

there was always an open invitation to her backyard pool.

Therese attributed her health and longevity to faith, family, friends AND a glass of red wine or a margarita as well as Wildwood Health Club. Therese brought a smile and sparkle into the lives of all who knew her, and she will be missed forever! She cherished the joyful fun times both small and large and the wonderful family and friends who made them happen.

Therese will be greatly missed by her daughters, Carroll (Jim) Nunemaker and Shannon (Rob) Congdon; her 4 granddaughters, Kelly Nunemaker, Courtney (Brett Poulos) Congdon, Caitlin (Matt) Mozzoni and Carli Congdon; and 4 great-grandchildren, Harper and Hudson Poulos and Mickey and Mack Mozzoni; and her sister-in-law, Nancy Barcelona. Therese was a favorite Aunt to all nieces and nephews because she always felt "We Are Family". She was preceded in death by her parents; her sister, Patsy Imber; son, Jimmy Naumann; and husband, Bill.

HONORING ROBERT S. CRAMPTON

(Mr. BURLISON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURLISON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a dear friend and true trailblazer, Robert S. Crampton, who passed away peacefully at the age of 95.

Robert was a man of wisdom, quiet strength, and action. He served in the U.S. Army, worked with the Austin Police Department, and spent his life building up the people and communities around him.

He helped construct satellite stations during the space race. He taught generations of students in Guam and here in the United States, as well.

Quite literally, he blazed trails across southwest Missouri. Through the nonprofit that he cofounded, Volunteers for Outdoor Missouri, Robert led volunteers in building and maintaining hiking trails that thousands now enjoy, including the nature trail at Lake Springfield.

He believed in community, hard work, and the power of education to change lives.

Robert lived his life by a simple but powerful truth: It is a choice to have a good day.

He made that choice every day, serving others with humility, humor, and heart.

To his wife, Ann, and the Crampton family, I thank them for sharing Robert with us. His legacy lives on in every step that we take down the paths that he forged.

OPPOSITION TO JOB CORPS CLOSURES

(Ms. TOKUDA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TOKUDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the Trump administration's abrupt, un-

justified attempt to close Job Corps centers nationwide.

I have been to the Job Corps graduation on Maui. I have looked into the eyes of students whose lives were changed. I have walked the grounds of the Waimanalo campus where young people, many of whom had nowhere else to turn, found a path to a good job and a better life.

These are not statistics. These are real people, and they deserve better than to be abandoned by a system that was supposed to lift them up.

A mother in Hilo wrote to me and shared that no amount of mental help was able to save her son, only Job Corps.

She told me: Please save my son. Please help save Job Corps.

Today, I rise not just for policy, but for people. Every young person in Hawaii and across this country just needs a chance. We must not turn our backs on them now.

IN MEMORY OF OFFICERS SAMUEL RIVEROS AND DARIUS WONG

(Mr. CISNEROS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CISNEROS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of Baldwin Park Police Officer Samuel Riveros, who lost his life in the line of duty while attempting to rescue a fellow officer.

Known for his infectious smile, love of the Dodgers, and snowboarding, Officer Riveros served in the Baldwin Park Police Department for over 8 years and was a member of the SWAT team.

Officer Riveros' absence leaves a wake of grief that will only be tempered by time, never to subside.

However, amidst our sorrow, may we find solace in his courage, character, and the oath he kept until the end. Officer Riveros' legacy as a hero will live on in the hearts and minds of the Baldwin Park community and the 31st Congressional District.

This devastating event also claimed the life of Darius Wong, a resident of Hacienda Heights and a beloved son, brother, husband, and father.

Both of these men should still be here, and it breaks my heart that their lives were cut so short from this disgusting act of cruelty.

Let us keep them and their families in our thoughts. May they rest in peace.

ELON CALLS IT QUILTS

(Mr. CONAWAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because we are witnessing a tragic breakup between a Nazi-saluting billionaire and the President of the United States.

Elon Musk has decided to call it quits after President Trump and con-

gressional Republicans moved to eliminate a tax credit that would have benefited Musk under the so-called big, beautiful bill.

To be completely honest, I agree with both sides on this. I agree that Trump should start to question Elon's Federal contracts, and I agree with Musk that the One Big Beautiful Bill Act is an abomination.

I am curious to see who my Republican colleagues will choose in this breakup because, unfortunately for them, they have pledged undying allegiance, either directly or indirectly, to both of these men.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle turned a blind eye as Musk was handed the keys to the government, enabling him to disable or, rather, dismantle—probably both—programs everyday Americans depend on. The majority stood by Trump through everything he has done, and now we will see if that support falters.

The American people deserve much better than the drama playing out between these two men, and it is time my Republican colleagues recognize this.

At long last, let's work together to focus on the real issues facing our beloved Nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

MONITORING BIG, BEAUTIFUL BILL PROVISIONS

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

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, first of all, due to when I was pushed back to start this, my speech will go a little less than 10 minutes, if anybody is planning around it.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk a little bit about the big bill that we just passed and some provisions that should be monitored as we work our way not only through the big reconciliation bill but through the appropriations bills, as well.

First of all, I think it is important that the public and the press corps pay attention to what becomes of the low-income housing tax credits in this bill.

Currently, the low-income tax credits were brought to my attention when I attended part of a seminar in which the speaker was bragging about how much money developers could make off of these low-income housing tax credits. The credits give a developer 10 percent of their value of their project over a 9-year period.

There is a time value of money. Even taking into account the time value of money, it means the government pays for 70 percent of the cost of a project. If we felt there was a shortage of anything else in this society, we would never say the answer is to give a business 70 percent of the cost of their

product so that they would produce more.

In a related comment on the low-income tax credit, once you say the government is going to pay for 70 percent of these housing projects, it results in overspending on the part of the developer. These projects in California have sometimes cost \$800,000 or almost \$900,000 per unit.

That is not the norm, but think of it. The government pays somebody 70 percent of the cost of a building. Is it surprising that these people don't put marble countertops in? Is it even surprising that it costs \$800,000 or \$900,000 per unit?

□ 1740

How in the world under any circumstances in a budget in which the government is borrowing 26 percent of the amount of Federal spending could we, under any circumstances, allow this program to continue?

Nevertheless, it not only continues, but the House of Representatives for some reason decided to increase the amount of money in these credits.

I also think it encourages a little bit of questionable behavior there because, of course, there is always going to be more demand for these credits because so much money can be made off them. Because there is so much demand, I think sometimes, on a State level, when they dole out these credits, the credits go to a politically favored class. It obviously encourages developers to curry favor with politicians who may directly or indirectly determine who gets these projects.

I hope our sleeping press corps pays attention as to what becomes of this program as it works its way through the process. Right now, we are spending about \$12.5 billion a year on low-income housing tax credits.

I want to point out that low income is in the title, but well over half the people who live in these buildings are not meeting sub- to low-income qualifications. Even if one is technically low-income, they could have unlimited assets, as well.

In any event, I really think, in all of my years in public life, the most questionable program I have ever come across is the low-income housing tax credit.

The press corps likes to run down politicians. Here is something they ought to be run down for, so I hope they pay a little more attention.

The next thing I would like to point out is what the Republicans do with the SALT deduction. There are a variety of changes in the tax code that we could make that would affect people's behavior. Because tax rates are so high, any change in the tax code affects people's behavior.

Some people feel we ought to make reductions to encourage more research and development. Other people feel that we ought to—I feel we ought to increase the personal exemption to give a special benefit to people who have

more children. Some people feel we should have an across-the-board cut and not influence one behavior or another.

There is a small group of people in this building who apparently feel the number one problem we have is that State and local taxes are not high enough, and they want to bring back a deduction for State and local taxes. Right now, we have a low deduction in there, so they are aiming things at not the poor or middle class. They are really aiming things at the well-off people and encouraging governments, like California and especially New York, to raise their taxes.

Recently, on the radio, I was listening to a guy who, I believe, is running for Governor there. He wants to raise the income tax in New York to 11 percent. It is not surprising, then, that I am sure people, like this person, who want to dramatically increase the income taxes in New York would want those taxes to be tax deductible.

Why a Republican would want to do that, I am not sure. I think it is something we ought to talk a little bit more about.

The next area that is going to be working its way that is affected indirectly by the great big, beautiful bill but will be more directly impacted by the appropriations bills that follow is what happens with the Department of Defense.

Right now, we have close to 900,000 employees who are not uniformed in the Department of Defense. I think one of the great things DOGE did is expose how hard or not hard some of those employees are working. We will see what happens with the overall defense budget and whether Congress is willing to take the step forward and say that maybe we don't need 900,000 employees in the Department of Defense who are not uniformed.

The other thing in the Department of Defense we can look at is what Pete Hegseth, who I think is going to be a great Secretary of Defense, has pointed out. He feels, in today's world, aircraft carriers are maybe not entirely obsolete but are not as valuable as they were 30 years ago. That should be obvious from what happened over the weekend when Ukraine used drones to wipe out some aircraft thousands of miles away in the Soviet Union, showing that the nature of warfare is changing rapidly. Our defense budget should change rapidly with it.

Mr. Hegseth has said we are going to use less combat troops. We certainly need a lot less noncombat troops. He has implied that he feels aircraft carriers are becoming a little bit obsolete. Right now, we have 11 aircraft carriers. We have three more under construction to replace the current aircraft carriers.

I think we have to protect our electric grid. I think we have to protect ourselves against hypersonic missiles. I think Israel is doing a good job at that.

We have to prepare for the next war, not prepare to refight World War II.

I think it is important for our press corps to publicize people who talk about the new type of munitions and the new type of armaments we are going to need in a new war. Given that we are so entirely broke and that 26 percent of our budget is borrowed, we have to make sure now more than ever that our defense dollars are spent wisely and not on things that, to a certain extent, are a little bit outdated.

I hope the press covers whether we still need 11 aircraft carriers and asks Pete Hegseth if he still believes that they are overrated because, in today's world, with hypersonic missiles and drones, as the Russians found out, big stationary things, even temporary stationary things, are sitting ducks.

Looking at the clock here, I think I should probably not deal with my other issues, so I will stop speaking. I believe we have somebody else ready to go.

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

CONSEQUENCES OF DOGE

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about Elon Musk and the Department of Government Efficiency, or DOGE, and the deadly and devastating consequences of their illegal actions, which will reverberate long after they are gone. The theme of today's Special Order hour is that the Musk is gone, but the stench remains.

Elon Musk supposedly has left the Federal Government. I just want to remind people that when President Trump issued his executive order creating the Department of Government Efficiency, or DOGE, and appointed Elon Musk in the role related to DOGE, DOGE was created as a temporary organization.

□ 1750

Elon Musk was appointed as a special government employee, and this was to avoid having any kind of Senate confirmation or congressional creation of the agency or any confirmation of Elon Musk.

Mr. Speaker, I will remind you that the entire time that Elon Musk was in office or as a Federal employee, he was, in fact, exercising powers that were far greater than any special government employee would be allowed to have. He was exercising powers that would be at the highest levels of government, higher than an agency or department head,