

1944 to 1945. Like so many of the Greatest Generation, he demonstrated courage, patriotism, and a commitment to something greater than himself.

Then, on Christmas Eve of 1947, Hal married the love of his life, Eileen Whited. Together they shared an extraordinary marriage of 67 years.

Following his military service, Hal devoted the rest of his career to education, retiring from Pacifica High School, where he inspired students through his dedication and his passion.

Today, as we recognize Hal's life and birthday, we celebrate a century defined by service, family, and education.

On behalf of southern California's 46th Congressional District, I am honored to recognize his contributions and wish him a very happy 101st birthday.

Happy birthday, Hal. We love you.

□ 1950

REOPEN MARTIN GENERAL HOSPITAL

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

Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Martin General Hospital was Martin County's only hospital until financial distress forced its closure, leaving thousands without nearby emergency care.

Since then, local residents have been forced to travel 20 to 30 minutes or more to see a doctor in emergencies. When seconds count, those delays can be fatal.

The hospital's closure didn't just hurt our health but also the county's local economy, costing over 180 jobs and pulling \$33 million from the community each year.

I believe in practical solutions, which is why I am fighting to bring our hard-earned tax dollars back home to work for us.

Mr. Speaker, I have sent President Trump a letter as I advocate for \$175 million in Federal funding to reopen Martin General Hospital. Eastern North Carolina families deserve healthcare close to home.

REAFFIRM THE PRINCIPLES OF LIBERTY BY DISMANTLING THE SURVEILLANCE STATE

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SELF. 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 the topic of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SELF. Mr. Speaker, America's founding generation did not take up

arms merely over taxes. They rebelled against a tyrannical government that planted spies in their taverns, searched their homes, and read their private letters.

Benjamin Franklin understood this threat deeply. He popularized the rattlesnake as the symbol of America, first with his "Join, or Die" cartoon, and later by praising the defiant motto: "Don't Tread On Me."

He also delivered a timeless warning: Those who would give up essential liberty to purchase a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety.

This year, 2026, marks the 250th anniversary of our Declaration of Independence. There could be no more fitting time to reaffirm the principles of liberty than by dismantling the surveillance state that has quietly eroded them. That starts with the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, FISA, which has become the modern incarnation of the general warrants that ignited the revolution.

Created originally to track foreign enemies on foreign soil, section 702 has morphed into a sprawling domestic surveillance machine that sweeps up American's communications and treats the Fourth Amendment like a suggestion.

On June 12, Congress faces another deadline to renew section 702. The intelligence community wants a clean reauthorization, but we are not going to accept that, Congress should not accept that, and no American, if they were actually told the truth for once about what their own government is doing to them, would accept that.

This is not opposition to national security. It is a refusal to sacrifice essential liberty for temporary safety. If Congress is going to renew FISA, then we must enact meaningful changes.

First, repeal the dangerously broad expansion of the term "electronic communication service provider." It now allows the government to compel churches, small businesses, and community organizations to hand over Americans' communications.

Second, strengthen the FISA Courts Amicus Curiae program so independent voices can actually defend Americans' rights in secret proceedings.

Third, close the data broker loophole that allows the FBI, IRS, and every other Federal agency to bypass the Constitution by simply buying Americans' geolocation, metadata, and browsing history off the market.

Most urgently, require a warrant for backdoor searches of Americans' communications.

At peak, the government conducted nearly 3 million warrantless searches of U.S. citizens' data, many of them illegal. Foreign threats must be watched, but Americans deserve probable cause and a real warrant on American soil.

In addition, we must ban the Central Bank Digital Currency permanently. The CBDC is the ultimate surveillance

tool that allows the government to track, control, and potentially freeze every purchase you make.

The CBDC cannot ever be allowed to operate in the United States. It is the biggest threat to our privacy.

While we are at it, let's secure our elections by ensuring that only American citizens vote in American elections.

Mr. Speaker, our Founders never intended for us to trade liberty for supposed safety. Our Founders never imagined today where illegal aliens would be voting in our elections.

In this 250th anniversary year of American independence, Congress must draw a line in the sand. Let us stand with our forefathers, the Constitution, and the American people who want secure elections and for the government to stop spying on them.

Reject the rubber-stamped FISA renewal, pass these reforms, secure our elections, ban CBDC forever, restore the Fourth Amendment, and protect our Republic. The rattlesnake is, once again, rattling. It is time for Congress to listen.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS), my distinguished colleague.

Mr. BIGGS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I am grateful, indeed, for the opportunity to address one of the most consequential issues facing our great Republic: the Federal Government's warrantless surveillance of the American people.

For years, Americans have watched headline after headline exposing the intelligence community's abuse of its authority, and I thought I would share just a few of those.

Most recently, John Brennan admitted that there is a legion of deep state operatives in DOJ and CIA who are resisting Trump's orders. Why is that important?

It is because they are the ones who violate the warrant requirement, as well.

House approves reauthorization of FISA 702, warrantless spy powers, and yet when you go and read it, we have problems still. We still have problems. Why do we know that? Because the FISC, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, has issued a report. It is classified. Former DNI Director Tulsi Gabbard wanted to declassify that secret but critical court document but was denied. Actually, in my opinion, that needs to be released before we ever take a vote on FISA again.

I will just leave it there on those headlines and get back to this.

President Trump has an agenda. He won the popular vote in a landslide. In my home State, he got 160,000 votes more than the Democrat. How did he do it? Because the people wanted him to get his agenda through, but it is being sidestepped and avoided.

Who are the people that are causing the problem, according to John Brennan? It is the same people that spied on

President Trump's campaign previously. They abused FISA. The abuses are not hypothetical. They are not ancient. They didn't just happen in 2016. They are ongoing. That is what Tulsi Gabbard and the FISC court have discovered, and we need to discover that, as well.

□ 2000

Section 702 has been used to search the communications of protesters across the political spectrum, 19,000 donors to a congressional campaign, Members of Congress, congressional staff, journalists, and ordinary Americans who did nothing wrong.

Now, it has come to my attention that the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court has this opinion that is sitting there. It details significant government compliance failures under section 702. We need that to be declassified. The American people, this great Republic, need to know what their government is doing.

The opinion must be declassified in order for us to know what we are doing in Congress to take a vote on this. Without transparency, the American people and their elected Representatives cannot have a meaningful, fact-driven debate about the future of this powerful authority.

Reports indicate the opinion will show persistent, systemic violations of the law, including U.S. person queries that directly violate the oversight requirements Congress established in the Reforming Intelligence and Securing America Act, just from a couple of years ago.

One filtering tool tied to these violations has been shut down, but similar tools remain in use. This is exactly why I have consistently pushed for a warrant requirement for U.S. person queries.

The Fourth Amendment is not ambiguous. It says, "no warrants shall issue but upon probable cause"—not sometimes, not when it is convenient, not unless the intelligence community thinks it takes too long.

We keep hearing the same tired argument: Getting a warrant is too hard. Getting a warrant takes too long. That is simply false. The work we have done in my bill, H.R. 7816, the Protect Liberty and End Warrantless Surveillance Act, ensures that is the case.

H.R. 7816 includes targeted, practical exceptions for imminent threats, cybersecurity emergencies, and consent situations. It protects Americans and preserves the government's ability to act quickly when lives are on the line. Anyone claiming otherwise either hasn't taken the time to read the bill, has read some propaganda, has accepted the intelligence community's narrative, or simply does not want reform.

As we in Congress keep negotiating what FISA and section 702 reform should look like, we seem to be forgetting that my bill is already the negotiated bill. We worked with a wide range of Members and stakeholders. We

built a bipartisan coalition, and last Congress, we reached a 212-212 vote on my warrant requirement, one vote away from passing. It was sitting at 212-211 for a long time, and then someone came in and cast a "no" vote.

This is fundamentally the same bill. The work has been done. The consensus exists. The excuses have run out. Meanwhile, the intelligence community continues to assure us that: This time, we will follow the rules; this time, we will respect the Constitution; and this time, we will stop violating Americans' privacy.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard that promise for a decade and more. The latest FISA court opinion, the one they are trying to keep classified, proves those promises are empty.

President Trump's administration took historic steps to increase transparency across government, and I appreciate former Director Gabbard's stated commitment to declassify this FISC opinion.

The commitment must be honored. Declassification is essential to restoring trust, strengthening accountability, and ensuring every branch of government operates within constitutional limits.

At the end of the day, this debate comes down to a simple principle: If you want to spy on Americans, you have to get a warrant. That is not radical. That is not partisan. That is the Constitution.

Benjamin Franklin warned that those who trade essential liberty for temporary safety deserve neither. For too long, Washington has done exactly that: traded away constitutional privacy for the illusion of security.

We are told that, without warrantless surveillance, America will be less safe. That is wrong. We can have both liberty and safety. It is the government's job to protect both, not force Americans to choose between them.

We cannot allow a legacy going to our grandchildren where they will end up growing up in a country where mass surveillance is normal and constitutional protections are optional. Congress has a responsibility right now to stop that future from becoming a reality.

Let me just add this: When we talk about CBDC, it is the last leg of the stool of surveillance. If CBDC were to become a reality, with the mass surveillance that is in FISA right now, guess what. It wouldn't be too long before we started looking like our main foe internationally, the Chinese. They surveil everything.

Do you know what? The U.K. surveils everything, as well. They watch everything.

What CBDC would do would allow them to shut down the entire banking system or your microbanking system and control you. It could be abused so quickly, so thoroughly, and so completely.

I will tell you that I am grateful for the bipartisan Members who have

joined me in this fight. We have a lot of them. We may not agree on much, but we do agree on this: The Constitution still matters. It is real. In just 13 years, we will be celebrating its 250th.

If the government wants to search Americans' communications—which is what they want to do, and it is what they are doing—it must get a warrant. That is the requirement of the Constitution that I took an oath to protect and defend.

Mr. Speaker, and my friend from Texas, Mr. SELF, I thank you for this. I would say this: Be careful. There are some illusions out there. There are some false prophets coming forward to tell you that they are going to fix this problem, but they are offering a false doctrine. There should be no hope in that. We should put no faith in that.

Mr. SELF. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for bringing this to light, and I am happy to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman. I am going to talk about a few things. I am going to talk about the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act.

We use a lot of acronyms around here, so I am going to try to stick to these words so people understand: Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. We will talk about facial recognition software, the kill switch in your car, automatic license plate reader cameras, central bank digital currency, and data centers. All are part of what we are here to discuss tonight, which is your privacy enshrined, guaranteed, in this document that everybody here swears an oath to uphold and defend.

I am sure that my friend from Texas, Mr. SELF, can see that this thing is made of paper. Try as it may, it can't defend itself. It depends on men and women of good character and integrity to do that job for it. That is how this system was designed. That is how our Founders saw it. It can't defend itself. It depends on us.

In this document, the Fourth Amendment says: You will not be spied on; you will not be searched; your property will not be seized; and your privacy will not be violated without probable cause and due process. Yet, we know it has been violated, Mr. Speaker, Representative SELF.

We all took this oath, and the people who violated it took an oath. The people who violated it, whether they were on the court, whether they were in law enforcement, somehow, somehow, the piece of paper couldn't stop the violations to the American people and their personal effect.

The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act—let me be clear, Mr. Speaker. What Americans do, what American law enforcement does, what the American intelligence services do to keep us safe regarding foreigners, God bless them, go do it. Do whatever is necessary within the bounds of legality and morality to keep us safe.

It is called the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act for a reason, because we are supposed to be surveilling foreigners, foreign countries, foreign entities, foreign individuals, not millions of Americans who were spied on without their knowledge and then found out after the fact. Of course, as the gentleman from Texas knows—well, maybe he doesn't know; I think he does. Well, let me ask you in this colloquy: Who has been held accountable?

Mr. SELF. As far as I know, no one.

Mr. PERRY. Right? No one of note, for sure.

Mr. SELF. Exactly.

Mr. PERRY. No one of note. We spy on millions of Americans and violate their constitutional rights. That seems like a civil rights violation to me, and no one is held accountable.

You couple FISA with facial recognition software, think about the limits of power there. It is ubiquitous now. You can buy this stuff on the open market for yourself, let alone government doing it. It is one thing if a store wants to do it. Maybe you want to do it personally. Maybe your neighbor gives you trouble, and you want to make sure that you see him or her coming before they get there. God bless you. That is your business to protect your property.

□ 2010

But when law enforcement, when the awesome, irresistible power of the government has these things, what are you going to do about it?

Well, I tell you what you are going to do about it—not much, not much. You are going to be bankrupted. Your reputation is going to be destroyed. Maybe you will be falsely accused. When it is all over, when the whole thing is done, you haven't done anything and the government finds nothing, well, they just quietly slink off into the darkness. And you will be left with your shattered reputation, your bankrupt, empty bank account, your destroyed marriage, your destroyed family, your destroyed reputation. That is what you will be left with.

Now, recently, under the guise of safety, this government mandated that every new car in 2027 and beyond will have a kill switch put in it, not because you ordered it, not because you have a family member that you worry is going to drive impaired and you want to make sure you protect them and your fellow citizens. So you say to the dealership: I want to have a switch in this car that I can shut it off in case I feel my loved one is driving impaired.

No. If you are going to buy a car, the government is going to mandate that that be in the car. You're going to get the kill switch whether you want it or not. The car is going to decide, the vehicle—judge, jury, and, as they say, executioner—whether you are going to keep driving or not.

It doesn't matter if it is 2:30 in the morning and Mr. SELF—Mr. SELF's family member, because Mr. SELF is a

little bit older than this now—but Mr. SELF's family, his beloved family member is taking his wife to the hospital to deliver Mr. SELF's grandbaby. Maybe he is driving a little erratically or a little differently than he normally does because the pressure is on. His wife doesn't want to have the baby in the car. She would prefer to have it at the hospital. Well, the car says: Hey, look. Something is off here. I don't like the way you are driving, so I think I will just shut it off and keep everybody safe.

How about this: What about some young lady who is leaving an establishment. She notices somebody watching her, stalking her, following her. She thinks, boy, I either better get home to my father or my husband, or maybe I want to get to the police station. I am a little nervous. I don't know what this person behind me is going to do. Maybe I run the stop sign or whatever.

The car is going to keep you safe. It is going to shut off for you. That is exactly what you need at that moment.

Again, hook this up with facial recognition software before an intelligence surveillance act, and you can see the whole world caving in on you and your privacy. That is the kill switch. Now ubiquitous, automatic—and it is important that you include automatic in this—automatic license plate reading cameras installed ubiquitously now.

Two years ago, there were probably 500 of them installed. Now, there is 100,000. Businesses are talking about installing them on their location, and businesses are allowed to do that. Maybe they want to determine what time you show up, what you are wearing, what you are buying. It is one thing for a business to do it, but now law enforcement is also accessing it.

Again, when you have to fight the power of the State, it is very, very difficult. And we found out that automatic license plate readers are being installed near gun stores, being installed near gun shows.

Why would that be? To the gentleman from Texas, what if they are installed at your next rally? The law prohibits the Federal Government from compiling a database of those who own guns. But if we have a database of their car, their license plate, model, year of car, what time they came, what time they left, what they were carrying when they came out of the rally, the gun store, the whatever, well, maybe the government didn't get a warrant; but easy enough, Mr. SELF, they just buy the data.

Now, I will say this: Myself; Representative BIGGS, who is going to be the next Governor of Arizona; Representative SELF, trying to save Texas, you won't find any Members more supportive of law enforcement than those three individuals and the people that come up and talk about these issues.

We want a robust law enforcement to go after criminals, to be armed with every single tool necessary for their

success and their safety, but—people say: “Well, you can't say but”—myself, Representative SELF, Representative BIGGS, and all of those law enforcement officers raised our hands to take an oath to defend this piece of paper that says you will not have your rights violated for expedience because it is easy, because it makes the job easier.

We want their job to be easy, but we have got to set rules here, and we have to follow those rules.

Finally, the Central Bank Digital Currency, I hear people in my office say to me: Nobody knows what you are talking about. CBDC, Central Bank Digital Currency, no one knows what you are talking about, so quit ranting about it. Well, they will know when it is too late, when they no longer have their dollar bills, when they pay with their phone or with their card, and we don't exchange—we are already not exchanging pennies. Oh, it would never happen. We are already not exchanging pennies.

The Central Bank Digital Currency means you will no longer be exchanging dollars, 20s, 50s, 100s. You will no longer exchange them. That will be done with a card. That will be done with a phone, and it will be monitored by the Federal Government at a central bank, digital, card, phone, currency, how you pay for things.

Now, maybe people say to me: Well, why should I care about the cameras? Why should I care about the kill switch? Why should I care about Central Bank Digital Currency? I am not doing anything wrong. Apparently, they haven't read Solzhnitsyn, right, because people didn't do anything wrong in the Soviet Union either.

But as often has been said—and I don't know who the quote really goes to because that is in dispute too, but governments have been known to say things like: “Show me the man, and I'll show you the crime.”

With all of these things, that is what we are going to have in America. It is slow. It is creeping. It is insidious. It is like boiling the frog.

Representative SELF from Texas and me are here to turn down the temperature. We don't want to boil the frog up. We are trying to wake the frog up. Don't let this happen in the United States of America. Let's not be like the Communist Party of China with a system of social credits, because after all of this is in place, that will be next.

We say: Well, I am not doing anything wrong. I don't even go to gun shows.

Well, I don't know, there are a lot of people in this country that subscribe and ascribe to climate change theory and theology. It is almost like a religion.

Well, Mr. SELF, I don't know, maybe you want to drive a 1978 F-250 with lots of carbon emissions. Mr. SELF, I have got facial recognition software. I can see you in that old truck, and now I have got a license plate reader. It doesn't have a kill switch in it, but I

think you are exceeding your carbon credits for the day, Representative SELF. And maybe I can't shut it off, but now I will send the police out to pull you over. But, Heaven forbid, if I can shut it off—maybe it is a newer one, and you are just driving too much. Maybe Mr. SELF doesn't like flying to Washington, D.C., from Texas, so he says: Well, I will drive.

Well, my goodness, you are exceeding your carbon credits for the day, Representative SELF. We have to shut that thing off. It is not because your daughter is pregnant. It is just because we disagree with you.

These are the powers that the government should not have. If this is a power that is available, it should be your choice whether you have it in your vehicle, whether you are surveilled on a camera, and whether you let the Federal Government determine whether you can buy something, how much of it you can buy, when you can buy it, how often you can buy it.

Then, finally, I want to talk to you about something that we see happening all across the country now: Data centers.

Now, we understand we are in an existential race against China, who calls us the enemy. They call us the enemy, by the way. China considers the United States of America an enemy, and they would like to defeat us. It is really important that we win this race on artificial intelligence, which requires the use of data centers. But the question is: Where all of these data centers are popping up, is this about the race against China for these data centers, or are we putting a data center up so that we can conglomerate data from automatic license plate reading cameras that are at this store or at that store so that that data can be bought so the other store can say: Well, how can I get this customer from going to that store to this store?

□ 2020

Hold on a second. I am all about commerce and competition, but my license plate and where it is and what it is doing there on what car is my business, not somebody else's business to just use. If they are going to use it, then they ought to pay me for it and ask permission or get a warrant—or get a warrant.

So I applaud my friend from the great State of Texas. I am happy to stick around and have a discussion with him, but we are trying to raise the alarm because the violations have happened. We are pretty sure the violations continue to happen if whistleblowers aren't lying to us.

We also know that some of the intelligence agencies aren't forthcoming with the information, right? So we have questions. We are here because we took an oath to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States and all of the amendments—not just some of them, not just when it is convenient, and not just to make things easy for some.

We want to protect America. We want to protect our liberties. We can do both. We have to do both. Just because we have these new capabilities doesn't mean that, suddenly, we walk away from what has made this country great.

With that, I will stay.

Mr. SELF. Please hang around.

I want to, first of all, say that this is about privacy. What we are advocating is privacy.

Mr. Speaker, 250 years ago, the Declaration of Independence had that most famous phrase: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Now, they debated happiness back in those days, and they started out with property. What is pursuit of property?

That is you own what is yours, and that included privacy, the ability of you to control what you own. What we are talking about is losing the ability to control what you own, what you buy, and where you go. That is what we are talking about, is privacy here.

Look, as the gentleman said, we support surveillance on foreign actors on foreign soil, and with a warrant, we support law enforcement to do what they need to do with a warrant.

I want to tell you a story about facial recognition. One of my staff members has a young boy. He is at camp right now, so when they dropped him off at camp, they said: Give us a photograph of your son.

They did so. What they are going to use that for is they have cameras everywhere at this camp to protect the young. What they are going to do is use AI to take one of the pictures that they take randomly, identify his son, chop out a picture with him in the middle of his campmates, and send it to the parents.

Now, that is an okay use. They agree to that, but that same capability will pick you out of a crowd with AI facial recognition. In the wrong hands—any technology in the wrong hands can be used for evil purposes.

Let's get back to cameras. The Ring doorbells, a lot of people have them. In fact, some communities have a lot of them. Law enforcement is now going and demanding—when they think there has been a crime that this camera might have seen, demanding that they be allowed to see what that Ring doorbell recorded. Again, technology can be used for good or for evil.

I want to point out that the United States—even without some of the things we are talking about here—today is one of the most surveilled nations in the world, right up there with China, Russia, some of the Middle Eastern countries. It is one of the most surveilled nations in the world, and that is before we get to CBDC.

I want to go back to Benjamin Franklin, because we are celebrating 250 years this year. Frankly, we don't need to be celebrating just the actual 250 years because we have made it 250 years. We need to be celebrating the wisdom of the Founders. Part of the

wisdom is what we have talked about several times here, this statement that is so apropos to what we are discussing tonight: Those who would give up essential liberty and privacy written into the Declaration of Independence, codified in the Constitution—those who would give up essential liberty to purchase a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty, nor safety.

Why would the safety be temporary? It is because when people come along who will use it for evil purposes, it would not provide safety at all.

Mr. PERRY. Would the gentleman from Texas agree that all of us men and women fall short of the grace of God?

Mr. SELF. Absolutely.

Mr. PERRY. Unfortunately, there is darkness within the hearts of men and women. On occasion, we all fall short, and this Constitution exists so that we have a remedy for the times when somebody misuses the awesome power that is provided at the government level, with the use of law enforcement as the enforcer.

I think back to a time not so long ago. There was a pandemic in this country. I was in some state of shock and disbelief that our government told people that they could not work, and that they could not earn a living. They were told that they had to inject an experimental substance into their body or lose their employment. People will say that it can't happen or it can't happen again, but it did happen. It happened just a little while ago.

I am talking to people who say—I see things with my own eyes right now, and I say: "How did they do that?"

And they said: "It is AI."

Mr. Speaker, 6 months ago, we didn't have the capability. We have that capability now.

FISA still exists. Facial recognition software is available. The kill switch is still being mandated for your car. Automatic license plate readers are being installed by the thousands and tens of thousands. We are on the edge—as a matter of fact, we just passed a bill about 1½ weeks ago with a go-live date for a central bank digital currency.

The datacenters that are going to collate all of this information are being put in every single town, in every single State and county, it seems like, across the country, and people don't even know what the datacenter is for. I think people would support them if it was to fight China, but if it is just to collect all this data about all of us, I don't think people are going to go for that.

Yet, I think that is what Mr. SELF is getting at this evening. Somebody has to be the stewards of this constitutional right that we have to our own effects, our own privacy, unless there is probable cause that we did something wrong. Not we are going to sweep it all up just in case you did something wrong or just in case we don't like you, and we don't agree with what you are

doing, and then we are going to declare it wrong and make it wrong and punish you for it.

Mr. SELF. To the gentleman's point, I want to end with China because a lot of people will say that this is all theory, you are overreacting, and that this is hyperbole. It will never happen here.

But China has something that they call the social credit score. They take your social credit score, and they measure you based on everything—what you buy, what you post on the internet, what you say to your fellow worker, what they see you do, how you drive, everything. Everything, the government takes into account for a social credit score, and then they will tell you how you can live your life based on your social credit score.

It is all on collected data. It is based on collected data.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to my fellow Americans that is what we are facing. We are facing a social credit score if all of this happens: the kill switch, CBDC, and warrantless surveillance on your electronic communications. That is what we are looking at if all of this happens and these cameras proliferate across America.

□ 2030

Mr. PERRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SELF. Absolutely.

Mr. PERRY. It has already happened. It is happening. It has already happened.

We already talked about the millions of Americans who were spied on under the guise of foreign intelligence surveillance. We have already talked about that. We have already talked about the government lying to us about the effects of the pandemic and forcing us to inject things into our bodies that were experimental.

These things aren't theory. These things aren't something that might happen in the future. These are things that did happen, are happening, and are happening at a more and more alarming rate, and are ubiquitous and becoming more ubiquitous in our society.

Mr. SELF. Let me make this point: It can get worse. What you are saying is true, but it can get worse. That is what we are trying to stop. That is why we are sounding the alarm that the surveillance state must be stopped.

The red line in the sand right now is FISA reform. Any FISA reform that does not include a permanent ban on CBDC and securing our elections, I believe, does not cut the mustard.

Does the gentleman have any closing comments?

Mr. PERRY. Well, it is interesting. Every single Republican Member here already voted in favor of limiting the government's ability to install a central bank digital currency. We have had assurances from leadership, from the top to the bottom. We are told that people in the other Chamber are all for it, as well.

It is fascinating and interesting to me that, as much as that may be true, and it is proclaimed, we simply can't seem to get an up-or-down vote on it, which leads me to believe they have every intention of instituting it.

The fact that they put a go-live date in the last bill that we passed should sound the alarm bell to every single American who doesn't want their bank accounts to be monitored and controlled by the Federal Government. Do not allow this to happen.

Mr. SELF. I will say that I consider the CBDC, the central bank digital currency, the final leg in the surveillance state stool.

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

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Kevin F. McCumber, Clerk of the House, reported that on May 29, 2026, the following bill was presented to the President of the United States for approval:

H.R. 3490. To require the Government Accountability Office to produce a report on esophageal cancer, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 4, 2026, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

EC-3686. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, AGC-010, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; ATR-GIE Avions de Transport Regional Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2026-2278; Project Identifier MCAI-2025-00628-T; Amendment 39-23335; AD 2026-09-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 26, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-3687. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, AGC-010, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2026-0738; Project Identifier MCAI-2025-01039-T; Amendment 39-23331; AD 2026-09-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 26, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-3688. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, AGC-010, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2026-0739; Project Identifier MCAI-2025-01040-T; Amendment 39-23332; AD 2026-09-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May

26, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-3689. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, AGC-010, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class C Airspace and Class E Airspace; Palm Beach International Airport, West Palm Beach, FL Docket No.: FAA-2026-4532; Airspace Doc. No.: 26-AWA-4] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received May 26, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-3690. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, AGC-010, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace and Revoke Class E Airspace; Fort Knox, KY [Docket No.: FAA-2026-3074; Airspace Docket No.: 26-ASO-5] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received May 26, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-3691. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, AGC-010, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Leonardo S.p.A. Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2025-2556; Project Identifier MCAI-2024-00034-R; Amendment 39-23330; AD 2026-09-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 26, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-3692. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, AGC-010, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2026-1324; Project Identifier AD-2025-00986-T; Amendment 39-23334; AD 2026-09-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 26, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-3693. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, AGC-010, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2026-0009; Project Identifier MCAI-2025-00436-T; Amendment 39-23338; AD 2026-09-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 26, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-3694. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, AGC-010, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2026-1323; Project Identifier MCAI-2025-01190-T; Amendment 39-23336; AD 2026-09-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 26, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-3695. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, AGC-010, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2025-2552; Project Identifier MCAI-2025-00623-T; Amendment 39-23339; AD 2026-09-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 26, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.