

at the Nevada Test Site. It will also extend compensation to uranium miners and expand eligibility for downwinders across the State of Utah. This will help relieve burdens for Utahns who were harmed during active nuclear weapons testing.

The bill will provide funding for technological advancement for our military and enhance the quality of life for our military personnel by allocating up to \$7.4 billion in benefits for servicemembers across the country.

Under this bill, the budget will provide for restoration and renovation of barracks, more funding for the Defense Health Program, aid to military families by adding to the childcare fee assistance, and bonuses for members of the military.

This policy reflects our commitment to honoring the sacrifices of our military by investing directly in servicemembers and the infrastructure that supports their well-being. It demonstrates our commitment to putting America first by ensuring our servicemen and -women in Utah and across the world receive the care and support they deserve.

This legislation is designed to put hardworking Americans, families, and small businesses first, including my constituents in Utah's Third District. By passing this bill, Republicans have delivered on the promises we made to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from North Dakota (Mrs. Fedorchak), my distinguished colleague.

Mrs. FEDORCHAK. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative KENNEDY for yielding and for leading this important Special Order tonight to talk about all the wins in the One Big Beautiful Bill Act.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight an important promise President Trump made to the American people that the one big, beautiful bill fulfills.

The One Big Beautiful Bill Act delivers a long list of wins for families, seniors, small businesses, farmers, energy producers, and our military. It prevents the largest tax increase in U.S. history, putting \$4.5 trillion in Americans' pockets instead of in the government's coffers. It delivers permanent tax relief, begins to rein in Washington's out-of-control spending, makes historic investments in border security and national defense, and restores the kind of commonsense priorities people in my State of North Dakota live by every single day.

There are so many wins in this bill that we need to break them apart and highlight them separately.

Today, I will focus on a provision that many think is too good to be true. In fact, in talking to people, they think, "How can this actually happen?" but it will, and that is no tax on tips and overtime.

During my time back home recently, I visited with folks across North Dakota, including those working in con-

struction, law enforcement, and service industries. This bill is great news for them and the hundreds of professions that regularly put in overtime to get the job done.

In fact, around 30 percent of all employees in North Dakota regularly work overtime and could benefit from the no tax on overtime provision in this bill.

According to the Council of Economic Advisers, an even larger 65 percent of workers in North Dakota are in occupations that are likely eligible for overtime and could also benefit.

We cut taxes on up to \$12,500 of overtime pay for more than 80 million hourly workers. This is estimated to increase yearly take-home pay by more than \$1,400.

The bill also eliminates Federal taxes on up to \$25,000 of tips for America's 4 million tipped workers. As a former waitress, I know how valuable this provision would be. This applies to all tips, whether they are tips that are cash or on credit. All tips qualify for the no tax on tips. This is estimated to boost incomes by an average of \$1,300 per year.

With these policies, we are rewarding everyday Americans' hard work, and we are not waiting. These provisions are retroactive, meaning that people will see the benefits of no taxes on tips and overtime this year, even for hours worked prior to this bill passing.

I was very proud to join my colleagues in delivering on this commitment to the American people, and I can't wait to see how it benefits them all.

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

□ 1700

RISK OF CONFLICT WITH NUCLEAR WEAPONS

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address one of the most serious issues of our time, the risk of conflict with nuclear weapons. It is a threat that challenges our conscience. It is a threat not just for Americans but for all humanity. It is a threat not just to humans, but to all species of life on our planet.

We raise this issue in the context of a series of important anniversaries. One week ago, July 16 marked the 80th anniversary of the Trinity test, the first detonation of a nuclear weapon in New Mexico. We still live with the legacy of above-ground nuclear tests.

Two years ago, the Defense Department awarded the Atomic Veterans Commemorative Service Medal to the still-surviving veterans of that era and their family members.

We must also honor the downwinders, civilians whose health and land suf-

fered from the effects of radiation from these tests. Many were in the State of Nevada. In addition, we cannot forget the Pacific Islanders who have not been able to return to their home islands or the Uyghurs and others whose homeland in Xinjiang was the location of China's nuclear tests. They, too, have suffered long-term health consequences.

In 2 weeks, we will commemorate the first use of a nuclear weapon in a conflict—and that was the atomic bombing of Hiroshima on August 6, 1945—and the second, the bombing of Nagasaki, on August 9. Let us pray that Nagasaki will be the last. Let us work to make sure that it is.

Sadly, the threat from nuclear weapons is only increasing. There are estimated to be 13,400 nuclear weapons in the world today. Some 90 percent of these are in the arsenals of the United States and Russia. The rest belong to the U.K., France, China, Israel, India, Pakistan, and North Korea.

Russia has threatened to use nuclear weapons against Ukraine and even against NATO nations. North Korea uses its nuclear weapons program to intimidate the United States, Japan, and Korea. China continues to build up its nuclear arsenal. It has some 600 warheads today and is expected to pass 1,000 by 2030, according to the Pentagon.

The question of Iran's nuclear program has been at the top of our concerns. The military strikes by Israel and the United States were, as stated, designed to degrade or eliminate Iran's nuclear development capabilities. However, as The Washington Post reported last week, U.S. intelligence agencies assess that only one of Iran's three principal nuclear facilities was destroyed by the U.S. attacks. This tells us that military action is not a reliable way to counter nuclear threats. In 80 years of the nuclear era, the only proven, demonstrated way to reduce the risk of nuclear conflict and to lessen the scale of its destruction is through diplomacy and negotiations.

If not for past arms control agreements, Mr. Speaker, today's arsenals would be larger and more dangerous. If not for limitation on above-ground and atmospheric testing, many more people would suffer from radiation and contamination.

However, our challenge is made harder by the fact that there is only one arms control agreement remaining in force between the United States and Russia. The New START Treaty limits the number of deployed strategic nuclear warheads for each party to 1,550. The treaty expires in February 2026. There are scant signs that either government is interested in extending it.

President Donald Trump can and should take forward steps on nuclear arms control. He can follow in the footsteps of other Republican Presidents. President Eisenhower, in his "Atoms for Peace" speech, expressed the moral imperative to warn Americans and the

world of the destructiveness of atomic weapons.

President Reagan in his second term negotiated the INF Treaty with the Soviets. He spoke privately with Gorbachev about the elimination of all nuclear weapons.

Earlier this year, President Trump said from the Oval Office: "There is no reason for us to be building brand-new nuclear weapons, we already have so many. You could destroy the world 50 times over, 100 times over. And here we are building new nuclear weapons, and they're building nuclear weapons."

He added: "We're all spending a lot of money that we could be spending on other things that are actually, hopefully much more productive."

On this point, Mr. Speaker, President Trump is right. President Trump has the opportunity to make nuclear threat reduction a part of his legacy.

As a smart first step, he and Putin can strike a deal to respect New START's central limits and set the stage for a more comprehensive nuclear arms control framework agreement.

Next, President Trump can put nuclear weapons on the agenda when he meets with Xi Jinping. He expressed a willingness to do this in his Oval Office comments.

Even talking about negotiations in itself can help reduce tensions. A deal requires a first step, and I encourage the President to take it and to take it soon.

We, in Congress, can use our voice. Along with our colleague, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. TOKUDA), I am the proud sponsor of H. Res. 317, a resolution that calls on the U.S. Government to return to the negotiating table on nuclear disarmament and to lead a global effort to reduce and eliminate nuclear weapons. It reaffirms our country's moral and strategic obligation to prevent nuclear war and pursue a world free of nuclear weapons as a national security imperative.

This call is in the spirit of Presidents Eisenhower and Reagan and Presidents Carter and Obama, and we hope President Trump. I am pleased to report that Senators MARKEY, MERKLEY, SANDERS, WELCH, and VAN HOLLEN have all introduced a version of our resolution. I urge the foreign policy committees of both bodies to consider these resolutions promptly.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, activity in House committees is taking us in the wrong direction. Last week, the Appropriations Committee approved an energy and water bill that cuts the National Nuclear Security Administration's Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation account by \$412 million. That is 17 percent. These activities help the U.S. stop the spread of nuclear weapons, detect hidden nuclear activities, and support arms control efforts. Why would anybody think it is a good idea to cut that account?

Also last week, the Armed Services Committee approved the National De-

fense Authorization Act. It authorizes \$62 billion for the nuclear enterprise, which represents a 26 percent increase over President Biden's request last year. Unfortunately, the Committee rejected an amendment by the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) to restrict funding to create a new land-based nuclear delivery system, the Sentinel missile, a \$180 billion boondoggle he has called an endless money pit.

The threat of nuclear war is an existential one. We have a moral imperative to address it and address it urgently. Debates over the utility and morality of nuclear weapons are as old as the nuclear age. Notably, many of the people who helped make atomic weapons turned out to be some of the most powerful voices against their use and for the reduction in their arsenals.

Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago this week, the film "Oppenheimer" premiered. It told the story of J. Robert Oppenheimer, the theoretical physicist who helped create the atomic bomb but then pushed against the development of more powerful weapons. For that position of moral courage, he paid a political price.

□ 1710

Mr. Speaker, 2 months ago, Dr. Richard Garwin passed away at the age of 97. He is best known as the author of the first hydrogen bomb. Less widely known is that he spent decades working tirelessly in arms control and disarmament, as well as scientific panels, conferences, and government boards.

In a 2018 interview, Dr. Garwin said: "There is a myth, and you saw it operate many times in the past, that if there is a perceived security problem, well, no difficulty, we will just buy more nuclear weapons. But that doesn't improve our security. What we want is less nuclear weapons and less cause for using them on the other side."

When I was a staffer for the late Congressman Joe Moakley in the 1980s, I recall going to hear Dr. Garwin and Dr. Carl Sagan give a talk on nuclear weapons and the Strategic Defense Initiative. Dr. Sagan, of course, is the physicist who helped us understand the idea of a nuclear winter, which is the hemisphere-wide Dark Age caused by the radioactive ash sent into the atmosphere following multiple nuclear detonations. It would wipe out food supplies and cause untold deaths from starvation, even beyond the millions killed by the blasts.

For us today, the dynamic Dr. Garwin identifies isn't in the past. It is in the present. Our inboxes are full of policymakers expressing fears about the growth of China's nuclear arsenal or Vladimir Putin's intentions or Iran's plans.

Too often, policymakers have a reflexive response. They are building more. Then we should build more. Mr. Speaker, this is so shortsighted. It is a dangerous reaction. It is very, very dangerous. We know firsthand the

harm that such devastating weapons can have.

On the 80th anniversaries, people of many generations will gather at Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Very few survivors of those atomic bombings remain with us, but their stories endure. The disturbing photos of the burns and the radiation sickness endure.

In those cities, those gathered will recommit to preserving the memory of the destruction, and to plead with current and future generations to work to ensure that such horrors never ever, ever happen again.

Mr. Speaker, I regret I cannot be with them in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. That is why I have organized this Special Order on the House floor today so that Members can share their message from the floor of the House.

To our colleagues, to the President, and to the American people, this is a crucial moment in world history. We have a moral responsibility to speak out and to do more.

When we return to Washington after the anniversaries and after the August break, let us commit to raising more awareness. Let us commit to more congressional hearings and more debate on the floor. Let us commit to more encouragement for scientists, civil society, and regular citizens to raise their voices. Let us commit to legislation to contain the growth of nuclear weapons. Let us commit ourselves to the elimination of nuclear weapons.

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

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for holding this Special Hour to discuss the dangers of nuclear weapons.

Mr. Speaker, when I first entered Congress, I was the third Ph.D. physicist elected to this body. We had at the time Vern Ehlers, a nuclear physicist and a conservative, religious Republican representing western Michigan.

We had Rush Holt, a plasma fusion physicist, a progressive Democrat representing Princeton.

We had me, a sort of garden-variety Democrat who spent the last 25 years smashing protons and antiprotons together to make particles that have not been around since the big bang.

Although our politics were quite different, we were united by a special responsibility to join the discussion about nuclear weapons and ask what we could do to strengthen global nuclear security and maintain U.S. leadership in trying to prevent nuclear war.

One area where we were always in violent agreement was to stop wasting money on Star Wars, which was then rebranded as the SDI, the Strategic Defense Initiative, and has now been rebranded Golden Dome.

For more than 45 years, scientists have been patiently explaining to policymakers that this is never going to work. It is easy to overwhelm with a trivial response to it.

We have spent over \$200 billion on it. We have never tested it once against the kind of countermeasures that we know any competent opponent would deploy. Even if we succeed at stopping ballistic missiles, there are, unfortunately, many other ways to deliver nuclear weapons that we can never stop.

This thing is deeply—I guess “stupid” is not too strong a word. We explain something to someone in a variety of terms again and again, and they don’t want to hear it because they think it messages so well.

Wouldn’t it be great if we had this magic Golden Dome, or whatever we want to call it, to stop nuclear weapons? Yeah, it would be great.

If it is an impossibility to do the fundamental physics of it, then we should stop talking about it, and we should certainly stop wasting money on it.

Another place where we were always in strong agreement was how we should be strengthening the nonproliferation efforts at our national laboratories.

Our national labs create an underlying foundation for all of our nuclear security efforts including the nonproliferation and national security priorities that we are talking about here today. In order to ensure that current and future arms control efforts are properly fulfilling their mission, we have to invest in our scientific workforce to maintain our leadership and verification efforts.

It is certainly not well-known among Members of Congress, but when the IAEA sends inspectors into Iran and into countries of concern, those have been largely trained by the national labs in the United States. When we gut the nonproliferation capacities of our national labs or simply allow them to retire, as has been happening, we risk putting aside one of the most powerful tools we have to actually enforce any deal that we may get.

The President is very fond of talking about this deal he is going to get on Iran nuclear. We listened to him talk about how he was going to get North Korea. I support efforts to try to do that.

If we ever succeed in getting one of these deals, for sure we are going to need to have experts we trust that can go in there and make sure nobody is cheating. Unfortunately, what we are seeing is the gutting of those budgets in that capacity. I guess it doesn’t satisfy the MAGA worldview.

Over the years, I have focused my attention on a few specific areas to strengthen our nuclear security architecture. One of them is what is called nuclear—well, it has a number of names. If for some reason a nuclear weapon is detonated somewhere in the United States or anywhere around the world, the President will come under huge pressure to say: Who did that? Whose weapon was it?

There is a lot of very detailed knowledge that we have had in the past in our national labs to be able to go in there and do what is called nuclear

forensics and find out whether that was a bomb from X, Y, or Z. That capacity has been under duress for a long time. It seems like it is every single time the appropriations budgets come up, we end up having to try to defend that.

That is something that is completely irrelevant until it is the most important question in the world. Who did that? Who let off this nuclear weapon? How do we make sure we don’t retaliate against the wrong person or entity that did that?

There are a number of other things I have been working on. First and foremost is H. Res. 100. It is a resolution I introduced in the House with 19 other Members. It supports arms control and condemns Russia’s purported suspension of its participation in the New START Treaty.

The current extension of the New START Treaty is set to expire in under a year, and anyone who remembers previous arms control negotiations will know that there is almost no time left to negotiate a subsequent treaty.

Additionally, any negotiations, whether with Russia, China, or any other country, will require partners who are willing to have discussions on arms control, which is something that is far easier said than done.

This is not something where the two great men leading great nations can come together and strike a deal. The details matter. We have to have technical experts that we trust to go deep down into the weeds to have an agreement so they can come back and say this is a solid agreement we can trust.

It is a time when traditional channels of dialogue on arms control and strategic stability have been closed or quiet, and we are going to rely more than ever on keeping alternative channels open and keeping the expertise in place. Then when the time comes for these agreements, we have people we trust who can carry them out.

□ 1720

Mr. Speaker, nongovernmental organizations, scientists, and research institutions have kept this dialogue open even during the worst parts of the Cold War, and we are going to need to rely on them to fulfill these roles again.

Another crucial institution that we must continue to support in these times is the IAEA, the International Atomic Energy Agency. We have already seen the incredibly hard work that Director General Grossi and his staff are putting in to responding to the Russian invasion of Ukraine with its many nuclear reactors and the myriad of other crises on their doorstep.

Mr. Speaker, that brings us to Iran. One of the proudest moments in my career was standing alongside Dr. Richard Garwin, who, as Representative MCGOVERN mentioned, was often pointed to as the father of the hydrogen bomb and a strong advocate for nuclear nonproliferation. He stood by my side, along with Energy Secretary Dr. Ernest Moniz, as I announced my support for the Iran nuclear deal.

One of the tragedies of the recent past has been this President’s abandonment of the Iran nuclear deal, which has gotten us into a heck of a pickle, as predicted by the people who actually understood what our true options were in that negotiation.

After the U.S. bombing of Iran, there has been an immense amount of debate about whether or not Iran’s nuclear program was set back by a certain amount of time, whether it is years or whatever. The level of technical ignorance that has been displayed by this administration is, frankly, frightening. They have access to the best weapons designers in the world, and they are either not listening to them or not asking questions.

When you hear Secretary Rubio, for example, saying not to worry about their 60 percent enriched uranium inventory because they are going to have to convert it to metal and that will take years, anyone with knowledge of the history of the Manhattan Project knows that is not a major activity. Iran has done it for a long time. They know how to do it.

If you are only interested in converting from uranium hexafluoride to metal, a few tens of kilograms, which is what you need for your first set of weapons, this happens in a laboratory. It can happen in a congressional office. You don’t need a big space for this.

The conversion of the uranium hexafluoride to what is called green salt, and the green salt to metal, is something that happens in a small industrial building. It can happen anywhere in any city in Iran, and it will be really hard to tell. We have not prevented them from doing what they have to do.

The enrichment level is another thing where we are seeing, frankly, technically ignorant statements made. We have three levels of uranium. Less than 20 percent is generally regarded as relatively safe and can be used in reactors without a lot of safeguards. When you get about 90 percent enriched uranium, that is the good stuff for really high-performance weapons.

What about in between? They have 60 percent uranium. Guess what? That is not weapons-grade, but it is weapons-usable. For example, the Hiroshima bomb was made with a mixture of 50 percent enriched uranium and higher enriched uranium.

The 60 percent enriched uranium that Iran has a significant inventory of is perfectly usable even for a simple Hiroshima-style gun-type device. Our leadership speaks in apparent ignorance of that fact, beating their chest and saying we set them back by decades, when that is not the case.

Just to give a sense of the scale, the 400 kilograms of uranium hexafluoride that the IAEA watched them enrich to 60 percent is stored conventionally in the United States in about 25 scuba tank-sized pressurized containers. Any five of those containers have enough uranium to make a Hiroshima-style nuclear weapon.

These things are not hard to smuggle. We will have a hard time convincing ourselves, in fact, that the Iranians haven't already done it.

Pretending like Iran does not have a credible threat and has no leverage is a dangerous and ignorant position for our government to be taking and one of the scariest things about the many threats that we face right now.

Those who don't know should go look at the Wikipedia article on the Hiroshima Little Boy bomb and the references in it. It is, unfortunately, very well-documented over the years because it is not the best weapon you can make, by far. You can make much more complex and efficient weapons, but the Iranians don't have to do that.

If they simply want to replicate what was done, they would get an old 155-millimeter howitzer, replace the explosive shell with some enriched—60 percent enriched will work just fine—uranium, shoot it into the right-shaped target, and they have something that is as effective as the Hiroshima weapon.

This is not a trivial risk. The only answer to this is negotiations, and we have to get very serious about that.

It is not something that the Iranians even have to test. We did not test the Hiroshima weapon. It was obviously going to work. The physics hasn't changed in the 80 years since then, so we are at a very uncertain position on that, and we shouldn't pretend otherwise.

We have also recently been hearing a lot of calls about the resumption of nuclear testing. This is particularly worrying because the move away from nuclear testing has been really one of the cornerstone successes of nonproliferation and nuclear security.

Just think of all the attention Donald Trump could get by giving the order that he wants to blow up a nuclear weapon just to make sure it works, or whatever it is. Yes, he would get a lot of attention that way.

Our country has a tremendous amount to lose if everyone begins nuclear testing again. The U.S., during the Cold War, conducted over 1,000 nuclear tests, far more than any other country, and we had much better instrumentation, knowing exactly what happened in those explosions.

The knowledge that we gained has allowed our Nation to maintain the safety, security, and effectiveness of our nuclear stockpile without any further testing. If we were to resume testing, the rest of the world would resume testing. I am sure they all have bomb designers that are just champing at the bit to get more data on exactly what happens if they explode one of their untested weapons.

If we do this, we would be giving away the most significant strategic advantage that our country has, which is this huge database of exactly what works and what does not work in detailed and very technologically aggressive designs for our nuclear weapons.

If we open that Pandora's box, every country that is nuclear-capable will say this is their opportunity to become coequal with the United States in knowledge of nuclear weapons. That will be yet another disaster for the proliferation regime.

The next few years are going to be crucial to making sure that the world we live in remains safe from the threat of nuclear weapons.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative MCGOVERN for bringing us together to discuss this.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER) for his thoughtful remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii (Ms. TOKUDA).

Ms. TOKUDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues and reinforce their warning and urgent call to action.

Mr. Speaker, today, we stand at a crossroads. The world is once again drifting toward a future where nuclear weapons are not just tools of deterrence but urgent threats hanging over every human life.

□ 1730

Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford to look away, not when the lessons of the past are still very visible amongst us. Look to the people of the Marshall Islands. Many of them are living in my district, part of our Hawaii ohana, whose lands became sacrifice zones in the name of power. Entire communities were displaced, and generations were scarred by radiation. The Bikini Atoll, once a paradise, became a proving ground for devastation.

These are not just theoretical consequences, lines on paper, assumptions, and equations. They were real, and they are very real still.

The United States and its allies conducted 318 nuclear tests in the Pacific islands. The people who lived on the islands lost their ancestral homes, now uninhabitable, and the people who were exposed to fallout were immediately sickened with ongoing, long-term impacts for human health, including increased rates of birth defects, genetic disorders, and secondary cancers.

The nuclear age taught us that while bombs may drop in seconds, their impact crosses centuries and generations, and now, instead of learning from history and learning from the mistakes of our past, we are poised to repeat it with greater risk, fewer safeguards, and far more at stake.

Today, the United States, Russia, and China inched closer to an unrestrained three-way arms race as we collectively spend well over \$1 trillion on updated and new nuclear warheads and means of delivery. Just one of these programs, as was mentioned, the Sentinel intercontinental ballistic missile, will cost \$141 billion according to the Department of Defense.

Keep in mind, Mr. Speaker, that is not even the bottom line. Their cost estimates keep growing and growing. A new arms race is a race with no finish

line. Let us be clear: There are no winners, only losers in this race.

It doesn't have to be this way.

We must urgently renew and expand nuclear arms control treaties with both Russia and with China. The path to security lies not in new warheads or Golden Domes but in dialogue, transparency, and mutual restraint. We must invest as much into diplomacy and prevention as we do into silos and interceptors.

Let us be clear. All it takes is one bomb, one miscalculation, and one moment of madness, and everything—everything—will end.

The clock is ticking, but the future is still ours to shape. Let us choose wisdom over fear, peace over peril, and life over annihilation.

Mahalo to my colleague, Congressman MCGOVERN, for organizing this Special Order hour.

I ask on August 6 and August 9, let us take a moment to pause and remember we do have a choice.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. OMAR).

Ms. OMAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to, once again, call on the United States to join the treaty on the prohibition of nuclear weapons and for all of the world's nuclear armed powers to adopt policies of mutual disarmament and abolition.

In a few short weeks we will mark the 80th anniversary of the only time nuclear weapons have been used in combat by the United States in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Japan. The fact is in 80 years since, we have only avoided nuclear war by sheer luck. As long as countries possess massive arsenals of world-destroying weapons, the risk of miscalculation and the risk of escalation is eternal.

In the last few years, we have seen multiple situations that remind us of the extent of this fragility and of the danger. Nuclear-armed India exchanged fire with nuclear-armed Pakistan just this year. Cooler heads prevailed, this time.

Nuclear-armed Israel conducted unilateral strikes on facilities in Iran. That war didn't go nuclear this time.

Nuclear-armed Russia continues its brutal war of conquest in Ukraine. We are avoiding escalations that increase the threats of nuclear war between Russia and the West so far.

The truth is, the era of nuclear weapons will only end in one of two ways. Either we will abolish these horrific weapons from the face of the Earth, or we will use them and abolish humanity instead.

The only sane position and the only legitimate position for anyone who values human life is abolition.

In addition, more than one-half of the countries in the world have now formally agreed signing on to the TPNW. We should join them.

That is because just as we have gotten terrifyingly close to nuclear war in

these past 80 years, we have gotten close to disarmament. It is not a pipe dream. Reagan and Gorbachev also did it. South Africa unilaterally dismantled their arsenal. Other countries have stopped developing nuclear weapons before they got the bomb.

It is possible to disarm, and it is possible to abolish nuclear weapons. We only need the political will, and we need the urgency.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, you will note that I said the bombs dropped in Hiroshima and Nagasaki were the only nuclear weapons used in combat, but they were not—we must be absolutely clear—the only times nuclear weapons have been used.

In fact, nuclear weapons have been used thousands of times, and their primary targets have been Americans. We also mark this month the 80th anniversary of the Trinity test in New Mexico. So we should remember that entire communities have been poisoned by these weapons right here in the United States. Entire generations have seen their families, their friends, and their classmates die of rare cancers caused by radiation exposure. They have been forced to drink poisoned water and breathe poisoned air.

The effects on the communities known as the downwinders have been catastrophic, and their suffering is still, sadly, mostly unknown in this country. We have made some small steps toward providing overdue compensation to these Americans, the first and the most consistent victims of our nuclear weapons program, but we still are a long way from justice.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. MCGOVERN for hosting this Special Order hour tonight and for his years of principled leadership on this issue.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her remarks. We are living in a time when there is great polarization in our politics, but the issue that we are talking about here today is how to bring Democrats and Republicans together, because as Democrats and Republicans and liberals and conservatives we do have a mutual interest in survival. If nuclear weapons are ever used in this current day, then nobody wins.

What we are talking about is the salvation or the destruction of our civilization from nuclear death. The stakes could not be higher, and yet what is shocking to many of us is the lack of urgency and the lack of attention to this subject.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAI B).

Ms. TLAI B. That is right, Mr. Speaker. There is a lack of urgency, and we need to move with urgency because a nuclear war cannot be won and would have catastrophic human consequences.

One warhead—one—has the power to wipe out an entire city. A full-scale nuclear war would devastate life as we know it.

Mr. Speaker, 80 years ago, the horrific U.S. bombings of Hiroshima and

Nagasaki caused unimaginable death and immense human suffering, and survivors to this day face long-term health issues and radiation poisoning.

So 80 years after these atrocities, we must, as a Chamber, recommit our efforts to finally achieving the complete and total abolition of nuclear weapons worldwide. We must ensure these war crimes are never repeated anywhere.

Nuclear weapons are tools of death and destruction. They cannot be used without disastrous consequences that violate international law and our shared humanity.

The White House and Congress need to immediately work to negotiate new constraints to cap and reduce nuclear arsenals, especially with Russia and China. We must do everything in our power to prevent an unrestrained nuclear arms race.

It is absolutely terrifying that in the United States the President has the power to unilaterally decide to launch a nuclear weapon.

Think about that for one moment, Mr. Speaker. The use of just a fraction of the nuclear weapons we possess, most of which are ready to launch within minutes of an order from any President, including the current one, would lead to mass destruction of unprecedented global scale.

Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle should back commonsense efforts to prioritize nuclear disarmament and adopt measures to reduce the risk of nuclear war.

We must continue to work toward international agreements, Mr. Speaker, with all nine countries that possess nuclear weapons through comprehensive nuclear test ban treaties, as well as the treaty on prohibiting a nuclear weapon.

Again, we must come together. I cannot say this enough: The devastation and the consequences of any nuclear launch could be, again, life-changing around the world. We must continue to strive for a world free from the threat of nuclear war.

I cannot thank enough my colleague, Mr. MCGOVERN, as he commits to banning nuclear weapons and, again, tries to save us from any kind of life-changing devastation to our world.

□ 1740

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman TLAI B and all of my colleagues who have been here today because this is the most important issue, quite frankly, facing our planet.

Mr. Speaker, we can never ignore the fact that behind the conference room discussions about the utility of nuclear weapons, behind the corporate lobbying for nuclear modernization spending, this is a story of human suffering.

The Nobel Committee awarded the 2024 Nobel Peace Prize to the organization Nihon Hidankyo for its efforts to achieve a world free of nuclear weapons and for demonstrating through witness testimony that nuclear weapons must never be used again.

Nihon Hidankyo is a grassroots movement of atomic bomb survivors from Hiroshima and Nagasaki. In 2 weeks, members of this organization along with activists and citizens from Japan and around the world will gather in Hiroshima and Nagasaki on the 80th anniversary of the atomic bombings. They will amplify this clear and existential message: that nuclear weapons must never ever be used again.

This organization keeps alive the testimony of the “survivors”; “Hibakusha” of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. They are the witnesses to the indescribable, the unthinkable, the incomprehensible pain and suffering caused by nuclear weapons.

Nihon Hidankyo highlights the nuclear taboo, the concept that nuclear weapons should never be used, an idea that is under threat from the growth in nuclear arsenals around the world.

Among the organization’s aims is an international treaty for nuclear disarmament. The Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons, or TPNW, was adopted on July 7, 2017, and entered into force on January 22, 2021. It is the first legally binding international agreement to comprehensively prohibit nuclear weapons with the ultimate goal being their total elimination. Mr. Speaker, 73 nations are party to the treaty. The United States is not. Neither are the other eight nuclear powers.

We won’t get there overnight, but we should not abandon the goal. My resolution, coauthored with the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. TOKUDA), H. Res. 317, calls for good faith negotiations with the other eight nuclear arms states to halt any further buildup of nuclear arsenals and to aggressively pursue a verifiable and irreversible agreement or agreements to verifiably reduce and eliminate their nuclear arsenals according to a negotiated timetable. I encourage my colleagues to support this resolution and join us in our efforts.

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the ranking member of the Rules Committee, Mr. MCGOVERN, for yielding. I thank him and the CPC for organizing this very important Special Order hour.

Next month marks 80 years since the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. These were the only times nuclear weapons have ever been used in war.

I have to say that this memorial, this memory, this 80th anniversary milestone is not just historical, it is somewhat personal and unexpectedly so, say, beginning in 2001, 2002 when at the age of 40, 41 I made my first visit to Japan.

I grew up as an American, a Japanese American. One of my grandparents, my only grandparent, my grandfather, Isao Takano, immigrated to the United States around 1916. He was born in 1898 in Japan, and he came from the environs of Hiroshima.

Growing up, we would go to his niece, my second cousin or I don't know how to kind of appropriate the right sort of familial designation of who is a cousin, a second cousin, but Kikue Takagi was my grandfather's niece who married an American and lived in Anaheim and worked at Disneyland.

We knew some facts, but we never in our times when we would get together for our family gatherings would we ever discuss what happened in Hiroshima. It wasn't until I was well into my adulthood on my first trip to Japan visiting Hiroshima and visiting Kikue, who was there taking care of her mother, that I learned that she was a "survivor"; "Hibakusha," that is the Japanese word for survivor, of the atom bomb.

She lived in the outskirts of Hiroshima. If you have been there, it is mountainous. It is a place, a delta, with five different rivers converging, and she lived in the outskirts. She was a middle school student. On the day that the bomb dropped, she was still ill, so much so that her mother said she didn't need to go into the city center to do her public service work. The middle schoolchildren were needed to clean up the debris of the area around the downtown of Hiroshima. They were doing an urban renewal project to widen the streets.

They knew, the people of Hiroshima, the political class knew that Hiroshima was a target because it was an industrial city. But little did they know that the teachers, the middle schoolteachers and the 13-year-olds who were there at the city center doing this public service work were all going to perish that day. My cousin survived because she stayed home at the behest of her mother.

She had not visited any of the memorials until I had arrived in the early 2000s. And I felt a tinge of guilt for asking her to do this because she had never really sort of delved into this history by visiting the memorial museum.

Riding over the bridge of one of the rivers to the museum the day that Kikue and I decided to go, she told me about how the river was not visible during the day that the bomb was dropped and the days afterward because of the number of bodies that just covered the surface of that water.

When you arrive at the memorial location, you can see bottles of water that many people who attend these memorials will leave for the thirsty souls of those who perished and those who were thirsty from the August heat.

I feel a deep obligation and responsibility to carry this memory forward. I remember as I crossed the bridge thinking to myself how I was personally connected by family to this historical event, that it was not something abstract. It was a moment that who I was, my identity, somewhat shifted and changed.

More than 200,000 people were killed, most of them civilians. Some died in-

stantly. Others suffered for months or years from burns, radiation, and grief.

Mr. Speaker, 80 years after the erasure of two cities we have still not learned the lessons of these terrible bombings.

There are an estimated 13,400 nuclear warheads on Earth today. The United States and Russia hold more than 90 percent of them. Together, we control more than 12,000 warheads, and that is more than enough to end human civilization. While the United States and Russia maintain the largest stockpiles, China is rapidly building.

According to the Department of Defense, China's arsenal already has 500 operational warheads, and if current trends continue, it could surpass 1,000 by the year 2030.

This growth adds to global instability and makes the case for urgent diplomacy and arms control even stronger. Yet, the most important arms control treaty still in force between the United States and Russia is set to expire in less than 200 days.

If we let the New START Treaty expire, we will be left with no legal limits on the size of the two largest nuclear arsenals in the world. At the same time, we are seeing headlines about strikes on Iran's nuclear facilities.

These actions revive a dangerous question: Can we stop the spread of nuclear weapons through military force? I believe the answer is no. We cannot destroy knowledge with a bomb. We cannot erase a nuclear program by targeting one facility.

Strikes might delay a program, but they almost always provoke retaliation and harden resolve. They do nothing to build the kind of long-term trust and transparency that actually reduces nuclear risk.

□ 1750

That is why we need a strategy based on diplomacy, prevention, and protection. We know that this strategy can work because it did in the past. Iran's nuclear weapons program development ground to a halt under the Iran nuclear deal. It was only after President Trump ripped up the accord that Iran set itself on the pathway that it is on today.

The recent strikes reinforce the military theocracy's paranoia that the only pathway to secure the regime's long-term survival is through the development of a nuclear program. Like I said before, if a nation has enough willpower and know-how, they will develop a nuclear weapon. That means that the United States' national security cannot solely rest on deterrence. We should lead by example.

That means modernizing verification tools, supporting the international inspectors, and investing in the diplomatic capacity to negotiate real agreements. It also means rethinking how we can make decisions about the use of nuclear weapons.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has a role to play. We cannot stay silent while the risks grow and the guardrails fall

away. The American people deserve transparency about how nuclear launch decisions are made and who is involved in making them. This is not just a matter of policy. It is a matter of survival.

Mr. Speaker, Hiroshima and Nagasaki were not mere tragedies. They were warnings. The people who died there cannot speak for themselves, but we can speak for the future they were denied. We can choose a path that avoids repeating the worst mistake in human history.

Let us honor the lives lost not only with remembrance but with responsibility. Let's choose diplomacy over destruction, prevention over provocation, and peace over peril.

Let me return back to that scene of riding over that bridge over the river with my cousin Kikue and the thought that I had that every world leader who has some control over a nuclear arsenal should make a commitment to visit Hiroshima, to walk the grounds and understand what happened there and in Nagasaki. I think that is the only way that one has the moral stature and authority to be a leader of a country that has a nuclear arsenal.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his eloquent remarks. There is so much more that needs to be said, yet our time is coming to a close.

Let me end by saying that when I was in college in the late 1970s, I interned for Senator George McGovern, no relation, but a leader on arms control issues. I was able to accompany him to a debate with William F. Buckley at Yale University titled "Resolved: That the SALT Talks Are in the Interests of U.S. National Security." Of course, the SALT talks were the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks.

George McGovern closed the debate—and I remember this like it was yesterday—I thought very powerfully. He said that he recalls that when he was a young Senator in 1963, they were debating the Limited Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, and Senator Everett Dirksen, who was the Republican Senate minority leader at the time, "took to the floor to close the debate. He said that he had just reread John Hersey's 'Hiroshima,' the description of what happened to that great city, the morning after—the scene of one family sitting charred around the breakfast table; out in the yard, bits and pieces of children's clothing; the broken arm of a doll; toys and debris scattered over the landscape. And he said: 'I thought about that scene, and I said that someday Everett Dirksen will be buried in Illinois, and when that happens, I don't want them to put on my gravestone: 'He knew about this, and he didn't care.'"

Mr. Speaker, we all know the realities of nuclear weapons and their devastation, and the fact that if they were ever used, it would result in the total annihilation of our planet.

The question for all of us is: Are we going to do anything about it?

I said earlier that one of the most troubling factors in this whole topic is the lack of urgency here in Congress. We don't talk about this. We are not pushing for arms control. We are not setting goals for the total abolition of nuclear weapons. Instead, we are, just out of habit, voting in favor of military budgets that contribute to the problem.

I think, at this moment, as we approach the 80th anniversaries of these horrible events, this is a time for us to step up and to do something before it is too late.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to commemorate and have moments of silence to remind their constituencies of the anniversaries of the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. I urge them to join with us in a bipartisan way in doing something about it.

George McGovern ended his debate with William Buckley at Yale by saying this: "Many years ago, in ancient wisdom, it was said: I have set before thee two choices, life or death. Therefore, choose life that thee and thy seed may live."

Mr. Speaker, that is the choice I want the United States to make at this moment. I hope that we are up to the task, and I hope that we don't just continue to ignore the perils of nuclear warfare.

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

DISMANTLING CALIFORNIA'S CITIZENS REDISTRICTING COMMISSION

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

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend from California (Mr. KILEY).

Mr. KILEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in 2010, California voters overwhelmingly voted to establish the Citizens Redistricting Commission. The voters said that they wanted to take the process of drawing district lines out of the hands of politicians. They said that voters should choose their politicians, that politicians shouldn't choose their voters.

That commission has drawn our district lines through the last two rounds of redistricting. Yet, the Governor of California has now announced a plan to abolish the Citizens Redistricting Commission and to seize its powers for himself. He initially proposed simply ignoring the commission, ignoring the constitution, and overriding his maps with those that he and the legislature drew. Yet, apparently, someone told him that that would get immediately struck down in court.

What they are now plotting is a special election where they will use confusing ballot language and other means of deception to try to convince voters—to fool voters—into dismantling the

very independent commission that they recently established.

The point of this is that the Governor would like to reduce the representation of Republicans in Congress in our State to 3 Members out of 52, so that Republicans will hold 6 percent of the seats even though Republicans typically get over 40 percent of the vote in statewide elections. It could be the single most egregious act of corruption in the history of our State.

Mr. Speaker, you don't need to take my word for that. You can take the word of Common Cause, which is a group that typically, almost always, aligns with Democrats on elections and voting issues. Its executive director said: "Point blank, it is a dangerous move."

Or take the word of Patricia Sinay, a Democrat sitting on the Citizens Redistricting Commission, who said: "The very purpose of the State's independent redistricting commission is to protect voters from partisan power grabs like this. If this were to succeed, it would set a dangerous precedent for suppressing voters across the Nation."

Mr. Speaker, this is a moment for every Californian and every American of decency, regardless of party affiliation, to speak out against the abject corruption that our Governor is attempting.

RECOGNIZING TEVIS CUP WINNERS HEATHER AND JEREMY REYNOLDS

Mr. KILEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Heather and Jeremy Reynolds, the first- and second-place winners of the 69th Annual Tevis Cup, a grueling 100-mile endurance trail ride from Robie Park to Auburn, held on July 12 of this year.

This year's competition proved even more challenging than usual, with the heat and rocky road providing unfavorable conditions for all competitors.

□ 1800

Of the 105 entrants, only 43 were able to complete the ride to Auburn. However, the couple persevered through, crossing the finish line in 17 hours 45 minutes.

Over the span of more than 20 years of competitive riding, the two have accumulated countless awards, including eight Tevis Cups and five Haggin Cups. Despite their many accolades, the one challenge they had never conquered was crossing the finish line together. In this year's competition, they did, crossing the finish line with their hands joined together, marking an astounding new achievement that has been a goal of theirs for over two decades.

Together, Heather and Jeremy Reynolds embody perseverance, teamwork, and competitive excellence. Their achievement serves not just as personal fulfillment but also as an inspiration to their peers, fellow competitors, and our community at large.

It is an honor to represent remarkable individuals such as Heather and Jeremy in Congress. Therefore, on be-

half of the United States House of Representatives, I proudly extend my heartfelt congratulations to Heather and Jeremy Reynolds for their exceptional athletic achievement at the 69th annual Tevis Cup and commend them for their unwavering dedication to the tradition and sport of equine endurance riding.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from California for his remarks, and as I always say to Californians, don't take Arizona's water.

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRESNAHAN). The gentleman from Arizona has 25 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I am going to try to do a run-through of a couple things here. I am going to try to walk through some economics. Then I am going to actually try to walk through some warnings that are in the documents that are around us that very few people seem to bother to read. Then I am going to actually do some things that are hopeful because I think sometimes I am a bit dour, and I don't do enough of this.

First off, in August, Republicans are going to go out and tell the morality of people's taxes not going up next year. What we did in the reconciliation budget: incentives to invest in America, to build new plants of equipment, for working people to have some things to actually draw them back into the labor force, no tax on tips, no tax on overtime, some of these things.

If you actually look at one of the reasons those things are in there, and we are actually starting to see some of the models of the economic side, seeing some very optimistic things that we think are going to change labor force participation, small changes.

The left will actually sort of do a bit of schizophrenia such as you cut spending over here, but too much of this money is borrowed. I agree too much is borrowed. I want to cut more spending, but then you attack us when we try to actually point out misalignment, bad acts.

What was the report that just came out a couple days ago, where we found 2.8 million of our brothers and sisters enrolled in subsidized ACA plans as well as Medicaid plans.

They don't want to talk about that because it screws up their pitch when you actually walk through what we see in the math. We know the American people believe and understand the morality and the great economics of encouraging those that are able-bodied, able to work to participate in society.

If anyone is a geek out there—it is probably 4 or 5 years old—the University of Chicago, four of their Ph.D. economists wrote a brilliant paper talking about: If you actually ask people to participate in society, in the economy, to take a job, even if you give them welfare or government subsidies, because they have an attachment to the economy, to work, at the