

body to join me in praying for the family of Iryna Zarutka, who was brutally murdered on the Charlotte light rail by a violent, repeat offender who never should have been on the streets in the first place.

Iryna was a 23-year-old woman who fled the war in Ukraine just to meet her horrific fate at the hands of a dangerous criminal who was repeatedly released from jail over and over on serious, dangerous charges.

Iryna had a bright future ahead of her. Sadly, she will never see her home country again. Gone is her chance for a new future here in America. It didn't have to happen.

This criminal had a rap sheet going back nearly two decades, including armed robbery and threats of violence. Yet, because of irresponsible policies by our former Governor Roy Cooper's administration, this brutal thug was set free and allowed to terrorize our community again and again.

Our people deserve commonsense leadership that puts victims first and keeps dangerous criminals behind bars. I will keep fighting to make sure violent offenders stay off the street and that our communities are safe for every family. I will pray for Iryna's family.

---

□ 1930

#### TEMPORARY BENEFITS FOR WORKING FAMILIES

(Mr. MRVAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MRVAN. Mr. Speaker, I recently held community conversations across Indiana's First Congressional District.

What I heard loud and clear was that families are struggling with rising costs at the grocery store, skyrocketing utility bills, and economic uncertainty that has been created by the chaos from this administration.

My constituents know exactly that this economic pain and unfairness stems from the so-called One Big Beautiful Bill Act. You can't fool hard-working people. They see the truth as clear as day.

Yes, there are tax breaks on tips and overtime but only for 3 years. This is at the same time that billionaires and those who can afford a \$1 million annual membership to Mar-a-Lago got tax breaks that are permanent. Why is help for working families temporary but handouts for the privileged permanent?

We won't be deceived. Communities in northwest Indiana are struggling with increasing costs, and they know that the Republican bill is unfair toward working families.

It is one of the many reasons that I opposed this unpopular legislation and why I will continue to fight to make the current tax benefits for working families permanent.

#### CALLING FOR USE OF RECONCILIATION PROCESS

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

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, we are going to follow up with a theme that has been talked about earlier within our Conference.

Frequently, Republicans have to go home and explain why they aren't getting done what they want to get done. It is because the rules in the Senate require 60 votes to break a filibuster, which means that you need CHUCK SCHUMER to sign off in order to get almost anything done in the Senate.

However, three times in this 2-year period, through the process called reconciliation, we are able to pass a bill out of the Senate with 50 votes or 51 votes with the Vice President. There are Republicans here who do not want to put us in that position.

Mr. Speaker, 8 years ago in Donald Trump's first term, some of these same Republicans, when we also had three votes—we used one vote for the tax cut, one vote to try and failed to do something on healthcare reform, and a third vote that the Senators didn't want to use. They wanted to restrict the floor votes to votes in which CHUCK SCHUMER signed off.

We are now at the same position this time, and I hope that our talk radio and mouthpieces will wake up and demand that the Republicans use all three reconciliation votes this biennium.

---

#### RESTORING LIFESAVING FOOD AID FOR MALNOURISHED CHILDREN

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

Mr. MAGAZINER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today for the 37th time to demand that the Trump administration restore lifesaving food aid for malnourished children.

This is Plumpy'Nut. It is manufactured in my district to treat kids who are starving to death.

Mr. Speaker, when children are starving, their organs stop working. They cannot digest regular food. This is their only chance at getting back to health.

It took the Trump administration 10 days to put a stop to USAID's shipments of Plumpy'Nut to starving children around the world. Since then, they have promised over and over again that the program will restart.

They have issued RFPs. They have said that they are going to start shipping again, but it has been 9 months. It took them 10 days to shut down this program and 9 months and counting to get it going again.

Every day that they delay and drag their feet is a day that children are starving. Stop the excuses. Stop the

delay. Restore this program. I will speak out on this floor every day until the program is restored.

---

#### BETTER IS POSSIBLE

(Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, Mrs. McIVER of New Jersey was recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.)

Mrs. McIVER. Mr. Speaker, once again, we find ourselves staring down a deadline to fund the government—deadline after deadline after deadline. Once again, we expect to see our colleagues across the aisle use this as an opportunity to put partisanship over people.

Like so many Americans watching from home, I must ask: Why does this keep happening? Why does this keep happening?

My colleagues across the aisle either don't understand, or they simply don't care about how a government shutdown impacts people, real people. They seem to think that it is a tool that they can use to force their cruel agenda onto our communities and a tool to take more from the folks who they have already hurt with their big, ugly bill.

During recess, I conducted a roundtable with school leaders from 18 cities in my district, and they talked about the challenges that students will face with cuts to SNAP benefits and the school lunch program. They spoke of how students will not be able to show up to school ready to learn and how it would impact their learning experience and their school environment.

I spoke to families who told me that they didn't know how they would be able to afford healthcare once their Medicaid is cut, once the effective date kicks in. We talked to many constituents about how they would be able to afford to put food on their tables once SNAP benefit cuts kick in.

The people deserve a government that works, a government that works for the people, one that is stable, functional, and focused on solving real problems, not constantly heading toward a shutdown, not a government engaged in constant cruelty, constant chaos, and constant confusion.

Once again, the American people deserve a government that works for them. That means investing in what matters, such as public safety. How about education, transportation, healthcare, and the services that families and communities rely on the most? Those are the programs we should be investing in, not cutting. We need more investments in these programs.

Mr. Speaker, we must and will oppose attempts to slash those services, and we won't support a partisan, poisonous bill that hurts the people we serve and the people who depend on us, the people who have elected us to work on their behalf and their behalf only. That is as simple as that. We will not support it, point-blank, period.

Better is possible. We know that better is possible. We know better, despite what the other side of the aisle does. That is why we are going to continue to fight like hell for the people we serve because we know that they deserve better.

We will not stop fighting, no matter what. We are fighting not just to pass something to keep the lights on for another few months but for a solution that actually serves the American people, something that makes people's lives better.

Did we forget why we are here and why the people elected us? They elected us to make their lives better, not to hurt them or make their lives worse. That is not our job. Let me remind you: The people elected us. They put their trust in us to make their lives better, not worse.

I invite all of my colleagues to join us. Join us to fight for people and to work for people. Let's get back to the real work in these Chambers. Let's make it make sense why we are here working on behalf of our constituents who have elected us. Let's get back to the people's business.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE).

□ 1940

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my illustrious colleague of the great State of New Jersey for being the lead for tonight's Congressional Black Caucus Special Order hour to talk about the government, money, funding, keeping this government open, and about why we come here every single day of each week and why some of us are fighting for the American people while others of us are fighting for Donald Trump.

This is a great time to share that Republicans don't care about you—you, all of you. Trump doesn't care about you, none of you. They don't care about your safety. They don't care about your freedom. They don't care about your voice. They don't care about your vote. They don't care about your pocketbook.

Why does the Congresswoman from California say this? Because I have receipts, and I am going to share them.

Earlier this year, Republicans voted on a \$4.5 trillion tax cut for the richest of the rich. In order to pay for that, they passed a honking series of cuts to all the services that you need to help you survive and thrive.

What kinds of services? It is things like shutting down or threatening to shut down Social Security offices in high-rent districts, which would include all of Los Angeles. They are cutting funding to SNAP, which helps young mothers who are looking for baby formula for their babies and folks who need help buying food so that maybe their children's bellies aren't empty when they are going to school. Services by farmers who actually produce goods that are sold into this agricultural program would be cut.

They are cutting funding to the Small Business Administration. Most people in my district are interested in their hustle, their small business that they are trying to get off the ground. I thought that was why the SBA was developed, designed, and created: to help start businesses. Now, we have a President who wants to cut that, maybe because he wants all the money.

We have a President, supported by the Republican Party, who is sending in the National Guard and militarizing soldiers against citizens in those cities and States. They are right here at Union Station in Washington, D.C. The taxpayers are footing a million dollars a day for these National Guard members to pick up trash. They are doing the job that sanitation workers would be doing in the District of Columbia.

We are talking about \$770 billion for Medicare. I talk to young people in my district, Mr. Speaker. They say: "I am not on Medicare." I say: "That is right. Maybe you are not, but your grandmother is, your elderly aunt is, and the doctor you see is able to see you because of the reimbursement they are getting from a Medicare patient."

With these cuts, we are hearing from community clinics. We are hearing from hospitals. We are hearing from doctors and other healthcare providers. They are trying to see if they are able to stay open to help you when you get sick, but that has been cut.

In the last administration, President Biden said that he was going to forgive student loans. This President says: Oh, no. Everybody pays except me. Everybody pays but me.

Not only are we doing away with that forgiveness, but we are actually capping the amount of money that you can get in student loans and in grants to maybe go to medical school because Lord knows we need more doctors, especially in rural communities, willing to help Americans as they search for healthcare.

One place, though, that didn't get cut is ICE and Homeland Security because this is an administration that wants his own personal militia to go after folks who ask for the truth. These cuts also mean and include cuts to Federal jobs. California is a State with the second largest number of Federal workers. These are workers who have been answering the phones when you call, checking on your application when you submit it, and getting back to you about your benefits. Those folks are being terminated, but this is the President who is all about workers first, which is why I had to drive down to the city to the Department of Labor and see the President's face on the big, old banner.

Why are we spending money on these banners but cutting money to farmers? Because dismantling USAID and cutting USAID is more than just what is happening in other countries. You are actually also cutting contracts to American farmers who produce goods and products that we then sell to other

countries. This is all about hurting all of us.

They are cutting funding to the National Institutes of Health. They are cutting cancer research.

In my State of California, we were on the cusp of clinical trials because a cure had been found for breast cancer. We were on the cusp of clinical trials for a cure for prostate cancer. All of that has now stopped because of cuts to the National Institutes of Health.

That is what we are talking about. The party in power has a responsibility to make sure that those basic services—because nothing I talked about was not basic—are not cut.

I am trying to find out why we have a President who is chair of both the World Cup and the Olympics. These are events that will be happening in my district and in my State. The World Cup festivities will be happening in cities across this State. How can you have cities that are preparing for the World Cup and the Olympics when they are being attacked by the Federal Government and when we are not providing them the support that they need to get ready?

Here we are on the verge of the third set of receipts, a funding shutdown, which is imminent and can be stopped by the party in power, the Republicans.

The Republicans have to make a decision. Are they going to prioritize the American people, or are they going to prioritize the President of the United States?

I don't know about you, but the Congresswoman from New Jersey talked about hosting townhalls in her district. I did, too. I didn't meet a constituent who said they wanted the Rose Garden paved at the White House. I haven't met a constituent who said they want to see more gold candelabras in the White House. I have met constituents who said: What is going to happen to my health insurance? When is ICE going to get out of the kindergartens in Los Angeles?

I hope we don't have a government shutdown, but that would require Republicans to make some decisions about who they are going to support. On top of that, which people like to forget, the last thing we did before the beginning of August was that Republicans voted on a rescissions package, which was essentially giving the President back money that Congress had already voted to appropriate to go to the American people.

Some Republicans said let's do this once a month. That is not an exercise. It is like going on a diet once a month. Let's cut more money out of the hands of the American people. It is not funny.

I know people think that Congress is drama and theater, but it is not theater when you talk to a constituent who says, "Thank God you called the agency on my behalf so I could get my benefits back." It is not theater when you have a constituent who is older and is going to get evicted, and they say, "Thank God you called HUD to

make sure that my grandmother doesn't get evicted from her house."

I thought that was what the government was supposed to do. How come no one answers my calls? How come this President doesn't care about me?

This is not theater. We have farmers in trouble. We have young children who are hungry. We have elders who are concerned if they are going to be able to go to the doctor when they get sick. We have young people who don't even know if it is worth going to college because they don't know if they will find a job. We have partners and friends who have opened up businesses in our cities across this country who are afraid to show up to their jobs because they don't know if they will be snatched and deported, even though they are legally allowed to be here.

□ 1950

What is going on? We read these headlines. It does not sound like anything that should be happening in the United States of America.

It is one thing to talk about policy, but it is another thing to cut the benefits of a veteran who put their life on the line to protect us.

It is one thing to debate policy. It is another thing to vote to shut down a hospital.

It is one thing to talk about foreign policy and where we should be and what we should be doing. It is another thing to cut jobs, folks who are building things that keep us safe.

I had a gentleman come into my office a week ago. He is not even from my State. He has a business in Mississippi, and they make the thermostats that we put into refrigerators. They have investments in another country. They have American people, American workers working in Mississippi and in that country, and you know the money they make comes here.

He said: I am going to have to fire all those people and shutdown because of these cuts on top of these tariffs.

Now, that man didn't vote for me. That man probably didn't even vote for my candidate, but he came in my office and said: Can you help? What is going on? What is going on?

My answer was: You have got some people up in here that ain't got no courage. They don't have no courage. I don't owe you nothing, you are not from my State. However, you are trying to create jobs to help American people, give young people an idea about how they can start their own business and be an entrepreneur and come up with a product they can patent that is good for business, that allows them to earn some money, save some money, start a family. All that is in jeopardy because of these cuts, because of these rescissions, and because of this potential government shutdown.

I don't know about you, but when I am in trouble, I don't call somebody and say, hey, are you a Republican or a Democrat? I just call and say: Can you help me?

My dad has got health issues right now. I was on the phone. I wasn't saying: Hey, who did you vote for? I said: Hey, can you help my dad?

That is what Americans across this country are asking, like, are you, the people in power, the people with the gavel, are you going to help me?

Make me drop my notes.

I want the party in power to say: Yeah, I am going to help you. I am going to prioritize you. I am just not going to prioritize you in March of 2026 before my name is on the ballot, I am going to prioritize you right now because American companies, American students, American innovators, American researchers, American veterans, American farmers, American students deserve all of us fighting for them and not for one person who is only looking to hang more banners up and put up more gold candelabras at 1600 Pennsylvania.

Mrs. MCIVER. Mr. Speaker, I am telling you, it is time for us to work for the people.

I thank the fine gentlewoman from California for those remarks. It is time for us to work for people. That is what we are here for. That is what your constituents voted for you to do; not to make cuts. Think about it. I say this to my colleagues across the aisle, the next time you are out in your district working, ask one of your constituents: Is your life better? Has your life been better since January 20? Is it better? Ask. See what they tell you. I can bet you that it isn't.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the fine gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. MCCLELLAN), my co-anchor of this Special Order hour.

Ms. MCCLELLAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman MCIVER for co-anchoring this Special Order hour tonight.

You don't grow up in the Commonwealth of Virginia without getting history lessons, and those lessons stuck with me. I am cognizant that next year we have the opportunity to celebrate 250 years of an extraordinary, revolutionary, radical idea that had never been tried, truly, before in the world: the idea that the power of government derives from the people, not from brute force, not from getting it from an inheritance, but the consent of the governed to give power to the government.

Why do they do that? It is to meet their needs, to solve their problems. It is an idea that sparked my imagination as a child. It is an idea that as I listened to my parents tell stories of what their life was like growing up during the Depression, growing up during Jim Crow, where they didn't always have their needs met, not because of any fault of their own or their parents, but they saw the best of government through the New Deal, where the Federal Government used its power to help people who couldn't afford to put food on the table, to help people who lost their life savings overnight in the stock market crash, but didn't help all

the people because at the same time, my parents saw the worst of government, a government that oppresses some for the benefit of a few.

That sparked my imagination again to say what can I do to make government a force for good that helps people and solves problems, rather than oppresses some for the benefit of a few? Eventually, that question led me to Congress.

After growing up as a member of Generation X on "Schoolhouse Rock," learning about just a bill's journey to becoming a law, I got here and thought, they didn't get it right because there is no song for what I have seen since coming to Congress, particularly in the 119th.

We stand here today, 22 days before government funding expires. We stand here, House and Senate Democrats, ready to pass a bipartisan funding bill that will improve the health of Americans, that will improve access to quality, affordable healthcare, that will improve the safety and economic well-being of every American.

As a matter of fact, our leaders sent a letter to Republican leadership in the House and the Senate to that effect. The very next day, the President sent down a pocket rescission that the Republican chair of the Senate Appropriations Committee said was unlawful. I happen to agree.

□ 2000

Most of this Congress, we have watched a President ignore the will of Congress, Mr. Speaker, or we have seen, at the President's request, congressional Republicans cut Medicaid, cut SNAP benefits, put lifetime caps on student loans, Federal student loans, cut funding that Congress appropriated for cancer research, for the National Institutes of Health, a whole host of things. People at home are scratching their heads saying: How does this help me? How does this solve my problem? It creates more.

I spent the August recess mostly in my district, but I spread out a little bit beyond my district because I am one of only two Virginians on the Energy and Commerce Committee. Healthcare, in particular, has been very important to me. I spent time talking to my constituents, and listening, more importantly, to their concerns, what they were worried about, what they were afraid of, and then talking particularly to healthcare providers across the Commonwealth.

What I heard was a lot of anxiety and fear, whether it was my farmers who because of tariff policies aren't seeing the kind of orders—particularly for soybeans—that they used to see this time of year going overseas. Mr. Speaker, some can't get the parts to repair their equipment because of tariffs. Some businesses have had to raise prices because they have absorbed them for as long as they can. Yet, they are in between a rock and a hard place where if they raise their prices too

much, especially the small business owners, they are going to go out of business.

I heard from State legislators who wonder how am I going to fill the hole in my State budget caused by cuts to Medicaid, cuts to SNAP, and the requirements on States to pay more when I am also trying to fill the holes in NIH funding and in all the other healthcare funding that helps me meet the needs of my constituents. How am I going to fill the hole when I am still waiting for the Department of Education to send money that was appropriated as schools are about to start.

What my State legislators and my local elected officials told me was—I keep hearing people say about how this big, ugly bill is a tax cut, but what it is doing to me is forcing me to either cut services or raise taxes at the State or at the local level.

Congress has 22 days for Republicans to decide whether we are going to have a government shutdown because they have made clear from day one that they are in charge. They have made clear from day one that the President can just decide not to spend money we have appropriated, and that is okay. They have made clear that they can pass reconciliation bills without giving us a seat at the table. It is up to them whether Congress will pass funding that meets people's needs and solves their problems and keeps the government open or not.

I am usually the eternal optimist. I am a little worried. I am a little worried. Virginia has the second highest number of Federal employees, and since the cuts to the Federal workforce have now seen unemployment increase multiple times before the folks that were paid to stay home until September 30 come off the job rolls, those people are not able to find jobs. Mr. Speaker, unlike what our Governor says: Just because you are a NASA engineer, doesn't mean that you are qualified for the healthcare jobs that our healthcare providers can't fill. The big, ugly bill is going to make all of those issues worse.

I want to share some of what I heard from our healthcare providers. You have the academic research hospitals who are worried they can't attract students, particularly medical students, because of the lifetime cap on student loans which are \$257,000.

Today, I talked to a physician from Roanoke, Virginia, who has \$500,000 in medical school debt. That math doesn't math. When you have enough medical school debt, you have enough debt to pay for somebody's house. Yet now, the next generation of students coming up behind him can only get half of that in Federal student loans. That math doesn't math.

I visited a dental clinic in Abingdon, Virginia. Before the dental clinic, most people west of Roanoke who needed dental services waited until once a year when the RAM Clinic came to Wise County. You would see the long-

est line you have ever seen of people waiting to get dental services because they live in a dental desert.

Now, this clinic was able to open, and 80 percent of their patients are Medicaid recipients. The other 20 percent are uninsured. They are worried what happens when the Medicaid cuts take effect and the 80 percent starts to decline as to how many are actually paying something. They won't be able to cover their costs. When Medicaid reimbursement rates were already too low for them to completely recover their costs, that is going to be even harder.

When I shared with the press what I was hearing from healthcare providers across the State, how they were worried they were going to have to close because of Medicaid cuts, the gentleman who represents that area said that Democrats are just spreading fear.

Well, imagine my surprise—actually not surprised—when last week Augusta Medical Group, which covers parts of southwest Virginia, announced they were closing three primary care centers in western Virginia as part of its response to the one big, ugly big.

It is not hyperbole. You have rural hospitals that are already operating on the margins who now are going to have to provide more uncompensated care.

□ 2010

Mr. Speaker, when people come off of Medicaid and when the Enhanced Premium Tax Credits for purchasing insurance on the Affordable Care Act Exchange expire if we don't act by the end of this year and more people become uninsured, they are not going to magically never get sick. They are going to get sick.

When they get sick and show up for care, they will go to the emergency rooms. They will be treated. It is going to be more expensive to treat them. It will be uncompensated care. Guess who pays for that? We do when our insurance premiums go up or when the price of care goes up to recover the cost from private insurers.

All of these jobs that are lost, that is also employer-provided health insurance. That is even more uninsured.

My colleagues on the Energy and Commerce Committee said they are trying to make sure Medicaid is made sustainable for future generations. That bill did not do a thing to address the underlying reasons healthcare costs are going up. It just provided that fewer people would end up getting health insurance, up to 17 million according to the Congressional Budget Office.

Mr. Speaker, I heard a lot about the SNAP benefit cuts. I heard from recipients who were worried, but I also heard from grocery stores, rural and urban. I represent Surry County. Surry County has one grocery store. It opened last year. Prior to that, it didn't have a grocery store for 20 years. That meant that people in Surry County drove 30 minutes to go grocery shopping. They couldn't get a lot of perishable items.

They could only get what would fit in a cooler.

The Surry Marketplace helped with that. The Surry Marketplace took forever, but we were able to help them become eligible for SNAP. They would receive SNAP benefits. They knew that certain times of the month the SNAP recipients would come in. It was mostly the seniors living in two senior facilities within walking distance to the grocery store.

The grocery store bought enough fresh food, produce and meat, that made it sustainable for the market to buy fresh food in bulk and know it would be sold. That is 10 percent of their revenue.

Their worry is that when people lose their SNAP benefits, they can't count on that bulk anymore. It will be harder for them to keep their doors open.

I heard the same thing from the market in Church Hill in downtown East End, Richmond. Both of these areas were food deserts before these stores opened. By the way, a lot of their customers are also Medicaid recipients. The same people who lose access to the food benefits and lose access to their healthcare in the HUD funding bill could lose access to rental assistance, as well.

I heard a lot about FEMA cuts. We had a water infrastructure roundtable. I represent cities that have water infrastructure that is over 100 years old. One of them received a grant to help upgrade its water treatment plant and its water infrastructure that failed earlier this year during a storm.

They got a resiliency grant from FEMA to help upgrade that infrastructure so they would know that when there is a natural disaster the water infrastructure will survive it and the people in the region will have clean drinking water. The Department of Homeland Security canceled that grant, saying it had nothing to do with natural disasters.

Mr. Speaker, I think we all want to be sure that a water infrastructure system will provide clean drinking water when there is a hurricane, a tropical storm, or another natural disaster.

From childcare to healthcare to housing to utility bills, these are just a few of the things that I heard from my constituents about how the price of everything is going up. You name it, Mr. Speaker.

So far, the funding actions of the President and Congress have made it worse. We passed an energy bill last week that gutted the very programs that help people weatherize their homes to reduce their energy costs. We cut in half the very department that has that program.

People ask me: Weren't you elected to help people solve problems?

I was, but we have to work together to do it. Just because Republicans are in the majority does not mean that they only govern over Republicans. Democrats, Independents, and Republicans in Virginia's Fourth District and

across the Commonwealth want us to come together to help them solve their problems. That is what the best of government does. It does not make them worse.

In November, the people made very clear—and they continue to make clear today—the cost of everything is too high. When I talk to Republicans, Democrats, and Independents—rural, urban, and suburban—no matter where they were born, no matter what language they speak, no matter the color of their skin, no matter who they love, no matter how they worship, they want three things: They want to know they live in a thriving and healthy community. They want to know that they have a job that allows them not just to pay their bills but to have a fair shot at a better life for their children than they had. When they get sick, they want to know they can go to the doctor and not go bankrupt.

Every single person that I talked to in my district during the August period said it is getting harder to do that, and they are afraid it is not going to get better.

We answer to our constituents. When we all took our oath of office, we took an oath of office to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States and to do our jobs to the best of our ability.

When we see people who are hurting and we have the ability to help, our job—or as Matthew 25 says: When we see somebody who is hungry, we feed them. When we see someone who is homeless, we give them shelter. When we see someone who is sick, we provide them care. When we see a stranger, we welcome them. When someone is in prison, we visit them. At a minimum, how about we make sure they are in conditions that are humane?

We can do a lot better. The American people deserve better. It is going to require us to put politics aside and focus on the people. We have 22 days to do it, Mr. Speaker. We have 22 days to decide: Are we going to come together, find common ground, fund this government in a way that helps people and puts people over politics, or are we going to let it all shut down?

I didn't come here to shut down the government. I also didn't come here to vote for a bill that strips food out of children's mouths and that strips healthcare away from the people that need it. That is not what my constituents sent me here to do.

□ 2020

That is not what my constituents sent me here to do. That is not what this government has done in the past when people were hurting.

I end where I started. My parents saw the best of government, and they saw the worst of government.

If we had another hour, I could walk down the path of how a lot of what I am seeing in 2025 reminds me of what my grandparents saw in 1925 or what my great-grandparents saw in 1905, but

we only have 1 Special Order hour and not 2.

Let me just say: Let's find our better angels and show the American people the best of government, where we come together and put people over politics and meet their needs and solve problems together.

Mrs. McIVER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Virginia for those remarks, and I yield back the balance of my time.

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, September 9, 2025, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-1880. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the August 2025 cumulative report on rescissions, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 685(e)(1); Public Law 93-344, Sec. 1014(e); (88 Stat. 335) (H. Doc. No. 119—91); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

EC-1881. A letter from the Supervisory Program Analyst, Media Bureau, Federal Communication Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Authorizing Permissive Use of the "Next Generation" Broadcast Television Standard [GN Docket No. 16-142] received September 5, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1882. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Cybersecurity and Communication Reliability Division, Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Resilient Networks [PS Docket No. 21-346]; Amendments to Part 4 of the Commission's Rules Concerning Disruptions to Communications [PS Docket No. 15-80]; New Part 4 of the Commission's Rules Concerning Disruptions Communications [ET Docket No. 04-35] received September 5, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1883. A letter from the Supervisory Program Analyst, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Delete, Delete [GN Docket No. 25-133] received September 5, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1884. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a notification of military action taken on September 2, 2025, in the Caribbean Sea and of the potential for further such actions, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1543(a)(3); Public Law 93-148, Sec. 4(a); (87 Stat. 555) (H. Doc. No. 119—92); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

EC-1885. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, De-

partment of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — International Traffic in Arms Regulations: U.S. Munitions List Targeted Revisions [Public Notice: 12744] (RIN: 1400-AF42) received September 5, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-1886. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Office of General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting a notification of a nomination and discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, Sec. 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

EC-1887. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting notification of an action on nomination and discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, Sec. 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

EC-1888. A letter from the Director, Office of Acquisition Policy, Office of Government-wide Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's small entity compliance guide — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2025-06; Small Entity Compliance Guide [Docket No.: FAR-2025-0051, Sequence No. 3] received September 5, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

EC-1889. A letter from the Director, Office of Acquisition Policy, Office of Government-wide Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's summary presentation of final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2025-06; Introduction [Docket No.: FAR-2025-0051, Sequence No. 3] received September 5, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

EC-1890. A letter from the Chairwoman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting the Board's FY 2025 NO FEAR Act report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, Sec. 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f); (120 Stat. 3241); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

EC-1891. A letter from the Acting Chief, Legal, External Affairs and Performance Branch, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting a notification of a designation of acting officer, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, Sec. 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

EC-1892. A letter from the Solicitor General, Department of Justice, transmitting a letter advising that the Department of Justice has decided not to file a petition for a writ of certiorari in *Reese v. ATF*, No. 23-30033 (5th Cir. Jan. 30, 2025), pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 530D(a)(1); Public Law 107-273, Sec. 202(a); (116 Stat. 1771); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1893. A letter from the Section Chief, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Revenue Procedure 2025-28 received September 5, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EC-1894. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting additional legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the first session of the 119th Congress; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Veterans' Affairs.