

□ 1140

THE CALIFORNIA REDISTRICTING WAR

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

Mr. KILEY of California. Mr. Speaker, the redistricting war in this country is starting to escalate to an absurd degree. Among the States now looking at redistricting, or are currently in the process of it, we have Texas, California, Nebraska, New Hampshire, Ohio, Kentucky, Missouri, Utah, Florida, Maryland, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Kansas, Virginia, and New York.

This is insanity. Where does it end?

It certainly won't end this election cycle. There is no reason that in every election cycle now, Mr. Speaker, you won't have States redrawing district lines if they sense any sort of advantage can be gained in the process.

However, just in this round of what will apparently be a new precedent of ongoing, rolling redistricting, you are going to see millions of Americans across all of these States, Mr. Speaker, lose the right to vote for their current Representative.

My own district, for example, under a newly proposed map, would be cut into six different pieces. Hence, at least five-sixths of the current constituents whom I have would lose the right to be able to choose me as their Representative.

What is more, this is going to consume an inordinate amount of time of State legislatures across the country, not to mention resources. It is going to consume an inordinate amount of time for Representatives of this body who are going to have to learn and get to know new communities that they are going to be representing that they have never represented before. They are going to lose communities that they may have represented for some time.

No one wants this, not Democrats in the House and not Republicans in the House. I have people coming up to me constantly agreeing that what is going on is a terrible thing for the country. It is going to stratify and polarize representation like never before. You are going to have more and more State delegations, Mr. Speaker, that are extremely asymmetrical. Some will have no Representatives of one party or the other. That can only mean fewer perspectives in this body and fewer Americans feeling like they are represented in our representative government. It can only mean more of the gridlock and division that Americans are so frustrated with.

This all raises the question: Where is the Speaker of the House in all of this?

Why is he, at the very least, going along with a redistricting war that the Members who elected him overwhelmingly oppose?

Why is the leader of this institution simply watching as the institution crumbles?

By the way, where is the minority leader, as well, want-to-be Speaker, would-be Speaker, Minority Leader Jeffries?

He is all too happy to just treat this as another form of partisan warfare and has adopted this horrible fight-fire-with-fire slogan. He is apparently willing to burn everything down if it means he can be the next Speaker of the House.

What our leadership seems to have forgotten is that the House is a co-equal, independent branch of our government. There are supposed to be tensions between the branches. That is the design of our system.

Even if the leaders of the other branches are carbon copies of yourself, Mr. Speaker, there should, from time to time, be some tension because of the difference in perspectives and institutional roles and responsibilities. When the system works well, that can be a constructive tension that is resolved in a way that carries out our shared vision for the country and is in everyone's interest. However, that requires real leadership, and right now that leadership is sorely lacking.

I believe that gerrymandering wherever it occurs is a plague on our democracy whichever party does it. Both parties have been amply guilty. That is why I proposed H. Res. 4889. H. Res. 4889 will bring this redistricting war to an end by preserving the district maps that were used in our last election until the next Census when redistricting is supposed to be done.

Ultimately, by the time of the next Census, we need to come up with a solution to eradicate this plague of gerrymandering from our democracy. That is why I have called on the Speaker to set up a bipartisan commission to end gerrymandering in this country once and for all.

By the way, I think that should go hand in hand with a requirement for voter ID in elections across the country so that we can finally have fair elections in the United States.

The reality is that Americans of all party affiliations are tired of the political division that only seems to get worse and worse every single year.

Mr. Speaker, you can ask the folks I represent in California. I will fight harder than anyone for the policies that I think are best for my district and State and for the country. I have fought harder than anyone against the corruption of the ruling class in Sacramento. Often my critique is that that corruption undermines the foundations that we ought to share when it comes to politics in this country.

We truly need to find common ground, at the very least, when it comes to the basic parameters of our politics. That is what is so pernicious about this redistricting war.

We are supposed to disagree about policies and about our visions for the country vigorously. That is what the political process is about. That is what democracy is about. However, we need

to have some shared foundation upon which those differences can be debated. When you have this rolling redistricting, Mr. Speaker, this redistricting war that we are seeing right now, it erodes that foundation, and it makes it much more difficult for us to actually govern in the interests of the country and to fulfill the promise of representative government.

I am hopeful that the legislation I have offered can be a first step in saying we need to find more common ground. We need to get back to the issues that actually matter to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, one of the worst consequences of this redistricting war we see breaking out across the country is that it has provided a pretext for the Governor of California to do what he has always wanted to do, which is to undermine the fairness of our elections in California by abolishing the Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission.

The Governor and his enablers insist they are only doing this because of what is happening in other States. However, the redistricting commission itself was opposed by NANCY PELOSI, for example, who led the opposition to its creation and was opposed by the California Democratic Party.

Nothing could justify what is happening in California right now. However, they have grabbed on to whatever pretext they can in order to move forward with returning us and moving us backwards as a State to the era of partisan gerrymandering.

The problem for Newsom is that the voters of California are overwhelmingly opposed to this plan.

How do we know that? California voters have voted three times to support the independent redistricting commission. A poll just recently came out from Politico asking voters: Do you want the commission to draw district lines, or do you want the politicians to get that power back?

By a 2-1 margin, over 60 percent of Democrats, over 60 percent of Republicans, and over 70 percent of Independents said: We want the commission drawing district lines. We don't think politicians should draw their own district lines.

To solve this problem, that is to say, the public overwhelmingly opposing his plan which does require voter approval, the Governor has come up with a two-pronged strategy which is to disenfranchise voters and to defraud them.

First, while the previous votes to establish the independent commission and to affirm it were done by our full electorate, he is now just summoning a partial electorate in a low-turnout, off-year special election to try to overturn that decision.

What is more, he has thrown out all of our election rules in order to accelerate and condense the election timeline unlike anything we have ever seen so that the county registrars are

unable to notify voters, as they usually would that there is an election going on, so that the voter guide, at least at first, is only going to be available online and such that there will be fewer polling places and vote centers for people to actually vote in.

It is voter suppression through and through in an attempt to reverse the clearly articulated and repeatedly expressed view of the California electorate.

□ 1150

That is not all. For those voters who do turn out, the Governor needs to make sure that they are unable to express their true will or at least have difficulty doing so. That is where he has made use of yet another tool that is available to the one-party rule that we have in California, which is to commit fraud on the ballot itself.

Now, that might sound like strong language. "Fraud" might seem a little strong, but it is not an exaggeration. The definition of "fraud" is lying to people in order to get them to act in a way that they don't want to act and that goes against their own interests. That is precisely what has happened here.

We now have the actual language that will appear on the ballot for California voters. If this were an honest description, it would simply say that we are tearing up the map drawn by California's independent redistricting commission and replacing it with a map drawn by politicians in order to maximize partisan advantage. That is literally what is happening, no more, no less.

Instead, we get this. Let's just walk through some of the language: "Authorizes Temporary Changes to Congressional District Maps." First of all, the changes are not temporary. They will last through the rest of this decade, when the existing map would have expired anyway. They are permanent changes, and they are not changes. "Changes" implies you are making a little tweak here, a little tweak there. No, they have drawn a completely new map that is going to affect districts all across California and cause voters all across California to lose their representation.

This is where it gets really good: "Authorizes Temporary Changes to Congressional District Maps in Response to Texas' Partisan Redistricting." First, it is blatantly untrue. The initial version of this said that it would only take effect if Texas moved forward. That language was deleted. This is taking effect, if it is passed, regardless of anything that has happened in Texas or any other State. At this point, it is completely inaccurate and is an attempt to simply smuggle some sort of argument or justification into a summary of the actual language.

What is more, there is no mention anywhere of the fact that this is overriding the map created by California's independent commission. If you just

read it, at first glance, it is almost designed to read as if Texas has somehow come in and messed with California's maps, so we need to restore them to proper order. That is the impression that this is designed to give. In fact, the independent commission is only mentioned in the next sentence, where it says that it directs the independent citizens commission to start drawing maps after 2030.

If you are reading this casually, you might say that this is the side that supports independent redistricting. After all, they are telling the independent commission to draw maps. The independent commission does not need to be directed to draw maps after the next Census. That is what they are already required to do. The only effect of this initiative is to throw out the map that the independent commission has drawn for this decade.

Then, to make things even more farcical, it goes on to say that it is establishing a policy of the State to support independent redistricting. No, this doesn't. It doesn't establish any policy supporting independent redistricting. The only thing that this initiative does, as it pertains to independent redistricting, is to shove aside California's independent redistricting commission.

A few other little inaccuracies: It says that this only lasts through 2030. In fact, the partisan map that was drawn behind closed doors by the California legislature and the DCCC will last through 2033. It says it will only cost a few million dollars. That is outrageous. The special election itself is going to cost between \$200 million and \$250 million.

Finally, what it doesn't mention at all is that this is overriding, literally, the entire rest of California's State Constitution. That is the language that is actually in this constitutional amendment. It says that everything else in our Constitution does not apply. Partisan gerrymandering will be the supreme law of the land.

All the protections in our Constitution right now that are manifested in the existing congressional map will be thrown out, which means the protections where we had extensive public input in drawing the maps. Instead, this map was drawn behind closed doors in a matter of days.

It throws out the protections that say those who draw the maps are not allowed to run for public office. This map was drawn by people who are in public office and hope to run in the very districts that they are drawing.

The protections that say that the district lines need to follow neutral criteria, like keeping communities together, and cannot be drawn in the interest of partisanship or to favor or disfavor any politician, are all thrown out.

This map tears communities apart. My district is torn into six different pieces. The county where I live is torn into three or four different pieces. It is

being designed for the explicit purpose of partisanship.

Gavin Newsom has said the entire point of this map is to make California a whole lot bluer and to pick up five seats. By the way, it says Texas' redistricting is partisan redistricting, but says nothing about that in California, when the very people who drew the maps have said that is literally the entire point of the exercise.

That is what is happening in California. There is this farce of democracy, this fraud that the Governor is perpetrating on the electorate. There is a systematic attempt to suppress voters in order to return our State to the era of partisan gerrymandering.

Indeed, we even now have reports that the leaders of the legislature itself who pushed this measure through at Newsom's behest have specifically gotten special districts drawn for themselves in order to run for Congress. This is precisely why voters have said we do not want politicians drawing district lines, because they do so in the interests of themselves rather than the interests of the people that they are supposed to serve.

That is the ultimate evil of gerrymandering. It shifts power from the people to the politicians. That is why it undermines democracy and proper representation.

Why is this happening, by the way? It is really about one thing. The Governor of California is desperate for some issue to run for President on. He has been trying throughout his tenure as our Governor to find something, anything, to get himself national attention. I have watched as he has failed time and time again.

I remember in his first term, at the beginning, he decided to create an animated Mario Kart-style video of himself racing Donald Trump, thinking this was going to get him a lot of attention. I saw during the COVID shutdowns how he would come up with one crazy scheme after another because he was jealous that Andrew Cuomo was getting all the attention. That didn't really work for him either. This is literally the first time anything he has ever done has gotten him the attention that he so craves.

Indeed, while his poll numbers are still abysmal in California, it actually seems to be working when it comes to the far left that tends to participate in primaries, which is another testament to just how badly our leadership here has failed, that they have managed to play into the hands of Gavin Newsom, who is not a very smart person and who is not a very crafty politician. Yet, this redistricting war has played right into his hands.

Despite all of this, I do believe that we can defeat Newsom's effort to defraud and disenfranchise California voters. The reason I believe that is because we just did so last year.

□ 1200

What happened with Prop 36, which is the initiative to make crime illegal

again in California, is a perfect case study into how the Governor of California has tried to undermine democracy in order to get his way. Yet, with respect to Prop 36, he failed miserably.

Indeed, in an attempt to stop this initiative, which he led the opposition to, he came up with three different schemes to undermine the will of California voters.

The initiative, Prop 36, gathered something like a million signatures, and so qualified for the ballot. It was an initiative to restore basic consequences for criminal activity, like retail theft, and to get treatment for folks who have repeated drug offenses. The Governor opposed this effort to make crime illegal again in California.

The Governor's first attempt to undermine this voter-qualified citizen initiative was what was called a poison pill. The scheme went like this: Newsom had the legislature pass a number of supposedly pro-public safety bills. They didn't really do much, but they were supposedly part of a public safety package.

Then, he inserted into those bills a poison pill. This is completely novel, from what I understand, in the history of legislative government in this country. He inserted a poison pill saying that, if California voters were so bold as to go out and vote for Prop 36, our initiative, then all of these other bills would automatically be reversed as a punishment, if you will.

I will say that again. The bills themselves said that, if voters go out and approve this initiative to make crime illegal again in California, then all of these other supposedly pro-public safety bills will automatically be repealed as a consequence.

What was the point of this?

Mr. Speaker, you might say that it was to punish the voters, maybe, but the real point was fraud. What the Governor hoped to do was to get these measures passed.

Remember how he was committing fraud on the ballot for the redistricting sham? What he wanted to do for the ballot on Prop 36 was to say that this is a measure that will repeal all of these other pro-public safety bills so that he could trick people into thinking that it was actually an anti-public safety measure when the whole point was to promote public safety.

Mr. Speaker, that didn't work. For various reasons, even this proved too corrupt for the California Legislature.

Newsom moved on to his next plan, which was known as "the imposter initiative." He came up at the last second with his own very much weaker, supposedly pro-public safety initiative to put on the ballot alongside Prop 36.

The goal was to confuse voters and to get them to prefer his initiative. Indeed, he even changed the rules for how propositions are numbered in order to put his first.

Mr. Speaker, you might say that that is not too much of a problem and that voters will just pass both, but he

thought of that. He actually wrote language into his initiative saying that, if it got more votes than our initiative, Prop 36, then Prop 36 would not take effect, even if it got more than 50 percent of the vote. The literal effect of his initiative would have been to overturn the results of a democratic election.

Fortunately, this plan failed, too, because the Governor, in his absolute disregard for any decency whatsoever, had used the name "Alexandra's Law" for a part of the initiative dealing with fentanyl.

This was genuinely part of our own initiative. It was a way to hold fentanyl dealers accountable. It was named after a young lady who, tragically, lost her life to fentanyl poisoning.

The Governor went ahead and misappropriated that name and used it for his much weaker version of this provision. The family of this young woman spoke out against it, and it was only then that he was forced to remove this imposter initiative from the ballot.

The third scheme that the Governor came up with targeted me specifically. One of his cronies, a woman named Ann Ravel, filed a completely made-up, frivolous complaint against me with the FEC. It alleged that I had transferred \$50,000 to the campaign account supporting this initiative. It was completely untrue. I never did anything of the sort. I didn't transfer any money to it. Even if I had, it wouldn't have been a violation of the law.

Yet, Ms. Ravel had a brief stint as chair of the FEC herself, and she has since turned this into sort of a gig where she can make partisan claims and give them a sort of aura of legitimacy, as coming from the former FEC chair. Fellow Democrats have called her out on this time and time again that this is what she is doing. Even in her own failed campaign for State senate, this is what she did.

She files this complaint. Before I even see it, she hands it off to the L.A. Times. The L.A. Times dutifully publishes a headline referring to the complaint by the former FEC chair related to Prop 36. Then, they went and showed that article to anyone who was considering supporting the initiative in order to try to deter them from doing it.

Mr. Speaker, the FEC rejected Ms. Ravel's complaints since it was completely made up. This was the very body that she was once the supposed chair of. It was a completely disgraceful thing that she did. Yet, that attempt also, of course, failed.

All three of these attempts to undermine the opportunity for voters to even vote on this fairly failed. It went to the ballot box. Newsom led the campaign against it at the ballot box. At the end of the day, Prop 36 passed overwhelmingly with nearly 70 percent of the vote in the State of California.

It passed in each and every one of California's 58 counties, even Gavin Newsom's San Francisco. It received

more votes than any other measure on the ballot last year.

Mr. Speaker, the Governor is using every corrupt means at his disposal in order to undermine our democracy, to overturn the will of our voters, and to deprive our people of fair representation. Yet, this example shows that we still have the power to fight back and to win.

CALIFORNIA GOVERNOR OPPOSES USE OF NATIONAL GUARD AGAINST CRIME

Mr. KILEY of California. Mr. Speaker, the Governor of California is outraged at the prospect that National Guard troops might be used in cities like San Francisco in order to protect public safety.

There is one problem with this outrage, and that is that Newsom himself sent the National Guard to San Francisco just 2 years ago saying: "... we cannot let rampant crime continue."

Of course, he did let rampant crime continue, and it was really just a token measure. Yet, even now, just a few days ago, while saying that there is no problem with crime in California, the Governor has announced that crime suppression teams will be sent into our major cities. Which is it?

Mr. Speaker, the Governor has also claimed that there has been a modest reduction in crime across California this year. To the extent that that is true, it is because of successes that we have had in stopping some of Newsom's worst policies.

Namely, we passed Prop 36 to make crime illegal again. We won a victory at the Supreme Court, over what Newsom wanted, to allow homeless encampments to be removed from our streets. By the way, we no longer have a completely open border. To the extent that there has been improvement, it is because Newsom's own policies have been reversed.

This includes in L.A., as well, where the rogue district attorney, George Gascon, who Newsom himself initially appointed, was overwhelmingly voted out by voters last year.

There has been a modest improvement in public safety in California, thanks to the fact that Newsom's policies are being overturned by the people of California. Yet, there still remains significant problems in our cities. Even in Los Angeles, the police chief there says that you shouldn't go outside while wearing jewelry.

Mr. Speaker, what is even more outrageous is that Newsom, after opposing Prop 36 to make crime illegal again in every way that he can, is refusing now to properly fund the initiative. It needs funding for various reasons, one of the most important of which is to get help to people who have drug issues and need treatment.

That was a big part of the initiative, is that people who have repeat arrests for abusing drugs can be offered treatment as an alternative to incarceration.

□ 1210

The Governor is refusing to fund the treatment programs that are needed.

He is all too willing to continue to let people wither away on our streets and die from overdoses because he is not properly funding this.

The mayor of San Jose, who is a Democrat, has said that the Governor's refusal to fund Prop 36 is "a joke." This is coming from a fellow Democrat mayor in California. Newsom's refusal to fund the initiative that Californians passed is a joke.

He doesn't have the money for it, I guess, even though he does have \$200 to \$250 million to call an off-year special election in order to return us to the era of partisan gerrymandering.

I am calling on the Governor and the leaders of the California legislature to properly fund Prop 36. If we do that, then we will continue to see not just modest but significant improvements in public safety and the quality of life throughout California.

RECENT UNEMPLOYMENT NUMBERS FOR THE COUNTRY

Mr. KILEY of California. Mr. Speaker, we recently received the latest unemployment numbers for the month of July for States across the country and there was only one State, one State alone, that saw an increase in unemployment: California.

Even before this, California already had the highest unemployment rate in the country, number one out of 50 States. This is not what you want to be leading the Nation in, which is why it was particularly farcical when the Governor this Labor Day claimed that California is the number one State in the country for workers. It is absolutely false.

California has the number one unemployment and the number one poverty. We have been among the worst States in the country when it comes to increase in the wages of workers. We are, of course, by far the worst when it comes to restricting job opportunities for workers through AB5, a law so bad that no other State has adopted anything like it.

Unfortunately, Californians continue to pay the price for the failed corrupt policies that have led to these outcomes, for the policies that restrict opportunity while raising the cost of living in California. If we really wanted to solve the problems in our State in a way that would benefit the people of California, then the Governor wouldn't be calling a sham special election. He wouldn't be focusing all of his time on appearing on podcasts and writing all caps tweets designed to mimic the President. He would instead be focusing on the quality of life challenges faced by the people of California that, unfortunately, are causing more and more people to leave our State.

Not only are we number one in unemployment and homelessness and wage stagnation, but we are also number one in poverty and in illiteracy. In the achievement gaps at our schools, we are among the very worse. We are number one in gas prices. We are number one, or near it, in the cost of electricity and the cost of water.

These things don't happen just randomly or by accident. They are the result of failed policy choices. If this redistricting sham moves forward, then the eyes of the Nation will be on California. I think it will be important to make the point, as well, that while our politicians are playing political games, our citizens continue to pay the price for their failed policies.

NO TAX DOLLARS FOR RIOTS

Mr. KILEY of California. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, I introduced the No Tax Dollars for Riots Act in response to the horrifying events in Los Angeles in recent months, where you had rioters attacking officers, using commercial dumpsters as battering rams, and threatening public safety in a variety of ways.

What we learned is that this violence was fueled and organized by a so-called nonprofit called CHIRLA that actually was blasting out on a Signal chat the real-time locations of ICE officers so that the rioters could then go find them and obstruct their activities and, in some cases, attack them with rocks and Molotov cocktails and other weapons.

What makes this all the worse is that this group, CHIRLA, is essentially a subsidiary of the State of California and received some \$32 million in funding from the State of California just in 1 year, as well as receiving Federal funding and receiving generous subsidies from the city of Los Angeles.

I introduced the No Tax Dollars for Riots Act to assure that this does not happen again. As if to underscore the need for this legislation, this same group, CHIRLA, that helped organize the L.A. riots, has now announced that they will be leading the grassroots organizing for Gavin Newsom's redistricting sham. The same group that has benefited so generously from his largesse that has received funding from California taxpayers in order to help organize and instigate the actions of rioters is now leading the grassroots organizing for this attempt to overturn the will of California voters.

It is all the more reason why this type of funding should not be allowed, so I am calling for the prompt passage of my bill, the No Tax Dollars for Riots Act.

GOOD NEWS ON THE ASSAULT ON THE FIRST AMENDMENT

Mr. KILEY of California. Mr. Speaker, we have some good news. Governor Gavin Newsom has lost in court again in an assault on the First Amendment designed to make parody and satire illegal in the State of California.

Last year, the Governor saw a parody video of Kamala Harris that he didn't like, so he comes out in authoritarian style and announces this speech should be banned. Not only did he announce it, the legislature did his bidding, passed a bill, and he signed it into law to ban the sort of parody video that was seen by many people during the election.

Now, of course, I made it very clear at the time that this was a violation, a

blatant violation, of the First Amendment. It didn't stop Newsom from signing the bill. He has had many bills before that violated the First Amendment and they were thrown out by the courts. Just a couple weeks ago, that is what happened with this bill, as well. The court has thrown out Gavin Newsom's attempt to ban satire and parody in the State of California.

Mr. Speaker, to make things even more absurd, this farcical account on X that the Governor's team is using, the Governor Newsom press office, has been putting out content designed to mock the President that would have actually violated the very terms of this bill that Newsom himself signed into law.

Fortunately, the courts, in this case, protected the rights of the people in California. I am glad to announce that the First Amendment is still operative in our State, that parody and satire, which throughout history have been the way that we can humble those in power and can be powerful instruments of political expression, are still very much allowable in our State.

END INSIDER TRADING BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. KILEY of California. Mr. Speaker, today, I am announcing that I will be coauthoring H.R. 5106, the Restore Trust in Congress Act, which is designed to end insider trading by Members of Congress. Specifically, this bill prohibits all Members of Congress, along with spouses, dependent children, and trustees from owning, buying, or selling individual stocks, securities, commodities, or futures.

Upon enactment, covered individuals are prohibited from purchasing covered assets and must divest from all covered assets at fair market value within 180 days for current Members and 90 days for incoming Members.

Individuals who acquire covered assets through inheritance during the course of their service will be required to divest those assets within 90 days of receipt.

□ 1220

Violators of this statute—or bill if it becomes law—will have to pay an amount equal to 10 percent of the value of covered assets plus the sale of profits, and it must be paid with personal funds, not office or campaign funds.

This is a commonsense measure that the overwhelming majority of Americans support. The notion that someone should be able to profit from their government service or even the appearance of that undermines trust in government, which is so essential to the representative form of democracy that we have here in the United States.

I am hopeful that this legislation will be brought to the floor by House leaders expeditiously, and we can get it passed and signed into law in a bipartisan way in order to help restore trust in Congress, as the name suggests.

BEAUTIFYING FEDERAL ARCHITECTURE

Mr. KILEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I am very excited to announce that

this coming week, I will be introducing the Beautifying Federal Civic Architecture Act, which will build on an executive order that has been signed and issued by the President to change the General Services Administration's policies to prefer classical and traditional architecture in Federal public buildings.

I think every American can imagine what we are talking about here. When you look at the Capitol, our national monuments, the White House, many courthouses, the classical style very much evokes the values that we have in this country, the values of representative government, the values of citizen participation.

However, in recent decades, there has been a move away from this architectural style, and it has produced some Federal buildings that don't evoke such feelings at all and that are, frankly, a bit of an eyesore as opposed to the beautiful buildings that mark many of our monuments and historic places here in Washington, D.C.

I am very happy to be authoring this bill in the House to make it the policy of the United States that Federal buildings should uplift and beautify public spaces, inspire the human spirit, ennoble the United States, and command respect from the general public.

It declares that these buildings should be visually identifiable as civic buildings and respect the regional architectural heritage. That is important, as well. While the policy gives preference toward traditional and classical architecture, other styles are permissible if they clearly convey the dignity, enterprise, vigor, and stability of America's system of self-government.

Of course, the bill also makes it the policy that Federal buildings should be selected with substantial input from local communities.

I have long argued that we need, in many ways, to return to the classical understanding of representative government, of self-government that was the vision of our Founders, and define ways in order to revive that spirit. The look of a building is a small way, but I think that it is a reform that, going hand in hand with other ways to enable greater participation, such as restoring proper civics in our schools and many other related measures, can be an important part of restoring that spirit, that civic spirit that guided our Nation's founding.

I look forward to introducing this bill. I look forward to it receiving, hopefully, bipartisan support in the House, and being signed into law in order to complement the President's executive order, and make this the policy of our country going forward.

EL DORADO COUNTY TITLE 25 PROGRAM SUPPORTS COMMUNITY OF GRIZZLY FLATS

Mr. KILEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a significant milestone in the community of Grizzly Flats: the groundbreaking of the first home under the new El Dorado County title 25 program created to support the victims of the Caldor fire.

In August of 2021, the Caldor fire burned more than 220,000 acres and destroyed more than 1,000 structures, including hundreds of homes in Grizzly Flats.

On May 23 of this year, U.S. Navy veteran "Mac" MacNeil and Cathie Adams were joined by their neighbors and community leaders as they broke ground on what will soon be their newly constructed home, the first home rebuilt by a nonprofit charitable organization in Grizzly Flats after the Caldor fire. This new home will provide Mac and Cathie with a safe, comfortable, and dignified living space after their home and many others were tragically destroyed 4 years ago.

The construction of this new home is being supported by an organization called Non-profit Construction, which is leading the rebuild, and El Dorado County's title 25 program, which streamlines the rebuilding process for homes damaged or destroyed by the Caldor fire.

This groundbreaking and upcoming construction of this new home represents not just shelter but also the community's unwavering strength, resilience, and its determined step forward on the path to recovery. I am confident that innovative housing solutions like this one will not only uplift the Grizzly Flats community but will also serve as a powerful blueprint for resilience and recovery across California and the Nation.

Therefore, on behalf of the United States House of Representatives, I am honored to join the people of El Dorado County and Grizzly Flats in congratulating Mr. "Mac" MacNeil and Ms. Cathie Adams on the groundbreaking of their new home.

CONGRATULATING ECO-CLEAN SOLUTIONS

Mr. KILEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate JB Harris and JT Chevallier, and the entire team at ECO-CLEAN Solutions for reaching a record-breaking milestone, 1 million square feet of Lake Tahoe shoreline cleaned up by the team's beach-cleaning robot, BEBOT. Congratulations to JB Harris and JT Chevallier for this amazing accomplishment.

JB and JT, two longtime friends from Las Vegas, were drawn to the Sierra Nevada by the beauty and lifestyle of the mountains. As their connection to the area and the great outdoors deepened, JB and JT witnessed the toll of increased tourism on their natural surroundings. With the motivation to give back to the home that had given them so much, ECO-CLEAN was created to respond to the need for environmental responsibility and sustainability.

With the annual number of visitors to Lake Tahoe growing to 15 million people, Tahoe's beaches experienced a surge in waste, particularly during peak travel seasons. JB and JT recognized the problem and set out to find innovative and low-impact solutions to this growing concern. In their search, the team discovered BEBOT, the first battery- and solar-powered beach-

cleaning robot on the West Coast. Through funding provided by the North Tahoe Community Alliance, the team was able to successfully deploy BEBOT to the shores of Lake Tahoe, maximizing beach cleanup efforts through advanced technology and in partnership with local volunteers.

Through this innovative solution, ECO-CLEAN and their beach cleaning BEBOT have cleaned 1 million square miles of Lake Tahoe's shoreline, picking up more than 30,000 pieces of litter in 2024 alone. They also partner and collaborate with several local organizations, one of which includes the Desert Research Institute, which analyzes the litter taken from the lake to better understand pollutants and proactively address their source.

It is an honor to represent exemplary organizations like ECO-CLEAN Solutions in the United States House of Representatives. This organization exemplifies how American innovation can serve as a solution to the issues that are facing our communities and the Nation at large.

Therefore, on behalf of the United States House of Representatives, I am honored to recognize JB, JT, and ECO-CLEAN Solutions for reaching this significant milestone and for their ongoing dedication to protecting the beauty of Lake Tahoe's shorelines for generations to come.

BRINGING ATTENTION TO ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE

Mr. KILEY of California. Mr. Speaker, with more than 7 million Americans living with Alzheimer's disease, including over 700,000 Californians age 65 and older, I rise today to bring continued attention to this growing public health challenge.

Alzheimer's, the most common form of dementia, impairs memory, thinking, and behavior, with symptoms that eventually interfere with daily life. The effects of this disease are not limited to the individuals diagnosed but, of course, extend to their families, friends, caregivers, and communities.

While there is no known cure, research and treatment are advancing in very promising ways. That is why I was proud to cosponsor H.R. 7218, the BOLD Act, last year, which supports programs advancing research and resources related to Alzheimer's disease and other dementias.

I have seen the impact of this disease firsthand, through people I know personally and through my work with the Alzheimer's Association Northern California and Northern Nevada Chapter. I have met with dedicated volunteers, heard their moving stories, and supported community events to help raise awareness. Their advocacy and compassion make a profound difference, bringing hope to millions.

Recently, the Alzheimer's Association visited Washington, D.C., and our U.S. Capitol. I would like to extend my sincere thanks to the volunteers and constituents from my district in particular, who traveled here to share their stories and to fight for progress.

On behalf of the United States House of Representatives, I commend their tireless efforts to supporting those affected by Alzheimer's and other dementias and to fighting this devastating illness.

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

□ 1230

BLOODY SUNDAY AND VOTING RIGHTS ACT

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, and still I rise, and I rise, Mr. Speaker, to call to the attention of this august body some important information.

I rise, Mr. Speaker, as the only Member of Congress ever to be evicted during a joint session of Congress. I have been censured, Mr. Speaker, but I have not been silenced.

Still I rise today to call to our attention some history associated with the Voting Rights Act and to bring to our attention how this Voting Rights Act has had a positive impact on our Nation, on this Congress, and, I would say, indirectly on the entire planet Earth.

A very important aspect of this Voting Rights Act is section 2. Section 2 had its genesis, as is the case with the Voting Rights Act of 1965, with Bloody Sunday. Bloody Sunday occurred in March 1965 at the Edmund Pettus Bridge.

One of our Members, John Lewis, was there. In fact, he was a leader of this march on Bloody Sunday. As such, he informed us—I talked to him on more than one occasion about it—how they started the march at a church, how they approached the Edmund Pettus Bridge, and how, on approach to the Edmund Pettus Bridge, they could see the bridge itself.

As they got more along the way, they could see that there were persons waiting for them. Some of these persons were on horseback. Others were not, but they were armed. These persons had intentions that were less than honorable.

They knew that the intentionality was less than honorable, yet they marched on, forward, knowing that this could become an unpleasant scene, that persons could be harmed.

They had been trained, and they had been lectured by Dr. King, who taught them how to engage in nonviolent, peaceful protest and how it is necessary to, when engaging in this protest, not engage in acts of violence because, in so doing, you can harm the actual protest movement itself.

They were there, unarmed, marching peacefully from Selma to Montgomery. After having been told by the officers that they must turn back and peacefully marched on, they were then beaten—clubs, men on horseback. They

were beaten all the way back to the church where they started.

The Honorable John Lewis reminded me that he thought he was going to die on that bridge, beaten all the way back to the church where they started.

This is what is important about Bloody Sunday, aside from many other things. There are many things important, but this is important. Bloody Sunday was a date that had some other circumstances that we don't often talk about.

I am just going to read something that will help us better understand why Bloody Sunday and this time in our history is so horrific, and it gave a President an opportunity to do something that, but for Bloody Sunday, he could not have done.

This is what I would like to read. Four deaths are directly attributed to the events of Selma to Montgomery marches: Jimmie Lee Jackson, who was shot by a State Trooper in February 1965 before the main march; James Reeb, a White minister, beaten in March 1965 after Bloody Sunday; Viola Liuzzo, a White civil rights activist, shot and killed in March 1965; and Jonathan Daniels, another White activist, shot and killed in August 1965 during a later demonstration related to the marches.

All of these things happened around Bloody Sunday, but Bloody Sunday afforded President Lyndon Johnson the opportunity to sign into law the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

My speculation is but for these horrific events and for the world having the opportunity to see the horrors of invidious discrimination, the horrors of segregation, the horrors associated with people who had hate in their hearts and were determined to prevent people of color from having the same rights that they enjoyed, meaning the people who were Anglos enjoyed—this Bloody Sunday is marked by violence, but it is also a mark in history that gave us the 1965 Voting Rights Act.

The 1965 Voting Rights Act was signed on August 6, 1965, by Lyndon Johnson. Here is what is important. When it was signed on August 6 in the 89th Congress, there were 6 Black Members of Congress—6, 5 Latinos, 4 Asians, a total of 15 persons of color that we could identify as such.

As of January 3, 2025, in this Congress, the 119th Congress, we have 68 Black persons, from 6 to 68; Latinos, from 5 in 1965 to 58; Asians, from 4 in 1965 to 24—a total of 150.

□ 1240

Mr. Speaker, I submit that a good many of these 150 are currently at risk. If things continue as they are in Texas, then we are likely to lose a third or more of these 150 Members of Congress.

Let's talk about Texas for just a moment. In Texas, we have evidence and, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD this letter from the Department of Jus-

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
CIVIL RIGHTS DIVISION,
Washington, DC, July 7, 2025.

Hon. GREGORY ABBOTT,
*Office of the Governor, Texas Capitol,
Austin, Texas.*
Hon. KEN PAXTON,
*Office of the Attorney General of Texas, Attention: Austin Kinghorn/Ryan Walters,
Austin, Texas.*

DEAR GOVERNOR ABBOTT AND ATTORNEY GENERAL PAXTON: This letter will serve as formal notice by the Department of Justice to the State of Texas of serious concerns regarding the legality of four of Texas's congressional districts. As stated below, Congressional Districts TX-09, TX-18, TX-29 and TX-33 currently constitute unconstitutional "coalition districts" and we urge the State of Texas to rectify these race-based considerations from these specific districts.

In *Allen v. Milligan*, 599 U.S. 1, 45 (2023), Justice Kavanaugh noted that "even if Congress in 1982 could constitutionally authorize race-based redistricting under §2 for some period of time, the authority to conduct race-based redistricting cannot extend indefinitely into the future." 599 U.S. 1, (Kavanaugh, J., concurring). In *SFFA v. Harvard*, the Supreme Court reiterated that "deviation from the norm of equal treatment" on account of race "must be a temporary matter." 600 U.S. 181, 228 (2023). When race is the predominant factor above other traditional redistricting considerations including compactness, contiguity, and respect for political subdivision lines, the State of Texas must demonstrate a compelling state interest to survive strict scrutiny.

It is well established that so-called "coalition districts" run afoul of the Voting Rights Act and the Fourteenth Amendment. In *Petteway v. Galveston County*, No. 23-40582 (5th Cir. 2024), the en banc Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals made it abundantly clear that "coalition districts" are not protected by the Voting Rights Act. This was a reversal of its previous decision in *Campos v. City of Baytown*, 840 F.2d 1240 (5th Cir. 1988). In *Petteway*, the Fifth Circuit aligned itself with the Supreme Court's decision in

Bartlett v. Strickland, 556 U.S. 1 (2009), and determined that a minority group must be geographically compact enough to constitute more than 50 percent of the voting population in a single-member district to be protected under the Voting Rights Act. See also *Thornburg v. Gingles*, 478 U.S. 30 (1986). Opportunity and coalition districts are premised on either the combining of two minority groups or a minority group with white crossover voting to meet the 50 percent threshold. Neither meets the first Gingles precondition. Thus, the racial gerrymandering of congressional districts is unconstitutional and must be rectified immediately by state legislatures.

It is the position of this Department that several Texas Congressional Districts constitute unconstitutional racial gerrymanders, under the logic and reasoning of *Petteway*. Specifically, the record indicates that TX-09 and TX-18 sort Houston voters along strict racial lines to create two coalition seats, while creating TX-29, a majority Hispanic district. Additionally, TX-33 is another racially-based coalition district that resulted from a federal court order years ago, yet the Texas Legislature drew TX-33 on the same lines in the 2021 redistricting. Therefore, TX-33 remains as a coalition district.

Although the State's interest when configuring these districts was to comply with Fifth Circuit precedent prior to the 2024 *Petteway* decision, that interest no longer exists. Post-*Petteway*, the Congressional Districts at issue are nothing more than