

created so many opportunities for each of us.

We each have a story about how our parents, our grandparents, and our great-grandparents, for that matter, came to this country. That is that dream of America, that they want to come to America, assimilate, and live the American Dream.

Sadly, the actions of the previous administration undercut that very ideal because people take a sour view of immigration.

As I get ready to close today, I am sorry that the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. CRANK) could not make it back from his other obligations, but I appreciate the good words of Congressman KNOTT, Congressman ONDER, and Congressman WIED. They have done a remarkable job of putting a human face on illegal immigration.

Let us never forget that the biggest victims of this, besides the crisis with fentanyl, are those young boys and girls who have been sold into sexual slavery.

I don't like the term "human trafficking" because it is such a bland term. The term is "sexual slavery," and I can't imagine the horrors that these individuals have gone through as they came across the border thinking that they would be given an opportunity in America. Instead, they were sentenced to a life of evil.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak tonight on this important issue, and I yield back the balance of my time.

SCIENTIFIC INTEGRITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RULLI). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring attention to an issue that should concern all Americans.

This evening, in this Special Order, we will be talking about scientific integrity. To be a problem solver today, I believe it is important for leaders to embrace scientific integrity, and we will talk about that throughout the course of the next hour.

Every day, our Nation's scientists are making vital contributions to our public health, economy, and national security.

Modern society as we know it is only possible due to Federal investments in everything from medical research and food safety to severe weather forecasting and pollution reduction. These contributions extend far beyond our own borders, lifting up people all over the world through life-changing scientific breakthroughs and innovations.

Under normal circumstances, federally funded scientists could often avoid the noise and clamor of public political debates. As the world has seen over the last 2½ weeks, the Trump administration is anything but normal.

The President and his billionaire cronies took no time at all to begin attacking our world-renowned institutions that support publicly funded science.

They are shamelessly attempting to destroy the visionary ideals of great leaders like President Franklin Roosevelt, who created the Federal Office of Scientific Research and Development during the Second World War. The creation of this office led to untold advancements in radar technology and nuclear energy, becoming a roadmap for our government to advance independent, fundamental, and necessary scientific knowledge for the benefit of all.

After the war, our government treated science as a necessary answer to clear and present threats. Today that is not the case. Federal research and development are primary targets of political attacks from this administration.

Science is no longer the answer but a direct threat to the cruel, backward, and barbaric Trump-Musk agenda. We can only look at the President's first term in office to know how his administration will treat the scientific community.

What exactly is on the table here? What is at stake? It is scientific integrity.

"Scientific integrity," as defined by the National Science and Technology Council, "is the adherence to professional practices, ethical behavior, and the principles of honesty and objectivity when conducting, managing, using the results of, and communicating about science and scientific activities."

Inclusivity, transparency, and protection from inappropriate influence are hallmarks of scientific integrity. Integrity in research is essential—essential—for maintaining scientific excellence and keeping the public's trust.

It is true that administrations from both parties may have violated scientific integrity at some point during their time in office, but the first Trump term exceeded them all with well over 150 reported attacks on science. They suppressed studies, altered reports, interfered in scientific processes, ignored concerns, refused to adopt scientifically backed guidelines, and politicized health assessments.

The level of damage from these attacks was, indeed, staggering and affected every single agency that employs science in its decisionmaking process.

That is why, as an engineer myself, I have consistently made it one of my top priorities in Congress to right the ship of America's science policy because science lives at the very core of a healthy democracy.

As part of that broad effort, I am proud to lead the bipartisan Scientific Integrity Act, which was reintroduced today alongside my dear friends and colleagues, Representative LOFGREN, Representative BEYER, Representative

BONAMICI, and Representative STEVENS, and over 100 original cosponsors.

This legislation establishes consistent scientific integrity policies across all agencies so that scientists, Members of Congress, and the American people can put their faith in Federal research findings.

Thanks to the efforts of the Biden administration, more than 28 Federal agencies have some form of scientific integrity policy today, but standards remain inconsistent.

America's most important science is conducted, reviewed, communicated to the public, and incorporated into policymaking in ways that must be transparent and free from inappropriate political, ideological, financial, and other undue influences.

My colleagues and I are fighting to ensure that sound, evidence-based policy is always readily available for policymakers and that scientists and advisers should never feel threatened to speak the truth.

This is a critical moment.

America is facing unprecedented challenges in the form of a rapidly changing climate, environmental contamination, and countless other concerns that threaten our public health, national security, and general welfare. We cannot afford to let the integrity of our scientific enterprise be demolished.

The Trump administration and Elon Musk are direct threats to U.S. scientific leadership on the global stage. My colleagues and I will highlight many of the most recent and egregious violations of scientific integrity by this new administration.

From removing data and censoring research at the CDC to the politicization of career scientists across government, this administration has once again made it clear that they do not care about scientific integrity.

They do not care about our national security or competing with China.

They do not care about saving American lives threatened by the climate crisis.

They do not care about public health or ensuring the safety and well-being of families from the threat of the deadly viruses that we have seen, like COVID-19.

The scientific knowledge we carry forward is critical for our continued survival, even as its validity is being questioned at a scale unprecedented in modern history.

America has both the skill and the structure to develop the knowledge that we need. Thankfully, many are rising to the defense of scientific integrity, and the reality is that this should not be a partisan issue.

Over the many years that I have led this bill, my colleagues across the aisle have been more than willing to join the effort. It passed out of the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee back in the 116th Congress with overwhelming support from both parties.

I like to think that we all recognize how important sound science is to

making any sort of progress in our great Nation. Indeed, a tremendous amount of progress was made under the last administration.

It is in the interest of all Members of this body, from every district across our country, to support scientific integrity and to support the outstanding scientific talent who come from all over the Nation and globe to do research right here in our Federal agencies or with federally funded grants or at our world-class academic institutions.

I hope that my colleagues across the aisle hear this and understand what is at stake. Decades of repair will be necessary to undo the damage that has already been done.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the Eighth District of Virginia (Mr. BEYER), my good friend.

DON is a member of the Ways and Means Committee, but the gentleman is also an active person who is working for improvement as it relates to scientific integrity. We appreciate his sponsorship of the bill and his work to drive soundness and reflection of science in all of our policy discussions.

I thank the gentleman for joining us.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. TONKO for his leadership, for putting this together, and for leading this bill year after year.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the Trump administration's unconscionable and irresponsible attacks on America's scientific integrity.

The very foundation of our success as a world power has been our scientific prowess, and now, the Trump administration is threatening to undermine that success.

That is why I am here to talk about our bill with Representative PAUL TONKO, the Scientific Integrity Act, and to defend the very foundation of what makes America a global leader: our scientific leadership and infrastructure.

I am proud to represent the National Science Foundation here in Alexandria, Virginia, the very heart of Virginia. The NSF is an incredible resource and institution. It was established in 1950 by Congress as an independent agency to promote scientific advancement in America. For 75 years, it has repeatedly accomplished that goal.

NSF has helped to keep the U.S. at the forefront of scientific discovery. It helped catalyze the internet and develop the technology for MRI machines and 3D printing machines. It helped to create the "Dictionary of American Sign Language on Linguistic Principles," detected gravitational waves, developed LASIK eye surgery, and much, much more.

Over its lifetime, the National Science Foundation supported over 350,000 scientists, and of this number, 262 have won Nobel Prizes.

Trump has already begun unprecedented attacks on the scientific com-

munity with purges of NSF workers and grants, scientific advisers, and the broader scientific workforce.

I strongly oppose these efforts to target the National Science Foundation and weaken one of the guiding lights that makes America strong.

I am also deeply concerned about this new era of censorship in science. NSF employees were given this list of words to look for in grants and flag them for possible termination. This, by the way, is only a sampling of the words. It is much longer.

Mr. Speaker, I invite all who are watching to take a look at this list right next to me. This is just a portion of the full list, but it is a representative sample.

Oh, wait. I can't use "representative." It is on the list.

What is most frustrating to me is that many of these words are just standard words used in basic science.

Why the censorship? I thought Republicans hated the cancel culture.

This list contains "women" and "female," but no mention of "men" or "male." My Republican friends have been telling me that there are only two genders, but now that we can't speak the word "woman," are we down to just one?

There is "black" and "indigenous" on this list, but no "white."

It is very clear that the only identity not censored is mine, but why does being a woman or being part of a Tribe make one ineligible for science? Why is the Trump administration attacking Tribal communities?

I also don't understand this censorship of indigenous communities. It is also clear that the person who wrote this list has never been a scientist. It is ill-fitting, unwise, and actively harmful for scientific purposes.

The inclusion of many of these words, like "bias," "included," or "excluded," clearly shows that none of the people in charge of this list were scientists. If they were, they would know that many of these words are commonly used in scientific papers.

Mr. Speaker, imagine being a grant applicant applying to develop the newest MRI technology or to develop a new drug locally, or being on the precipice of discovering a new gene in a plant or about to be taking pictures of two black holes for the first time. Imagine that this is someone's life's work.

Now, imagine having to comb through a proposal or dissertation, the work of months or years, just to find every instance of words that don't belong there.

It doesn't matter if the instance of the word "polarization" refers to the magnetic field on an MRI machine instead of political polarization.

It doesn't matter if the use of the word "indigenous" is referring to an indigenous plant or if "activism" refers to the state of an enzyme or "inclusion" or "excluded" refers to the statistical analysis of the variables used. It also doesn't matter if "black" refers to the black hole being studied.

The study is now going to be flagged by Trump's immature and sometimes, we learned today, even blatantly racist cronies at DOGE, who built a flowchart on how to handle these words. They want to find any way to terminate the program regardless of intent.

□ 1815

The fact that these commonly used words are on this list indicates a lack of consideration of basic science. Someone should have spent more time in high school chemistry, physics, or biology class.

The list also indicates that the Trump administration is sending NSF on an internal manhunt, one that will waste an incredible amount of time and energy that could be much better used on advancing science.

If this list forces scientists to rewrite papers to avoid or minimize use of the words found on this arbitrary list, it further delays our already long grant process and then it hurts science.

If this list delays a drug's development or incredible discoveries that keep America at the forefront of scientific development, then it hurts science.

If scientists are interrogated by DOGE to determine if their use of polarization refers to a scientific principle or a political principle, then it hurts science.

If our scientists have to seriously reconsider whether they even want to apply for the grant in the first place, then it hurts science.

If NSF is discouraged from hiring or giving grants to any scientist except White, non-Hispanic men, well, we shouldn't expect many Nobel Prizes in the future.

If this treatment of our science and our scientists escalates and pushes scientists out of America or out of the field, then it only hurts our economy, hurts our country, and it helps China.

It is time to stop this madness and protect the American success story, and that is why I am here today, to decry these attacks on America, our science, and the National Science Foundation. That is why our Scientific Integrity Act is so important.

This bill would call on agencies to develop scientific integrity standards. We need scientists, not corrupt industry hacks, leading our future.

We need scientists who seek the truth rather than those who are paid to produce studies that help the businesses who pay them.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join us on the Scientific Integrity Act and act now to protect America's international leadership.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative BEYER for joining us in this fight and for his very challenging observations that he has shared. His activism on behalf of this bill and science, in general, is most appreciated.

Mr. Speaker, within the first few weeks of the Trump administration, we

have seen an onslaught of attacks on scientists, on science, and evidence-based decisionmaking.

At the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention alone, we have seen public communications halted, critical datasets made inaccessible, and scientific manuscripts purged of terms deemed to invoke so-called gender ideology.

CDC researchers were instructed to remove references to or mentions of a list of forbidden terms such as: gender, transgender, pregnant person, pregnant people, LGBT, transsexual, nonbinary, assigned male at birth, assigned female at birth, biologically male, biologically female.

Now, this effort to scrub scientific terms, erase demographic data, and silence researchers is not just wrong; it is dangerous.

Health disparities exist. The data proves it. Ignoring those disparities, preventing experts from studying them will not make them disappear. It will only make our response to crises weaker, less effective, and certainly less equitable.

When we can't track racial and ethnic disparities, gender, and sexual orientation in health outcomes, we lose the ability to make informed, evidence-based decisions.

Doctors and policymakers rely on clear, unaltered data to guide their work. Without it, we risk failing in the fight against public health crises like HIV, mpox, and maternal mortality.

Let me be clear: This is not just about words on a website. This is about access to lifesaving information.

It is about whether we allow science to function as it should or whether we allow political interference to dictate what truths we can or cannot acknowledge.

I urge all of my colleagues, this administration, and all who value truth in science to push back against this alarming trend.

Scientific integrity must be protected not just for our research community but for the millions of Americans whose health and well-being certainly depend on it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER), a good friend, and a very active, outspoken, bold voice for scientific integrity, he represents Illinois' 11th District, and is a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative TONKO for holding this Special Order hour on preserving scientific integrity.

Mr. Speaker, I am a scientist. For 25 years before entering Congress, I worked at Fermi National Accelerator Labs, smashing protons and antiprotons together to make particles that have not been around since the Big Bang.

If you are a scientist and you stand up and deliberately say something that you know is not true or if you publish something fraudulent, it is a career-

ending move. You will lose your position. Nobody will publish your papers. You are done. It should be that way, frankly, in politics.

The reason that we scientists take truthfulness so seriously is that we are always operating on the frontiers of what is scientifically known. We are always operating with statistically incomplete datasets, with partially confirmed hypotheses, and defining the next experiments to perform to get to the next level of scientific truth.

So we scientists simply cannot tolerate the additional uncertainty of whether or not the person that we are listening to is deliberately lying or even hiding parts of what they know to be the scientific truth.

That is why it is so corrosive and demeaning when the Trump administration orders scientists to suppress their best understanding of the scientific truth, forcing scientists to choose between either their scientific integrity or potentially their jobs.

As the Trump administration has already made it clear that they will continue to undermine science and dismiss evidence-based policies, this discussion could not come at a more important time.

Unfortunately, the situation is not new. During the first Trump administration, as chair of the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee's Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight, one of the first hearings that I held was on the damage done to our Nation's scientific enterprise by the President's policies.

The statistics were concerning. There were significant losses in key STEM positions at the Department of Energy, the Environmental Protection Agency, NOAA, including a 20 percent reduction in the Department of Energy Office of Nuclear Energy, something that Republicans claim to support.

Far too often, a scientist's expertise was simply ignored or their motives were questioned or their work was dismissed or censored.

Unsurprisingly, this resulted in the hemorrhaging of career scientists of all different backgrounds from our Federal workforce and from the university programs that they supported. Often, these talented scientists left for better offers in the private sector.

The departure of so much scientific talent and institutional knowledge from the government and from our universities represents a permanent, competitive disadvantage for the United States.

The responsibility, once again, falls on lawmakers like myself and my colleagues to protect the funding and the scientific freedom of speech that drives scientific advancement. It is our duty to ensure that regardless of the political climate, science remains at the forefront of our Nation's progress and innovation. Even as Trump continues his onslaught of executive orders that neglect scientific fact, I know that many of my sensible colleagues on the

other side of the aisle would not want to see the U.S. fall behind in this era of rapid technological innovation.

That is precisely what we risk if we do not continue to fund and support the scientists at our Federal agencies and the scientific programs that they support around the country.

At the same time, we must also make sure that we support scientists of all different backgrounds, including those who come to the U.S. for their education and want to stay and contribute their skills to our economy.

During my two decades at Fermi National Accelerator Lab, some of the brightest and most accomplished scientists and engineers that I had the privilege to work with came from foreign countries. In one circumstance that still makes me angry, we lost one of our best and brightest through LGBT intolerance in our immigration policies.

I know firsthand that Trump's dangerous rhetoric against diversity in our Federal workforce threatens the very foundation of what fuels U.S. innovation. Both Democrats and Republicans actually recognize this truth.

My Keep STEM Talent Act, which would effectively staple a green card to a graduate degree for international STEM students who study at a U.S. university, received bipartisan support with multiple Republican cosponsors.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my sensible colleagues on the other side of the aisle to support efforts like this and increase the resiliency of our Federal workforce and help defend our Nation's competitive edge in the face of these growing threats.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, we appreciate Mr. FOSTER's participation this evening and for his work as a scientist, engaging all of us in the importance of having unadulterated science policy and science research done so that we can move forward with a pure truth and science-based and evidence-based discussion.

Mr. Speaker, so scientific integrity, or the lack thereof, has its consequences.

Once again, we are witnessing a troubling pattern: Science and public health experts are being sidelined.

The decision to purge members of the EPA's Science Advisory Board and Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee is nothing short of a setback for scientific integrity.

These panels exist to provide statutorily required, independent, science-driven public health reviews, not to serve as a revolving door for political agendas.

History has shown us what happens when we weaken those advisory bodies by replacing well-respected academic experts with representatives that are financially tied to regulated industries.

The last time a similar purge took place, key air quality standards were delayed and polluters were given a pass. And who suffers? Children with asthma, seniors with heart and lung

disease, and communities already burdened by pollution suffer.

Let's be clear: Sound science is the foundation upon which we built public health protections.

Just last year, based on expert recommendations from the CASAC, EPA strengthened fine particle pollution standards for the first time in over a decade.

The reason was simple: The science was sound.

Fine particulate matter from sources like fossil fuel combustion and wildfires is directly linked to lung disease, heart attacks, and premature death.

The evidence demanded action and public health won, but now that progress is at risk. This move sends a dangerous message that politics matters more than science and that corporate interests carry more weight than public health.

That simply is unacceptable. The American people deserve clean air and strong environmental protections grounded in facts, not the whims of special interests.

I will not stand by while scientific integrity is undermined, expert voices are silenced, and our Nation's environmental safeguards are eroded.

I will continue fighting to ensure that science, not politics, guides our policies and that the health and well-being of our communities remain the top priority.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI), a good friend and colleague, who is a bold voice on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Congresswoman BONAMICI from Oregon's First District has been preaching scientific integrity for a long while, and we appreciate her joining us this evening.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman TONKO for his leadership on this important issue.

I have been on the Committee of Science, Space, and Technology since I joined Congress 13 years ago, Mr. Speaker.

It has been so inspiring to meet and hear from some of the Nation's, and sometimes the world's, leading scientists.

Today, I rise in defense of science and scientific integrity and in defense of truth. I rise in defense of the hard-working scientists and researchers who dedicate their careers to keeping our country safe, our economy strong, and our future secure.

The assault that is happening right now at our Federal science agencies is appalling and dangerous, and it must be stopped.

The Trump administration, working hand in hand with Elon Musk and his shadowy group of hackers calling itself the Department of Government Efficiency, or DOGE, is dismantling the critical programs that protect clean air and water, grow the economy, and save American lives.

Experienced and talented scientists at NOAA and the National Science Foundation are being demeaned and threatened with termination. Communications have been disrupted and critical research has been stalled. This is not just an attack on these individuals; it is an attack on the very foundation of our Nation's scientific enterprise. It is also affecting higher education. There is a lot of research being done in higher education with NSF grants.

□ 1830

It is not efficiency. It is not reform. It is sabotage. For what? Is it to silence the truth about the fact that climate change is real and poses a serious threat? Is it to give billionaires more control over public institutions? Is it to gut the research that drives American innovation at a time when China and the EU and the rest of the world are making moves to surge ahead?

My home State of Oregon received more than \$370 million in Federal research grants last year. That funding supported groundbreaking research into cleaner, cheaper energy, earthquake and tsunami warning systems, and wildfire prevention. That funding is now in jeopardy because Donald Trump has unlawfully and unconstitutionally halted Federal research dollars.

That means stalled renewable energy innovation. It means fewer tools to combat wildfires. It means fewer jobs in the growing industries that help our State and country thrive.

I want to follow up on the remarks that Mr. BEYER made recently and all the words that are going to trigger this review. "Women" but not "men"? "Disability," "advocacy," "institutional," "barrier"? What if someone is doing research on the Great Barrier Reef? Are they going to be denied their funding?

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing woke, DEI, or radical about predicting the next devastating earthquake or tsunami, detecting a wildfire before it spreads, or protecting ocean health to support our coastal and fishing economies.

Demonizing committed scientists is shameful. Impairing decades of life-saving research because it might help communities on the front lines of the climate crisis is derelict. Infiltrating Federal agencies with unelected hackers and rescinding lawfully appropriated funds is illegal.

Is this what happens when we have a lawless, science-denying, vindictive person in the White House? I tell you, we won't stand for it.

Oregon's coastal communities rely on NOAA for fisheries management, ocean health monitoring, and storm forecasting. Without it, livelihoods and lives are at risk.

Let me be crystal clear: Silencing scientists doesn't stop hurricanes. Firing researchers doesn't stop rising sea levels. Blocking climate data doesn't change the fact that last year was the hottest year in recorded history.

The United States has long been the world leader in scientific innovation. We led the space race. We mapped the human genome. We pioneered the technology that powers the global economy. Today, under this administration's reckless interference, we are watching that leadership slip away, our scientific edge erode, and America's future be sold off to the highest bidder.

This is frustrating. I just read that the National Cryptologic Museum just taped sheets of paper over plaques that celebrated women and people of color who served honorably in the National Security Agency. That is absurd and demeaning.

The assault on science demands action. What is happening now is not leadership or patriotism. It is corruption.

I truly hope that my Republican colleagues who for years have recognized the value of Federal science agencies and advocated for their investment will join me in speaking out against this reckless attack on scientists and science. Congress must reassert its constitutional authority to guard the science agencies it authorized and the funds it has appropriated from political corrosion.

Public data, peer review, and a diverse research workforce are the cornerstones of the U.S. science enterprise. Yes, I said "diverse." Politically driven propaganda masquerading as science, like we saw during the first Trump administration—remember Sharpigate—erodes public trust and damages scientific credibility.

Mr. Speaker, we must protect the integrity of our Federal science agencies. The world is watching. We must restore funding to the research that drives our economy. It is a lot of the basic research that then goes into advanced research in the private sector. We must hold those who undermine scientific integrity accountable, no matter how powerful they think they are.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative BONAMICI for joining us this evening but, more importantly, for her work on science, tech, and space as a committee member and for her leadership in fighting for scientific integrity.

Earlier, Mr. Speaker, I made mention of ongoing censorship at the Centers for Disease Control. We are seeing climate-related information targeted in other agencies, too. It is not just targeting CDC. We are seeing climate-related information disappearing from government sites, from NASA to the Department of Agriculture.

This isn't just about tweaking websites. It is a deliberate effort to erase essential data that researchers, farmers, businesses, and communities across the country rely on. We have seen this playbook before. The Trump administration is once again using the same tactics from its first term, removing climate language, pausing programs, and undermining science.

Take the USDA's Partnership for Climate-Smart Commodities, for example.

It is a program designed to help advance sustainable practices. It has funded critical work with food companies, nonprofits, and universities to help farmers shrink their carbon footprint, develop more resilient crops, and restore land. By halting programs like this, the administration is stripping our agricultural sector of the very tools it needs to withstand worsening floods, droughts, and wildfires.

We cannot afford to turn back. We cannot allow climate denial to override science. The cost of inaction is already upon us.

In just the last few years, extreme weather has wiped out entire peach crops in Georgia, flooded farms in North Carolina, and worsened citrus greening disease in the Florida oranges crop. Wildfires in the West have devastated vineyards, while droughts have forced ranchers to shrink their herds.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues and this administration to reject this dangerous retreat from science. We must defend the data, research, and progress for which we have fought because, in the case of a worsening climate crisis, denial is just not irresponsible, but it, indeed, is deadly.

Scientists knew that change was coming under the Trump administration, but few were prepared for the chaos and fear caused by a flurry of executive orders and policy shifts that have destabilized the American engine for innovation and discovery. Overnight, researchers were left questioning whether their work, funding, or even careers could survive a political assault on science itself.

This is not an abstract concern. It is an existential threat to our Nation's scientific enterprise.

Scientists should be focused on their next breakthrough, not their next paycheck. They should be in the lab, not fighting for the right to pursue knowledge free from political interference.

Instead, we see confusion, delays, and outright fear gripping our research institutions. Postdoctoral fellows are scrambling to pay their bills because their stipends have been frozen.

Research projects essential to public health, economic prosperity, and national security are being reviewed not for their scientific merit but for whether they contain words like "diversity," "women," or "underrepresented."

Our United States has long been a beacon of research excellence because we uphold principles that transcend politics. We have built a system that rewards rigorous peer-reviewed research, fosters a diverse and dynamic workforce, and keeps American innovation at the forefront globally.

Those principles are now under attack. We cannot allow political ideology to dictate which discoveries are pursued and which are silenced. We cannot allow critical research—whether on climate change, public health, or emerging technologies—to be derailed by shortsighted political mandates. We certainly cannot allow the United

States to cede its leadership in science and technology to competitors that are eager to capitalize on our self-inflicted wounds.

The CHIPS and Science Act, which I was proud to support, underscores our commitment to a broad, inclusive, and merit-based research enterprise. It recognizes that diversity is not a threat to science; it is a strength. The next great discovery, the next cure, the next technological revolution could come from any lab, any researcher, any corner of this country. I truly believe the pioneer spirit is really in our DNA as a nation, but only if we let science be science.

I stand with the scientific community in calling for the protection of scientific integrity and the rejection of any effort that seeks to muzzle, manipulate, or politicize research.

We must ensure that American scientists can continue to push the boundaries of human knowledge, free from fear and with full confidence that their government stands behind them.

I ask again, Mr. Speaker, that people join us in this effort for the Scientific Integrity Act to be passed in this House, moved to the Senate, and signed into law. It is about the strength of our Nation, the future of discovery, and, again, honoring the pioneer spirit of America.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCHMIDT). Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

ADVANCEMENTS IN AI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. KILEY) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KILEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to say a few words this evening about the rapid advancements that we are witnessing when it comes to the capability of artificial intelligence models.

I don't refer just to some of the narrow applications that folks are familiar with, that they might take advantage of in their work, that they might fear eventually replacing them in work. These are sort of the narrow conceptions that exist in public discourse.

The broader situation here involves the explicit goal of the leading labs to create what is known as artificial general intelligence, which is incredibly capable models that exceed human capability across essentially any domain.

I actually find it stunning that some of the advancements that we have seen lately have gone essentially unnoticed, unreported on by the media. What we have seen just in the last few weeks, I think on several occasions, there should have been front-page stories about the dramatic advances that have been made, given the capacity these advances hold for transforming our lives, economy, society, and much else.

What I wanted to do today is present just a few basic thoughts and pieces of information on the development and innovation that has been taking place. I am someone who has no technical expertise in this area at all. I just try to follow it closely because I believe the changes that will be upon us soon are so profound.

To give you just kind of a flavor for the scale of change that I am talking about, here are a few quotes from leaders in the field:

Sundar Pichai, the CEO of Google, said: "AI is probably the most important thing humanity has ever worked on. I think of it as something more profound than electricity or fire."

Demis Hassabis, the founder of DeepMind, echoed these sentiments. He said that AI should not be thought of as just another technology. He said that it is more epoch-defining than even the internet or mobile, more like electricity or fire.

Sam Altman, who, of course, is the head of OpenAI, said: "With these new abilities, we can have shared prosperity to a degree that seems unimaginable today. In the future, everyone's lives can be better than anyone's life is now. . . . Eventually, we can each have a personal AI team full of virtual experts in different areas working together to create almost anything we can imagine."

Along those lines, Elon Musk, who, in addition to his other ventures, is the founder of xAI, said: "AI will ultimately render money meaningless." Why is that? He believes the capabilities will essentially allow any person access to basically any good that they desire.

Dario Amodei, who is the CEO at another lab, Anthropic, says that it is his guess that powerful AI could accelerate the rate of scientific discoveries by a factor of 10, giving us the next 50 to 100 years of biological progress in just the next 5 to 10 years.

We are already seeing incredible applications such as AlphaFold from DeepMind, which Demis Hassabis recently won the Nobel Prize for, which has predicted the 3D structures of over 200 million proteins, essentially solving the protein folding problem.

At the recent unveiling of the Stargate initiative, Mr. Altman was joined by Larry Ellison, who also spoke about the potential to cure cancer and essentially any other disease.

This might all sound pretty vague and certainly very optimistic. Maybe it sounds like hype, so I want to present a couple of charts that really clearly make this point, not only about the ultimate potential of AI models but about the rapid acceleration that we are right now currently in the midst of.

□ 1845

This chart is one metric of basically how smart a model is. It is called the GPQA diamond. If you look at the chart here, this axis is how well it does on the test, the model.