

excellencies of Him who called you out of darkness into his marvelous light.”

What is the darkness? The darkness is sin. It is what has afflicted mankind since the Garden of Eden, and it causes humans to be self-consumed, rebellious, and foolish. Yet, we should draw near to the Lord and come boldly to his throne in time of need.

Hebrews says: “Let us then with confidence draw near to the throne of grace, that we may receive mercy and find grace to help in time of need.”

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN), my good friend.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I am honored to be able to speak here and that Congresswoman MILLER has yielded me time to talk about Faith Month here.

When our country was founded, John Adams said that our country was made for a moral and religious people and totally unfit for every other kind.

We, therefore, must be especially concerned—and I realize there are many good people who do not go to church—that church attendance has fallen so overwhelmingly in the last 40 years, particularly in the last 20 years. I believe it has fallen 25 percent in a very short period of time.

I think we should be very concerned that the number of people who say that they don't believe in God of any sort has, from the statistics that I have seen in the Gallup poll, gone up by about 9 to 1 over the last 40 years.

Our country will be protected if we turn to God and ask for forgiveness. We will be given the wisdom and the good fortune to make our country the Bible-believing country that it has been through most of our history. We will get back to the moral country that we all envision the United States to be.

However, if we continue to go down the path of rejecting God and just thinking that all the wonderful blessings that we have are going to show up automatically, we will be in deep trouble.

I, like the other speakers tonight, ask the American people to ask for forgiveness and ask for God's wisdom and ask us to make the appropriate decisions that America again become the moral and religious country that John Adams wanted us to be.

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I remind everybody again that our Founding Fathers did not shy away from sharing their faith.

Benjamin Rush, signer of the Declaration of Independence, Surgeon General of the Continental Army, ratifier of the American Constitution, father of American medicine, Treasurer of the U.S. Mint, father of public schools under the Constitution, said: “By renouncing the Bible, philosophers swing from their moorings upon all moral subjects. It is the only correct map of the human heart that ever has been published.”

Daniel Webster said: “The Bible is a book . . . which teaches man his own individual responsibility, his own dignity, and his equality with his fellow man.”

“Whatever makes men good Christians, makes them good citizens.”

“The Christian religion—its general principles—must ever be regarded among us as the foundation of civil society.”

I conclude by saying that I begin almost every morning by reading Psalm 25, and I encourage us as a country to read that and pray over it. I have almost gotten it memorized.

Psalm 25 reads:

“To You, O Lord, I lift up my soul. O my God, in You I trust; let me not be put to shame; let not my enemies exult over me. Indeed, none who wait on You shall be put to shame; they shall be ashamed who are wantonly treacherous. Make me to know Your ways, O Lord; teach me Your paths. Lead me in Your truth and teach me, for You are the God of my salvation; for You, I wait all the day long.”

God's Word unites, and I believe this body would function a lot better if we took a little time each morning to pray and meditate on this Psalm. It is Psalm 25.

What a privilege that we get to share our faith on the floor of the United States House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I thank each of my colleagues for participating in this year's Faith Month Special Order. I especially thank the ladies of Concerned Women for America for their work in sharing their faith across our great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, may God continue to bless our Nation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

ENDING OF DEI PROGRAMS THROUGH EXECUTIVE ORDER

(Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana was recognized for 30 minutes.)

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to talk about something that happened on January 20.

On January 20, the President of the United States took the oath of office at this Capitol. Shortly thereafter, he signed several executive orders.

One executive order was Executive Order No. 14151. That executive order ended all DEI programs. The argument that DEI initiatives constitute reverse discrimination fundamentally misunderstands both the history and the purpose of these programs.

DEI initiatives emerged as thoughtful, evidence-based responses to documented inequities suffered by rural communities, minorities, women, the poor, and the disabled. These programs represent America at its best, acknowledging our Nation's shortcomings and tireless work to overcome them.

The ratification of the 14th Amendment in 1868 codified equal protection as a constitutional principle. Yet,

Americans soon discovered that simply declaring equal protection didn't automatically create it.

The real challenge was in translating these legal guarantees into everyday justice through their implementations. When the landmark Supreme Court decisions in 2023 and 2024 further restricted race-conscious university admissions and workplace policies, they accelerated a retreat from this understanding.

□ 1930

The history of DEI efforts in America is not some partisan agenda. It is part of our Nation's ongoing work to ensure that America's promise extends to every American. In 2025, as we face renewed attacks on these principles, we must renew our commitment to this work.

Let me be clear: Diversity, equity, and inclusion are not about guarantees and preferences; they are about removing barriers. They are not about lowering standards; they are about ensuring that the standards we apply don't inadvertently favor some groups while disadvantaging others who are equally qualified.

When our military, for example, embraced diversity and inclusion, it didn't become weaker. It became the most formidable fighting force in human history.

When our businesses embraced diverse talents and perspectives, they didn't become less competitive. They gained access to broader markets and built the strongest economy in the world.

When our universities created more inclusive learning environments, they didn't sacrifice excellence. Instead, they became global leaders in research and education.

The world is always watching us to see what we will accomplish, but now more than ever before, they are watching us to see who we will become.

I still believe in an America where a child's potential isn't limited to his ZIP Code, the color of his skin, their gender, or other factors beyond their control.

I believe in an America where we can acknowledge our imperfect past while working together toward a more perfect future.

Most of all, I believe in the fundamental goodness and fairness of the American people.

When we move beyond slogans, when we truly see each other as fellow citizens on one shared journey, we find that what unites us is far greater than what divides us.

While the temptation is great, we cannot let this moment divide us. We were never meant to be the divided States. We were created as and have thrived for over 250 years as the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON), the chairman of diversity, equity, and inclusion.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Honorable Congressman

CLEO FIELDS from the Sixth District of the great State of Louisiana for yielding.

I would like to read for you, Mr. Speaker, a speech that the Honorable George W. Bush gave at the inauguration of the African American history museum. I was proud to be in attendance there, and I must say I was not a big fan of the Presidency of Mr. George Bush, but now, looking back over the times from which we have entered, I have to give him credit where credit is due. He gave a speech that day that I wish my Republican colleagues would take the time to listen to, and I will summarize it. Mr. Bush was the person who granted the land rights on behalf of African Americans.

He said: "This museum is an important addition to our country for many reasons. Here are three.

"First, it shows our commitment to truth. A great nation does not hide its history; it faces its flaws and corrects them. This museum tells the truth, that a country founded on the promise of liberty held millions in chains . . . that the price of our Union was America's original sin. From the beginning, some spoke the truth—John Adams called slavery 'an evil of colossal magnitude.' Their voices were not heeded, and often not heard, but they were always known to a power greater than any on Earth, one who loves His children and meant them to be free.

"Second, this museum shows America's capacity to change. For centuries, slavery and segregation seemed permanent parts of our national life—but not to Nat Turner or Frederick Douglass, Harriet Tubman, Rosa Parks, or Martin Luther King, Jr. All answered cruelty with courage and hope. In a society governed by the people, no wrong lasts forever. After struggle and sacrifice, the American people, acting through the most democratic of means, amended the Constitution that originally treated slaves"—Americans that had been enslaved—"as three-fifths of a person to guarantee equal protection of the laws. After decades of struggle, Civil Rights and Voting Rights Acts were finally enacted. Even today, the journey toward justice is still not complete, but this museum will inspire us to go farther and get there faster."

These are the words of George W. Bush.

"And finally, the museum showcases the talent of some of our finest Americans. The galleries celebrate not only African-American equality but African-American greatness. I can't help but note that a huge influence in my teenage years is honored here, the great Chuck Berry; or my baseball idol growing up in far West Texas, the great Willie Mays; and of course, something I never really mastered, the ability to give a good speech, but Thurgood Marshall sure could."

He concludes by saying: "Our country is better and more vibrant because of their contributions and the contributions of millions of African Amer-

icans. No telling of American history is neither complete nor accurate without acknowledging them. The lesson of this museum is that all Americans share a past and a future. By staying true to our principles, righting injustice, and encouraging the empowerment of all, we will be an even greater nation for generations to come. I congratulate all those who played a role in creating this wonderful museum."

These are the words of George W. Bush.

I thank Mr. Bush for having helped erect that magnificent museum now that the current administration is trying to take out its materials.

Earlier today, I wished Mr. Hegseth, our Secretary of Defense, could have shown the honor and the decency to come into the Capitol Visitor Center to acknowledge the women of Six Triple Eight. There, Speaker JOHNSON was present, and the leader of the Senate, Mr. THUNE, but notably absent was our Secretary of Defense.

Someone made the remarks, Mr. Speaker, today that people were hidden, there were hidden figures in American history. I know the message that they are sending, referring to the movie "Hidden Figures," the African-American women who did the math to put man on the moon but somehow were unceremoniously removed from all the accolades and all the parades, these women who were called human calculators. It came to my mind that they are really not hidden. Hidden is to be made inconvenient to the dominant narrative, shuffled to the footnotes or left on the cutting room floor of America's memory. It is dishonest, yes, but it leaves room for some discovery.

Erasure is more sinister. Erasure says that we were never here. Erasure digs into the archives with red ink and crosses out our lives, achievements, and sufferings. The women in Six Triple Eight have suffered erasure. It removes their names from the rolls and gravestones from the earth. It doesn't just forget. It forbids remembering.

These 885 women who put together 17 million pieces of mail that kept the morale of our troops high were given no recognition until today, after 80 years. I thank Speaker JOHNSON and Leader THUNE for their contribution.

When we talk about erasure, ask the descendants of Tulsa's Greenwood District, who for decades lived with silence where there should have been national mourning, and ask the generations denied their roots by a system that said their past wasn't worth recording.

We see it now in the battles over school curriculum, in sanitized histories where the enslaved become mere workers and civil rights are a footnote to a fabled color-blind dream.

When we allow erasure to masquerade as reform, we not only assault those who live the truth but endanger the consciousness of a nation already prone to moral amnesia.

To hide history is cowardice, I would say. To erase it is cruelty. America

must choose neither because when we forget what we were, we forfeit the right to know who we are.

Mr. Speaker, we are addressing the issue today of diversity, equity, and inclusion. I would like to speak on this matter because it is an urgent matter, one that touches the very soul of our Nation's promise and its founding ideals of equality, justice, and the pursuit of liberty.

We are at a crossroads, a critical juncture where the direction we choose will define the future of this Nation. I speak today about the persistent and harmful attacks on diversity, equity, and inclusion policies and how these attacks, particularly under the leadership of the President of the United States, are undermining the values upon which this Nation was built.

More profoundly, these attacks are not merely political, but they represent a direct assault on civil rights. Specifically, they started by targeting African Americans, and they threaten to undo the hard-fought progress that has been made over generations.

DEI, at its core, is not just a set of policies but an embodiment of American values, values that ensure every citizen, regardless of race, gender, or background, has the opportunity to thrive.

It reflects the notion that our strength as a nation lies in our diversity, that our success is drawn from the breadth of our collective experiences, and that our unity can be found not in the erasure of differences but in the celebration of them. Today, this fundamental belief is under siege.

When President Trump and his allies launched their attacks on DEI, they were not merely engaging in political rhetoric. They were dismantling policies designed to correct historical inequities and promote a more just and inclusive society.

These efforts, cloaked in the language of "merit" and "individual responsibility," are, in fact, a thinly veiled attempt to perpetuate a system that continues to privilege a select few while marginalizing the very communities that have fought the hardest for their rightful place in the American story. The deep scars of racism and inequality are not erased by wishful thinking or by policies that deny their existence.

The attack on DEI is an attack on civil rights, the idea of an egalitarian democracy, and the constitutional ideals that undergird the very idea of America.

This rhetoric is dangerous because it fundamentally misrepresents the mission of DEI and, in doing so, misrepresents the broadest civil rights movement that has shaped this Nation. It was, after all, the civil rights movement that won the battles to dismantle segregation, that fought for voting rights, and that created the foundation of a more inclusive society. The very principles of DEI stem from these victories.

When we attack diversity, equity, and inclusion, we erode the gains made through blood, sweat, and tears from the marches in Selma to the legislative victories in the sixties, seventies, eighties, nineties, and beyond.

To push to eliminate DEI policies is a dangerous step backward in this ongoing fight for justice and equality. It is no accident that this movement to undermine DEI coincides with the resurgence of racism and hatred, and this rhetoric and these policies are un-American.

These policies also coincide with the banning of books. I ask, when does a society move forward banning books? When we talk about restraining freedoms on women's bodies, when has that ever been good for society?

□ 1945

We talk about xenophobia when most people in this country have come from other lands. It is as if society has never moved forward. It is not a coincidence when I tell you, under the guise of fairness and colorblindness, these policies have disproportionately harmed the African American and the marginalized communities all while maintaining a status quo that favors the privileged few.

While it is true that the Black community created the pathway that led to greater diversity in America, the reality is that Black people are not the only community that benefits from it. Women are a part of DEI. Veterans are a part of DEI. People with different abilities are a part of DEI. American workers are a part of DEI. Even women and families that need IVF, in vitro fertilization to build strong American families, are all communities that benefit from DEI initiatives.

Here is a news flash: Diversity does not mean Black. Diversity can mean making sure people who use wheelchairs are not discriminated against and get equal consideration for housing and employment opportunities. It can mean making sure that senior citizens have the same protection as young people. To say nothing of the fact that ensuring the right of young people to be in leadership is what diversity and inclusion is all about.

The move to get rid of these policies is not theoretical; they are real. They are felt and they have consequences. Take, for example, the recent span of book bans across the Nation, particularly those targeting African-American authors, targeting our history, and targeting our lived experiences. Books like "The Hate U Give" by Angie Thomas, "Beloved" by Toni Morrison, "Between the World and Me" by Ta-Nehisi Coates have been removed from classrooms and libraries not because of their literary merit but because of the discomfort they cause to those who wish to ignore the brutal realities of race in America.

These bans are not merely an affront to academic freedom; they are an assault on Black identity and an attempt

to stifle the critical conversations necessary for a truly inclusive society.

Moreover, the policies that aim to ban discussions of race and racism in the classroom directly undermine the very spirit of education. It is no secret that Black students—especially those attending public schools in underserved communities—are already facing systemic barriers to educational opportunities. When DEI programs are eliminated, when history is whitewashed, and when Black experiences are rendered invisible, the message sent to our children is clear: Your history, your experience, and your potential does not matter.

These policies contribute to a culture of exclusion, a culture that denies the very existence of our humanity as a people, and by extension, the humanity of all people.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, one of the problems I think that many people have with DEI programs—which is one of the same problems they had with affirmative action, if you recall—they viewed it as two parallel lines, where you took a person who was less qualified and you elevated him to the level of somebody who was more qualified.

That is not DEI. That was not affirmative action. Instead, people should look at it as a circle and every single person within the circle are all qualified to do the job, but there is just one single problem: There are folks in the circle, although they are qualified, they never get chosen. There are women in the circle who never get chosen simply because they are female. Hispanics, Blacks in the circle don't get chosen simply because of the color of their skin. People need to view it as: Everybody in the circle is qualified, but DEI comes in and grabs people who are not chosen only because of the color of their skin or because of their sex.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I find it interesting when we started this conversation about diversity, equity, and inclusion, I invited some of my other colleagues to participate. One person asked me: Is it legal for you to discuss DEI, diversity, equity, and inclusion?

As coequal branches of government, we do not work for the DOGE. We do not work for the Presidency. We fundamentally disagree with the way the Nation is going under the Presidency. Mr. Pete Hegseth, our Secretary of Defense, needs to understand, if he would take the time to read it, that diversity is legal according to the United States Supreme Court in the Students for Fair Admissions.

Mr. Speaker, the generals that have written the amicus brief said: "Growing and maintaining a highly qualified, diverse officer corps remains a U.S. national security imperative."

We had discussed this at one point. Further on, they go on to say: "The

U.S. military's commitment to diverse and inclusive leadership derives from decades of experience." This is exponential.

"The U.S. military's international presence and engagement abroad with foreign military and civilians requires diversity in this officers corps."

In part C, they say: "U.S. military diversity initiatives have led to significant progress in growing a highly qualified and racially diverse officer corps, but this work must continue."

"Invalidating universities' modest race-conscious admissions policies would seriously impair the military's efforts to maintain cohesion and effectiveness."

Mr. Speaker, Members can read the entirety of the amicus brief at the following link: <https://www.harvard.edu/admissionscase/wp-content/uploads/sites/6/2022/08/Amicus-Brief-Military-Brief72.pdf>.

When they say they are anti-DEI and then they take down the statues and remove the gravestones of Jackie Robinson, that does not help with military cohesion. If there is one of our colleagues that is watching us in the Chamber, we invite you down so we can have a debate, a discussion on DEI and stop the polarization and racializing this. They find it okay.

Mr. Pete Hegseth finds it okay to resurrect the name of Ku Klux Klansman General Bragg, Fort Bragg, but yet you take down the name of Jackie Robinson. And you are not done with improper ideology? Then you resurrect the names of so many others. There are six military bases that have some of these Confederate generals on there, but then you take down the names of Medgar Evers and Harriet Tubman? That is shameful and hypocritical.

Diversity makes the Nation stronger. Being committed to truth and justice about our paths only serves as a benefit. It doesn't take anything away. The false narrative that people are unqualified simply is not true. We know from these Halls of Congress right here that people whose parents have been here before can teach their children how to run for office, how to raise the funds, and you will see children of those that have been in power following in that tradition.

We are talking about creating an on-ramp for greater inclusiveness, for greater cohesion amongst the troops. Lastly, if it is good enough for the war room, isn't it good enough for the boardroom and classroom?

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

What is interesting is when the President signed that executive order to do away with three words: diversity, equity, and inclusion, it sent universities in a tailspin. They didn't know what to do. In fact, the President himself ended a program—and I am glad the gentleman from Illinois serves on the Agriculture Committee. I am glad that you and others wrote letters and he restored the program that gave

young scholars scholarships to go to college, 1890 universities. He said that it was a DEI program, and then later he reversed it. It was a program where these kids had to score high scores on the ACT in order to qualify. They had to have high GPAs.

Not to mention the impact it has had on businesses. There are businesses that have ended their DEI programs simply because of that executive order.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, if I could jump in on that for just a moment.

These are voluntary programs. These are aspirational programs, as you have shared with me. There is no DEI law. No DEI law has been passed by the Congress. How can you outlaw something that never was a law?

When we go into the Senate, just at the other end of this Chamber, you see “E Pluribus unum” over the Speaker, which means “out of many, one.” That is the call for diversity.

When we talk about equality in the 14th Amendment, equal protection under the law, we only had that once the Nation could confront its history and tell the truth. We wouldn’t have had to have the 13th Amendment abolishing slavery, and the 14th Amendment that was meant for equal protection for those Americans that had been enslaved for 246 years from 1619 to 1865. And it was 346 years from 1619 to 1965 before the Voting Rights Act was even passed. Then the 15th Amendment came around to make sure that everyone had equal access to the ballot, and that wasn’t fully enacted until 1965.

Yes, this has been a long journey and we cannot be cowards and not confront the history and the truth of our past.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON).

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman FIELDS for the privilege of standing here beside him. I thank him for his commitment to justice, for his commitment to the American way, and I thank him for making America better.

His case right now before the United States Supreme Court, *Louisiana v. Callais*, is taking into account, once again, the maxim of equal protection under the law. We want to make sure that America stays strong and America gets better.

I tell those that say “Make America Great Again,” I tell them that this is the greatest America has ever been. This body now has more female Senators, has more people of ethnicities, more diversity, and I am proud of the culture that this great country has.

I hope other people would step forward to find the courage to come and join us on this floor so we can have a conversation.

Do not live in fear of the President primarizing you. Do not live in fear of

the President taking words out of your mouth. You can be a major law firm. Don’t lose the ink in your pen because you have fear. You can be a major university. Don’t give up your academic freedom because of fear. You have a major corporation. You have the right to align yourself with the interests of your shareholders and the interests of your future marketplace. Hold on to the DEI.

Members of this body, as coequal branches of government and the United States, fundamentally disagree with President Donald J. Trump.

Mr. Speaker, I want Mr. Pete Hegseth to know that diversity is legal in the United States military. Colin Powell was an affirmative action general. We should tell the truth about it. He came through under the Carter administration.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman FIELDS for this Special Order.

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

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Kevin F. McCumber, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly an enrolled joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 20. Joint Resolution 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 Consumer Gas-Fired Instantaneous Water Heaters”.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

S.J. Res. 18.—A joint resolution disapproving the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to “Overdraft Lending: Very Large Financial Institutions”.

S.J. Res. 28.—A joint resolution disapproving the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to “Defining Larger Participants of a Market for General-Use Digital Consumer Payment Applications”.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o’clock and 57 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 30, 2025, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker’s table and referred as follows:

EC-812. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation,

transmitting the Corporation’s 2024 Merger Decisions Report; to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC-813. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation’s final rule — Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing Benefits received April 17, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

EC-814. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department’s temporary rule — Third Temporary Extension of COVID-19 Telemedicine Flexibilities for Prescription of Controlled Medications [Docket No.: DEA-407] (RIN: 1117-AB40, 1117-AB78, and 1117-ZA06) received April 24, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-815. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department’s final amendment — Schedules of Controlled Substances: Placement of Etodesnitazene, N-Pyrrolidino Etonitazene, and Protonitazene in Schedule I [Docket No.: DEA-900] received April 24, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-816. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department’s final amendment — Schedules of Controlled Substances: Placement of 2-Methyl AP-237 in Schedule I [Docket No.: DEA-1245] received April 24, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-817. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department’s temporary amendment — Schedules of Controlled Substances: Temporary Placement of N-Desethyl Isotonitazene and N-Piperidinyl Etonitazene in Schedule I [Docket No.: DEA-1143] received April 24, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-818. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Schedules of Controlled Substances: Placement of Zuranolone in Schedule IV [Docket No.: DEA1258] received April 24, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-819. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Schedules of Controlled Substances: Placement of Ethylphenidate in Schedule I [Docket No.: DEA-1142] received April 24, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-820. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Schedules of Controlled