

thank and honor Detective Wolfe for serving and protecting the region as a dedicated public servant.

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

### HONORING WHAT D-DAY HEROES FOUGHT FOR

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

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I recognize that today is an important day in the history of our country. As we all know, 81 years ago, on June 6, 1944, we had over 150,000 Allied troops who attacked the beaches at Normandy, knowing full well what they were walking into.

You had 150,000 Allied forces, tens of thousands of Americans who stormed the beaches, jumped out of boats into stormy waters, walked into a virtual wall of bullets, went through the fire, went to the cliffs, got shot at on the cliffs, scaled the cliffs, to then have to fight for every yard for the privilege of then getting all the way to Bastogne to sit in foxholes in the freezing cold on Christmas of 1944 while being bombarded by Germans as they were mounting their last offensive.

What would cause young men from all over this country to do that? Why would they do that, knowing a huge number of them would not make it through the day? They knew that, but they did it anyway. They knew that when they were jumping out of planes in the middle of the night, many of them wouldn't survive.

I saw yesterday on social media photos of dozens of young men who didn't make it through that day, photos from them. They lead up to that morning and the day before in training. What would cause these young men to do that?

The reason is that they knew that this country was worth fighting for, not simply because of the existence of the country but because of what this country represents in terms of opportunity to live free and prosper according to your own talents and to be able to live according to your own conscience under our Constitution and under the principles that were advanced in the Declaration and that are central to Western civilization.

That is what those young men did. We had 400,000-plus Americans who lost their lives to defend this country in World War II. Precious few who survived that conflict are still alive.

Madam Speaker, if you go down to the memorial here in Washington, the World War II Memorial, there are 4,000-plus stars that are across the monument, each representing 100 young men who did what I just described or who did something similar in Iwo Jima or did something similar in the Doolittle Raid.

Again, what would cause them to do it? It is to live free. That is what it is about.

I have a letter from a dear friend of mine named Victoria Coates, who served in the first Trump administration, from her grandfather Howard. I want to read the letter really quickly.

"Jane darling, yep, honey, it is true. Your boyfriend is in it now. I can't tell you how long I have been here or where I am. That will have to come later when I get home. It is the most serious thing I have been in during all of my life.

"I am well, though, darling, and still all in one piece. As you said in the last letter I got from you, the one you wrote on invasion day, I am well-trained and will take care of myself.

"Of course, the men come first, and our mission, but I am not taking any chances personally, except those in the line of duty. Most all of our officers and men are reacting fine to these new conditions. I have my own platoon and my own headquarters out in the field.

"Fact is, I am sitting in my CP now writing this letter. I have Charlie Mugford here as my executive officer, and he is very capable in the field. My staff sergeant is a boy by name of Vabek from Pittsburgh. He is Polish and a darn good man. The Germans killed his grandparents in their invasion into Poland, so you can well imagine his reaction to all of this.

"The morale of the men is good, and that makes the job easier. Golly, I like my little field setup. Have good radio equipment, also a nice switchboard. . . . I have a Jeep and weapons carrier for my CP, plus my CP personnel. . . . We get a special dehydrated ration that requires only the adding of a little water. . . . For supper last night, we had, as an example, baked beans, sausage, cold-packed tomatoes, rice pudding, biscuits, jam and butter, coffee.

"I haven't received the picture yet but am very anxiously awaiting it. Please write regularly. I need it. We haven't received any mail since coming to France but hope to get some soon. That helps plenty.

"Well, darling, you are ever in my thoughts over here and are my big driving force. I, like the thousands of other Americans, am doing my damn best to get this war over with and get home safely to my family."

What did they fight for? I can tell you what they didn't fight for. They didn't fight for a Congress to come here and continue \$36 trillion of debt and mortgage their children, their grandchildren, and their great-grandchildren's futures.

They didn't come here for this Congress to run away from the fight of policy. They didn't risk everything and walk into a wall of bullets so that people in this Chamber can be afraid of tweets or constituents that come in and talk about, oh, but you are cutting some program. They expected us to actually defend this country in this Chamber.

A trillion dollars of interest every year—we are spending more on interest than on the entirety of our national defense.

□ 1240

I have to be honest with you, I don't know whether the big, beautiful bill is beautiful enough to support. I have to be honest.

I voted for it off of the floor to send it to the Senate. There were a lot of important provisions in it, and I need to level set some of those provisions right now because it is not appropriate for us to run away from the fight now that these young men 80 years ago ran into the fight to preserve.

This country will not survive if we mortgage it away, and that is what we are doing. President Reagan was correct when he said that every Member of Congress when they come to this floor and they offer a new bill for a new program should all bring a tax increase to go alongside of it.

Because everybody in this Chamber, particularly on this side of the aisle, are all too fine offering tax cuts because it is like selling dessert, but refuse to put forward the spending cuts so that people have to eat the broccoli. That is why we are \$36 trillion in debt and growing. That is why we have a trillion dollars of interest.

By the way, as interest rates go up, the price of that debt goes up. We are going to be at \$1.5 trillion, \$2 trillion of interest payments because we can't do our job correctly.

Now, let's go through the big, beautiful bill. The bill is what I would call the good, the bad, and the ugly because that is the truth.

I am not going to get into personalities and squabbles and back and forth. The President is right that we need to move a bill through here with tax cuts and spending restraint so that he can get the agenda done that he campaigned on. He is 100 percent right, and we should do that. Elon is right that this bill doesn't cut enough. That is the truth.

Two things can be true at the same time. The barrier to actually achieving the greatness of moving the big, beautiful bill through and that would achieve the President's agenda and achieving what Elon is rightly saying, which is that we should cut more, the barrier is right here in this Chamber. It is right over there in the Senate.

We have people unwilling to face their constituents and tell them the truth. Well, I am going to try to sit here on the floor and tell the truth.

I had to hold my nose to vote for this bill 2 weeks ago off the House floor to the Senate. Why? It does not cut enough, and it is not even close to cutting enough.

My colleagues say: Oh, but CHIP, it is the biggest spending decrease in history. Let's be very clear: It is a reduction in future increases of about \$1.6 trillion.

Yes. That is the biggest amount ever. But guess what? We have sizably more debt and sizably more spending than ever, so, of course, it should be, but it should be more.

Madam Speaker, \$1.6 trillion in cuts on future reductions is really about

\$160 billion a year over 10 years. That is the truth. The truth is that our whole budget has grown from about \$3.6 trillion a decade ago to \$7.2 trillion now. It has doubled.

Everybody wants to applaud themselves for \$160 billion of reductions in increases. I am sorry. I don't think that is good enough. The fact is, our budget, the budget we passed to get the big, beautiful bill through says that we should be at \$6.5 trillion for 2026, but after this bill, if it is passed this way out of the Senate, we would be at \$7.2 trillion.

That is a lot of numbers. You want me to tell you back home—the fact of the matter is, unless we have record economic growth for an entire decade, deficits will go up. That is the truth.

This bill front-loads all of the cost for the first 4 years, 2026, 2027, 2028, 2029 deficits are up. That is, by the way, on a dynamic basis. You are going to hear a lot of people taking shots at the CBO, and they should.

The CBO is biased. The CBO is left leaning, and the CBO doesn't always get it right. But guess what? No economist ever gets it right. The fact is, we took care of that, at least in part, in the Budget Committee by assuming growth. We assumed economic growth of 2.6 percent, higher than the last two decades averaged, lower than the historic average.

Why does that matter? Because we have already accounted for what you call dynamic scoring, meaning the impact of the tax cuts on revenue.

What does that mean in simple terms? It means that if you look at our analysis, even assuming economic growth and more revenue from that growth, we will still have \$400 billion of deficits added to the existing \$2 trillion deficit in 2026 because of the bill.

Those deficits will go up even more and will be another \$400 billion or so in 2027 and 2028, we add to the deficits, 2029 we add to the deficits.

Finally in 2030, the deficits go down. If you look across the entirety of the 10 years under this bill, you are basically—it is somewhere around break-even on the impact on deficits.

Now, again, everybody understand what I am saying. The deficits of roughly around \$1.8 trillion to \$2 trillion a year will continue. This bill will adjust taxes and adjust spending, will increase deficits for 3 or 4 or 5 years, and then cut deficits in the outer 5 years if you believe that will ever happen. Only in this town do you assume that the good things will happen in 5 years and accept the bad things in the first years, but that is what we are doing.

Now to be clear and to be fair, this does not account for tariff revenue, which is up. Of course, tariff revenue has to be factored into the economic impact of the tariffs. You have got to stir all that in the pot and decide what you think is going to happen. If you ask me to weigh all of this, I will tell you that on the simple question of

whether this bill will add to or decrease deficits, I think it will add to the deficits.

Because for the first 5 years, even dynamically scored, they add to the deficits. Even if you assume the current rate of about—I don't know—\$250 billion of tariff revenue, which you can't assume because they change, you are still going to be adding to the deficits even factoring in for the economic impact of growth.

Okay. That is all a lot of nerdy speak. Everyone sent us here to save the country. You can't save the country if you are adding to the deficits. You can't save the country if interest rates aren't going to be able to go down because you are being fiscally responsible and the bond markets respond.

That is the simple truth, but here we are. Why are we here? Why, despite what I just said, did I hold my nose and vote for the bill?

Well, A, as part of the process and I am hopeful the Senate might work its will to make the bill better. Probably not a good bet. The Senate rarely makes things better.

Okay. B, we did get some serious reforms to Medicaid. I am proud of those reforms, but I do have to be honest with you, they are kind of like breathing.

When I tell you the reforms, you are going to be, like, wait. We don't do that already. We are simply going to reverse a lot of the damage of the Biden administration and reverse a lot of the damage of the expansion of ObamaCare by simply saying this: You shouldn't be on Medicaid if you are able-bodied and can work and you are not working.

Now, Democrats will say: Oh, you are slashing Medicaid. No, we are not. They are not telling you the truth about that. What we are doing is simply saying you should have to work. It is the same thing for food stamps. My Republican colleagues will say: Oh, my gosh, these are the biggest savings in history. This is the greatest thing since sliced bread.

Every American I talk to says: Why weren't you doing that already? It is like the basic business of commerce. Why would you do that? Why would you provide benefits to people who are able to work and don't? It is insane.

We are going to say: Oh, my gosh, we saved hundreds of billions of dollars on Medicaid reform by tightening and making sure we are enforcing eligibility and that only the vulnerable get it instead of the able-bodied.

But we are not doing anything to stop the money laundering scam. We are not doing anything to stop the fact that expansion States under ObamaCare get seven times more money for the able-bodied than the vulnerable. We are going to do nothing about that.

We are going to do nothing about the provider taxes that are part of that scam, that have blue States getting money to give money to illegals and to

people at Planned Parenthood and other things because they launder the money through Washington to get a multiple to give it to hospitals and insurance companies and then give them a tax break on the back end.

It is well documented, well reported, and this body is doing not a damn thing about it because they are too afraid. They are too afraid to take on the insurance lobby. They are too afraid to take on the hospital lobby. They are too afraid to be honest with the American people.

□ 1250

Yet, I voted for the bill. Why? Because if we don't, we keep operating under the current system, which means we keep giving Medicaid to people without work requirements.

Therefore, I am faced with a conundrum: Do I vote for the bill so I can actually have the common sense of a Medicaid work requirement start in 2026 or do I vote "no" on the bill because I think deficits are going to go up and I think this is the bare basics of reform we should do while we are not doing anything to stop the money laundering scam that will likely encourage the 10 nonexpansion States to expand and cement ObamaCare permanently?

This is the Hobson's choice that someone like me or some of my other colleagues face, all under the bluster of what this bill does or does not do, which 90 percent of the people in this body can't even explain, much less the American people or anybody in the media. That is the truth.

We add lots of new tax cuts. Here is the little secret that everybody should understand: All of the new tax cuts expire after 4 years or 5 years. You want to know a classic Washington gimmick? That is one. You are getting absolutely the bait-and-switch by Republicans in the House and the Senate by saying we are going to have these tax cuts only be applied for 4 years because they will expire, don't you know, in 4 years, so you don't have to score them now. They always say: Don't worry, over 10 years this thing, man, it reduces deficits. However, they don't score the last 5 years because the tax cuts expire.

Now, let me ask you a question. If you are watching this, all 12 of you on C-SPAN, tell me whether you think if we put in place the \$500 enhanced child tax credit—I don't care whether you like the policy or not. I have my concerns with the policy. I think it is a giveaway. I don't think it is actually all that helpful. I don't think it creates economic growth, but, okay, we are all in the giveaway business in this Chamber. We are going to give away another \$500 for every child in this country, even though it costs thousands to raise them, but we are only going to do it for 4 years.

I am not allowed to speak and address the audience, I have to address the Speaker, but for anybody who happens to be listening in the Chamber or

on C-SPAN, would you go to Vegas and bet yes or no that those tax credits would be expanded in 5 years? You know damn well they will be expanded in 5 years, but we don't score that. That is a Washington gimmick.

There are seven of those, I think, or more of these tax cuts that expire in 4 or 5 years but are not then scored for the outer 5 years so that everything can balance, but it doesn't. That is \$1.6 trillion of additional lost revenue.

Now, again, let me be clear: I support a lot of those policies. I don't think we should be taxing Social Security on seniors either at all or certainly as much. I don't think we should have taxes—let me restate it.

I think we should give tax benefits for moving manufacturing to the United States and give rapid depreciation expensing for those companies. I am for that policy. That might actually be one of the few that might pay for themselves with the growth.

How about the auto loan tax deduction? We have got that in there now. Well, do you think that is going to pay for itself? Do you think they will let that expire in 4 years when everybody is used to deducting their auto interest? Maybe it is fine policy, but shouldn't we pay for it?

Shouldn't we have more spending reductions, or are we going to keep up the fiction that we can continue to do these policies? All my Republican colleagues go: CHIP, they all pay for themselves. Are you a tax raiser? That is what they do. They go: CHIP, you are out there, you are saying we have got to raise taxes.

There is a reason, as I said a minute ago, Ronald Reagan said if you come down here with a new idea, you ought to have a tax increase attached to it. Everybody in this Chamber cannot say no to the Farm Bureau when they come in and they want more money, when the ALS people come in and say they need more research, when the cancer people come in and say they need more research.

I am a cancer survivor, and I tell them no because, damn it, we don't have any more money. But everybody in this Chamber just says: Okay, we are going to authorize more spending, and I am going to go do a tax cut because, oh, that is your money, you get to keep your taxes, I agree.

Let me be clear: They are all going to sit there and play some clip; CHIP ROY is for tax increases. It is all crap. The truth is everybody in this Chamber says every tax cut pays for itself. What if I cut taxes to 1 percent? Do those all pay for themselves? No, they don't. And we owe \$36 trillion.

Everybody watching this: Your kids, your grandkids, your great-grandkids are holding the bag because you wanted all your free crap. As I have said before in a speech, this is always the United States House of free crap, and that is what we do, we just write checks.

The Inflation Reduction Act, the green new scam, I am going to tell you

the one reason I voted for this bill—one. Yes, I like the Medicaid requirements; yes, I like a lot of the extensions of the tax cuts; yes, I like some of the policies that stop funding Planned Parenthood; yes, I like some of the policies that stop funding transgender surgeries. All of those are good, but in my opinion, we needed more spending restraint, if you want to be honest about deficits.

I voted for this bill for one reason, and this is why I am on the floor today, because I need the United States Senate to hear this as clearly as I can say it: We got restrictions on the green new scam to ensure that about 55 or 60 percent of those subsidies that are going to enrich billion dollar corporations to put money in the pockets of the Chinese, to undermine our grid with unreliable energy and undermine natural gas and undermine nuclear, all while bolstering wind and solar, which is littering our fields and littering our landscape, all to provide unreliable energy.

We fought like hell to get restrictions on that, to get 60 percent of the green new scam basically terminated. The President campaigned on terminating all of it, but this weak-ass Congress and Senate are going to not do that because, oh, we can't disrupt the existing flow of the \$400 billion of subsidies going into the pockets of all those big companies raking in the money so they can get free money. While you guys all subsidize, they are getting rich, and your grid gets weaker.

This Congress is going to do that, and we fought like cats and dogs to get that 60 percent. Everybody in town, the K Street lobbyists are freaking out: Oh, no, we are not going to be able to have our subsidies to build more wind farms and solar farms. We are going to have more giveaways because their energy won't compete. That is the one reason I voted for this bill.

My message to the Senate: This will get clipped. It will get sent to the Senate. I am looking at you, THOM TILLIS. I am looking at you over there in the Senate, you backslide one inch on those IRA subsidies, and I am voting against this bill. I want the White House to hear it. I want the Senate to hear it because it is the only reason I voted for this bill. Those God-forsaken subsidies are killing our energy, killing our grid, making us weaker, destroying our landscape, undermining our freedom, and I am not going to have it.

You do what you want to do in the Senate, House of Lords, have your fun, but if you mess up the Inflation Reduction Act green new scam subsidies, I ain't voting for that bill. We have a duty to actually honor those who fought 81 years later.

All these colleagues of mine, both sides of the aisle, they will go out. You watch, today, D-day, there will be a tweet from everybody. June 14, the 250th birthday of the Army, there will be a tweet from everybody. July 4, they

will get in their parades, they will walk around with the flag. They will kiss babies. Yay.

What will they do on Veterans Day?

What did they do on Memorial Day?

What are we doing to actually honor the memory of those who gave the last full measure of devotion, who walked into the wall of bullets, who died for this country? So that we can be \$36 trillion in debt? So that we can subsidize the green new scam? So that we can run away from the fight of having a tough conversation with constituents that there, in fact, is no more room in the inn, that we are out of money?

I have got to tell you; this bill does not meet the moment. I voted for it because I believe strongly in stopping those green new scam subsidies and for a variety of other good provisions, but we ought to do better. The Senate ought to do better. If the Senate weakens it, shame on the Senate. If the House just takes it, shame on the House.

The President of the United States campaigned on terminating the green new scam. We should terminate it.

The President of the United States said that we should get rid of waste, fraud, and abuse in Medicaid. Well, we should, including the money laundering scam enriching blue States at the expense of red States, expansion States at the expense of nonexpansion States, and enriching the able-bodied at the expense of the vulnerable.

The President campaigned on tax relief. We should deliver it. But we should have the commensurate spending cuts to go alongside of it to ensure that deficits go down to do what the President also campaigned on, which is balancing the budget of the United States.

I do not believe this bill yet will do that. We will see what the Senate does over the next week, but we will do a disservice to the memories of those that we are celebrating today on the 81st anniversary of D-day, and we will do a disservice to the memory of all those who came before us who fought and died and bled for this country. But more importantly, we will do a disservice to their ancestors, a disservice to our kids and our grandkids, who are the ones left holding the bag of rampant inflation, high interest rates, and a bond market that is teetering on the edge of a knife's edge because we refuse to do our job.

□ 1300

Mr. Speaker, we have an obligation to do it. I hope the Senate will step up and make this bill better.

If they leave it the same, they can send it to the President's desk. If they leave it basically the same and they send it back, I guess a lot of us will hold our nose again and say: Well, I guess that is the best this Congress is capable of doing.

It is like General Patton's quote in the movie:

“‘What did you do in the great World War II?’ You won't have to say, ‘Well, I shoveled crap in Louisiana.’”

What is Congress going to say that they did at this moment in time and in history to save this country? I hope the Senate will listen and make this bill better. I hope they will make it deserving of the President's campaign and mandate and deliver for the American people. They better darn well not backslide.

Frankly, it was hard to hold my nose to vote for that bill in the first place because I am over a barrel. I am trying to actually make Medicaid work, trying to make these subsidies get repealed, and trying to do the job that the President campaigned on, while we are too inclined to want to have giveaways that don't simply add up.

This is a moment for us to rise up and deliver. I hope the Senate will do it, and I hope the House will follow.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RULLI). Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not to a perceived viewing audience.

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

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

S. 160.—An act to amend the Wildfire Suppression Aircraft Transfer Act of 1996 to reauthorize the sale by the Department of Defense of aircraft and parts for wildfire suppression purposes, and for other purposes.

S.J. Res. 13.—A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency of the Department of the Treasury relating to the review of applications under the Bank Merger Act.

S.J. Res. 31.—A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "Review of Final Rule Reclassification of Major Sources as Area Sources Under Section 112 of the Clean Air Act".

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 9, 2025, at noon for morning-hour debate.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GRAVES: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 188. A bill to require that the Amtrak Board of Directors comply with the open meetings requirements of section 552b of title 5, United States Code, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 119-144). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRAVES: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 2390. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to clarify that port infrastructure development program funds may be used to replace Chinese port crane hardware or software, and for other purposes (Rept. 119-145). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRAVES: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 248. A bill to require Amtrak to install baby changing tables in bathrooms on passenger rail cars (Rept. 119-146). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRAVES: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 2035. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Transportation to ensure that all cargoes procured, furnished, or financed by the Department of Transportation are transported on privately-owned commercial vessels of the United States, and for other purposes (Rept. 119-147). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRAVES: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 252. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to prohibit certain contracts for port operations and management, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 119-148). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRAVES: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 2351. A bill to direct the Commandant of the Coast Guard to update the policy of the Coast Guard regarding the use of medication to treat drug overdose, and for other purposes (Rept. 119-149). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRAVES: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H. Res. 137. A resolution designating the House Press Gallery, Rooms H-315, H-316, H-317, H-318, and H-319 in the United States Capitol, as the "Frederick Douglass Press Gallery", with amendments (Rept. 119-150). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SCALISE:

H.R. 4. A bill to rescind certain budget authority proposed to be rescinded in special messages transmitted to the Congress by the President on June 3, 2025, in accordance with section 1012(a) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MASSIE (for himself, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. MCDOWELL, and Mr. NEHLS):

H.R. 3795. A bill to provide for the first true audit of gold owned by the United States in more than 65 years and to conduct subsequent audits every 5 years; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BEGICH:

H.R. 3796. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Transportation to authorize the use of unmanned aircraft systems and satellites in inspections of rights-of-way of certain pipeline facilities; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BURCHETT:

H.R. 3797. A bill to codify Executive Order 14278 (relating to preparing Americans for high-paying skilled trade jobs of the future); to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Mr. BURCHETT:

H.R. 3798. A bill to codify Executive Order 14233 relating to establishment of the strategic Bitcoin reserve and United States digital asset stockpile; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BURCHETT:

H.R. 3799. A bill to codify the executive order relating to Enforcing Commonsense Rules of the Road for America's Truck Drivers; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LAMALFA (for himself, Ms. MATSUI, and Mrs. KIM):

H.R. 3800. A bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 to prohibit the deferral of the issuance of letters of map revision based on the placement of fill or conditional letters of map revision based on the placement of fill, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BURCHETT:

H.R. 3801. A bill to codify Executive Order 14280 (related to reinstating common sense school discipline policies); to the Committee on Education and Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BURCHETT:

H.R. 3802. A bill to codify Executive Order 14190 (relating to ending radical indoctrination in K-12 schooling); to the Committee on Education and Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BURCHETT:

H.R. 3803. A bill to codify Executive Order 14285, titled "Unleashing America's Offshore Critical Minerals and Resources"; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, Foreign Affairs, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARBAJAL:

H.R. 3804. A bill to direct the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment to conduct a study on the feasibility of carrying out a grant program to assist communities affected by noise from space launch activities of the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CARTER of Louisiana:

H.R. 3805. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to modify the definition of franchise fee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. DE LA CRUZ (for herself, Mr. BABIN, Mr. ROY, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas, Mr. GOODEN, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, Mr. NEHLS, Mr. ARRINGTON, and Mr. GILL of Texas):

H.R. 3806. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to study and report on strategies to combat the New World screwworm and enhance the United States' preparedness and response capabilities against potential outbreaks; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FALLON (for himself and Mr. VINDMAN):