

he was unable to share details from internal discussions but that the ministry was in contact with “all the relevant agencies on an ongoing daily basis” and closely monitors the situation in Gaza.

Israeli restrictions on aid to Gaza have been one of the most contentious issues of the war. Israel cut off supplies to Gaza in March, shortly before breaking a cease-fire with Hamas, which remains entrenched in Gaza despite losing thousands of fighters and control over much of the territory during the war.

Israel said the aim of the blockade was to reduce the Palestinian armed group's ability to access and profit from food and fuel meant for civilians. In the process, a senior Israeli defense official said, Hamas would be more likely to collapse or at least release more of the hostages that the group captured during its attack on Israel on Oct. 7, 2023 that ignited the war.

The blockade was discussed at an emergency meeting of the United Nations Security Council on Tuesday, called by Britain, France and other European nations. Tom Fletcher, the U.N.'s humanitarian chief, told the council that Israel was “deliberately and unashamedly” imposing inhumane conditions on civilians in Gaza and the West Bank.

“What more evidence do you need now?” Mr. Fletcher asked. “Will you act—decisively—to prevent genocide and to ensure respect for international humanitarian law? Or will you say instead that ‘we did all we could?’” All of the council's 15 members except the United States, which has staunchly supported Israel throughout the war, called on Israel to immediately let aid into Gaza.

The Israeli government has repeatedly said that the blockade had caused “no shortage” of support for civilians, partly because so much aid had entered the territory during the truncated cease-fire.

But aid groups swiftly warned that civilians would be the main victims, adding that the restrictions were illegal under international law. Those warnings increased as civilians said they were eating as little as one meal a day as food prices spiraled. Palestinians interviewed by The New York Times said the cost of flour has risen 60-fold since late February, leading to a rise in looting.

“All I ate today was a little bit of fava beans from an expired can,” said Khalil el-Halabi, a 71-year-old retired U.N. official from Gaza City. He said on Monday that he was too dizzy and weak to walk, adding that his weight had dropped to roughly 130 pounds from about 210 pounds before the war.

Mr. el-Halabi said his daughter, who recently gave birth, was unable to breastfeed because she has not been eating enough. No baby formula is available, he said.

Specialist officers in COGAT, the Israeli government agency that oversees policy in Gaza and the West Bank, have reached the same conclusion as the aid agencies. The officers continuously assess the humanitarian situation in Gaza by speaking with Palestinians there, scrutinizing updates from aid organizations about their warehouse stockpiles, and analyzing the volume and contents of aid trucks that entered Gaza before the blockade.

The officers then privately briefed senior commanders on the worsening situation, warning with increasing urgency that many in the territory were just a few weeks away from starvation. An Israeli general briefed the cabinet on the humanitarian situation in Gaza last week, saying that supplies in the territory would run out within a few weeks, according to an Israeli defense official and a senior government official. The cabinet briefing was first reported by Israel's Channel 13.

According to three of the defense officials, the military leadership has acknowledged the severity of the situation and is exploring ways to restart aid deliveries while circumventing Hamas.

Last week, the Trump administration said it was working with Israel on such a plan. Israeli officials and aid groups said it would involve private organizations distributing food from a handful of sites in Gaza, which would each serve several hundred thousand civilians. The Israeli military would be posted at the sites' perimeters, while private security firms would patrol inside them.

The plan was dismissed by aid agencies, including the U.N. Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, which said it would not join the initiative because it would place civilians at greater risk. The agency said the proposal would force vulnerable people to walk longer distances to get to the few distribution hubs, making it harder to get food to those who need it most. Under the current system, the U.N. said, there are 400 distribution points. The new one, it said, “drastically reduces this operational reach.”

The U.N. also warned that the plan would force civilians to regularly pass through Israeli military lines, putting them at greater risk of detention and interrogation. It added that the plan would accelerate the displacement of civilians from northern Gaza, since the distribution centers were expected to be located far away in the south of the territory.

Israeli officials confirmed that the plan, if enacted, would help the military to intercept Hamas militants and help to move civilians from northern to southern Gaza. But they said the aim was not to increase civilian hardship but to separate civilians from fighters.

Experts on the laws of international conflict say it is illegal for a country to limit aid deliveries if it knows that doing so will cause starvation.

“Enforcing a military blockade with the knowledge that it will starve the civilian population is a violation of international law,” said Janina Dill, co-director of the Oxford Institute for Ethics, Law and Armed Conflict at the University of Oxford.

Ms. Dill said that even if there is some debate over Israel's obligations toward Gazans, “when Israeli decision makers state that the purpose is to extract political and military concessions, it clearly constitutes a war crime.”

STOP TRUMP'S CHAOS—STAND UP FOR SCIENCE

(Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, Ms. STEVENS of Michigan was recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.)

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, tonight I rise with my Democratic colleagues, frankly, to call out the dangerous and draconian antiscience agendas of this current administration. Since day one, this administration has unleashed chaos on our national scientific enterprise, undermining our Nation's competitiveness, our health safety, and the dignity of research and how it is conducted. It is coming at a time that will, frankly, move our country in the wrong direction, and it will cost us.

In just over 100 days, we have seen the firing and rehiring of experts, the illegal impounding of congressionally authorized and appropriated research funding, and the future of our STEM

student pipeline jeopardized. Frankly, it has created a chilling effect across our scientific research enterprise.

For the science enthusiasts watching at home, allow me to clarify that, yes, we support our national scientific research enterprise, our National Science Foundation, and our National Institute of Standards and Technology.

In this country, we also have the National Institutes of Health. Some of us are old enough to remember when we passed a DARPA for health research, ARPA-H, Advanced Research Projects Agency for Health.

While much of my remarks will be dedicated toward our hard-nosed scientific research funding, I do want to make mention of what it means to have our health sciences under attack right now as well because doctors and researchers, particularly in the medical fields, are feeling extraordinary pain.

These aren't just talking points. This isn't just fear-mongering. This is the cessation of scientific research, health research, special projects dedicated toward combating cancer, pilot projects being suddenly halted. It is a blow to patients. It is a blow to medical researchers and physicians.

My colleagues tonight are going to join me in speaking about the antiscience agenda that is in full swing in the United States of America and what it means. Tonight, I am going to speak about Michigan. I am going to speak about the harm of this chaos and the antiscience agenda that it poses to the incredible State of Michigan.

The State of Michigan is known for its manufacturing prowess. Yes, we have great healthcare institutions as well, but we are known as the place that has put the world on wheels for our best-in-class workforce. We are, of course, also known for the beauty of our Great Lakes. We are known as a place that has the most number of first robotics teams in the Nation. Also, that we are a hotbed and a place that people and businesses come to to expand, to grow, and to tap into our engineering talent.

□ 1730

Mr. Speaker, you can't have a shop floor without research and development. You can't have incredible manufacturing and incredible innovation without scientific research and development.

It is about problem-solving. I know this from my time in the Obama administration. I know this from my time working in a scientific research lab. That innovation takes place on the shop floor and in the heart of Michigan's manufacturing capabilities.

We are so proud of public-private partnerships. We are so proud of how the government can provide seed funding through the National Science Foundation and support for our National Institute of Standards and Technology through the Manufacturing Extension Partnership Program.

My friend Mike Coast, the former leader of the Michigan Manufacturing Technology Center, Michigan's MEP, and I are overdue for a conversation. He is ringing the alarm bell about what these cuts will do for Michigan and what this means.

From growing up and from my upbringing, I saw this story of what it means to have a strong and vibrant manufacturing economy. It is intertwined with the Nation's scientific research enterprise and appropriated dollars.

I have visited my friends in over 250 unique small businesses, small manufacturers, innovators, entrepreneurs, and training centers. The innovation story is powered by Michigan's incredible workforce, our hardworking men and women, and those large concentrations of engineers that we have. They are from Grand Rapids, Flint, Saginaw, Lansing, and, of course, all over southeast Michigan, from Detroit to Macomb County and throughout Oakland County.

All of this goes hand in hand from the lab to the shop floor, to the classroom, to the tinkering in the garage, or in Michigan—because we do have those cold winters—in our basements. People are innovating, designing, and doing.

I woke up on a Saturday morning to a headline that the National Science Foundation is canceling more than 400 STEM grants. What does it mean for Michigan? What does that mean for our schools that are not fully funded? What does it mean when we are competing on the world playing field?

We need to have these scientists. We need to have these technologists. We need to have engineers and mathematicians. The student pipeline is absolutely essential, Mr. Speaker.

Because of this Trump-Musk antiscience agenda undermining the symbiotic relationship and threatening Michigan's future in advanced manufacturing, environmental protection, and next-generation mobility technologies—news flash, we had 40-plus new factories built and developed in Michigan last year alone—the chaos continues to set us back.

These aren't false threats. They are now a reality. It is blow after blow. It is self-inflicted chaos at a time when we don't need it, when it is not going to work for Michigan and not going to work for this country.

Michigan is a national leader in public university research, with nine public institutions in the great State of Michigan ranked as top-tier universities. They are what we call R1 research universities. We also have R2 universities. They all rank in that top nine.

This also includes Oakland University, which is located in my district and where my parents met, and it is part of my origin story. They have a very robust engineering department that relies on these National Science Foundation grants, basic scientific re-

search, technology readiness 1 through 9.

What does that mean? We need to have basic scientific research. We need to have the scientific method, of course, dictating and governing how we conduct research in the United States of America.

University of Michigan and Michigan State University recently came forward with what it would mean to see these grants and the relationship between our universities and our government shrink.

I will hold this up. In fact, that was also in The Detroit News, that the MSU president has spoken about the partnership between research universities and innovation driven by government. We need these things.

At Wayne State University and Michigan Technological University, it is the same thing. They conduct over 90 percent of the State's academic research, totaling more than \$3 billion. We want to compete. We want to be a driver of the moonshot of this century.

Every day, Michiganders reap the benefits of these universities, these small businesses, the entrepreneurs, and the small business innovation research grants. I walk out my door, and people are practically coming up to me, saying that this is where they want to grow and go. The STEM talent is so mission critical to all of us.

Just the three largest research institutions created an economic impact of nearly \$24 billion for the State of Michigan. This is personal for us, and this is very real. Our universities are where tomorrow's breakthroughs are going to begin, breakthroughs that our automakers are going to rely on, breakthroughs to compete in the global marketplace, and also breakthroughs to win on the battlefield.

We are in a race for technological and, frankly, innovation dominance. These cuts that have come through from the stroke of a pen in the Oval Office have sincere, grave, and real results that are harmful.

As a lawmaker, I choose to use my time to continue to craft the legislation on quantum and on reauthorizing NSF and NIST that I am so proud to see making its way through the Committee on Science. I hope that my colleagues will join in to pass those bills.

Today, we use our voices to call out the harms of an antiscience agenda, the setbacks it means for equity, the setbacks it means for disadvantaged students, women, and students of color, and what this means for our manufacturers that rely on the diversity of a fully educated, skilled, and trained workforce, something that I see happening every single day in my incredible home State.

It is that grit that Michiganders bring to everything that I know will get us through, and it is with tremendous honor, Mr. Speaker, that I sit and stand with my colleagues tonight as we speak out.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SUBRAMANYAM), my

incredible colleague, for tonight's Special Order. I thank him for leading with me tonight.

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman STEVENS and all the Members here today who stand up for science and innovation.

This is a matter of profound significance for many Americans. It is a matter of life or death, whether they realize it or not.

It is the responsibility of this body to be stewards of our country's future and leave this country better than how we found it. That means recognizing the pivotal role of science and innovation for the people, as well as the funding, and how it plays a role in making our country great now and in the future.

Standing up for science is more important than ever right now because the reality is this administration has declared a war on science with DOGE, funding cuts, firing contractors, firing scientists and innovators, and trying to chase others out.

For decades, America has been a leader in science and innovation, but this leadership is not our country's birthright. It has been earned over the years through an unwavering commitment to science and innovation.

Make no mistake, our adversaries are watching closely the work we are doing and everything that is happening right now. They want to undermine and replace our leadership in science and innovation. We are at risk of being out-run on AI, quantum, and so many other critical technologies and innovations.

Instead of helping us maintain our global leadership, this administration is slashing funding to our science agencies and firing Federal scientists. The President is proposing a \$4.9 billion cut to the National Science Foundation. That is on top of over \$1 billion in grant funding that this administration has already terminated. At least \$100 million in grant funding was cut from universities just in my State of Virginia alone.

Investments in science and innovation have fueled our economy and started entire industries, given us healthcare breakthroughs, fortified our national defense, and reinforced our leadership in the world.

Make no mistake, these firings and cuts to science and innovation will hurt every single American. They will make us less safe, less healthy, and less prosperous.

I have the honor of representing in northern Virginia one of the most scientifically advanced communities in the country and many of the folks who have been cut, fired, or have seen their funding subject to these cuts. They have seen harassment, intimidation, and firings. They are losing the ability to help Americans stay safe and healthy.

What is happening is that there is a brain drain of science and technology innovators in our country because of these cuts. One of my constituents is a graduate student in astrophysics. She

is pretty smart. Their research funding is at risk of being cut right now. Folks like her are wondering whether they should stay in the science field.

These cuts are destroying our Nation's pipeline of scientists, technologists, and innovators.

A teacher from my district has been dismayed that the President plans to cut the NASA budget by 24 percent. This will end educational programs that get students excited about the sciences. Do we want to go to Mars? Who is going to take us there? It is going to need the ingenuity and expertise of the American people.

The cuts are not just limited to NASA and the National Science Foundation. They are cutting healthcare research, as well.

A woman in my district said her son has a disease for which NIH was researching a cure. Mr. Speaker, with recent cuts, you can kiss that cure goodbye right now or any hope of her son getting that cure.

Right now, there are so many cuts that we are not solving the problems in healthcare that we need to, to keep our country healthy.

For another woman, her son had congenital blindness, and NIH was searching for a cure for that. That funding is on the chopping block, as well, and also the people who are doing that research.

Another biomedical researcher in the district said it perfectly when he said that the NIH, FDA, CDC, and NSF are making discoveries now that will be the foundation for solutions needed in the years and decades ahead.

We won't even know what we missed with some of these cuts. We won't know what innovations we could have made but for these cuts.

I want to end by saying that I am pretty sure these firings and cuts to science and research aren't about waste, fraud, and abuse or government efficiency. If they were and if this administration actually cared about efficiency, they would know that funding to science, technology, and innovation doubles or triples the investment back in economic activity, not to mention all the lives that research saves and all the people who are kept healthy and safe by this research.

This does not have to be partisan. This does not have to be controversial in any way. Mr. Speaker, I call on all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to stand up for science, research, and innovation because standing up for science means standing up for the health, safety, and prosperity of every American.

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. SUBRAMANYAM, a new freshman member on the Committee on Science and Member of this very body. As we can tell, he is already leading in an extraordinary way.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER), who is well past his freshman term but also from the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for putting this together. I really appreciate it.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the Trump administration's attack on our scientific workforce and on science, specifically at the National Science Foundation, located a few blocks from my home.

Today, my colleagues and I introduced a resolution commemorating the 75th anniversary of the National Science Foundation. We should be enormously proud to support the work of the NSF.

Since 1950, the National Science Foundation has helped the U.S. lead the world in science. It supported the research and key investments that helped catalyze the internet, advanced technology for MRI machines, 3D printing, and artificial intelligence.

It created American Sign Language, detected gravitational waves that developed LASIK eye surgery, and much, much more.

It has been a cornerstone of our scientific education in the United States, providing support from elementary and prekindergarten right through the Ph.D. level.

NSF's prestigious awards draw researchers from across the world to come to the United States to do their work and to study. Best for us, they often stay.

The same incredible talent is under attack by this President, who is not only recklessly removing our best scientists from the Federal workforce but also defunding science and the scientific research at our Nation's premier institutions. These are exactly the people who create America's future.

In his skinny budget request, the President proposed a \$5 billion cut to the National Science Foundation, including \$1 billion in STEM education and workforce programs. If that budget request is enacted by Congress, this will be a death knell for our innovation economy and for America's future.

□ 1745

I have already been alarmed by the workforce cuts the Trump administration has made over the past months. We are losing our best and our brightest. Some might find jobs in the private sector, but many are likely to be poached by other countries. We hear again and again that many countries are trying to recruit our best and brightest.

I know this personally because these cuts have heavily impacted my home. I have had hundreds of constituents, thousands, fired or coerced out of the Federal workforce by the toxic environment that DOGE is intentionally creating. These are professionals who have dedicated their talent, their lives, and their scientific expertise to ensure that the National Science Foundation is advancing the most cutting-edge, innovative research proposals.

Mr. Speaker, the last thing we should be doing is losing that talent.

I am also deeply alarmed at canceled grants and funding at NSF and our scientific agencies.

The Trump administration has cut more than \$1 billion in awards this year. Many of these grants were terminated for no reason by the administration. One particularly egregious example was an award on improving the effectiveness of teaching students how to do computer science. Really?

At a time when we need to increase our domestic AI and STEM focused workforce, we need students to be familiar with the artificial intelligence systems of tomorrow, so that they can contribute to our continued leadership in tech.

Mr. Speaker, I keep looking for examples in history on this retreat from knowledge. There were England's Luddites in the early 19th century who fought the use of new textile technology. There was Mao Zedong's Cultural Revolution 1966 through 1976 when intellectuals and scientists were labeled the "Stinking Old Ninth" and were sent to reeducation camps in the countryside.

For 75 years, the National Science Foundation has kept the U.S. at the forefront of science and has made us the envy of the world.

The NSF can claim 268 Nobel Prize winners. Yet now we have a President and an administration that is antisience and antiprogess.

Just as we have made investments in projects that are pivotal in artificial intelligence, quantum, and other leading areas at NIH, NOAA, NASA, the CDC, EPA, and, tragically, the National Science Foundation, now is not the time that we stop investing in our future. This is what the Trump administration is doing.

I join my colleagues today to stand up for science, to oppose the administration's attacks on the National Science Foundation, and to fiercely champion our investment in science and knowledge for generations to come.

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. BEYER for his great leadership in Congress and for his continued dedication to education as he is getting a degree in artificial intelligence.

Mr. Speaker, we also have another very well-degreed Member of Congress, Dr. BILL FOSTER, whom I have been so proud to serve alongside for many years in this Chamber and, of course, for many years on the Science Committee where we have passed a lot of bills together.

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

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman STEVENS and Congressman SUBRAMANYAM for organizing this on such an important topic.

As Congress' sole Ph.D. physicist, I spent 25 years of my life, before coming to Congress, working at the Department of Energy Office of Science supported laboratory. We were smashing protons and antiprotons together to make particles that have not been around since the big bang. I am proud to have been on the team that discovered the top quark, the heaviest known

form of matter. We worked with scientists from all over the world who came to America because we had the best equipment, the best experiments, and the best scientists, and they wanted to collaborate. All of this is at risk.

Amidst the Republican assault on science, I am going to focus my remarks tonight mainly on the NSF.

On May 10, we celebrated the 75th anniversary of the National Science Foundation. Today, together with my fellow Representatives DON BEYER, Dr. SCOTT FRANKLIN, and HALEY STEVENS, we introduced a House resolution to celebrate that anniversary.

The resolution highlights the importance of the NSF for our Nation's research enterprise and the workforce it supports, totaling roughly 350,000 students, teachers, scientists, entrepreneurs, and researchers, including 268 Nobel Prize winners to date.

The NSF is a cornerstone of American innovation and is foundational for continuing basic research discoveries. We hope this work continues for many decades to come.

Support for Federal science agencies like the NSF have led to new and unexpected research directions that would not have been possible without Federal funding.

That is why it is important that we recognize the role that NSF-funded basic research plays in the discoveries driving the next generation of science.

This includes funding for AI, for cybersecurity, for supercomputers, fusion energy, space, ocean exploration, black holes, semiconductors, and, last but not least, the internet.

In addition to basic research, the NSF also funds many educational programs supporting the next generation of scientists. Perhaps in the fullness of time that is its most crucial mission because it enables the careers to move forward in science of these young people who have shared my fascination with science.

Over the past 75 years, the NSF has stayed true to its mission to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; and to secure the national defense.

Underpinning this has been its commitment to a merit-based and peer-reviewed grant process that has ensured that good science is consistently prioritized and free from political interference.

The NSF has had an exemplary 75 years, and I look forward to its progress in the next 75.

So, how are Republicans celebrating this anniversary?

By slashing the budget by a factor of two and muzzling the science.

Unfortunately, the Trump administration has failed to see the importance of this Federal investment in science for our country's future.

The President's fiscal year 2026 budget proposes cutting the NSF budget by 55 percent, including fundamental research, education, and broadening participation efforts.

Other agencies have been impacted by the funding cuts, including NIH by 37 percent, NOAA by 24 percent, the EPA by 54 percent, NASA's science arm by 46 percent, and the Department of Energy Office of Science by 14 percent, among many others.

Long term, these cuts will have detrimental impacts on scientific and technological innovation and cause irreparable damage to our global competitiveness. So this discussion could not come at a more important time.

As a result of Trump's directives, all grant funding at the NSF is now halted, and the existing grants are under review for termination.

I led over 100 of my fellow Members in a letter to the administration opposing this unconstitutional grant freeze, which is in direct opposition to Congress' appropriations.

This measure comes after canceling over 1,000 NSF active research grants last month, with another 344 more grants canceled recently in the third consecutive round of Friday terminations.

Why Friday?

It is because Friday traditionally is the time that they reveal actions that they are ashamed of. I wonder why they put it on Friday.

In addition to freezing all grants at the NSF, the agency instituted a 15 percent cap on indirect cost rates for colleges and universities where many of our future scientists receive training and participate in research experiences early in life that spark their curiosity.

Many of these grants across many agencies are impacting STEM education across the career pipeline. In addition to stopping research discoveries, these cuts will lead to the loss of STEM talent, which places the United States at a permanent competitive disadvantage.

President Trump's budget also proposes eliminating NASA's Office of STEM Engagement, which will significantly deter young talent from participating in STEM programming and impair our Nation's ability to lead in scientific fields.

In another Republican assault on STEM education, which seems to be a theme of their cuts, at the U.S. Geological Survey, the Federal hiring freeze led to the termination of a summer internship program for undergraduate students. The National Association of Geoscience Teachers-USGS Cooperative Summer Fellowship program had been running since 1965, matching undergraduate students with mentors and projects at the agency.

Through this program, talented student interns benefit from working with well-established scientists and gain valuable research experience at a well-known science agency. This experience can spark their curiosity in science and may set them up for long-term research careers, assuming, of course, the budget is not slashed there as well.

Altogether, since 1965, around 3,000 interns have contributed to scientific

projects in research areas of importance to USGS and NAGT to promote high-quality Earth education.

Programs like this allow students to contribute to our country's scientific achievements, energy resource development, and economic prosperity. However, this year, 39 promising young geoscientists will not have this opportunity.

So what does this mean for the scientific workforce?

The recent departure of the NSF Director Sethuraman Panchanathan, known to all of us as "Dr. Panch," from the NSF was a really notable negative milestone for this administration's actions.

It is a significant loss when we lose such dedicated and talented public servants. They are leaving the Federal Government workforce not as happy campers, and everybody knows it.

This follows workers like Dr. Peter Marks, who is one of the heroes of Operation Warp Speed and one of the lead scientists at the FDA. There are hundreds of others, unfortunately, following in their footsteps.

To shed light on this issue, for example, this last March, together with my colleague, DON BEYER, I led 37 House Members in a letter to the Trump administration expressing our strong support for the agency and grave concerns with the firing of 168 workers at the NSF.

Unfortunately, the DOGEs in the Trump administration have ignored this sort of appeal completely.

This letter highlighted the importance of NSF funding to our country's leadership in cancer research, energy, artificial intelligence, and quantum computing. None of this work would be possible without program managers and experts who play central roles in grant funding decisions at the agency.

A negative consequence of these actions for our country is that we will not only miss out on scientific breakthroughs that drive our country forward, but lose an entire generation of scientists who cannot complete their NSF-supported training and will abandon research careers altogether, or perhaps, as was mentioned, simply depart for countries abroad.

So I want to assure NSF-funded researchers and staff that we are on their side, and we are supporting them. They should keep coming to Congress to tell us about the direct impacts, and that goes for scientists in all fields throughout this country.

It is our duty to ensure that, regardless of the political climate, science remains at the forefront of our Nation's progress and innovation.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my sensible colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support efforts that increase the resiliency of our Federal science agencies in the face of these growing threats from the administration, and to continue supporting the U.S. research workforce.

Congratulations, again, to the NSF on celebrating 75 years. We will continue to fight for the agency's viability

and for our Nation's competitiveness by supporting all of our Federal science agencies.

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. FOSTER for his always wise and important words.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. WHITESIDES), who is a leader in the field of science and space exploration.

Mr. WHITESIDES. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman STEVENS for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, my name is GEORGE WHITESIDES, and I represent California's 27th Congressional District.

Before I was a Member of Congress, I served as the Chief of Staff of NASA and later as the CEO of an aerospace company that created hundreds of well-paying jobs in the Antelope Valley. I have a degree in remote sensing with GIS. I grew up in a science family. My dad is a chemist and a professor. I have worked on new and innovative ways to tackle our wildfire crisis, a growing threat that the people I represent know all too well.

I know from firsthand experience that the United States is home to the smartest, most hardworking, and most impressive minds of our time who have dedicated their lives to helping families across the country fight deadly diseases, predict and prevent natural disasters before they hit, and mount a challenge against our foreign rivals like China.

However, we can't continue this important work without our scientific institutions.

Recently, our biggest scientific agencies have come under a full-scale attack with the administration's proposed budget effectively annihilating the very science that keeps us safe. Programs that previously had broad, bipartisan support, such as the Army Corps of Engineers water infrastructure fund, EPA's drinking water and clean water funds for States, forestry operations, energy utility assistance for low-income households, science and technology programs, and agricultural support are all on the chopping block.

At NASA, satellites that allow us to understand weather patterns, monitor our changing climate, and track fires as they move and spread are at risk of being deorbited. Employees in my home district who work at NASA Armstrong and JPL have no idea what their futures hold.

NOAA, an organization that helps families across the country prepare for natural disasters like hurricanes and tornadoes, is being gutted from the ground up.

The NIH, which works on groundbreaking cures for diseases like cancer, Alzheimer's, and heart disease, has supplied significantly fewer grants and awards to scientists than in previous administrations, effectively halting our work on critical medical advances.

□ 1800

From February to April, the administration terminated nearly 700 grants

across 24 NIH institutes and centers focused on subjects such as aging, cancer, child health, diabetes, mental health, and neurological disorders.

We are not only losing the promise of progress and cures and climate technology, we are losing critical data that allow us to better understand the world we live in and respond to growing threats that we face, both foreign and domestic.

That is why today I led my colleagues with similar scientific backgrounds to let the administration know exactly what will happen to our Nation if they gut these science agencies. A letter was sent to the President drawing on our diverse backgrounds and constituencies to let him know exactly why science is a good investment for the future of our children and for our country.

Make no mistake, we can always be better and more efficient, and these are ideals that we should all strive for. These are ideals that Americans fairly demand from their government, and we should all be working toward that challenge.

When I helped lead NASA for President Obama, we constantly iterated and improved our existing systems because we knew how important it was to stretch the taxpayer dollar as far as it can go.

Taking a sledgehammer and a chain saw to entire institutions that allow us to stay safe and also remain competitive on the global scale is not only unwise, it is dangerous.

The bottom line is that science is an incredible investment for jobs today and for the future of our country.

I am going to keep fighting for the families across my district who need NASA satellites to know if their houses are going to be safe from fires, for seniors who need medical advancements to live long and healthy lives, and for red States and blue States that will be hit by tornadoes and hurricanes in the months and years to come.

I am here to stand up for families in my district and across the country who will be less safe and more at risk as a result of these cuts. I am here as an innovator and entrepreneur to stand up for science.

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. WHITESIDES for his comments. How lucky the people of California are to have his representation and how lucky the United States Congress is to have his expertise.

Mr. Speaker, I yield now to Mrs. FOUSHEE of North Carolina, another proven expert, leader and fighter, and ranking member on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Ms. FOUSHEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my esteemed colleagues for organizing this Special Order hour.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in solidarity with my colleagues to stand up and speak out against the proposed budget and demonization of science and the science community.

America is where we are today because of what we create. Whether it is

manufacturing, innovation, scientific and medical research, or technology transfer, all these fields require science and the millions of researchers and innovators who push American STEM in our Nation's workforce to the forefront.

These efforts are critical to my district, which includes the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Duke University, North Carolina Central University, Durham and Wake Technical Community Colleges, and so many new up-and-coming industry leaders in STEM.

However, in total, the Trump administration has canceled nearly \$20 million in NSF research grants to North Carolina as a whole.

Take, for instance, an NSF-funded grant that was recently canceled in my district, North Carolina's Fourth, that was aimed at addressing the lack of diversity in the engineering doctoral workforce and promoting the retention of students from underrepresented groups.

Recent doctoral engineering attrition rates revealed a disproportionately high loss of students from groups historically underrepresented in STEM, like women, minorities, and people from rural areas.

Researchers in my district were working to help us address this critical gap, funded by NSF, now canceled under the guise of being so-called woke.

Still, the majority continues to conflate the need to bolster manufacturing with the destruction of our scientific institutions.

We need to make things here at home. Does America really win if China does all the innovation?

I like the idea of an America that supports domestic manufacturing and is a leader in innovation, not an America that does China's manufacturing work.

Right now, because of the senseless cuts to NSF, NIH, and scientific institutions across the board, we are, instead, taking steps toward losing a generation of innovators and helping China lead global STEM innovation, not us.

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman FOUSHEE for her ongoing leadership for women in the sciences and for HBCUs that are also so important to our STEM scientific research enterprise.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to pass the floor over to the congresswoman from New Mexico (Ms. STANSBURY).

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Speaker, Donald Trump's war on science is putting our country and our economy in peril. From haphazard firings of Federal workers who work on nuclear security and keep our food and medicine safe to firefighters and healthcare workers, I am here to say enough is enough.

As a proud woman in STEM and a bona fide science nerd, I cannot sit quietly as this administration jeopardizes the scientific advancement of this country.

That is why I am here to say enough; enough of the lies about Project 2025 and its antisience agenda; enough with the dismantling of the National Institutes of Health, the Centers for Disease Control, and the National Science Foundation; enough with canceling grants for medical research and STEM programs that ensure our country stays safe and globally competitive; enough with pedaling disinformation that jeopardizes the health and well-being of millions of Americans; and enough with hiring unqualified pundits, influencers, and political loyalists who pedal conspiracy theories and openly admit that no one should rely on them for advice. Mr. Speaker, everyone knows who I mean.

America is a leader in science and technology. We were the first in the world to send a man to the moon. We invented the polio vaccine and DNA sequencing. We invented the microchip, the internet, and GPS. Americans invented the airplane, the lightbulb, television, and email, and we fed the world with our innovations in food and agriculture.

Over the last 3½ months, we have seen an unprecedented attack on our Nation's science and technology, programs gutted, projects halted, and the world's leading scientists and engineers fired for no reason. A budget delivered to Congress just a couple of weeks ago by the President that would cut over a billion dollars in science, education, and workforce programs. A budget that would slash 30 percent of NOAA's budget, and strip the Environmental Protection Agency of more than half of its funding.

That is why nearly 2,000 doctors, scientists, and researchers have called this administration a wholesale assault on United States science that threatens the country's health, national security, and economic development.

Congress, the courts, and our communities are fighting back, conducting oversight, voting no, showing up to agencies, supporting cases across the Federal court system, and, yes, getting loud in the streets to stand with science.

Democrats stand with our scientists, our engineers, our innovators, and our healthcare workers. Democrats stand with our Federal science and healthcare agencies. Democrats stand with the people of this country who depend on that science and who depend on that innovation to keep us safe and fuel our economy because that is all of us.

I say to my fellow leaders in STEM, stay strong, stay in the fight. Democrats are fighting with you, and we will win.

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, I thank our science nerds and enthusiasts for their work, just as Ms. STANSBURY so nicely laid out.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the floor to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO), another great warrior for scientific research and funding and support for the

manufacturing economy of this country and a leader in the Congress.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative STEVENS for the kind introduction. I thank Representative SUBRAMANYAM for cohosting this showcasing of supporters of science and tech in our economy and the investments that we can make in our government.

No nation can maintain its leadership status in the world without investments made and attention paid to science, to science technology, engineering, and math.

It is essential that we grow that population of scientists, of engineers who can then provide for the muscle of our innovation economy, to allow for that intellectual capacity of this great Nation and the pioneer spirit of this Nation to continue to foster this growth of product delivery that speaks to the quality of life of people across this great world.

We as a nation have been a leader. I think back to the humble beginnings of this Nation. In the 1800s, there was a development of the Erie Canal in upstate New York that is still looked to as perhaps the first tech corridor.

The eastern mouth of that Erie Canal is included in the geography that I serve in New York's 20th Congressional District, in the greater capital region. Along that canal, we not only provided for a great connection of a great ocean, the Atlantic, with the Great Lakes that inspired a westward movement into the midland of our country, into the States that border the Great Lakes.

With that came the development of a necklace of communities dubbed "mill towns" that became the epicenters of invention and innovation, that inspired all sort of product delivery and responses to the needs of this world, and impacted favorably not only the quality of life in our United States but in nations around the world.

That whole history, that powerful statement of what can be created when we invest in our manufacturing, in our technology, in our science community is proof that we need to continue forward in that vein.

Since January, Donald Trump and his political allies have launched a full-scale assault on America's scientific enterprise. Federal investments in science power nearly every aspect of our modern life, medical breakthroughs, clean air and water, accurate weather forecasts, safe food, and real solutions to the climate crisis.

This administration has made their position painfully clear. They simple many don't care. Instead, they are injecting partisan politics into research, censoring scientists, punishing experts, and pulling funding from projects that challenge their narrow ideology. They don't care about protecting communities from the climate disaster, and we are going to continue to write checks for disaster aid if we continue this ignoring of climate change.

They don't care about preventing the next pandemic. We have learned that

science became very much focused upon during the whole COVID crisis. They don't care about making STEM more inclusive, and they certainly don't care if Americans suffer as a result.

This isn't just wrong, it is a blatant attack on scientific integrity. Integrity in research is essential, essential to scientific excellence and to maintaining the public's trust.

That is why, as an engineer and lifelong advocate for science, I have made it one of my top priorities in Congress to right the ship of American science policy.

As part of that effort, I am indeed proud to lead the bipartisan Scientific Integrity Act. Tomorrow, we will be the launching of the Scientific Integrity Task Force to continue the fight to protect science from political interference.

□ 1815

Hands off science. Let that pure product of research get delivered to those decisionmakers, those policymakers, and let us determine what those findings mean in terms of the need for additional policy and research advocacy. Let us do it in the purest sense.

New York's 20th Congressional District has felt the effects of these attacks firsthand. Over \$715 million in National Science Foundation grants have been terminated in New York's 20th Congressional District alone, including a \$1 million award to the University at Albany's Project SAGES.

Project SAGES was created to confront one of the deepest, most persistent inequities in science, and that is the underrepresentation of women, especially women of color, in faculty positions. This was peer-reviewed, data-driven, mission-critical science, and we need to make certain that we continue to build upon that.

Cutting this program sends a clear message to a generation of researchers: You don't belong.

It doesn't stop there. Another canceled UAlbany NSF grant supported a collaborative study to improve public understanding of population science, especially around climate change, racial justice, and the rise of misinformation. The goal was to equip students in communities with tools to recognize and challenge the misuse of demographic data, data increasingly weaponized to justify political extremism and division.

Does that sound familiar? You bet it does.

SUNY campuses, the State University of New York campuses, across the State lost almost \$2.5 million in NSF support for programs helping students of color succeed in STEM through research opportunities, mentorships, and academic support. These students are the future of a diverse and dynamic scientific workforce, and this administration slammed the door in their faces.

Let's be clear. These cuts are not about efficiency. They are not about

fiscal responsibility. They are rooted in racist, sexist, and authoritarian ideology.

I will not stay silent while extremists attack our scientists, our students, our universities, and our future.

We are woefully underproducing scientists and engineers in our society. You can look at the growth of those communities in other nations, other continents. This country is woefully underproducing. We do not have the luxury of walking away from any one demographic of students out there based on gender, race, or ethnicity to meet our goals. We cannot skip over any of those populations.

We must stand up—stand up for science, stand up for equity, and stand up for the truth.

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. TONKO for his years of leadership on the Scientific Integrity Act, still very essential legislation for this country.

What a profound honor it is to be with colleagues in this democracy sharing these views.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO).

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleagues, Ms. STEVENS and Mr. SUBRAMANYAM, for hosting this Special Order hour. Their leadership is much needed, and I appreciate them.

Madam Speaker, I rise today because something is deeply wrong. The Trump administration is gutting our Nation's scientific infrastructure and doing it with purpose. This isn't some misunderstanding or clerical error. It is an attack on research, on truth, and on the people who have dedicated their lives to making our country stronger, smarter, and healthier.

Thousands of scientists have been laid off. Grants approved by Congress are being withheld. Whole labs are shutting down. Now, the administration wants to slash funding for the NIH, the CDC, the Department of Energy's labs, and the university partnerships that have built the modern American economy.

They call this reform. It is not reform. It is a dagger to the heart of American innovation.

Let's be honest about what's going on here. Elon Musk and the so-called Department of Government Efficiency are using the Federal Government to settle scores: cancer trials, nonessential; national science databases, too expensive. That is not policy. It is a crusade against expertise.

Last month, I sat down with five undergraduate researchers at UC Riverside. They are doing remarkable work on everything from climate change to biomedical engineering. Their students are bright; their ideas are bold; and their funding is suddenly at risk, not because the science failed but because politics did.

While we fire researchers, other countries are sending job offers. France, Germany, Canada, and Australia are rolling out the red carpet for

the scientists we are pushing out the door.

While we make it harder for international students, researchers, and the greatest minds around the world to come, to bring their talent, other countries are offering funding, housing, and guaranteed lab space.

One institute called it a "once-in-a-century brain gain opportunity," a once-in-a-century brain gain opportunity for other countries. This is what it looks like when a country values science. Meanwhile, we are bleeding talent.

As ranking member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, I need to speak plainly: Our veterans are being hurt, too.

In Pennsylvania, doctors at VA hospitals warned that lifesaving cancer trials were being shut down. I was told by the Secretary—I rushed from that hearing—that they really weren't being shut down, but there are a lot of questions around the status of these trials.

More than 1,000 veterans are at risk of losing access to treatments for head and neck cancer, kidney disease, and traumatic brain injuries. Some of these trials have not been restarted.

In Pittsburgh, a study for veterans struggling with opioid addiction stalled out when a hiring freeze hit.

In Los Angeles, all chemotherapy treatments almost stopped entirely before the VA reversed course.

These are not just numbers. These are people. These are veterans who stepped up for this country, who are now wondering why the country will not step up for them.

We passed the PACT Act to expand care to those exposed to burn pits and other toxins. It was the largest expansion of veterans' care in generations, making good on a promise to help those who served our Nation. Now, it is being broken.

While all of this is happening, China is investing billions in biotech, AI, and clean energy. They are not just competing with us; they are outpacing us because they are not undermining their own scientists.

While we fire, they fund. While we second-guess researchers, they fast-track them.

We are not losing this race because we Americans are not capable. We are losing because we are allowing our government to sabotage them.

Today, some of the National Science Foundation scientists who were fired may be watching from the gallery, others—grad students, post-docs, public health experts—are tuning in from their labs and classrooms across the country.

To all of them, I say this: We see you. We value you. We are not giving up on you. This is not about science; it is about who we are as a country.

Do we invest in the people solving cancer, or do we dismiss them as expendable?

Do we stand by our veterans mid-treatment, or do we tell them to wait until the budget looks better?

Do we fight to stay at the forefront of discovery and innovation, or do we hand the future to someone else?

Madam Speaker, I represent a region full of young people who believe they can cure disease, fight climate change, and explore the stars. What message are we sending them right now?

We should be investing in their future, not pulling the rug out from underneath them.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject these cuts, reject this anti-science, anti-veteran agenda. Let us fight for the truth for our researchers, for our vets, and for the country we still have a chance to become.

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SUBRAMANYAM) to close us out. He is such a leader, and I am so proud of him for helping with this Special Order hour.

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. Madam Speaker, I thank Congresswoman STEVENS for yielding, and I will keep it very short.

A study a few weeks ago said that a 25 percent reduction in public support of science and research would correlate to a 3.8 percent drop in economic output. That is the same as the Great Recession. That is how bad it would be.

Protecting science funding is not just about labs or some agencies. It is about preserving hope for families across the country. These cuts are bad for our economy, small businesses, parents, children, teachers, patients, you name it. Our country cannot afford these massive cuts to science and innovation.

We must reject these cuts and stand up for the health, safety, and prosperity of every American.

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

We will continue to use our voices. To every scientific researcher, science student, and American wondering, we have your back. We will use our voices. We will not be silent in the face of these cuts.

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

HONORING LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

(Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, Mr. EVANS of Colorado was recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.)

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of this Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. FEDORCHAK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER), a fellow former law enforcement officer, who