

includes \$330 billion in cuts. Pell grants, school lunches, Head Start, and everything are on the chopping block.

In my district, we have L.A. Unified School District. For many of the kids who go to school, their only meal is when they go to school.

I am trying to figure out when folks say that they are Christian, what kind of Bible are they using? That is because the Bible that I have, Mr. Speaker, doesn't say that you starve children, that you cut off their healthcare, and that you cut off the healthcare for their grandparents.

Mr. Speaker, if your Bible says that, then I submit that maybe you change your Bible. That is because that is unchristianlike to kill seniors and children.

Let's talk about rolling back bedrock civil rights-era policies that are designed to actually allow everyone the opportunity to compete and participate in this marketplace. It is not about giving handouts. It is about creating opportunity. It is about creating access to competition.

Mr. Speaker, why would you be afraid of that unless you are mediocre, less than average, and need extra help because you can't compete?

Well, don't come for Black America. Fix yourself.

Let's talk about the workers who are the backbone of our economy, the workers who run this government. I am always surprised when folks are talking about unelected bureaucrats. Elon Musk is an unelected bureaucrat. Keep it real. All the staff who help us do our jobs and help our constituents are unelected bureaucrats, and the majority are actually Republicans. The administration wants to cut the salaries that allow folks to answer the phones for our constituents.

California has the second highest number of Federal workers.

Why are the Republicans going to cut that?

Mr. Speaker, might I remind you that we have the Olympics coming, we have the FIFA World Cup coming, we have the All-Star Game, and Super Bowl coming, and we are still producing movies and TV. We are helping people with their passports and their visas. If Republicans want all these games to be successful, then they have to resource the departments that process the visas and applications that allow people to come here. So let's keep it real.

Mr. Speaker, if you want to talk about housing, this administration is proposing to terminate section 8, cutting rental aid and evicting 32,000 families from their homes. This President even refused to come to Altadena after the urban fires. That is how little this administration thinks about Black communities.

This administration is not interested in Black America, even though this administration wanted to thank Black America.

What kind of thanks is that when they cut funding to HBCUs, when they

cut Medicaid, Medicare, and Social Security, and when they cut Meals on Wheels and SNAP?

We are going to make America hungry again. We are going to make America sick again. I have a binder full of actions from this administration that have come out of this administration in just the last 100 days. They are terrifying. Not only are they terrifying for Black America, but they are terrifying for all America.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to happily close out this CBC Special Order hour and remind America that we will be back again next week with more information, more receipts, and more truth.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my co-lead, Congresswoman SHONTEL BROWN from the great State of Ohio, and all the members of the Congressional Black Caucus who spoke tonight, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

REPUBLICAN TAX CUTS

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to start today with some good news. I think it is fantastic that the Golden State Warriors played an incredible basketball game last night and brought them to victory over the Rockets out of Texas and are going to advance onto the next round of the basketball playoffs. So I congratulate the Dubs.

Sadly, that is where the good news ends. What we are going to talk about for the rest of this evening is some bad news, bad for the American people.

The Republican plan to extend the Trump tax cuts for billionaire donors like Elon Musk is a bad deal for the American people.

During this Special Order, we are going to lay out exactly how reckless this Republican plan is to extend the Republican Trump tax cuts. An extension of the Republican Trump tax cuts would disproportionately benefit those who need it the least, would recklessly increase our Nation's deficits, and it fails to prioritize hardworking Americans' contributions.

Republican tax cuts get our priorities exactly backwards. When Democrats passed tax cuts, we focused on who needed the help the most. The tax cuts that Democrats passed and that Presi-

dent Biden signed into law were some of the most significant middle-class tax cuts we have seen in a generation.

In 2021, our expanded child tax credit nearly cut child poverty in our country in half. We also made historic expansions to both the earned income tax credit and the dependent care credit which dramatically cut child poverty. In other words, when Democrats do tax cuts, we focus those tax cuts on those who need it the most.

The Republicans on the other hand are looking to extend tax cuts that are overwhelmingly tilted to benefit those who need it the least.

Under the Republican tax bill, a taxpayer who makes \$1 million or more saw an average tax cut of \$79,000, where a taxpayer making \$50,000 only saw about \$270 in tax cuts. Putting this another way, for every dollar they are giving to the average working person, they are handing \$288 to a person making over \$1 million every year.

Let me be clear about that statistic. I am not talking about a millionaire, not someone who is sitting on a house and a 401(k) that they have worked for and saved for for 30 years to hit \$1 million. This is what they are giving to someone who makes \$1 million every year.

Now, I don't know how you feel, Mr. Speaker, but I don't think people who are making \$1 million a year are the ones who need a helping hand in this economy.

Now, suffice it to say, we have made this point once or twice before, and every time we do we get the same response from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. They say: People who make over \$1 million pay a lot in taxes, so, of course, they get a bigger tax cut.

However, that argument is full of prunes. Let's be clear. Congress is perfectly capable of cutting taxes for working people without also cutting taxes for those at the top.

That is right. Believe it or not, Mr. Speaker, you can lower the tax rates at the bottom without also lowering the tax rates at the top.

In fact, last year, the Treasury Department did a study. They looked at how much it would cost to extend the Republican Trump tax cuts so that everyone making under \$400,000 a year was held harmless. There was no impact on the bottom 98 percent of the income distribution.

How much did it cost?

They said it would cost \$1.8 trillion. Now, that is not pocket change. We all know that, but it is a heck of a lot less than the recent Joint Committee on Taxation estimate of \$4.6 trillion that it will cost to extend the Republican Trump tax cuts that favor those who don't need any help.

□ 2030

The thing is, if Republicans would be willing to abandon their goal of cutting taxes for the most fortunate, if they would genuinely focus on the middle

class and focus on offsetting those tax cuts in a responsible, deficit-neutral manner, I bet they could get a lot of colleagues on my side of the aisle to join them in that effort.

Instead, they have embarked on a go-it-alone strategy, and go it alone they will. As long as their goal is to reward their big donors with massive tax cuts while leaving working people behind, they can go it alone.

Someone who knows the impact that these tax cuts have had on taxpayers across our country, the negative impact they have had on working people across our country; someone who knows well how these Republican tax cuts stole from people who live in high-cost areas their ability to deduct their State and local taxes, costing constituents in those areas thousands and thousands of dollars a year; someone who knows well what that is and has been working tirelessly ever since they did that, ever since they foisted that tax increase on people in high-cost-of-living areas; and someone who has been working on it ever since they did it, trying to work with people on both sides of the aisle to figure out how to resolve the State and local tax deduction is my colleague, TOM SUOZZI from New York. He is a great Member and a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SUOZZI).

Mr. SUOZZI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for bringing attention to this important issue.

I am going to talk about the State and local tax deduction in some detail, but first let me just say generally that what we are talking about is so important. We have so many of our friends on the other side of the aisle who are constantly talking about how the government spends too much money and how deficits are getting so much bigger.

Here, under their tax bill that they are proposing right now, they are going to increase the deficit in the United States by \$4.5 trillion. Now, that doesn't make any sense. Why would they propose something when they have people on their side who their singular most important issue is reducing the deficit, but they would increase the deficit by \$4.5 trillion?

Now, my colleague talked about the tax cuts from 2017, well, a lot of my residents didn't see a tax deduction. They saw a tax increase. The reason they saw a tax increase is because they capped the State and local tax deduction at \$10,000.

Let me just explain what the State and local tax deduction is. The State and local tax deduction was in place for 100 years, from 1913 until 2017. In 1930, they started the Federal income tax code in the United States of America. When they said we are going to tax people's income at the Federal level, a lot of Governors, mayors, and local elected officials said, no, they don't

want a Federal income tax because that will stop them from raising the taxes at the State and local level. Since America's founding, government was mainly paid for at the State and local level through State and local taxes. The Federal Government was funded by tariffs, quite frankly, a very interesting topic for today.

When the mayors and Governors protested, they said: We don't want to have a Federal income tax because you are going to hurt us. We don't want to pay taxes on the taxes we have already paid at the State and local level.

The Federal Government said: Don't worry about it. We will put a deduction in place that says you can deduct your State and local taxes from your income, so you don't have to pay taxes on the taxes you have already paid.

Okay, let's do that. They put it in place for 100 years.

In 2017, they said we are going to cap this deduction that has been in place for over 100 years at \$10,000. They took the long arm of the Federal Government and reached into local governments. They violated the covenant of federalism, and they said: We are going to make you pay taxes on the taxes you have already paid to your States, to your cities, to your towns, to your villages, to your school districts. We are going to tax you on the money you have already paid in taxes at the State and local levels.

That caused some people's taxes to go up, especially in high-tax States that happen to be Democratic States, such as in New York, New Jersey, California, Connecticut, Illinois, Massachusetts, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Rhode Island, and Hawaii. They caused people's taxes to go up because they could no longer deduct their State and local taxes.

It is not fair. In fact, people have moved away from our States to other lower tax States.

Why are taxes higher in my State and in your State compared to, say, Florida and Texas? They are higher because in New York State and in California, we insure our children. We have the lowest rates of uninsured children in the United States of America and the lowest rates of uninsured adults in the United States of America, whereas Florida and Texas have the highest rates of uninsured children and uninsured adults.

Our taxes are higher in our States because we pay our teachers, police officers, firefighters, and other public workers in public employee unions and other union workers higher wages. They don't like unions in Florida, Texas, and other low-tax States.

It is not fair that in States like mine and yours, Mr. THOMPSON, and other Democratic States, we are net donors to the Federal Government. We send more money to the Federal Government than we get back.

A lot of our colleagues criticize our States. They say it is so ineffective the

way we are running our States. Why is it that we are doing so well economically that we are the biggest net donors to the Federal Government? We send more money to the Federal Government in income taxes than we get back in Federal contracts and Federal programs.

In fact, most of the red States in the United States of America are net takers, and most of the blue States are net donors, so it is not fair. It is very different from State to State in our country, but in my State, for example, and in Mr. THOMPSON's State, similarly, if you have a teacher and a police officer who are married, their income could be over \$150,000, \$200,000 a year. In our States, because the taxes are higher, because the cost of living is higher, the cost of housing is higher, so that \$150,000 to \$200,000 a year is not a wealthy person. That is a middle-class person.

I talked to a friend of mine from Oklahoma, and I told him that person making \$150,000 between the husband and wife is middle class. They said: \$150,000 a year? If they lived in my State, they would be living in a gated community. They would belong to the country club.

That is not what it is like. It is different from place to place.

We set up these different State and city governments throughout our country to be laboratories of democracy, to run their States and their cities the way they see fit, to tax them as they see fit, and the one way that they used the Federal income tax code to move forward was to have a State and local tax deduction that was ripped away from them in 2017.

Some of my colleagues on the Republican side have said they will not support this new tax bill unless we restore the State and local tax deduction. We would like to see a complete repeal of the cap. We would like to have you be able to claim all of your State and local taxes. We passed it three times when the Democrats were in charge. We passed it once, complete repeal; twice, complete repeal; third time, \$80,000 cap.

Some Republicans have proposed a cap of \$25,000. Five Republicans have stood up and said \$25,000 is not acceptable. I want to commend them for standing up for their residents and taxpayers against their party and saying they will not support this bill.

President Trump came to my State, actually right near my district in Nassau County, where I used to be the county executive. He spoke at a campaign rally in the summer of 2024, and he said we have to restore the State and local tax deduction. Now, he is the one who took it away. He said that we have to restore the State and local tax deduction. Well, let's hold the President to that.

Let's commend our five colleagues who are standing up against their party to say they want to raise the State and local tax deduction.

Let's be fair to these middle-class families. Let's be fair to these States. Let's be fair to these mayors, Governors, and county executives. Let's be fair to our firefighters and teachers. Let's be fair to make sure that these States that are net donors to the Federal Government are treated with the proper respect and dignity that they deserved throughout America's history and stop penalizing them for trying to serve their residents the best way they can.

Again, I appreciate the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the passion he brings to this issue. I know how much work he has put into it.

I want to add a couple of things on the SALT topic.

One, as I think the gentleman remembers, when this was happening, my subcommittee held hearings on SALT. We brought witnesses in from a number of different States, not all blue States. Blue States are the ones that are generally recognized as being most harmed by this terrible tax policy that the Republicans put on us.

What we saw in those hearings were red States are quickly catching up. This is catching red State taxpayers as well, and it is hurting them just like it is hurting taxpayers in blue States.

I want to mention that the gentleman talked about our Republican colleagues who are talking a good game about how they won't vote for this, that, and the other thing unless SALT is taken care of. Well, SALT goes back to what it used to be if we don't do anything, so that is where we could end up if this foolish tax bill that is being pushed on the American people right now were to go away. We get our SALT deduction back.

I certainly hope that the colleagues that the gentleman mentioned are going to hold to their word and work with us to see if we can fix that.

The gentleman is spot on regarding donor States like his State and my State. We give more money to the Federal Government than we get back.

Just to demonstrate how big that is, in my State of California, if you deduct the money that we get back from the Federal Government from all the money that California taxpayers send to the Federal Government, what is left, what stays in Washington to go out to all the red States, is more than the entire State budget of 47 other States.

To say that we represent donor States, that is almost a throw-away line. We are paying the freight for all the States that are voting in a way that is hurting the American taxpayer. It is inexcusable. It is inexcusable that my Republican colleagues are looking to enact these tax cuts at the expense of the American people, including cutting up to \$880 billion from Medicaid over the next 10 years.

Nearly 1 in 4 Americans, or 80 million American people, are covered by Med-

icaid. These cuts that the Republicans are promoting mean that our neighbors will struggle to afford to see a doctor, struggle to pay for medication, or won't have access to nursing home services if they need it.

For over 60 years, Medicaid has been a lifeline for people with low incomes and for people with disabilities so they could have access to healthcare. Already, we are seeing rural hospitals struggling and not just in my district. Rural hospitals across the United States of America are struggling. Many of them are closing or are eliminating critical services.

These hospitals, every one of them, are heavily reliant on reimbursement from Medicare and Medicaid. Any cut in Medicaid funding would lead to catastrophic results for all—not just those on Medicaid, for everyone. Those lacking coverage will skip necessary care, only making people sicker and requiring costlier treatment. It will put a strain on local emergency rooms and community health providers when these folks show up in the emergency room with a very serious problem that, as I said, will cost more to treat. In fact, every uninsured person results in a \$900 uncompensated healthcare cost per year.

This results in services being offered at higher prices for patients and reduced investments in local healthcare centers. Cutting Medicaid will devastate the most vulnerable.

Mr. Speaker, 12 million people in rural areas, not rural areas in blue States, rural areas across the United States of America, 12 million people in those rural areas have health coverage through Medicaid, including 47 percent of children living in rural communities. It is, in many instances, the only way that kids can get healthcare. Mr. Speaker, 38 percent of children in urban areas also rely on Medicaid coverage.

Yet, these Medicaid and ensuing service cuts will just show new physicians that they can't count on keeping a job in a rural hospital. The Medicaid cuts will widen the gap between what a rural hospital can offer and what an urban or suburban hospital can offer.

It is not just those on Medicaid who will suffer. Without Medicaid reimbursement, hospitals, clinics, doctors' offices, and urgent care centers will close, leaving even those with private insurance without access to healthcare.

□ 2045

In my State, one-third of the population is covered by Medicaid. Republicans can't cut one-third of the money that goes to healthcare and expect our healthcare system and infrastructure to stand. Hospitals and clinics will close their doors. If they don't close, they will cut services dramatically.

It doesn't matter if you are on Medicaid, on Medicare, if you have private insurance through your employer, or you are filthy rich with pockets full of

gold. If you go to the hospital or to the clinic or to an urgent care center and they have had to make drastic cuts to compensate for these terrible Medicaid cuts that the Republicans are trying to push down their throats, there is not going to be anybody there to take care of you. It doesn't matter if you have the money or you have the insurance.

If the majority cuts services, your healthcare access will be truncated. There is no two ways about it. It has been a very interesting exercise to watch some of our Republican colleagues wrap themselves into pretzels claiming not to have voted for the Medicaid cuts, but it was just an overall structure giving direction of how we should cut these moneys.

Remember, cut these moneys so that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle can give a tax cut to their billionaire, Musk-like donors. That is just not true. Republicans can't vote for a structure that takes \$880 billion out of the healthcare safety net and claim not to have done it. Republican Members voted to cut Medicaid, which will hurt everybody's healthcare delivery.

Now we see it again. The majority Members are trying to justify it by creating this balancing effort to suggest that Republicans are not cutting Medicaid but are just going to put in place some seven-bank shot procedure where the \$880 billion is still at risk but Republicans can do it without voting to say that the majority actually cut Medicaid.

My colleagues can't just hide the ball. It doesn't matter what Republicans call it. The priority of tax cuts for the very rich, people who don't need the help, will cut healthcare for all of our constituents. That is going to hurt every one of us. It doesn't matter if Members are in an urban area, a rural area, a suburban area, a red State, a blue State, or whatever color State my colleagues think they live in.

These cuts are devastating. I have had hospital administrators in my district tell me that they are closing their hospitals if these go through. I have had clinics tell me that their clinics are done if this goes through. This is mean, cruel, and it doesn't have to happen. It is going to hurt everyone.

I think it is important for the American people to know what the Senate is planning on doing in regard to this discussion. Senate Republicans are using what they call a current policy baseline. Remember that: current policy baseline.

Mr. Speaker, I don't care what finance classes Members took. I don't care if you are the CFO in the biggest corporation in the world. This is not a policy definition that any of my colleagues have ever studied before. This is a new thing that the Senate majority Members made up in order to justify what Republicans are trying to do in regard to the tax cuts for people who don't need it.

Senate Republicans call it current policy baseline to measure the cost of

the tax bill. According to Republicans, current policy baseline is just a fancy word for: We are not really doing what we say we are doing, but it is accounting fraud.

Any way my colleagues cut it, it is accounting fraud. Here is what is going to happen: Republicans are going to pass massive tax cuts, with much of it going to those at the very top of the income scale, those who don't need our help.

The nonpartisan professional economists at the Joint Committee on Taxation and the Congressional Budget Office are going to provide a score. In other words, they are going to tell us how much it is going to cost to do what Republicans want to do. They submit that information to all Members of Congress so that we know what the cost of this tax cut policy will be.

Yet, with what the Senate is doing, the way the Senate majority is setting up this score, the score that has been developed by experienced, nonpartisan officials with Ph.D.'s in economics who provide this good information to us, they are going to have to do some kind of maneuver to figure out how to deal with this new accounting fraud.

They are going to put all of the good work and all of the experience they have to the side because the Republicans don't want us to see what the real score is. The majority doesn't want my colleagues to see the kind of reckless deficits that this bill is going to create.

Mr. SUOZZI said it well:

All of the tax policy that we are talking about is not paid for.

Mr. Speaker, all of the pearl-clutching that went on leading to the election and all of the crying and screaming about the national debt all of a sudden doesn't matter? We are going to put, at a minimum, \$4.6 trillion onto the national debt because of this.

What Republicans will do instead is make up their own score with this new accounting fraud that the majority has developed. The Senate has made it clear what the score will say. It will say that extending the Republican Trump tax cuts costs zero. It is pretending that the tax cuts are free.

Tax cuts, the American people know good and well, are not free. There is a cost associated with those. The ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, Mr. NEAL, former chairman, described this magical-thinking tax fraud accounting system that the Republican Senators came up with in a recent editorial in *The Washington Post*. I like his description. This is what he said:

It is like saving your money and paying for three family vacations and then saying: Now all of our future vacations are free. We don't have to save. We don't have to pay for them.

Mr. Speaker, let me assure the whole House and the American people that extending the Trump tax cuts is not free. In fact, we have a recent estimate from the Joint Committee on Taxation that says that extending the Trump tax cuts costs \$4.6 trillion.

This is \$4.6 trillion that will be added to the debt. Not only does extending the Republican Trump tax cuts cost an extra \$4.6 trillion, but because they are pretending that it is free and doesn't cost anything and doesn't need to be offset, every last penny of those tax cuts will be borrowed money.

Borrowed money isn't free either. Who is going to pick up the tab on this? Your kids, your grandkids, and future generations are paying the freight for this irresponsible tax policy that is coming down the way.

On top of that, there is another \$1.5 trillion in tax cuts that the Republicans want to add to that. That is \$6.1 billion of unpaid-for tax cuts. That is \$1.6 billion in debt on our children and our grandchildren just to give a tax cut to the wealthiest people in this country, people who do not need our help.

This is wrong, Mr. Speaker. We need to stand up. Our friends and our colleagues on the other side of the aisle need to stand up and need to show the courage that their voters placed in them to stand up and speak out against this.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ADERHOLT (at the request of Mr. SCALISE) for today on account of a health consideration.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. JEFFRIES) for today on account of weather delays.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois (at the request of Mr. JEFFRIES) for today on account of flight delays.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 146.—An Act to require covered platforms to remove nonconsensual intimate visual depictions, and for other purposes.

JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Kevin F. McCumber, Clerk of the House, reported that on May 5, 2025, the following joint resolutions were presented to the President of the United States for approval:

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".

H.J. Res. 20. 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".

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 6, 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-879. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the situation in or in relation to the Democratic Republic of the Congo that was declared in Executive Order 13413 of October 27, 2006, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-880. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 24-105; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-881. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 24-099; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-882. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 25-018; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-883. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 24-119; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-884. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a DC Act, "Residential Building Permit Classification Temporary Amendment Act of 2025", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 813); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

EC-885. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting nine (9) notifications of a nomination, action on nomination, discontinuation of service in acting role, and designation of acting officer, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, Sec. 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

EC-886. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Office of the General Counsel, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting a notification of a nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, Sec. 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

EC-887. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Office of the General Counsel, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting a notification of a nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, Sec. 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

EC-888. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Office of the General Counsel, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting two (2) notifications of a vacancy, and a