

border crossings have plummeted, but Congress needs to act to ensure the proven policies of President Trump are codified and continued for generations to come. Our bill makes historic investments in our border security by ensuring we can finish the border wall, stop the trafficking of fentanyl, and give our Border Patrol agents the resources that they need.

Our bill invests in our national security by ensuring our defense systems are prepared to handle 21st century threats. It invests in cutting-edge technology that our warfighters and our military needs for its readiness. This package invests in modernizing our Nation's air traffic control systems and cuts wasteful spending in the Green New Deal pet projects that only benefit far-left activists, all while strengthening the safety net for those who are the most vulnerable Americans and our Nation's agriculture community at the same time. It cuts wasteful, fraudulent, and abusive spending and gets able-bodied adults back on the ladder of opportunity while giving them a fair shot at the American Dream.

I am pleased with all we have been able to accomplish in this one big, beautiful bill, and now it is time to get it over the finish line. It is frustrating that some of my Democratic colleagues hate President Trump so much that they refuse to work with him even when it means securing a more prosperous future for America. Instead, they have chosen to lie again.

The lie that they tell us is that by making tax cuts permanent, Congress is taking money from working-class and low-income families to give tax cuts to the rich. The facts show that this is the farthest thing from the truth. President Biden's own Treasury Department reported that the average person would see a 2.2 percent tax cut if the Trump tax cuts were extended. According to the Tax Foundation, the bottom 50 percent of earners in the country saw their average Federal tax rate fall by 15 percent when the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act took effect. On the other hand, the top 1 percent of earners only saw a decrease of about 5 percent during that same period. Some of my colleagues across the aisle may want to force a tax hike on the vast majority of American families next January, but, please, let's just be honest about it.

Some of my Democrat colleagues have been clear that they are anti-Trump. I would like to ask, then what are they for? The truth is they are here to fight for future tax hikes, foreign energy reliance, wasteful spending, government dependence, and a future of America last.

On the other hand, Kansans from the Big First sent me here to fight for working families, tax cuts, energy dominance, the military, American agriculture, and the American Dream, a future of America first. That is what I am focused on doing, along with President Trump, and that is what the one big, beautiful bill is all about.

I am looking forward to supporting our bill when it comes to the floor for a full vote and delivering on the mandate the country gave us on November 5, 2024. We can't afford to miss out on this once in a lifetime opportunity, Mr. Speaker.

TAX CUTS

(Mr. KHANNA of California was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the fiscally irresponsible one big, beautiful bill that simply gives tax breaks for the richest Americans and takes away services for working- and middle-class families.

Here are the facts: We currently have about a \$36 trillion debt, and we are spending right now \$2 trillion more every year than we take in. The Republican budget would add \$3.8 trillion to that deficit. It will do that over 10 years.

How are they going to get those \$3.8 trillion of tax breaks? Let me just outline who those tax breaks are going to go to: \$96 billion a year are going to go to people who make over a million dollars a year. If you are a millionaire in America, you are going to get about \$82,000 a year in tax breaks. If you are making under \$100,000, you get about \$750 in tax breaks. That is \$82,000 of tax breaks for the millionaires, and \$750 to working- and middle-class families. That is not a fair deal.

Democrats believe that we need to raise taxes on people who are making over a million dollars, not give them \$82,000 a year in tax breaks.

By the way, the tax breaks for those millionaires and billionaires are permanent over 10 years. The tax breaks the Democrats support for working-class families, like no tax on tips, they only want them for 4 years. Democrats have been fighting to get the no tax on tips for 10 years. Republicans say: No, for working families, we only want 4 years. Tax breaks for the billionaires in my district in Silicon Valley, for those we want 10 years.

Then what are they cutting? They are cutting \$750 billion in Medicaid benefits. That is just a fact. Go Google it. You will see the cuts. They claim that people aren't going to lose their healthcare, but the independent CBO says that up to 14 million Americans may lose their healthcare. Up to a million of American children, kids born in the United States, may lose their healthcare. It is the largest cut to Medicaid in the history of this country, all to finance \$96 billion a year of tax breaks to the millionaires and billionaires. Those are the facts.

Look, CBO did an analysis, and they said that the top 10 percent in America are going to benefit enormously from this bill. If you are in the top 10 percent, if you make over a million dollars, over a half a million dollars, you should applaud.

The bottom 10 percent, the folks who are working hard, struggling to make

ends meet, the truck drivers, people who work at Walmart, nurses, HVAC technicians are going to lose 4 percent.

This bill benefits those who are already doing well and ignores those who are working hard and struggling the most. It is the exact opposite of what we should be doing.

Even Donald Trump challenged the Congress to say: Raise taxes a bit on the rich. I am fine with it. Did the Republicans do that? No. They cut them further for the wealthy.

People ask what do Democrats believe? Democrats believe that the tax breaks and the tax cuts should be going to the working and middle class in this country. Democrats believe we should be taxing more the people who are making a million and a billion dollars a year. We believe we should not be cutting Medicaid, essential healthcare services that help families, that support hospitals, and that support the health of so many seniors in this country.

□ 1115

This debate is about whose side are Members on. Are my colleagues for those who already benefited from the income divide, or for the working and middle class? I hope enough Republicans on the other side will say "no" to these cuts of working-class benefits.

I hope enough Republicans will say "no" to the tax breaks for the millionaires and billionaires, and will say "no" to piling on more debt which will raise interest rates, hurting our economic growth, exploding our trade deficit because of our reliance on foreign firms and foreign investment, and crippling ordinary Americans' ability to get loans.

It is bad economics. We need a new approach.

STOP THE START-STOP TECHNOLOGY

(Mr. LAMALFA of California was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, many regulations are being enacted so often in California due to CARB, California Air Resources Board, or even federally with previous iterations of the EPA.

One of those features is the start-stop feature on newer automobiles, which is when you stop your car and the engine shuts off.

This is a design, in theory, to save gasoline or diesel, whatever your vehicle is powered by. Yet, most drivers or the vast majority of drivers you talk to and survey are really annoyed by this feature because they pull up to a stoplight, a stop sign, or just merely wish to stop somewhere for a moment, and their engine shuts off.

Mr. Speaker, you can point to this button bypass that many of the cars have—some don't—that you can bypass and shut off the feature that shuts off your car. Yet, a lot of people will forget to turn it off. They get in their car,

pull up to the stoplight, and the darned thing shuts off.

They are really annoyed that their government treats them that way and that they can't decide on their own how to operate their vehicle. What you see is that the vehicles also have to build in extra technology and extra heavy-duty equipment in order to accommodate this.

For example, when you stop and start your car all the time, you are going to wear out your battery more, so they have to have a battery with an extra-heavy-duty build to it, as well as the starter itself, in order to accommodate many, many more frequent starts using these systems.

One of the things mechanics will talk to you about is that when you shut an engine off, your oil pressure goes back down to zero. Each time you start your engine without the oil pressure, you gain a little extra wear on your bearings—your crank bearings, your connecting rod bearings, and even in the cylinders—because the oil has settled back down between starts. There is a lot of extra wear involved with the engine wear and engine component wear.

Then, reading up on how the factory has to accommodate this so that it lasts 100,000 miles and doesn't become a warranty problem, they have to build in extra-heavy-duty wiring harnesses so that the extra load from the starter, from the battery, and all of that can be accommodated over a longer period of time so the car will last longer.

When you have these systems in place, this adds to the cost of a new car by having to make heavier batteries, heavier starters, and heavier wiring harnesses on that, all for the concept that you might be saving a little bit of gasoline.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting when you ride around here in D.C., for example, when you have to take an Uber downtown to go to some meet-up or what have you, by the time you get through all of the blankety-blank stoplights in this town—and they are all on timers instead of even on sensors like some of them are at home—that you are riding with somebody and you hear the car shut off, then it starts up again 2 seconds later, if the light happens to change.

For me, who is mechanically inclined, it kind of drives me crazy listening to that because it is such abuse on the car and the engine system, all because somebody dreamed up the idea, if we shut off the engine at stoplights all the time, it might save a little bit of gas.

On some engines, it actually takes a little bit of extra gas to restart it versus just letting it run a few extra seconds. What is seen is that statistics have shown that, maybe over the lifetime of the car, you have saved a few gallons of fuel. Yet, in that process, you have had to buy more batteries, replace starters more often, and build a lot heavier components which are more costly and require more resources, as well.

Mr. Speaker, I am really pleased that EPA Administrator Lee Zeldin has called for changes to this feature. Since it may be perceived as a mandate, I know the auto dealers are afraid to shut it off. If you take it in and say: Would you just disable this thing for me. They say: Well, it is an emissions thing.

If you don't like the gong going off on your seatbelt all the time, they can't shut that off because it is a safety thing. You don't really have the choice of how you are going to operate your vehicle.

For those of us who drive around in a rural area or on our own, if you are a farmer on your fields and such, you have to listen to the gonging of the seatbelt all the time or have it shut off every time you need to stop to irrigate in your field, for example, or if you remember to shut it off with the silly button. Yet, I understand there are bypass systems you can get for that if you want to bootleg it a little bit.

I understand that if you open the hood on certain vehicles, it disables that, so they have a little hood bypass mechanism you can get to bypass that. Mr. Speaker, maybe they just don't need to put the stuff on to begin with and let people decide for themselves if they want to shut their car off at the stoplight every time.

Mr. Speaker, what do you get? When you stop at the light, you get a hesitancy to go again. You can read anecdotes of how people are getting ready to pull out into traffic but the car stopped on them, so they lose their opportunity. They lose their moment to pull out and they have to wait longer.

These silly mandates that come along, people generally don't like them, such as the auto start-stop feature on automobiles. I am pleased and will continue to work with Administrator Lee Zeldin on things like that to give people more car choice on what they want.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NUNN of Iowa). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 21 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CRAWFORD) at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Margaret Grun Kibben, offered the following prayer:

Lord, You have been our dwelling place throughout all generations. Before the mountains were born or the

world was brought forth, from everlasting to everlasting, You are God.

In light of Your eternity, we apprehend all too quickly our finitude. We realize how quickly our days pass, even more so when one of our own friends or loved ones come rapidly to the end of the life You have given them.

Such is this day for us as we grieve our friend and colleague, Representative Gerry Connolly, for his was a life that kept on giving. With his unquenchable passion, his unfading whimsical spirit, Gerry Connolly exuded a sense of perpetual persistence to get things done.

Thank You for his unwavering testimony of justice and mercy, equity and compassion. May his legacy of geniality and gentle gibing spark in us the desire to pay forward his lust for life and his love for Your people.

While we may miss the green ties, the Boston brogue, his blarney, and his bluster, we know that his family and friends will want for that much more. Give them comfort in their sorrow and solace in Your steadfast and abiding love in their grief.

Teach us all to number our days. But even as the grass withers and the flowers fade, may we find strength knowing that the word of the Lord endures forever.

In Your eternal name, we offer our prayers this day.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House the approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1 of rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HOULAHAN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. HOULAHAN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the passing of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), the whole number of the House is 432.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.