

veterans as threats without proper evidence or evaluation.

By passing the Veterans 2nd Amendment Protection Act, we send a clear message that our nation values the rights and well-being of our veterans. It is essential that we provide them with the protection they deserve, especially when it comes to their civil liberties without eliminating the protection of veterans and the community.

Thank you for considering my views on this important matter. I urge all members to support the Veterans 2nd Amendment Protection Act to ensure fairness for all veterans in our country.

Sincerely,

JACK MCMANUS,
National President.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION,
NATIONAL POLITICAL ADVOCACY
DEPARTMENT,
Washington, DC, May 20, 2026.

VOTE YES FOR THE VETERANS 2ND AMENDMENT
PROTECTION ACT (H.R. 1041)

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the American Civil Liberties Union, we urge you to vote in favor of H.R. 1041, the Veterans 2nd Amendment Protection Act, as amended, when it comes to the House floor for a vote. We support this legislation because it ends a government practice that discriminates against, stigmatizes, and harms veterans with mental disabilities. For this reason, we will score this vote.

The Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) assigns a fiduciary to veterans who are unable to manage their VA benefits. The VA does so upon a showing of clear and convincing medical evidence that the veteran, because of injury or disease, lacks the mental capacity to contract or to manage his or her own affairs. It was, until recently, the Department's practice to report all veterans who have been determined to be "mentally incompetent," pursuant to this process, to the National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS). This referral makes it unlawful for the veteran to possess a firearm. While the VA has paused this process of referrals voluntarily, it retains authority to resume referrals at any time.

The Veterans Second Amendment Protection Act would prohibit the automatic referral of veterans with fiduciaries unless there has been a separate judicial finding or order that the veteran is "a danger to themselves or others." It would also require the Attorney General to remove the veterans currently on the NICS who were placed there by the VA solely because they were assigned a fiduciary.

We urge Members to vote for this legislation because it combats the false and misguided, but unfortunately pervasive, belief that people with mental disabilities, a vast and diverse group of citizens, are violent and therefore should not own a firearm. There is simply no data to support a connection between a propensity towards gun violence and needing help to manage one's VA benefits because of disability. Opponents of the bill report that the most common disabilities among veterans assigned a fiduciary are post-traumatic stress disorder, traumatic brain injury, schizophrenia, bipolar disorder, and dementia. But these conditions are not evidence of dangerousness to self or others, and they should not be used as the sole basis for denying veterans a constitutional right.

The few research studies cited to support the placement of veterans with fiduciaries on NICS are too speculative to support widespread curtailment of rights. Indeed, one study acknowledges that previous studies on this issue did not examine veterans with fiduciaries and did not directly assess the

issue in question: the risk that a veteran with a fiduciary would misuse a firearm.

Instead of acknowledging this lack of evidence, some have concluded that the fiduciary process serves as an adequate proxy for a determination of dangerousness. We strongly disagree and urge you to reject this assertion. It is discriminatory to assume that veterans with mental illness or other disabilities who need help managing their benefits are a danger to themselves and others. Every veteran has the right to be judged on her individual capabilities, not the characteristics and capabilities that are sometimes attributed (often mistakenly) to any group or class to which they belong. A disability must not constitute grounds for the automatic per se denial of any right or privilege, including gun ownership.

Additionally, relying on assumptions rooted in harmful stereotypes does not advance the safety goals—for veterans themselves, their loved ones, and the general public—we all share. Indeed, it is possible that a substantial number of veterans who were not assigned a fiduciary are a danger to themselves or others and those who do have a fiduciary are, in fact, not a danger to themselves or others.

We recognize the grave concerns members of Congress, and many others, have expressed about both the impact of gun violence in our communities and the imperative to reduce access to some firearms. But the policy at issue here is the wrong approach. It scapegoats and stereotypes veterans with disabilities who need help with their VA benefits without evidence that they are a danger to themselves or others. Gun violence prevention should not be advanced by perpetuating discrimination against people with disabilities.

There are few, if any, issues with more universal support than providing our veterans with the tools and resources they need to minimize the risk of self-harm and prevent suicide. Their courage and sacrifice deserve nothing less. Congress should continue its attention to that urgent task, but with tailored solutions that directly address the problem rather than discriminatory proxies.

We urge Members to vote for this legislation.

Sincerely,

MIKE ZAMORE,
National Director of
Policy & Govern-
ment Affairs.

VANIA LEVIELLE,
Senior Legislative
Counsel.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, my message to all Members is really clear: Support this bill. Support the constitutional rights of those people who fought for those constitutional rights for you.

As I said, this has gone on long enough. I think that a person who knows and understands this issue will stand up for their veterans and support this bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARIDOPOLOS). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1300, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Morrison of Minnesota moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1041 to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

The material previously referred to by Ms. MORRISON is as follows:

Ms. Morrison moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1041 to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Add at the end (before the long title amendment) the following:

SEC. 5. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Section 5501B of title 38, United States Code, as added by section 2, section 5501C of such title, as added by section 3, and section 5501D of such title, as added by section 4, shall take effect on the date on which the Secretary of Veterans Affairs submits to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives certification in writing that the implementation of such sections will not lead an increase in the rate of death by suicide using a firearm among beneficiaries for whom the Secretary pays benefits to a fiduciary for the use and benefit of the beneficiary under section 5502 of title 38, United States Code.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

**SMITHSONIAN AMERICAN
WOMEN'S HISTORY MUSEUM ACT**

Mr. STEIL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1300, I call up the bill (H.R. 1329) to permit the Smithsonian American Women's History Museum to be located within the Reserve of the National Mall, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1300, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on House Administration, printed in this bill, modified by the amendment printed in part B of House Report 119-653, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 1329

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Smithsonian American Women's History Museum Act".

SEC. 2. SITE OF SMITHSONIAN AMERICAN WOMEN'S HISTORY MUSEUM.

(a) **AUTHORIZING SITE WITHIN RESERVE OF NATIONAL MALL.**—Section 107(d) of division T of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021 (20 U.S.C. 80t-5(d)) is amended by striking “, except that” and all that follows and inserting a period.

(b) **SITE DESIGNATION.**—Section 107(a) of division T of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021 (20 U.S.C. 80t-5(a)) is amended to read as follows:

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The site for the Museum is hereby designated as the South Monument site, located on the National Mall, bordered by 14th Street Southwest, Jefferson Drive Southwest, Raoul Wallenberg Place Southwest, and Independence Avenue Southwest, except that the President may designate an alternative site for the Museum within 180 days of the date of the enactment of this subsection.”.

(c) **USE OF SITE.**—

(1) **TRANSFER.**—Section 107(b) of division T of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021 (20 U.S.C. 80t-5(b)) is amended to read as follows:

“(b) **TRANSFER OF SITE.**—As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the head of the Federal agency or entity shall transfer to the Smithsonian Institution its administrative jurisdiction over the land described in subsection (a).”.

(2) **BUILDING REQUIREMENTS.**—Section 107(c) of division T of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021 (20 U.S.C. 80t-5(c)) is amended to read as follows:

(c) **BUILDING.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Board of Regents, in consultation with the head of the Federal agency or entity and the council established under section 104 and with the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts, National Capital Planning Commission, the National Capital Memorial Advisory Commission, and the head of the Federal agency or entity, may plan, design, and construct a building for the Museum, which shall be located at the site described in subsection (a).

“(2) **CRITERIA.**—In considering site and design proposals, the Commission of Fine Arts, the National Capital Planning Commission, the National Capital Memorial Advisory Commission, and the head of the Federal agency or entity shall be guided by, but not limited to the following criteria:

“(A) The Museum shall be located so that to the maximum extent practicable, it protects the open space, existing public use, and cultural and natural resources.

“(B) The Museum shall be constructed of durable material suitable to the outdoor environment.

“(C) Landscape features of the Museum shall be compatible with the climate.

“(D) The National Capital Planning Commission and the Commission of Fine Arts may develop such criteria or guidelines specific to each site that are mutually agreed upon to ensure that the design of the Museum carries out the purposes of this section.”.

(3) **EXPENSES.**—Section 107 of division T of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021 (20 U.S.C. 80t-5) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) **EXPENSES.**—The Smithsonian Institution shall reimburse within 60 days any and all costs incurred by the head of the Federal agency or entity for implementation of any recommendations resulting from the approval process described in subsection (c).”.

(d) **MUSEUM PURPOSE.**—Section 103 of division T of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021 (20 U.S.C. 80t-1) is amended by adding at the end the following:

(c) **SCOPE OF MISSION.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Museum shall be dedicated to preserving, researching, and presenting the history, achievements, and lived experiences of biological women in the United States.

“(2) **PROHIBITION.**—The Museum may not identify, present, describe, or otherwise depict any biological male as a female.”.

(e) **ENSURING A RANGE OF POLITICAL VIEWPOINTS AND AUTHENTIC EXPERIENCES.**—Section 104(b)(4) of division T of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021 (20 U.S.C. 80t-2(b)(4)) is amended to read as follows:

“(4) **ENSURING A RANGE OF POLITICAL VIEWPOINTS AND AUTHENTIC EXPERIENCES.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Council shall ensure that the exhibits and programs of the Museum reflect, to the extent practicable, an equal representation of a range of the political viewpoints and authentic experiences held by women in the United States, accurately and comprehensively representing the varied cultures, histories, events, and values held by such women.

“(B) **SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS.**—In carrying out its duties, the Council shall ensure that it seeks and utilizes to its maximum ability guidance from a broad array of knowledgeable and respected sources reflecting a range of the political viewpoints and authentic experiences held by women in the United States, and shall seek such guidance for both the creation and substantial revision of exhibits and programs.

“(C) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this paragraph—

“(i) the term ‘broad array’ means a range of experts and publications that represent the broad spectrum of communities of women, to include varied viewpoints, political ideologies, cultures, and lived experiences in the United States; and

“(ii) the term ‘knowledgeable and respected source’ means an individual who has gained through education, publication, or witnessing an important or historical event, the ability to advise on at least one unique viewpoint or experience of a particular community of women in the United States, and whose knowledge has been relied upon by a notable segment of that community for education, heritage preservation, or historical purposes, and includes the work of such an individual which reflects such ability and knowledge.”.

(f) **REPORTS TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and every 2 years thereafter, the Secretary of the Smithsonian shall submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate, the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate a report on actions taken by the Director of the Smithsonian American Women's History Museum and the Council of the Museum to comply with the requirements of the amendments made by subsection (f), including a description of actions taken with respect to substantial revisions of current exhibits and programs as well the planning of future exhibits and programs.

(g) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—This section and the amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the enactment of title I of division T of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021 (20 U.S.C. 80t et seq.).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debated for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration, or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIL) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. MORELLE) will each control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIL).

□ 1320

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STEIL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may

have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEIL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1329, the Smithsonian American Women's History Museum Act, introduced by my colleague, Representative MALLIOTAKIS, from New York.

This year, our Nation marks its 250th birthday. It has been 250 years since we declared independence. As we celebrate this milestone, I think it is all the more worthy that we pass this bill and begin construction of the museum dedicated to the history of American women.

Throughout our history, women have played a pivotal role in so many of our Nation's most celebrated achievements and innovations. In my home State of Wisconsin, three women participated in the famous 1854 meeting at the Ripon schoolhouse, where the Republican Party was born.

Mr. Speaker, I was proud to support previous legislation authorizing the creation of this museum. Today's bill takes the important next step by designating an exact location on The National Mall. Additionally, it creates guardrails to ensure this museum does not represent history in a partisan way.

I thank Representative MALLIOTAKIS for her work on this bill and her continued support to get this to the floor. She has been tenacious in a great way to get us to this spot. I thank her for her hard work.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I have said it before, and I will say it again: The Smithsonian American Women's History Museum is long overdue, and it deserves a place on The National Mall, period, end of sentence.

The National Mall is America's front yard. It is the place we welcome visitors from all over the world. The Smithsonian is where we gather the stories, ideas, inventions, and memories that make us who we are. It is where we keep what matters to our large and, yes, very diverse American family. It is where our Nation tells its story, and American women have shaped every chapter of that story.

This is why I enthusiastically supported the bipartisan version of H.R. 1329, produced by my Republican colleague and friend from New York, Representative NICOLE MALLIOTAKIS, along with her companion bill, H.R. 1330, related to the National Museum of the American Latino.

Together, those bills would resolve a statutory anomaly that has stalled both museums and allow them to move

forward on The Mall as Congress intended.

The bipartisan legislation is a simple, straightforward fix with 231 cosponsors in this House, including over 100 Members from each side of the aisle.

For some reason, that is not the bill we are debating. I am saddened and disappointed that the Republican majority has needlessly politicized what has for years been a bipartisan priority.

The hyperpartisan museum bill we are debating right now differs from the original legislation in four primary and important ways.

First, it omits the National Museum of the American Latino, which has been paired with the women's history museum since they were both authorized together in 2020.

Second, for reasons that pass all understanding, it grants the President of the United States unprecedented, unilateral, and unchecked authority to disregard the Smithsonian's recommended site and the Congress' recommended site for any reason, or for no reason at all, and pick his own.

Third, it hands control over design and construction to boards stacked with political loyalists who have already shown they will rubberstamp whatever the President wants. To see evidence of that, look no further than the pile of rubble that used to be the White House East Wing.

Fourth, it inserts an ideological poison pill intended to dictate what the museum can and cannot say about women's history.

Mr. Speaker, we deal with a lot of complicated issues around here that require complex solutions. This is not one of them. There is a Republican-led bipartisan bill just sitting here with 231 cosponsors, including 104 Republican Members. We could pass that bill on suspension right now.

The American people will be baffled, as I am, that my Republican colleagues have chosen this route instead, especially since, in 2019, Democrats accepted a Republican amendment requiring the museum to reflect "the diversity of the political viewpoints held by women of the United States."

Virtually identical language appears in this bill—ironically, right next to the provision that explicitly excludes political viewpoints held by women of the United States. I guess it should have explicitly read: the diversity of political viewpoints held by Republicans alone.

If the goal were actually to move this museum forward, we would not be abandoning the yearslong bipartisan process that has brought us to the brink of construction. We would not be considering a bill with a cynical, ideological poison pill. We would not exclude the Latino museum. We would not allow boards filled with Trump loyalists to have final say on the museum's design and construction. We would certainly not be giving President Donald Trump, of all people, un-

checked authority to pick a location for the women's history museum. We would not be spending time debating a bill destined to fail.

Ask yourselves: Who should decide what appears in a Smithsonian museum, where it goes, and what it looks like? Should it be historians, scholars, and curators who, for 180 years, have made the Smithsonian the premier museum complex in the world, hosting 15 million visitors per year? Is that who it should be? Or a politician who complains publicly that the Smithsonian focuses too much on "how bad slavery was" and who has taken a literal wrecking ball to some of our most dignified and important landmarks in this country, a politician who uses our cultural institutions to rewrite history and hand out no-bid government contracts to his friends? That is the question before us.

If House Republicans want the museum to succeed, the path ahead is straightforward and easy. Bring the clean bipartisan fix with its 231 cosponsors to the floor, pair it with the Latino museum as we have done for years, and let the historians and experts do the work of telling the full and complex story of American women.

This legislation does the exact opposite. It takes a bill, the narrow purpose of which is to specify a museum location, and throws even more uncertainty into that very question. It makes literally no sense.

Mr. Speaker, I will conclude where I began: The National Mall is where we welcome visitors from around the world, of all types. Everyone comes here. The Smithsonian is where we mark what makes us who we are. They belong to the American people, and the American people deserve both the women's history museum and the National Museum of the American Latino on The National Mall that tells their stories without political interference.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill, and I urge the majority to bring the bipartisan bill that 104 Members of their Conference have cosponsored to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STEIL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I remind my colleague that Democratic leadership had the full opportunity in the 117th Congress to bring forward this legislation. They chose not to. They used their time to do things like rename the Cannon Caucus Room after the current Speaker in the 117th Congress. That is just a reminder of the importance that this bill has on our side.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MALLIOTAKIS) to speak on the bill.

Ms. MALLIOTAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman STEIL for helping us advance this bill to the floor. He knows very well the role that his State of Wisconsin played in being the first to ratify the 19th Amendment.

We are here today because we are voting on a very simple bill. It is a bill to transfer land on The National Mall for the Smithsonian American Women's History Museum, which was already authorized by Congress, overwhelmingly bipartisan, in 2020, and signed by President Donald J. Trump.

□ 1330

Mr. Speaker, this bill, as my colleague has mentioned, had over 230 sponsors. It is very bipartisan, and I think we all agree that it is long past time that the women of this country, who make up more than half of the population, deserve to have a museum that tells their stories and shares their contributions to our great country.

Women like Rosie the Riveter and the millions of women who stepped onto our factory floors during World War II; the more than 10,000 code girls of Arlington Hall, who were secretly recruited by the U.S. Army and Navy during World War II to serve as code breakers; the 855 women of the Six Triple Eight, the only all-Black, all-female battalion deployed overseas during World War II; the Black Angels of my district, who were courageous nurses who, at the height of segregation, worked toward and did find the cure for tuberculosis; the first female Member of Congress, Jeannette Rankin; Susan B. Anthony and the suffragists, the great role that they played in our Nation's history, they are who we are here to honor today.

Yes, we have more than enough women to display in this museum that we shouldn't be fighting over the need to have nonbiological individuals in there.

I don't understand why we are pulling bipartisan support from legislation to establish this museum. As a matter of fact, let me read it so that everybody at home knows exactly what this debate is over. It is over one sentence: "The Museum shall be dedicated to preserving, researching, and presenting the history, achievements, and lived experiences of biological women in the United States."

That is what the disagreement is about. That is what the big controversy is about.

I hate to alert my friends on the other side of the aisle, but a museum dedicated to women's history should have women in it. That is it. That is simple. That was just something that, through this process, regular order, going through the committee process, a Member put forward an amendment. It was adopted by the majority of the members on the committee, and it added that simple provision.

The idea that President Trump—by the way because Democrats are saying that the National Planning Commission is now a Trump commission. This is a commission that was established by Congress over 100 years ago. It is not a new commission. In fact, the President only has three appointees to that 12-person commission. To say that

he has complete control is just simply not true.

I really hope that some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will join us on this because it would be sad to see that all of the Democrats would vote down this important bill.

Yet, I will say that it was a Republican Senator who introduced the 19th Amendment, which gave women the right to vote.

It was a Republican Congress that passed the 19th Amendment to give women the right to vote.

It was a majority of GOP States that gave women the right to vote when they ratified that amendment.

It was a GOP President who gave us Title IX, which prohibited sex-based discrimination in the educational programs.

And, yes, it was President Donald Trump, a Republican, who authorized this museum in 2020.

If Republicans have to carry the water again to deliver for the women of America, we will do so, but I really hope that this can remain a bipartisan measure.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate my colleague and friend, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, and her comments.

But the truth is, I don't, first of all, think anyone who lives in Rochester, New York, the home of Susan B. Anthony, just to the west of Seneca Falls, needs to be told about the history of the women's suffrage movement in the United States or the fact that Susan B. Anthony was arrested in 1872 for voting in a Presidential election.

We are well-steeped in it, and we think this ought to be a museum that is curated by scholars and by women and those groups.

The location of this, which was identified in a bipartisan bill—and the suggestion that somehow we now are not supporting or withholding our support for a bipartisan bill is simply wrong.

Actually, that would be the simple thing to do, to put the bipartisan bill on the floor. I don't know what the objection to it is, except that it doesn't have the following language, and this is really what it is all about, and I will read from the bill:

"The site for the Museum is hereby designated as the South Monument site, located on The National Mall, bordered by 14th Street Southwest, Jefferson Drive, Southwest, Raoul Wallenberg Place Southwest, and Independence Avenue Southwest, except that the President may designate an alternative site for the Museum within 180 days of the date of the enactment of this subsection."

The extraneous portion that was added basically takes away everything the previous sentence said. Everything the bipartisan bill was intended to do is identifying this location. But for reasons, as I said earlier, that surpass all understanding, we are now going to give the President of the United States

complete, unilateral, unchecked power to make this decision.

It makes no sense. It is not a bipartisan bill. In fact, if you want to have this resolved, you could eliminate that portion of the bill, and we could just do the simple sentence under the bipartisan bill, which has 104 Republican sponsors of it. We could do that. We could do that right now.

That bill is already in print. Ms. MALLIOTAKIS is actually the sponsor of that bill, so I would be happy to support that bill of hers. But don't suggest for a minute that this is a bipartisan bill because it is not. It is actually the most hyperpartisan of bills, all intended to make sure that the President is happy with the location of the museum and give him the complete power over Congress to make that decision.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO), my dear friend.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this amended bill. I was a proud cosponsor of the bill, as introduced. Yet, instead of moving the bipartisan text, Republicans have hijacked this bill to give President Trump complete and total authority over the Smithsonian American Women's History Museum's location. Contrary to what Congresswoman MALLIOTAKIS has asserted, he does have loyalists who have power over the museum's design. He does have loyalists on the commission, which will determine the museum's design.

The museum was supposed to be a celebration of every American woman's contribution, but, of course, Republicans couldn't help themselves from adding text that would prohibit trans women from being included in the museum. This is really a harmful provision that will undoubtedly lead many conservatives to challenge the inclusion of any woman they deem not feminine enough.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this bill and pass the original bipartisan bill with the National Museum of the American Latino.

Mr. STEIL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. LEE), also a member of the House Administration Committee, to speak on this bill.

Ms. LEE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the creation of a Smithsonian museum dedicated to the history of American women. I thank Chairman STEIL and Representative MALLIOTAKIS for their leadership in this important effort.

Before coming to Congress, I had the privilege of serving as Florida's Secretary of State. In that role, I oversaw our State's museums, archives, and historical resources, and I gained a deep appreciation for the importance of preserving our history carefully and telling it well.

Museums are not simply collections of artifacts. They are places where we remember who we are, where we came from, and the values that shaped this

Nation. The story of America cannot be fully told without the story of American women.

From the earliest days of our country, women have helped to build families, communities, and institutions. They served in times of war, advanced science and medicine, strengthened our economy, and helped expand the promise of liberty for future generations.

Today, women serve in leadership roles across every aspect of American life, but much of that progress in America is relatively recent. As someone who has spent much of my career in fields historically dominated by men, I know personally how meaningful it is when young women can see the stories of those who came before them.

As an example, since the founding of our Nation, roughly 12,000 Americans have served in the United States Congress. Yet, only about 450 of them have been women. Hearing and sharing the stories of those women will no doubt pave the path for the talented generation to come of women leaders in America.

□ 1340

Representation matters, and so does remembrance. The stories we preserve shape what the next generation believes is possible. This museum will tell the story of countless women, teachers, entrepreneurs, scientists, soldiers, mothers, and public servants whose perseverance and courage helped shape this Nation.

It is disappointing that some Democrats are opposing this museum because it is dedicated to the history and achievements of biological women when we should be coming together to honor the women who helped shape this Nation.

As the mother of a daughter, I think often about the examples that she sees and the stories that she learns about the women who helped shape this country. May she know us, may she and all of the other young women like her see what is possible, and may they go further than we ever dreamed.

When young girls walk through the Smithsonian and see the contributions of women woven into the fabric of our national history, they will understand something important: that they, too, are foundational to the American story.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. STEIL. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. LEE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the day when all Americans can visit a museum that honors the remarkable legacy of women in the United States. For these reasons, I support this effort, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I will say I find it rather astonishing that we feel the need here to give a lot of advice and counsel

to the Smithsonian Institution about how to appropriately build and operate a museum, to curate a museum—I don't know if anybody has been—and, by the way, they do museums really well. We are supposed to pass legislation, which we don't even do that well, and now we are going to tell them how to run museums.

I would just encourage my friends, if you haven't, the Smithsonian runs a number of museums in town—one on American history, one on African Americans, one on American Indians, one on natural history, one on air and space. Fifteen million people come to them.

In the 8 years I have been privileged to be a Member of Congress, I have never once had a constituent or anybody else stop me and say, you know, I really have some advice to give to the Smithsonian Institution about how to run museums. I think they do it exceptionally well.

In fact, I would argue that the Smithsonian Institution is the greatest museum complex anywhere in the world. It is an extraordinary place, free to Americans and others who come from other places to see the American experience. I don't think they need, really, a whole lot of help from Members of the United States House of Representatives on how to run museums. Let's let them do that. Let's let academicians, scholars, historians, and museum curators do that.

All we are supposed to do here is say where the location of the museum is to be located. That is the one issue in front of us. Talk about making complex a simple issue. People will be baffled and scratching their heads to watch this debate should they ever watch this debate because this is a simple, simple matter, and we should not complicate this. Let's identify the location, and let's let the Smithsonian Institution do what they do better than any other organization in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. RANDALL), my dear friend and colleague.

Ms. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Smithsonian American Women's History Museum Act, as amended. Frankly, that is disappointing because this bill used to be a bipartisan success story.

Democrats and Republicans came together to support creating both the American Women's History Museum and the National Museum of the American Latino on The National Mall, but instead of building on that bipartisan agreement, this bill was turned into another political power grab with a last-minute partisan amendment in committee.

Republicans inserted culture war language limiting the museum to biological women. That language was not added to improve the museum. It was added to erase trans women from American history.

Whether my Republican colleagues want to acknowledge it or not, trans

women are just as much a part of this country's history as anyone else. Museums are supposed to expand our understanding, preserve truth, and reflect the full complexity of this country.

They went even a step further to corrupt this bill, handing President Trump extraordinary control over museum design and planning. Congress should not hand any President unilateral power over how American history is told, especially after we have seen this administration pressure institutions and whitewash history.

This legislation also leaves behind the National Museum of the American Latino, even though Congress established both museums together under the same law. Let's be honest about why. We are watching a systematic effort by Republicans and this administration to strip out uncomfortable truths and erase marginalized communities.

"But Latino history is American history"; "Pero la historia de los Latinos es la historia americana."

It is not secondary. It is not optional.

For all these reasons, at the appropriate time, I will offer a motion to recommit this bill back to committee.

If the House rules permitted, I would have offered the motion with an important amendment to this bill.

My amendment would have stripped out the exclusionary language targeting trans women, moved the Women's History Museum and the National Museum of the American Latino forward together, as Congress originally intended, and block this dangerous power grab that hands President Trump unilateral control.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of this amendment into the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Ms. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in voting for the motion to recommit.

Mr. STEIL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. CAMMACK), the mother of Augusta, to speak on the bill.

Mrs. CAMMACK. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague from the great State of Wisconsin for his leadership on this issue.

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1329, the Smithsonian American Women's History Museum Act, and I want to start by recognizing my colleague NICOLE MALLIOTAKIS for her tenacity and her leadership in bringing this legislation to the floor. I thank Nicole for never backing down or giving up.

As you can see, I have my daughter, Augusta Dair, here with me today because I wanted her to be a witness to this incredible moment in our Nation's history where we stood up for all of the women who have helped build this country and told their stories.

That is what this museum is. It is not a political statement. It is a promise, a promise that the women who came before us will not be erased, will not be minimized, and will not be forgotten.

We all know—or at least I thought we knew—that women's history is not a partisan issue. It is American history, full stop. Now, the women whose stories will be told in this museum, I want you to think about what they went through. It wasn't that long ago—1974—that a woman couldn't open a credit card in her own name without her husband's signature. Before that, she couldn't serve on a jury, and before that, she couldn't vote.

Yet, these women, extraordinary, stubborn, gritty, American women, they didn't quit. They persevered. They built something anyway. Now, if that is not an American story, I don't know what is. Quite frankly, it is that story that deserves to be told and have a place on our National Mall.

As Chairwoman of the Republican Women's Caucus, I have had the honor of standing alongside some of the most incredible women who fight every single day not for headlines but for the next generation of girls who need them to know that hard work, courage, and grit will take them further than anyone can ever tell them they couldn't go before.

We believe that these women deserve to be honored, proudly, without political manipulation, which is why I am genuinely baffled that the Democratic Women's Caucus has chosen to oppose this bill. Their reasoning for opposing the bill is because we want biological women's stories to be told—that we want a museum to be dedicated to women, to celebrate women? That is the controversy, Mr. Speaker?

Forgive me, but this issue should never have become partisan. It is common sense. Biological women deserve to have their stories told.

For those who say that this gives the President too much say about what is happening with this museum, that is just nonsense. Representative MALLIOTAKIS has already refuted the claim that the President will have that type of power. He cannot.

What this bill does is ensure accountability over a federally funded institution that will represent American history for generations. The Smithsonian belongs to the American people, not to political activists, not to ideological agendas.

I know that millions of women around the country right now are standing with us, and they will not apologize for standing up for women; not today and not ever.

□ 1350

I am here right now on the House floor with my daughter, Augusta Dair, and I can only do this because of the women who came before me. It is those women we strive to honor: the pioneers, the mothers, the scientists, the

servicemembers, the entrepreneurs, the educators, the ones who broke barriers before it was fashionable, and the ones who never got a thank-you. They deserve this. Every little girl in America deserves this.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject the political noise around this bill, pass this legislation, and ensure that future generations like little Augusta's can walk through these Halls, if she chooses to, and know without question what American women are made of.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

To quote Mrs. CAMMACK, whom I have great respect for, women's history "is American history, full stop." I completely agree, and I am delighted to see her and her daughter in her maiden speech in front of the House talk about the importance of women in American history. I completely agree with that, as well.

What I find perplexing is that the construction of this museum has been held up now for several years since its authorization, because Congress could not reconcile the fact that we hadn't fully identified a location for the museum. That is the only thing that prevents the construction of this museum from moving forward. We have a bipartisan solution to address just that, the exact location of where this museum should be built.

I think the question that needs to be answered in this moment is why we are not doing that bill. It has 231 cosponsors, a majority of this House, and over 100 Members on both sides of the aisle. It is simple and straightforward.

Why aren't we doing that? Why are we here? Why do we have to debate for the balance of an hour a bill that is so simple to pass and has broad support?

It is because this bill was rewritten by the White House. This bill was rewritten so that not a woman but a man, and, frankly, a man with something of a questionable history toward women, would have the final say.

By the way, if he didn't like the location that we have identified in this bill, he has a way to raise his objections called veto the bill. He could veto it if he didn't like the location, and then we would negotiate.

The Article I prerogative of the Congress is to pass laws. That is what we should be doing, but what we have done is, we have managed to twist ourselves into a pretzel just to satisfy the President so that the President can look at the location that Congress by, law would, like to make clear and say: I don't like that after all. Sorry, Congress. Thank you for your input, but go away. I, Donald Trump, will decide unilaterally where the women's history museum will go. Forget about the 435 Members of the House. Forget about the 100 Members of the Senate. We appreciate your input, like little children. Now, go away. I will make the decision.

That is what is going to happen. That is what this bill is. If that is not the

case, I would love to hear a single word of explanation about why we are not doing the bill that has broad bipartisan support that specifically says where this museum will be located on The National Mall, on America's front yard.

Why is that not the case? Why are we here? We can dance around it. We can talk about the contributions of women. Certainly, no one on this side of the aisle would ever, ever spend any time disputing that. We are in complete agreement, which is why we have over 100 sponsors for the bill on our side of the aisle, as well.

The question is, and the question that people watching will want answered, is: Why aren't you doing that bill?

I will be eagerly listening for an explanation as to why the bipartisan bill with 231 cosponsors, which specifically says where this museum should be, the exact location, and why we are not doing that bill.

I will sit quietly and listen. Maybe not so quietly, but I will sit and listen. I am looking for one word of explanation about why that is not the case. Until that time, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STEIL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. DE LA CRUZ) to speak on the bill.

Ms. De La CRUZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding, and I thank Congresswoman NICOLE MALLIOTAKIS for working so hard to get this piece of legislation on the floor today.

I stand proudly to support H.R. 1329, the bipartisan Smithsonian American Women's History Museum Act, as an original cosponsor.

For 30 years, lawmakers on both sides of the aisle have worked together to establish a space that carries on the legacy of the American women who fought tirelessly for our rights. It is absolutely unacceptable that any Member would oppose this bill because they want a biological male, a man, to be honored in the space designed for women, biological women.

Any vote that opposes this legislation undermines every woman who fought for our right to vote, our right to own a home, our right to attend college, and even our right to own our paychecks.

Ultimately, I represent a community that understands the difference between a man and a woman, a community that respects women, a community that will be proud that today and always they can count on me to stand up for biological women and stand up for common sense.

Common sense, let's think about that. Let's think about common sense, which obviously my colleagues on the other side of the aisle do not have and lost along the way.

Today, I will "with pride"; "con orgullo" vote "yes" on this bill. I will vote "yes" on this legislation. I will vote "yes" for my "grandmother";

"abuelita," who is in Heaven smiling down, and "for my mother"; "para mi mama," who is watching right now on C-SPAN "with pride"; "con orgullo," watching her daughter speak on behalf of women here in America, to tell our story, to share our history, women's history.

I will vote "yes" for this legislation. I will vote "yes" for biological women. Today, I will vote "yes" for common sense.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate the gentlewoman's comments. It is interesting she began her comments by citing the bipartisan bill that isn't before the House, the bipartisan bill that I am urging us to pass, the bipartisan bill that has over 100 sponsors on the Republican side of the aisle and over 100 sponsors on the Democratic side of the aisle.

She used that frame even though that is not the bill before the House. Of course, she could not offer an explanation as to why the bill that she cited actually isn't before the House, and instead, we have a hyperpartisan bill that gives Donald Trump unilateral power to decide where this museum is going.

I would also note that among the rights that she talked about for women, the right to vote, et cetera, she didn't mention the right to control their own bodies. You know why? Because we have taken that away from women. This Supreme Court and this President have taken away the right of women so that my grandchildren, my granddaughters, have fewer rights than my mother did, than their grandmother and their great-grandmother had. We didn't talk about that if we are going to talk about the rights of women and how important it is to support women in this country. We didn't talk about why this bill is going to end up with no museum being built because we insist on giving unilateral power to Donald Trump to decide all things that the Congress should be deciding.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU).

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to Republicans' partisan version of my previously bipartisan bill, the Smithsonian American Women's History Museum Act.

Today should have been a celebration of success after years of bipartisan collaboration and good faith negotiations on a bill that I was proud to be a leader on, ensuring that women receive their rightful recognition in our Nation's Capital.

Instead, Republicans threw all of that away by unilaterally making extremist changes to our once bipartisan bill, giving President Trump the power to decide the location, the design, and even the content of this museum.

This completely undermines our bill's original intent. This museum is about honoring the prolific contributions that women have made to this

country. Instead, Republicans have disgraced this process and, embarrassingly, made it entirely about one man, Donald Trump.

Mr. Speaker, women deserve better, and I urge my colleagues to vote “no.”

□ 1400

Mr. STEIL. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUEST). The gentleman from Wisconsin has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. STEIL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MALLIOTAKIS), who is the author of the bill.

Ms. MALLIOTAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to clarify some points and answer some of the questions of my colleague. This is like the good old times in the New York State Assembly. Mr. MORELLE and I had fun debating there, as well.

First of all, let me say that this bill is actually site-specific. It does include the quadrants of the site that was selected by the American Women’s History Museum Advisory Council. The original version, which we have introduced, did not have those specific quadrants. It did not specify a specific site. It just allowed for a future selected site to be transferred.

In that case, there was no clarity on what the site was, so we amended the bill to add the specific quadrants of the south Capitol site on The National Mall so it would be clear that it is the selected site of the museum’s advisory council.

Yes, it does give 180 days for the President, if necessary, to alter. That is because if, for some reason, there is a problem with that site, and it turns out we can’t build on it, if the engineers come back and say that there is a problem, that it can’t be built on, then we don’t want to have to go through this entire process and have to pass another piece of legislation. We would just all work together to select a site that would be suitable.

In terms of specificity, this bill actually gives more clarity on the location than the initial version.

That is the only thing that has changed, that provision, as well as adding the sentence about ensuring that it is biological women. That was amended in the committee process.

As I said, every piece of legislation is introduced here. We garnered 230 cosponsors. It went to the committee. The committee went through regular order. Somebody had an amendment, and the amendment passed. Therefore, it was added. That was added as a result to ensure that there is clarity that only biological women would be represented in a women’s museum.

I also want to address this issue about the National Capital Planning Commission. This is not President Donald Trump’s commission. This was a commission that was established over 100 years ago, in which the President

gets only three appointees. The commission is a 12-member Federal body.

Obviously, anything that is built as a Capital project goes through this commission. It is not as if it is a new commission that was set up by this particular President. Both this commission and the Fine Arts Commission were established well over a century ago, and the 12-member makeup of this is 3 appointees only by the President. That is not a majority. That is not giving the President unanimous control.

The Mayor of Washington, D.C., gets an appointment. The chair of the D.C. Council gets an appointment. The House and Senate committee chairs with the D.C. jurisdiction, their committees get an appointment. The heads of the DOD, Interior, and GSA get an appointment. There are two mayoral appointees. That is the makeup of this.

I know sometimes my colleagues on the other side may have a little difficulty with math. We see that during the budgeting, where they want to spend more than we can afford. Three is not the majority in a commission of 12.

Please stop lying and saying that the commission is being controlled by one particular man. That is simply not the case.

I just wanted to give those clarifying points.

Again, I want to reiterate that I am very proud that it is the Republican Party that is putting forward this legislation. This was authorized, again, by President Trump in 2020. President Joe Biden had 4 years to move this ball forward and to designate the land. He did not do it, so we are here today with the same President who authorized the women’s museum, President Donald J. Trump.

What I will say is that they claim, the other side, to be the party of women, yet it is the Republican Party that introduced the 19th Amendment and that passed the 19th Amendment. It was majority Republican-led States that ratified the 19th Amendment.

Title IX is so important to women in our colleges, female athletes, and all educational programs. That was signed into law by a Republican President.

Yes, it is a Republican President today who has authorized the women’s history museum, and it will be a Republican majority in Congress that gets this done. That is because, for 4 years, the other side, when they had control, failed to do so.

I still hope that this will be a bipartisan vote. It really should be. There is no reason for this not to come out of this House today and to celebrate the women of America.

We can all be proud of women who have contributed from our respective States to the building of this Nation. As my colleague said, there have been so many struggles over the years, whether it be the right to vote or whether it be to apply for a credit card without needing a male cosigner. Women weren’t allowed to be on a jury.

They weren’t allowed to attend a military academy. These are stories that need to be told.

Sadly, the current generation and future generations may take a lot for granted. We don’t know the history of the struggles that women have endured.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we can come out of this today with a bipartisan vote in support. Let’s get this museum done, and let’s do something that we can all be proud of as Americans.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we could do this bill, get this done, and make clear where this museum is supposed to be. All we have to do is pass the bipartisan bill.

If we want to amend it with this exact location, if that is what Ms. MALLIOTAKIS is suggesting, then I am happy to do that, but there are so many things that she said that I have to respond to.

First of all, President Biden couldn’t do this because Congress has created in the authorizing legislation this anomaly, so we need Congress to be able to specify the location, which is the point of the bipartisan bill, which has over 230 sponsors on both sides of the aisle. We could do that. This is simple, but that is not what is here.

By the way, just to remind the gentlewoman in case she is not clear, the chairperson of the NCPC, which has responsibility here, the chair of that is the current White House staff secretary, William Scharf. It is the President’s employee who runs it.

By the way, anyone who believes that the President has much regard for the law or how these things should go should just look at the pile of rubble that is the East Wing of the White House, where the President defied tradition, common sense, and appropriateness and just knocked down one of the most historic sections of the most historic building in the world and is building it without anyone’s contributions, without any appropriate guardrails, and without any appropriate oversight. That is because, let’s face it, that is what this President does.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to go back. I am sorry. I thought I read this into the RECORD, but just to be clear, if people think this is an exact location, then they should read it to the end. After we identify the site, it says: “except that the President may designate an alternative site for the museum within 180 days of the date of the enactment of this subsection.”

That is a little like when I was in high school, saying to my father: Can I stay out late? He would say: Yes, unless I say you can’t. Does that mean I can stay out late? It only means I can stay out late if he gives me permission.

We are going to put it at this site. We have it specifically here. Ms.

MALLIOTAKIS is right. There is an exact location, unless the President says that is not where he wants it.

This is the Congress. Article I—when I first came to Washington, Article I, it must have been said 1,000 times in my first few weeks—Article I prerogatives, the Congress, Article I, the first section of the Constitution, the legislative responsibilities herein lie with the Congress of the United States.

Yet, what are we doing, Mr. Speaker? We are passing legislation, which the President does have the right to sign or veto, in which case, if he vetoes, it comes back here for further action by the Houses. He gets one bite at the apple, but we are not content with that. We have to then give him unilateral power over what we have just passed to do whatever he wants. It is insanity.

There is no explanation for why we are not doing the original bill—None. I am still listening, and I still haven't heard it.

I will continue to listen for the explanation. Perhaps in the close by my colleagues and friends, we will hear why, finally, there is something wrong with passing the original bill.

By the way, this isn't going to clear it up because this bill is not going to become law. I will tell you what, Mr. Speaker, in a new Congress, when there is a new majority, we will put the actual location. We will put it in law. We will send it to the President, and we will see whether or not he insists on not only a bill that has a location, but insists more on the power to unilaterally do whatever he wants.

The only way this majority is willing to do anything in this House seems to be to ultimately give the power, complete power, to the President to do what he chooses to do without our input.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1410

Mr. STEIL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, do you want to know why I think so many Americans have given up on this institution? Think about what we are doing right now. Think about this debate. I hope people see it.

We were handed something extremely rare in this building nowadays, a finished, bipartisan bill sponsored by more than half the Members with over 100 Members on both sides agreeing to it, and we lit it on fire. We have basically thrown it out and put it in a dumpster.

And for what: to stroke the President's ego, to bully a vulnerable group of people who make up less than 1 percent of the population?

The worst part is that we are doing it at a museum that is intended to honor women and the enormous contributions of women to this country who suc-

ceeded despite a government that failed them at times. They overcame great obstacles. We manufactured ours. They had every excuse to fail and made history anyway. They overcame those obstacles. We have no excuses. Yet, here we are on the verge of failing them, once again.

They deserved better then and they deserve better now.

Mr. Speaker, I implore my colleagues one last time: Stop with the games. Bring the bipartisan version of this bill to the floor, along with the Latino museum build so we can finally get shovels in the ground on The National Mall for these critically important museums and honor the amazing people in this country who have written the chapter of American history that we all stand on the shoulders of and whose legacy we enjoy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge defeat of this bill. Bring back the bipartisan bill. We will enthusiastically build it. We will put shovels in the ground and we will build these national museums as they should be.

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

Mr. STEIL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 1329, the Smithsonian American Women's History Museum Act, as introduced by my colleague Representative MALLIOTAKIS from New York.

As we know, this year is the Nation's 250th anniversary, and we have an opportunity to place the Women's History Museum of the Smithsonian on The National Mall. The bill designates and takes an important step by designating the exact location of where that museum would be on The Mall and provides guardrails regarding the content of the museum.

Mr. Speaker, I thank, again, my colleague Representative MALLIOTAKIS for her hard work on this issue. I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1300, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 1329 is postponed.

SHARRI BRILEY AND ERIC EDMUNDSON VETERANS BENEFITS EXPANSION ACT OF 2026

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1300, I call up the bill (H.R. 6047) to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to increase the dollar amounts for the payment of certain

disability compensation and dependency and indemnity compensation under the laws administered by the Secretary, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1300, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part A of House Report 119-653, is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 6047

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Sharri Briley and Eric Edmundson Veterans Benefits Expansion Act of 2026".

SEC. 2. INCREASE IN RATES OF CERTAIN DISABILITY COMPENSATION AND DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION UNDER LAWS ADMINISTERED BY SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) INCREASE TO RATES OF WARTIME DISABILITY COMPENSATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1114 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(u) In the case of a veteran eligible for a monthly aid and attendance allowance under subsection (r) or subsection (t) of this section, the Secretary shall, in addition to the total amount of compensation for which the veteran is eligible under this section, pay the veteran a supplemental monthly allowance at the rate of \$833.33.”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE; APPLICABILITY.—Subsection (u) of such section (as added by paragraph (1)) shall take effect on December 1, 2026, and shall apply to months beginning on or after such date.

(b) INCREASE TO RATES OF DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION.—Section 5312 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d)(1) Whenever there is an increase in benefit amounts payable under title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.) as a result of a determination made under section 215(i) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 415(i)), the Secretary shall, except as provided in paragraph (2), effective on the date of such increase in benefit amounts, increase the dollar amounts in effect for the payment of dependency and indemnity compensation by the Secretary under paragraph (1) and paragraph (3) of section 1311(a) of this title, as such amounts were in effect immediately before the date of such increase in benefit amounts payable under title II of the Social Security Act, by a percentage equal to the sum of—

“(A) the percentage by which such benefit amounts are increased; and

“(B) one percent.

“(2) After the first increase under paragraph (1) to the dollar amounts in effect for the payment of dependency and indemnity compensation by the Secretary under paragraph (1) and paragraph (3) of section 1311(a) of this title, the Secretary shall carry out paragraph (1)(B) by substituting ‘one half of one percent’ for ‘one percent’.

“(3) Whenever there is an increase under paragraph (1) in amounts in effect for the payment of dependency and indemnity compensation, the Secretary shall publish such amounts, as increased pursuant to such paragraph, in the Federal Register at the same time as the material required by section 215(i)(2)(D) of the Social