

Yet, the United States Postal Service is denying street delivery to rebuilt homes and forcing residents to use cluster mailboxes instead.

That is a slap in the face. A cluster mailbox is not a welcome mat for families who fought to come home. It is an insult. Now, adding insult to injury, the U.S. Postal Service is considering permanently closing the downtown Lahaina post office damaged in the fires, with little notice and virtually no meaningful community input.

The United States Postal Service needs to restore home delivery, stop the closure, and listen to Lahaina. Our community has already lost enough. Recovery means restoring what was lost, not taking more away.

RECOGNIZING JAYLEN BROWN

(Ms. PRESSLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the contributions of NBA Finals MVP Jaylen Brown to the city of Boston on and off the court.

Born in Marietta, Georgia, and drafted number 3 overall by the Celtics from the University of California, Jaylen embraced our community and the city of Boston from the day he arrived in 2016.

Fiercely competitive on the basketball court, never missing the playoffs in his 10 seasons with the Celtics, he has been equally driven to uplift those around him through mentorship in his nonprofit, Boston XChange, which seeks to build wealth in communities of color, as well as his 7uice Foundation, connecting young people in and around Boston with opportunities.

In 2022, just before the Celtics turned their season around and made it all the way to the NBA Finals, Jaylen stated simply: "The energy is about to shift."

Mr. Speaker, thanks to the example, impact, and influence of this brilliant and proud Black man, the energy has shifted in Boston. Jaylen delivered banner number 18, the most in NBA history. His legacy as an advocate, truth teller, community builder, justice seeker, and champion will endure.

Job well done. We thank him. His faith, consistency, and hard work have certainly paid off.

BAN DATA CENTERS IN RESIDENTIAL COMMUNITIES

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

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Speaker, today, I am calling to ban data centers in residential communities and to ban Federal funding for Flock cameras.

We can't have a surveillance state in America. We didn't fight a revolution to be ruled by tech billionaires.

Americans are for innovation but not for the extraction of natural resources. Americans are for safety but not for

the abuse of their privacy. We need guardrails on this technology.

Communities should have the right to say "no" to a data center being shoved down their throats, and we should have the right for women not to be surveilled by Flock cameras by rogue police officers.

As a Representative of Silicon Valley, I am calling for democratic accountability of this technology revolution. We the people should call the shots.

□ 1710

FOOD SAFETY

(Mrs. MCCLAIN DELANEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MCCLAIN DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I sit on the House Agriculture Committee and grew up a potato farmer's daughter in Buhl, Idaho. I now represent Maryland's most agricultural district, Maryland's Sixth District. It encompasses 1,200 farms in Frederick County alone, the Agricultural Reserve in Montgomery, and specialty crops and livestock farms in Garrett, Allegany, and Washington Counties.

I represent all working families in the Sixth that eat food and trust that our government has the necessary resources and mechanisms in place to ensure that it is safe.

Unfortunately, that trust has been broken. That probably is what Project 2025 and massive cuts to our agencies has been all about.

This summer, more than 17,000 Americans were confirmed sick with cyclospora, the largest outbreak of its kind in our history. Nearly 500 were hospitalized, and two died. The lettuce came from a facility that the FDA had not inspected in 7 years. That is not bad luck. It is a choice.

The administration has cut the FDA by 23 percent. It is closing the USDA Beltsville Agricultural Research Center facility. It has cut USDA by 25 percent and the CDC by 28 percent. The administration is requiring States to not track cyclospora at all.

We need to reinstate the resources necessary to make sure that our food system is safe. National security is food security.

PROTECTING ECONOMIC AND ACADEMIC FREEDOM

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

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my bill with Ms. VIRGINIA FOXX of North Carolina, the Protect Economic and Academic Freedom Act.

No student or professor should be shut out of research, study abroad opportunities, academic partnerships, or feel unwelcome in the classroom be-

cause of where they are from or what religion they practice.

Yet, that is what boycott, divest, and sanction seeks to do, which targets one country and one religion: Israel and Judaism.

My bill prevents discriminatory BDS practices and policies from being enacted at universities that undermine academic freedom by cutting off study abroad, joint research and exchange, restricting students' and faculty's ability to study what and where they choose.

It is narrow, targeted, and doesn't touch anyone's speech. It doesn't touch protest or academic debate. It simply says: If your university that takes federal taxpayer dollars, it can't discriminate against academic partnerships or investments with one country. That is it.

This has been our Federal funding policy for decades. This is why this bill passed out of committee with overwhelming bipartisan support, including the ranking member and five other Democrats.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this bipartisan bill.

SALUTING LITTLE LEAGUE SOFTBALL WORLD SERIES

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MOORE of Utah. 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 Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I am excited to welcome my colleagues to speak with me tonight during this Special Order. I understand some of my colleagues have commitments, and I want to be respectful of their time. I will have them start us off before I provide some of my own comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. KNOTT).

Mr. KNOTT. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to recognize and salute the Little League Softball World Series Champions from Johnston County, North Carolina, today. Earlier this month, they won a rigorous contest to become the champions, making all of North Carolina's 13th Congressional District proud.

The team is out of Clayton, North Carolina, and all of these girls and their coaches are from the greater Johnston County area. Many of them are classmates, neighbors, friends, and family. For the entire season, they worked, competed, and improved together.

On August 8, they took the field against Kentucky in the championship

game of the Little League World Series. They did not just win. They won in dominant fashion.

Pitcher Anna-Lynn Clark threw a complete game and also completed a shutout. The team's defense allowed one Kentucky runner to reach scoring position for the entire game. The final score was 2-0. This was, remarkably, their second straight shutout of the tournament.

But the scoreboard is not the whole story. In the first inning of that championship game, the girls from Johnston County lost their starting second baseman to a serious injury. Her team did not fold. They rallied around her, dug in, and secured the victory.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate these champions, their families, their coaches, and the greater Archer Lodge community. All of North Carolina is proud of them.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I concur. The greatest sporting event of the year is always, of course, the Little League World Series. Thank you to the gentleman from North Carolina for highlighting it, and congratulations to that incredible team.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. KIGGANS).

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD WORK FOR
AMERICAN PEOPLE

Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on one of our Nation's most sacred founding principles: the idea that the Federal Government should work for the American people, not the other way around. It is an ideal that dates back to the founding of our constitutional Republic and one that I never thought would need to be reaffirmed.

However, it became a topic of debate this week, as my colleagues and I voted to advance a resolution condemning and denouncing socialism in all of its forms.

Socialism, at its core, represents the very antithesis of small government. In socialist economies, the means of production are wholly owned and controlled by the State, completely dismissing the potential for human innovation and without the accountability and opportunity that only come from free market capitalism.

Growing up during the Cold War, members of my generation witnessed the failure of the very socialist policies that some are advocating for today. We saw the poverty-stricken cities of eastern Europe, the underserved healthcare system of Cuba, and the violence committed against political dissidents that bravely spoke out against their failing governments.

Socialism is not just about bad policy, but it represents principles that are fundamentally at odds with economic freedom and individual liberty upon which our great Nation was founded.

I believe, just as the Founding Fathers believed, that government works best when it gets out of your way. We should never feel government. Unfortu-

nately, so many rules and regulations have been put in place on local, State, and Federal Government levels that are growing the size of our government.

Limited government means knowing where the Government's responsibilities end and where people's freedoms begin. That means cutting unnecessary red tape and protecting taxpayer dollars from waste, fraud, and abuse. Choosing to ignore identifiable fraud in our government isn't just wrong. It is theft at the expense of the American taxpayer.

A small government is one that supports our small businesses because it recognizes that they are the backbone of our local economies, driving job creation and opportunity across our Nation. A small government gives businesses the freedom to invest, grow, and put more men and women to work. A small government protects our environment without stifling growth and development.

A small government sets its eyes on the responsibilities that only it can fulfill, from taking care of our veterans and securing our borders to providing a strong national defense and standing by our allies. We, as elected officials, have a duty to meet the constitutionally outlined obligations entrusted upon us every election day.

These values that prioritize a small government are important to me as a commonsense Conservative, and they are the very same values that our brave men and women in uniform have gone to some of the most dangerous places around the world to defend. I have worn that uniform, my husband has worn that uniform, and my son proudly wears it today, as do so many across Virginia's Second District.

□ 1720

I am proud of the work that I, alongside my Republican colleagues, have been able to accomplish in pursuit of these ideals. We passed the Working Families Tax Cut Act to keep the Federal Government out of your bank accounts and out of your pocketbooks by doubling the standard deduction, expanding the child tax credit, and establishing a new deduction for seniors because we believe that you, not the government, should keep more of your hard-earned money.

We passed the 21st Century ROAD to Housing Act to cut burdensome red tape so we can incentivize developers, lower costs, and put the American Dream of homeownership back within reach for millions of Americans.

We most recently passed the Stop Insider Trading Act to increase transparency in Washington because public office should never be a pathway to personal profit.

These pieces of legislation embody the very spirit of what it means to have a limited government. They reflect the belief that you know how to spend your money better than the government does, the potential for growth

and innovation when Washington gets out of the way and, most importantly, the assertion that at the end of the day, we work for you.

With much more work to be done, I couldn't be prouder of what we have achieved and what Americans will continue to achieve. Limited government isn't just a talking point. It has been proven to deliver prosperity and economic freedom for millions around the world, and it is firmly ingrained in the fabric of the American way of life.

The United States is the greatest country in the world, not because of the power and scale of our government, but because we empower the people to live their lives by embracing freedom, ingenuity, and hard work here.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from the Commonwealth of Virginia for her remarks. I appreciate all of the work that she does. She cares. I have been able to go throughout her district with her to her military bases. I know of nobody who understands the issues more than her and who cares about the issues of our servicemen and -women more than JEN KIGGANS. I thank her for sharing that message with us tonight.

I now yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. KUSTOFF).

Mr. KUSTOFF. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friend and colleague from Utah organizing our time this afternoon.

In Congress, a lot of times the public focuses on the things we don't get done, which is fair. I think it is good to celebrate the things that we can accomplish that are good for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that last year House Republicans worked with President Trump to pass the One Big Beautiful Bill Act, which stopped the largest tax increase that could have happened in American history.

There is no doubt that the One Big Beautiful Bill Act is rooted in our Nation's founding principles, and that is limiting Washington's reach into the lives and also the paychecks of Americans, which gives people the freedom to shape their own future, quite frankly, allowing people to keep more of their hard-earned money in their own pockets.

As a member of the Ways and Means Committee, I was proud to help secure lasting tax relief and certainty for individuals and for small businesses.

During this August district work period, I was back on the road in west Tennessee, talking and meeting with farmers, manufacturers, small business owners, and people. Time and again, I heard how heavily their decisions depend on a tax code that they can count on and also depend upon.

For a family farm, the tax code affects plans for the next season. On Main Street, the tax code affects the next payroll. Workers' livelihoods depend on decisions that cannot wait for the next vote in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, from no tax on tips to no tax on overtime to a doubling of the

standard deduction to lowering tax brackets for everybody at all income levels, the One Big Beautiful Bill Act is a benefit to working Americans across the board.

One of the most important provisions in the One Big Beautiful Bill Act—and there are a lot—for small businesses was something known as section 199A. It allows eligible small businesses to deduct up to 20 percent of their qualified business income.

Now, for a small business, permanence is paramount. Farmers and local employers can now plan ahead rather than wait for the next congressional deadline.

For everybody who voted “no” on the One Big Beautiful Bill Act, I will tell them that my Republican colleagues and I worked with President Trump to make section 199 permanent, which delivered substantial relief for small businesses as well as American farmers. I also worked to strengthen the employer-provided childcare credit under something known as section 45F.

Before we passed the One Big Beautiful Bill Act, I introduced the Child Care for American Families Act to make this credit more useful for employers, especially for small businesses. Language from this bill was included in the final law.

For most employers, the law increased the credit from 25 percent to 40 percent of qualified childcare credit expenditures and raised the annual cap from \$150,000 to \$500,000. Eligible small businesses can now claim a 50 percent credit with an annual cap of \$600,000.

Employers can now partner with outside organizations or other businesses to provide childcare. That is so important because when childcare is reliable, parents can stay in the workforce and employers can retain valued employees.

The One Big Beautiful Bill Act was a victory for families, for Main Street, and for manufacturers. I am proud of what House Republicans and President Trump were able to accomplish.

We should all pledge to fight for lower taxes and limited government so small businesses can create jobs and people can keep more of what they earn. I am proud of this. We showed that Congress can work with the American people and accomplish a lot under the One Big Beautiful Bill Act.

I again thank my colleague from Utah for organizing this Special Order hour today.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for his remarks. I loved the opportunity to work with him on that bill.

As he brings up 199A, it is always fascinating. The one thing I wish we didn't have to go through back here—there is a long list of that, I guess—is the misrepresentation of that bill. The vast majority of it is targeted at small business and middle- and lower-income Americans. There is a constant, let me call it, like I said, misrepresentation of “this goes to the billionaires and doesn't help the working class.”

Then explain to me why the child tax credit is income capped, so middle- and lower-income Americans are the ones who take advantage of it. Then you add in the standard deduction, things like 199A, those are all targeted at small businesses and lower- and middle-income Americans. It is frustrating and disheartening to constantly hear the misrepresentation from the left on that tax policy. It is what it is, unfortunately, but it is one of the things that really wears on you because it is just not accurate, and they know it, but it is where we are. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for sharing that.

I now yield to the gentleman from the great State, maybe the greatest State, I think we can call it the greatest State in the United States of Utah (Mr. KENNEDY).

□ 1730

Mr. KENNEDY of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman MOORE for the opportunity to speak in this Special Order and also for the gentleman's advocacy for our outstanding State. I am proud to be with my friend and the congressional delegation from the great State of Utah.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on a principle that is as old as our Republic: Small government delivers big results.

Before I came to this Chamber, I spent my career as a family physician in Utah. Throughout those years, I saw firsthand what happens when Washington inserts regulations and when the bureaucracy inserts themselves between people and their lives.

As an example, I wanted to bring up an experience that I had as a doctor years ago with an individual with whom I spent a significant period of time in the room trying to understand the symptoms that this person described and trying to help them move forward in their health and well-being.

In that circumstance, some of the symptoms that this person described worried me or had me concerned about a possible cardiac condition, some problem with their heart. I ordered a stress test, which is an expensive test. It is a test to look at the function of the heart to see if there are any blood flow issues or aspects of the heart that would threaten for a heart attack.

I ordered that test, and, Mr. Speaker, I waited for days, ultimately 13 days, for the insurance determination as to whether they would pay for that test. On day 13, I received notification from this person's insurance that they would not pay for the heart test. Come to find out, the very next day this individual suffered from a heart attack.

The insurance in this case thought it was beneficial to their bottom line to reject the judgment that I had as a professional to determine that this person needed a preventative heart evaluation to make sure that they wouldn't have a heart attack. Instead, they denied my efforts to diagnose this problem before it became a critical problem, saving

themselves a few thousand dollars potentially on a heart test and subsequently threatening the life of this patient, as well as spending tens of thousands of dollars.

Ultimately, the person went through the heart symptoms that they had. They went to the emergency department and were admitted to the hospital. They had a coronary artery bypass graft, the procedure that was done saving this person's life, but after serious debility associated with that—and also this person's life was threatened. Subsequently, the insurance company spent tens of thousands of dollars instead of a few thousand dollars on that person.

Excessive government has built a great deal of bureaucracy between a doctor and that doctor's patients. There are rules. We have approvals. We have requirements and determinations that are made somewhere far away by someone who has never met the patient and never sat with them or their family. In many cases, these individuals have no medical training at all, yet that person or those systems can still override the judgment of the professionals or the people.

Nearly every one of those barriers began with someone's good intention, someone who is trying to fix a real problem and believed that another rule, another program, or some other layer of government was going to be the answer to the problem.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, good intentions are where Big Government contributions end. That is because when those ideas are put into practice, Americans are too often left with a government that is slow, a government that is costlier, and a government that is more obstructive than is needed.

For too long, Washington has operated under the flawed assumption that the size of the program measures its success and that the more money Federal agencies spend, the more the American people will benefit. Progress does not come from expanding bureaucratic power in this way. Progress comes from individuals, from their dreams, and from their aspirations and their inspiration.

Nowhere is that principle more clearly demonstrated than in the tangible benefits that Americans are already seeing through the working families tax cuts. When we passed that landmark legislation, we made simple promises to the American people: They should keep more of what they earn, and we, Congress, would rein in Federal overreach, eliminate wasteful spending, and return resources to the people who worked to earn them.

Today, those promises are producing real results in Utah and across the country.

Mr. Speaker, the government cannot create lasting prosperity. The American people are who create lasting prosperity. When Washington steps back, American families will step forward.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Utah (Mr. MOORE). I am grateful

for the opportunity to address this issue.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Utah (Mr. KENNEDY) for his excellent words. They come from a place of firm understanding, being a physician and recognizing that the answers are not derived from Washington. I had it couched. I was talking with a colleague the other day, saying that the legislation of the working families tax cuts that we accomplished last year had the largest spending reductions in history. At the same time, it has provided more relief to families with respect to the tax policy than any piece of tax legislation that we have seen.

It is all focused on middle- and lower-income Americans. That is where the bulk of that comes from, and it gives them more opportunities and options to be able to choose their course, their decisionmaking, and their potential upward mobility.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for highlighting all of that.

Mr. Speaker, this week, we passed legislation to prevent another government shutdown and provide more time to make intentional decisions about the other Federal spending aspects that still need to be accomplished.

We acted early to keep the government open and made the investments needed to keep America running, putting the interests of families and businesses first. There was no last-minute crisis, just responsible government well ahead of the shutdown date. That keeps America moving forward.

This bill protects veterans, families in need, and our national security. It preserves programs for senior nutrition; women, infants, and children in the WIC program; housing assistance; veteran services; and disaster relief.

It provides the stability needed to meet critical national security obligations and maintain America's strength. It extends major highway, rail, and transit authorities, which gives States and communities certainty while longer term legislation will continue to move forward. Now, we will continue debating, discussing, and moving forward on that larger appropriations process. We are ensuring the process is committee-led and Member-driven, as it should be, with more transparency and accountability.

Last year's government shutdown hurt American workers and families. I am grateful both sides of the aisle came together to avoid another one.

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

GIVING VOICE TO DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION PRINCIPLES

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all

Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous materials in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the time, and I thank my colleagues for their presence today.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I rise at this moment and in this Chamber to give a voice to the tens of millions of Americans who do not believe that diversity, equity, and inclusion is an offense to the spirit of America.

Nor are they under the impression that intentionally including the talent and abilities of qualified Americans who have been historically and systematically locked out of the promises of America is anything other than the right thing to do.

In fact, there are millions of Americans who understand that it is impossible to remunerate 300 years of oppression with only 62 years of inclusion. However, that is why we are here, and that is why we find ourselves here today, making sure that this voice is given airtime.

Regrettably, Mr. Speaker, it is also where we begin because we will let the word go forth from this time and in this place: If the Government of the United States had simply honored the 14th and 15th Amendments ratified in 1868 and in 1870 respectively, there would be no need for diversity, equity, and inclusion today because we would have fulfilled our promise and our obligation. There would be no need for affirmative action had we simply gone forward and honored the 14th and 15th Amendments.

There would be no need for civil rights legislation had we honored the 14th and 15th Amendments. To state the matter with even greater clarity, if the government of this country had honored its own laws, then this country would have never needed a civil rights movement.

That is because we would have fulfilled that obligation in our 14th and 15th Amendments. Unfortunately, it was not honored, and here we are. We will continue this fight to make sure that America fulfills its promise and its destiny.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be joined by my colleague and good friend, the Honorable Congressman CLEO FIELDS, who hails from the great State of Louisiana. Congressman CLEO FIELDS is the co-chair and founder of the DEI Caucus.

Congressman FIELDS has led an incredible career in public service my entire adult life, over the last 35 years and counting. All the while, he was championing voting rights issues on behalf of his constituents in the face of relentless opposition.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the great State of Louisiana (Mr. FIELDS).

□ 1740

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and including me in this very Special Order. In fact, I remember the first day we were here. The late Sylvester Turner and I were sitting right on this floor, and the gentleman from Illinois invited us to be a part of the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Caucus.

Let me just tell the gentleman that I am so proud to be a part of this caucus. When the President signed an executive order to do away with diversity, equity, and inclusion, it was, in my view, totally wrong, and I think people need to stand up for what they really believe in.

I was going through the dictionary today, Mr. Speaker, and I was looking at all three of these terms.

First, diversity. Diversity simply means the quality or condition of having or being composed of different elements, such as forms, types, and ideas. There was a time that our military wasn't diverse, and then the American people said there is nothing wrong with African Americans serving in the military. There is really nothing wrong with women serving in the military. There were some folk all across the country who said, oh, you are going to weaken the military. Did it make the military weaker? No, you bet it didn't. It made the military stronger. When we became diverse, it became the most fierce fighting machine in the world.

We need to talk about what is good about diversity, equity, and inclusion and not talk about all of these scare tactics that we have heard from people all across the country.

Second is equity. What is equity? The quality of being fair, just, especially in a way that takes account and seeks to address existing inequities.

Let's be honest about it. There are people in this country who have been facing all types of inequities from the day they were born.

We used to debate affirmative action, for example. Folk used to say affirmative action is two parallel lines where you take somebody who is unqualified and elevate them to the level of somebody who is qualified. That wasn't affirmative action. Affirmative action should be viewed as a circle instead of two parallel lines. When you take a certain person out of the circle, they are all equally qualified. We have been fighting those battles all along.

There has been some talk that there is no need for equity. Businesses across America have decided to end their diversity, equity, and inclusion programs as a result of the Executive Order No. 14151 signed by the President on January 20, 2025.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, inclusion. Who can be against inclusion? Inclusion means inclusion. People of all walks of life. There was a time in this country that Blacks weren't able to even register to vote. This Nation said that was wrong, and they changed it and passed the 15th Amendment.