, commercial freezers and refrigerators.

Do you know what I think that is?

I think that is insane. I think it is unhinged. It is not what I am hearing at my townhalls. I have done six townhalls, and thousands of people have shown up. Maybe if Republicans actually held townhalls and listened to people, they would know what the hell is going on right now. People are not worried about commercial walk-in freezers or refrigerators, Mr. Speaker. They are pissed at Elon and his unelected, unappointed bureaucrats for blowing up the Department of Education. That is what they are worried about.

They are demanding resignations because Trump's national security team recklessly mishandled classified information on unsecured phones. They might as well have mailed a copy to the Kremlin, for God's sake.

People are mad as hell that you guys are going to try to kill Social Security.

Mr. Speaker, you can say whatever you want, but that is what Republicans want to do. They want to kill Social Security. That is a fact.

They want to raid Social Security like a piggy bank so Elon can steal people's money and give more tax breaks to billionaires.

I was at a retirement community in my district on Friday, and seniors are scared out of their minds. They are not stupid. They know what is happening. It is crystal clear. They see through all the BS, and they know Elon and Trump are trying to sabotage Social Security so they can start kicking people off.

The Social Security website crashed four times this month. Millions of Americans couldn't log into their accounts. Elon fired so many people that there is nobody to answer the phones at some Social Security offices. The lines keep ringing and ringing and ringing.

We don't even know how long wait times are because, get this, they eliminated the program to track customer satisfaction. Elon is still lying saying that millions and millions of dead people are collecting Social Security checks and calling Social Security a Ponzi scheme.

Mr. Speaker, that is a lie. It is not true, and he knows it is not true. We heard Donald Trump parrot that same propaganda in this Chamber because president Elon told him to and because they want an excuse to cut seniors off of Social Security. These guys are rich and out-of-touch billionaires who just don't get it. They are having champagne and caviar at Mar-a-Lago while senior citizens wait for hours on the phone to talk to somebody.

Trump's Commerce Secretary said that if Social Security didn't send out checks for a month, his 94-year-old mother-in-law would not complain. That is good for her, but he is a billionaire, for God's sake. It must be nice to have one in the family.

Guess what, Mr. Speaker. Most people are not so lucky.

When I talk to seniors, they tell me that one missed Social Security check means going hungry. It means falling behind on rent. It means skipping medications.

People out there can't afford groceries, but Trump's team is telling them to go buy Tesla stock. That is their retirement plan. These people are nuts, Mr. Speaker.

The bottom line is that for Republicans, Social Security is just another thing they can cut to pay for billionaire tax breaks.

Guess what, Elon. We are not letting you get your greedy, grubby, billionaire hands anywhere near Social Security. It is not a handout. It is not a giveaway. It is a benefit that 70 million Americans paid into for their entire lives expecting that it would be there when they needed it. It is a promise, and we are going to fight like hell to

keep that promise for the people who built this country.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I have said it before. They are cutting and pasting and saying the same things over and over again. Fear-mongering is beneath the dignity of this body. That is not what we are here to do.

We have told our colleagues over and over, and they know this, but they refuse to acknowledge it. Nothing we have done this session has touched the sanctity of Social Security, nothing. In fact, President Trump has over and over again said that he will not touch the sanctity of Social Security. I have said that, and our colleagues have said that. We have done nothing.

Putting out false information to the American people is really unfortunate because it does frighten people. However, we have the facts on our side, Mr. Speaker, and the facts are that no bills we passed, the budget bill nor the Trump administration continuing resolution, hurt in any way Social Security, Medicaid, Medicare, or any other program that the Federal Government has a contract with the American people on. It is time for our colleagues to stop saying that.

In fact, Republicans sued over ads that were being run in certain districts last week, and the Democrats had to pull those ads because the court ruled that they were not factual. They were the same kinds of things that are being said on this floor day after day.

Nonetheless, let's get back to the bill at hand: the rule that we are discussing and the underlying bill of that rule.

We have talked in the abstract, but I would like to drill down on the actual problems this bill would address and the specific failures of disclosure that this bill addresses.

A 2019 Senate report found that up to 70 percent of all institutions, these are postsecondary institutions, failed to comply with section 117 and those that do not comply often underreport.

Investigations by the Trump administration discovered that there was \$6.5 billion in previously undisclosed gifts and contributions provided to so-called elite colleges, and this money came from countries that pose serious national security threats to our country.

In 2020, the Department estimated that schools had anonymously accepted \$8.4 billion in foreign money over the past decade.

Let's keep in mind that the Biden administration did not utilize section 117 authorities at all in its 4 years. You heard that correctly, Mr. Speaker. In 4 years, the Biden administration did not enforce section 117. Despite the Trump administration's uncovering and investigating, the Biden administration didn't invoke section 117 at all, not once.

Let's turn to some more recent examples.

In April 2023, the former chair of Harvard University's chemistry and chemical biology department was sentenced to prison for lying about his affiliation with and income from the Wuhan University of Technology in Wuhan, China.

In July 2024, University of Maryland, College Park paid \$500,000 for failing to disclose foreign funding from the Chinese companies of three researchers who simultaneously received Federal grants.

In September 2024, the Research Foundation of the State University of New York paid \$313,574 after a scientist failed to disclose Chinese support.

In December 2024, the University of Delaware paid \$700,000 for not disclosing that a faculty member receiving a NASA grant taught at a Chinese university.

A 2024 joint investigation between the House Select Committee on the Chinese Communist Party and the House Committee on Education and Workforce found 21 joint U.S.-Chinese education institutes. A case study of two such institutes, UC Berkeley and Georgia Institute of Technology, revealed both a lack of proper disclosure under section 117 and research with clear military applications. Just those two schools alone totaled over \$40 million in unreported contracts with China.

Clearly, Congress needs to do more to bring these unreported contracts, gifts, and funding sources of all sorts into the public eye. Taxpayer dollars are going to these universities. The public is owed the facts about where the rest of these funds are coming from.

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

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. NEGUSE. First, I just want to note, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps it is a point of information for your purposes, you admonished the prior speaker, the ranking member, for not making personalities, or rather making personalities against the President. My understanding is the only person he referenced throughout the duration of his speech was Elon Musk. So I am not sure if that was an accident on your part or if that is intentional, and perhaps the Speaker can clarify because I don't believe he referenced President Trump, but apparently you mistook his references to Elon Musk as a reference to the President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is not going to issue an advisory opinion.

Mr. NEGUSE. I would just say, Mr. Speaker, that would be an important thing to clarify in the House moving forward that references to Elon Musk will be treated as references to the President of the United States, which is apparently what the Speaker is doing, that if someone references Elon Musk, that the Chair, that the Speaker

will treat it as though we are referencing the President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not correct on that point.

Mr. NEGUSE. It is perhaps a point of clarification for a future time. I will say this, before yielding some time to the distinguished gentlewoman from New Mexico, the chairwoman made reference to supposed fear-mongering regarding Social Security. It isn't fear-mongering. It is on the front page of The Washington Post.

I will read you the quote: "Elon Musk put a big target on the Social Security Administration in the first weeks of the Trump administration."

So it is not fear-mongering to share on this floor the concerns that have been articulated by our constituents regarding the dismantling of the Social Security Administration that President Trump and his administration is engaged in. It happens to be the truth.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ), who is a member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, we are in a constitutional crisis. President Trump and his co-president Musk apparently are blatantly rejecting the role of the courts while Republicans in Congress are too scared to stand up for their constituents or the Constitution.

When we talk about Social Security, the idea I kept hearing from the other side is: We have done nothing to Social Security.

Yes, they have. Republicans have done nothing to stand up for their constituents who are worried about their Social Security check. They are appropriately worried about their Social Security check because Republicans have done nothing to complain about the executive cutting the workers at the Social Security Administration. Republicans have done nothing to complain about the closing of offices at Social Security or done nothing about the idea that a person can no longer call Social Security. Republicans have done nothing to reject Project 2025 cuts and proposals to cut Social Security.

Social Security is also important, Mr. Speaker, because we are in a cost-of-living crisis. Prices for groceries, food, and housing are rising thanks to Trump's policies and Trump's tariffs.

What are House Republicans doing in response to these crises? Bringing appliance bills, appliance bills which show how out of touch they are with their constituents. These appliance bills, by the way, have consequences. They raise costs. They raise costs so that American small businesses will pay for utilities so that big companies, those big utility companies, can continue racking up more profit.

Republicans seem to always stand with the greediest corporations and not the consumers.

For those few Republicans—not our colleague here—but those few Republicans who are willing to hold town-halls, they are hearing a lot of anger

about Medicaid and Social Security cuts, but not much about refrigerators, are they?

What do they say in Iowa?

In Iowa they said that Trump and Musk are “moving very rapidly toward a dictatorship and an oligarchy.”

This is in Iowa.

In Wyoming, farmers shared with their Representative that Trump’s cuts will limit the resources they need to deal with the devastating impacts of drought.

H.R. 1048 under this rule continues Trump’s and Republicans’ attacks on higher education and the lifesaving and innovative research conducted at our universities. I don’t know why they hate our universities so much, because we already have a law that requires disclosures of foreign gifts. However, this Republican bill will have impossible burdens of reporting to a Department that they want to eliminate.

What are we doing here with a bill that goes to a Department they want to eliminate?

This bill shows how out of touch Republicans are, once again, to Americans’ concerns because a majority of Americans want to keep the Department of Education that funds programs for kids with disabilities, provides student loans, and makes sure poorer schools can hire enough teachers.

□ 1300

If Republicans were truly worried about national security, they would look at how this administration is destroying America’s leadership abroad, from having Signal chats about our national security to everything else they are doing.

I will end with this Mr. Speaker: While Republicans’ billionaire class might not need public schools for their kids, the kids in my district do.

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

Mr. Speaker, give me a break. We are to believe that something printed on the front page of The Washington Post is always true? Mr. Speaker, only 31 percent of the American people have any faith in the print media in this country, and they are very, very wise in that assessment. That is almost as low as the 27 percent of Americans who have faith in the Democratic Party right now.

I would like to clarify something else that was said. It was said that Republicans hate universities or there is a question as to why we hate universities. Mr. Speaker, we don’t hate universities. We just want the universities to be honest, and we want them to be transparent. That is one of the bills we are discussing here today that this rule covers. It is very important that we have transparency throughout our government, and that is what Republicans want.

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

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

I understand the chairwoman apparently now is saying she won’t believe The Washington Post articles. I wonder if she will believe the sentiments of her own colleagues? I believe it was Mr. LAWLER from New York who a week ago was bemoaning online the closure of one of the Social Security offices in his own district.

What are we talking about? These offices are being closed in North Carolina, as well, I believe. This isn’t some fictional, imaginary hypothetical. The Social Security Administration is closing down offices. Wait times are getting longer.

I just would urge my colleague, whom I have great respect for, to visit with her own constituents, and I suspect that they would share the same frustrations that I am articulating here on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 433, the Department of Education Protection Act, which would shield the U.S. Department of Education from efforts to dismantle the agency and ensure that every student receives the education they deserve.

As my colleague Representative LEGER FERNANDEZ already articulated, it makes no sense that Republicans have pushed forward a bill today to give more responsibilities to an agency that they are trying actively to dismantle.

Nonetheless, there is a way forward to save teachers and students and rural schools across the country, including back in Colorado, and that is by ensuring that the Department of Education Protection Act receives a vote here on the House floor.

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 gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. HAYES) to discuss this bill. Mrs. HAYES is the author and the sponsor of this legislation, a former public schoolteacher, and a National Teacher of the Year. She is someone who has spent her life serving the students, the young folks, and the working families of the people of Connecticut.

Mrs. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, last week, the President of the United States signed an executive order to dismantle the Department of Education.

Instead of reaffirming the integrity of the Department of Education or pursuing real plans to explain to parents how services will continue, House Republicans are again fixated on appliances. Today, we are debating eliminating two cost-saving energy regulations and legislation that could hinder

research at institutions of higher education.

It is important to understand what calls for the closure of the Department of Education would mean to local communities.

The Department of Education is responsible for protecting the civil rights of students, exactly what this DETERMENT Act would do. The Department of Education would handle the enforcement. The Department of Education supports students from low-income backgrounds. They develop and prepare educators. They provide resources for English language learners. They collect statistics on enrollment, staffing, and crime in schools and manage the \$1.6 trillion Federal student aid program.

Parents are concerned about disruptions to programs and services that ensure that the 7.5 million children with disabilities and the 49 million students enrolled in K–12 public education will still get the education they deserve.

My legislation, the Department of Education Protection Act, would shield the Department from efforts to dismantle the agency and ensure that every student receives the free and appropriate public education that is mandated by law.

My legislation would prohibit the use of appropriated funds to decentralize, reduce staffing levels, or alter the responsibilities, structure, authority, or functionality of the Department.

The Trump administration has not developed or articulated a clear plan to how these programs would continue their functions without disruption. They keep saying they will return it back to the States. What has been taken from the States, and what are the next steps moving forward?

We need the Department of Education to enforce Federal law and protect the civil rights of students across the country.

I thank the nearly 100 Members of Congress who have already cosponsored my legislation, and I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the previous question so we can bring up my bill, the Department of Education Protection Act.

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman and the gentlewoman seem to believe that the new personnel structure at the Department of Education couldn’t possibly implement this bill, yet our colleagues failed to mention the fact that section 117 investigations weren’t invoked a single time under the Biden administration. What were the people at the section 117 desk doing under President Biden’s watch? They were collecting a check, apparently, or perhaps they were asleep at the switch, which is very fitting for the Biden era.

Mr. Speaker, President Trump has made it clear that the Department of Education will implement the laws that we pass here in Congress until such time as the full transition is made with the Department.

The number of personnel at the Department doesn't really matter if you don't have the political will to carry out the authorities. I know that the people in the Department of Education will carry out these authorities until such time as the Department does not exist, and at that time, whatever laws exist will be implemented by appropriate agencies and departments.

Whatever we do is going to be better than what was done under the Biden administration when this law was never enforced and should have been.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, some of this can get lost in translation, so I will try make this very simple. The gentlewoman, who I respect, wants to abolish the Department of Education. She is unabashed about that. She has voted to close the Department of Education. She supports the President's efforts to dismantle the Department of Education. I presume she supports the President's efforts to reduce the workforce by half. Mr. Speaker, 50 percent of the personnel in the Department of Education are now gone on administrative leave.

Yet, here we are today, debating her bill to create new responsibilities, new requirements, new duties on the very department she seeks to destroy.

What are we doing here?

If they don't want the Department of Education—again, that is their view; they don't want a Federal Department of Education; they are not hiding that—why are we debating a bill to give the Department of Education more power? It is insanity, insanity.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. STANSBURY).

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Speaker, I think "insanity" is a good word for what is happening here on the House floor today. Another good word is "bizarre."

When I go home and I tell my constituents what happens in these Halls, they are amazed. Today is one of those days where I am wondering what the hell are these folks doing. While our economy is in crisis, while groceries and housing are at an all-time high, while our veterans and our firefighters and our teachers are being illegally fired, while Elon Musk is dismantling the U.S. Department of Education, and while the Secretary of Defense is trying to cover up the most incompetent national security leak I have ever heard of in my life, the Republicans in the House are trying to save the American people from the scourge of walk-in cooler and refrigeration efficiency standards.

That is right. We are here wasting precious debate time on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives debating dismantling efficiency standards for walk-in refrigerators. How out of touch are Republicans with the American

people? Like literally, I know Republicans are not holding townhalls and meeting with their constituents anymore, but do they think that the American people voted for them to waste our time on refrigeration standards? That is what they think they were elected to do?

Literally, how out of touch are Republicans? No American voted, no American—I don't care where you are on the ideological spectrum, you did not vote for this. This is ridiculous. It is preposterous and it is just stupid.

Yesterday, it was reported that the Secretary of Defense, the National Security Advisor, and the Vice President leaked war plans to a journalist. This is the same administration that accidentally fired nuclear scientists and engineers who maintain our nuclear stockpile. This is the same administration that is illegally firing Federal employees and dismantling Federal agencies, and they are here running a resolution on refrigerators.

Meanwhile, tomorrow, Republicans are going to hold a hearing and haul NPR and PBS in front of Congress to try to undermine the media just like they did here on this floor just a few moments ago as they are kicking the media out of the Pentagon and the White House because they don't believe in the media anymore.

Well, maybe this is exactly what the end conclusion of dismantling education and American democracy is because this is ridiculous. I will vote "no."

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

Mr. Speaker, I would characterize what we are doing here today as the people's business. We are the people's House. We are here to look after the American people in the best way that we can. We are fulfilling our constitutional duties. Unnamed, unaccountable bureaucrats pass rules and regulations in this city every day that they should not be passing.

Congress gave us the ability to stop them, and my colleagues are complaining that we are wasting time, that it is slow and inefficient to implement the Congressional Review Act. It is slow and inefficient, but we passed a bill called the Midnight Rules Relief Act primarily with Republican votes that would have allowed Congress to dispense with multiple rules and regulations under one bill. That bill is currently in the Senate, and if that would pass and be signed by the President, we could all save time and be much more efficient. We are doing the people's work today.

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

□ 1315

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

Mr. Speaker, I simply echo the sentiments that have been expressed by so many of my colleagues that the policies that Republicans are pursuing here

on the House floor are not the priorities of the American people. I think we all would be far better served if we debated the actual issues of the day, such as the challenges that Representative STANSBURY and so many others described so eloquently.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of discussion about townhalls. I don't quite understand, and perhaps the gentlewoman would be willing to expound upon her opposition and the opposition of so many of my colleagues in the Republican Conference to doing townhalls.

I have held 100 townhalls over the course of the time that I have had the privilege of representing Colorado in the United States Congress. We have held them everywhere in my district. I represent communities and counties that voted for Donald Trump, and I have held townhalls and will continue to hold townhalls in those communities because my obligation is to represent every person in western Colorado and in northern Colorado in the district that I serve.

My job is to be accessible to my constituents regardless of their political beliefs. I understand that Republicans are scared right now to host townhalls because my colleagues on the other side of the aisle know that the policies that the majority is pursuing in Washington are deeply unpopular.

If I spent my week in Washington pushing bills on commercial freezers, I would probably be a little nervous to do a townhall back in my district, too. I get it. I understand where Republicans are coming from. However, maybe the way forward is to spend our time in Washington working on matters of substance. If we do that, I can promise Republicans that their townhalls will go just fine. They will go just fine.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. GOLDMAN).

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE) for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my disappointment that my common-sense amendment to the DETERRENT Act was rejected yesterday in the Rules Committee by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

My amendment would have distinguished between benign donations from friendly democratic countries and donations from potential adversarial, undemocratic states.

My amendment would enact strict oversight on funding from regimes seeking to manipulate students on university campuses and to spread hate, particularly anti-Semitism, on those campuses for their own agendas.

My amendment would have significantly expanded the list of countries whose donations the universities would be required to disclose, including a number of countries not included in the DETERRENT Act that have given

billions and billions of dollars to universities in recent years.

More importantly, my amendment would also require that universities disclose the detailed terms and conditions that they agreed to in return for the foreign donation from this expanded list of countries, critically revealing whether those foreign donations come with strings attached that can foment antidemocratic influences on campuses.

Instead, this bill hampers universities' abilities to engage in important educational programming in conjunction with our democratic allies while failing to confront the real problem of antidemocratic and anti-Semitic foreign influence.

Mr. Speaker, it is a shame that we could not work in a bipartisan way to make this bill better and to address the root issue that both sides of the aisle are trying to address, which is the potential nefarious foreign influence on college campuses from a list of countries far greater than the four countries of concern outlined in the DETERRENT Act.

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

Mr. Speaker, being lectured to about how we feel about anti-Semitism on our side of the aisle is not something that I am used to hearing. It is the Republicans who have led the fight against anti-Semitism on our college campuses.

Mr. Speaker, we did make Democratic amendments in order in this rule. If my colleague had submitted his amendment in a more timely fashion and not just a few minutes before the Rules Committee met yesterday, we would have certainly had a chance to consider it. The deadline for submitting amendments was last Thursday, and that gives us an opportunity to review the amendments to see what can be put in.

Mr. Speaker, I urge our colleagues to follow the rules for deadlines because that is very important for all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I am not really amenable to hearing people criticize us about our response to anti-Semitism when I fight it every day of my life. I am wearing my necklace that I wear every day, which says: "Bring Them Home." I am wearing my yellow ribbon. Being told that I am not sympathetic to fighting anti-Semitism is not something that I take lightly.

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

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I don't know if the gentleman from New York (Mr. GOLDMAN) is still here, but I will relay the substance of the chairwoman's remarks regarding his amendment and the timing of his amendment submission.

Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close. I have only a few minutes of debate left. As the chairwoman said, this is the people's House, a House that I have great reverence for.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might, via the Speaker, make a request to the

chairwoman to engage in a brief colloquy. Perhaps that could provide the viewing public a sense of real debate, as opposed to us just giving speeches.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, we are nearly at the end of this, and I don't believe that we need to have a colloquy. We each have an opportunity for closing comments.

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

Mr. Speaker, with much respect to the gentlewoman, I think that is a shame because I think the American people ought to be able to hear a fair and full exchange of views in an active debate. I think that is far more present when we actually have a colloquy as opposed to just making speeches.

I simply say that the question I was going to pose to the chairwoman is that she has made clear that these three bills, the bill to give more power to the Department of Education that she seeks to dismantle and bills on the regulation standards for refrigerant walk-in freezers and commercial refrigerators, that those bills are very important to the House Republican Conference, that they are a top priority. Interestingly enough, not a single Republican Member of Congress in the last hour that we have had allocated for debate has indulged us with their presence today to come to the floor and extol the virtues of the legislation that Republicans have pursued on commercial refrigerators. I wonder why. It is probably not an accident.

Mr. Speaker, I can't imagine that there are a lot of Republican Members of Congress who wanted to sign up to come do floor debate today on commercial refrigerators. In light of the biggest mishap on a national security front in decades and in light of all of the challenges that our country is facing, debating refrigerators apparently was not something that many of my chairwoman's colleagues wanted to do.

Nonetheless, I am grateful that we have had an opportunity to share with the American public and give them full transparency into how the Republicans have decided to spend their time and their majority here in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure we will proceed with a few more days of debate. I am sure Republicans will pass their bills on commercial freezers and walk-in refrigerators, and then we will be back next week. One can only hope that Republicans will have seen the light by then and that we won't be up for appliance week number 4, 5, 6, or whatever it is now.

Mr. Speaker, if my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would like to actually debate substantive issues, there is an easy way to do it: opposing the previous question and opposing the rule and the underlying bills so that the House can get back to doing the people's work.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, House Republicans are laser focused on governing and advancing legislation that addresses pertinent issues across the Nation. It is unfortunate that our colleagues do not agree that protecting Americans from unnecessary rules and regulations is not something that is important to them.

It is very important to us, and we are following regular order here. The Rules Committee is represented by me, the chair, on this important rule today. That is significant.

The three pieces of legislation that will be considered under the rule that will be debated tomorrow are part of our governing efforts and are in alignment with the mandate that Americans gave us last November.

Shielding consumer choice and combating foreign influence within higher education are issues that Americans care about. We have heard their concerns, and we are addressing them yet again this week.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the previous question, "yes" on the rule, and then, later, "yes" on the bills that will be presented as a result of this rule.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 242 OFFERED BY
MR. NEGUSE OF COLORADO

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 4. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 433) to prohibit funds made available to the Department of Education by previous Appropriations Acts from being used for any activity relating to implementing a reorganization of the Department, 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. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 433.

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

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

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

Mr. NEGUSE. 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.