AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 119th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 172 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, 2026 *No. 146*

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 16, 2026.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DUSTY JOHNSON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

MIKE JOHNSON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Margaret Grun Kibben, offered the following prayer:

Holy God, we cannot fathom Your mysteries. We cannot probe the limits of Your being, for they are higher than the heavens above and deeper than the depths below.

And yet You allow us, in the finitude of our lives and the brevity of our days, to receive the wideness of Your mercy, which is wider than the sea. You offer us the kindness of Your justice, which is more than freedom from our transgressions.

For Your love, O God, is broader than we can measure. Your heart is eternally and wonderfully kind.

In this moment, may we, with open minds and contrite hearts, receive the bounty of Your mercy and submit ourselves to the greatness of Your sovereignty, that we may, as servants of the Most High God, honor You in all that we do and say this day and in all the days You have numbered for us.

In the light of Your word and in the power of Your name, we dare pray.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House the approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1 of rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. NEAL led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

RECOGNIZING COMMANDER MICHELLE CAPONIGRO

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

Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Commander Michelle Caponigro for 20 years of outstanding Active-Duty service as a Civil Engineer Corps officer and registered architect with the United States Navy.

For the past 2 years, Commander Caponigro has served as a legislative liaison, strengthening the relationship between the Navy and Congress, while advocating for the Navy's military construction, housing, real estate, shore infrastructure, and utilities resiliency portfolio.

Previously, as a public works officer for Naval Support Activity in Naples, Italy, she led more than 240 facility professionals in the planning, design, construction, facility sustainment, and environmental compliance across 11 sites throughout Italy and Iceland, supporting naval operations across Europe, Africa, and Central Command.

She also represented Naval Support Activity in Naples as a liaison to various international governmental organizations, committees, and commissions. She consistently ensured the Department of the Navy's infrastructure needs were met abroad while strengthening partnerships with our allies.

Throughout her distinguished career, Commander Caponigro has served at NAS Oceana, Walter Reed National Military Medical Center, Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune, and Marine Corps Air Station New River, supported Hurricane Florence recovery efforts, and led Seabees during operations in Djibouti, the Baltics, and Norway.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons, I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking Commander Michelle Caponigro for her exemplary service to our Navy and Nation and congratulating her on a well-earned retirement.

WHAT HAPPENED TO PATRICK FINUCANE

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

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, today, in Belfast in the north of Ireland, there is a murder inquiry that is underway. For those of us who have had a longstanding interest in this issue, this is an opportunity to shine light on what happened to the solicitor Patrick Finucane.

He was brutally murdered during a Sunday dinner in his dining room. The question is, as he was murdered in

☐ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., ☐ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.
Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

front of his wife, Geraldine, and their children, what happened with collusion with British forces at the time?

The British Government has time and again said that they would honor a full inquiry into the murder of Patrick Finucane. Decades have gone by while we await that judgment and that scrutiny of what really happened on that fateful day.

The Good Friday Agreement brought to an end decades, if not centuries, of antagonism between two traditions, but getting to the bottom of what happened to Patrick Finucane should be part of what we do here in America to scrutinize what we had done to successfully bring about the Good Friday Agreement.

RECOGNIZING ROBERT H. ''HANK'' MENKE

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

Mr. MESSMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Robert H. Menke, or Hank, to most people. Hank is a third-generation Hoosier business leader from my home district in Indiana.

For more than five decades, Hank Menke has dedicated his career to American manufacturing and to the Hoosiers in Indiana.

After earning his degree in industrial engineering and starting his career in North Carolina, he soon returned to southern Indiana to join his family's furniture business.

In 1982, he became president of the family company, Styline Industries, and under his leadership, it evolved from a residential furniture manufacturer into a leading producer of office, healthcare, and hospitality furniture, employing more than 1,900 people.

Hank Menke's legacy is about more than just the furniture business. He has built a culture centered on integrity, service, strong relationships, and giving back to his community.

In 2017, he was inducted into the Dubois County Business Hall of Fame, which honored his leadership and his contributions to the local economy.

Mr. Speaker, I know I am joined by many other Hoosiers as we celebrate the remarkable career of Hank Menke. I thank him for his continued commitment to Huntingburg, Dubois County, and everyone in the great State of Indiana.

MOVING LONG-DELAYED FLOOD PROTECTION PROJECTS FORWARD

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

Ms. POU. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Water Resources Development Act.

In north Jersey, flooding is not some distant threat. In just the last few weeks, our communities have seen terrible flash floods turn streets into rivers, destroying homes, cars, small businesses, and upending lives.

We cannot keep waiting until after disaster strikes to act. We must be proactive and give our communities the tools to protect themselves before the next storm comes.

As a first-term member of the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee, I have pursued commonsense solutions. This bipartisan bill presents exactly that by moving long-delayed flood protection projects forward across Bergen and Passaic Counties.

I am especially proud that this includes my bipartisan CLEAN-UP Act to help the Army Corps cut through obstacles that have held up critical work for years. People have waited long enough.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to pass the bill now, before the next flood comes.

HONORING THE LIFE OF COMMISSIONER FRED MCCLURE

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

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Davidson County Commissioner Fred McClure.

Fred lived a life of service. He served our country in the Air Force, the Navy, and the North Carolina National Guard, including two tours in Vietnam.

After his time in the Armed Forces, Fred found himself in Welcome, North Carolina. He built a business, raised a family, and continued to serve his community as a member of the Davidson County Commissioners beginning in 1994.

He loved Davidson County, and the people of Davidson County trusted him for a reason. Fred had a servant's heart. He was a father, a grandfather, a friend to many, and a man of faith. Rachel and I are praying for his wife, Kay; the entire McClure family; and all those who knew and loved him. Davidson County lost a good man and a true public servant.

Mr. Speaker, may God bless Fred McClure and may he rest in peace.

□ 0910

HONORING LIFE AND LEGACY OF MARIAM TARIQ

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

Mr. MIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of my friend, Mariam Tariq, a beloved member of the Irvine community who dedicated her life to serving others.

I first met Mariam when she came to work as an intern on my 2024 State senate campaign, and I will always remember her as someone who was incredibly kind, whip smart, deeply passionate, and beloved by everyone who knew her.

Mariam believed deeply in public service. From working in congressional and local government offices, including as an APAICS fellow for Representative JUDY CHU in 2021, to helping build civic organizations in Irvine, she devoted herself to uplifting underserved communities.

That commitment was especially clear in her humanitarian work where she helped provide clean drinking water, emergency relief, and healthcare to communities in need.

Mariam's legacy lives on in the people she mentored, the communities she strengthened, and the countless lives she touched through her service.

Cancer sucks. It took this beautiful person from us far too early. This is a huge loss for Mariam's family, for Orange County, and the world. She will be deeply missed.

CELEBRATING ITALIAN HERITAGE MONTH

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

Mr. LATIMER. Mr. Speaker, in October, communities come together to celebrate Italian Heritage Month with events, parades, and celebrations taking place all across the country.

At home in New York, we will take part in the celebrations at the 99th annual Yonkers Columbus Day parade, featuring live music, a flag-raising ceremony, and concluding with an Italian street festival filled with everyone's favorite Italian dishes and treats.

This event will also crown a new Miss Columbus, a longstanding tradition of honoring one resident of Yonkers who exemplifies leadership and service in the community.

We will also recognize events to be held in Eastchester, in Port Chester, and in Harrison to celebrate Italian Heritage Month.

From the floor of the House of Representatives, I commend the city of Yonkers, alongside the Yonkers Columbus Day Celebration Committee, for continuing to keep these cherished traditions alive and providing a space where our Italian neighbors can gather to celebrate their history and culture.

SUPPORTING EARLY-CHILDHOOD EDUCATORS' DEDUCTIONS ACT

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution Number 1530, I call up the bill (H.R. 5334) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow early childhood educators to take the educator expense deduction, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendments thereto, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the Senate amendments.

Senate amendments:

Strike section 1 and insert the following:

DIVISION A—LINDSEY O. GRAHAM SANCTIONING RUSSIA AND IRAN ACT OF 2026

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Lindsey O. Graham Sanctioning Russia and Iran Act of 2026''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this division is as follows:

TITLE I—SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION

SEC. 101. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) ACCOUNT; CORRESPONDENT ACCOUNT; PAYABLE-THROUGH ACCOUNT.—The terms ''account'', ''correspondent account'', and ''payable-through account'' have the meanings given those terms in section 5318A of title 31, United States Code.

(2) ADEQUATE MARITIME INSURANCE.—The term ''adequate maritime insurance''—

(A) means verified documentation evidencing protection and indemnity insurance with audited financial statements of the insurer; and

(B) does not include insurance provided by an insurer organized under the laws of the Russian Federation or otherwise subject to the jurisdiction of the Government of the Russian Federation.

(3) ADMISSION; ADMITTED; ALIEN; ETC.—The terms ''admission'', ''admitted'', ''alien'', and ''lawfully admitted for permanent residence'' have the meanings given those terms in section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101).

(4) ARMED FORCES OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.—The term ''Armed Forces of the Russian Federation'' includes—

(A) the Aerospace Forces of the Russian Federation;

(B) the Airborne Forces of the Russian Federation;

(C) the Ground Forces of the Russian Federation;

(D) the Navy of the Russian Federation;

(E) the Special Operations Command of the Russian Federation;

(F) the Strategic Rocket Forces of the Russian Federation;

(G) the General Staff of the Armed Forces of the Russian Federation;

(H) the Main Directorate of the General Staff of the Armed Forces of the Russian Federation (formerly known as the Main Intelligence Directorate of the Russian Federation);

(I) the Federal Security Service of the Russian Federation;

(J) the Foreign Intelligence Service of the Russian Federation;

(K) cyber actors of the Government of the Russian Federation; and

(L) any successor entities or proxies of the entities described in subparagraphs (A) through (K).

(5) BLOCKED PROPERTY.—The term ''blocked property'' means any property blocked pursuant to the authority of the President under section 203 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702).

(6) CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''critical infrastructure'', with respect to Ukraine, means systems and assets, whether physical or virtual, so vital to Ukraine that the incapacity or destruction of such systems and assets would have catastrophic regional or national effects on public health or safety, economic security, or national security.

(B) INCLUDED SECTORS.—The term ''critical infrastructure'' includes assets in the following sectors:

(i) Biotechnology.
(ii) Chemical.
(iii) Commercial facilities.
(iv) Communications.
(v) Critical manufacturing.
(vi) Dams.
(vii) Defense industrial base.
(viii) Emergency services.
(ix) Energy.
(x) Financial services.
(xi) Food and agriculture.
(xii) Government facilities.
(xiii) Healthcare and public health.
(xiv) Information technology.
(xv) Materials and waste.
(xvi) Nuclear reactors.
(xvii) Space.
(xviii) Transportation systems.
(xix) Water and wastewater systems.

(7) FOREIGN PERSON.—The term ''foreign person'' means an individual or entity that is not a United States person.

(8) KNOWING; KNOWINGLY; KNOWS.—The terms ''knowing'', ''knowingly'', and ''knows'', with respect to conduct, a circumstance, or a result, means that a person had actual knowledge, or should have known, of the conduct, the circumstance, or the result.

(9) MILITARY INVASION.—The term ''military invasion'' includes—

(A) a ground operation or assault;

(B) an amphibious landing or assault;

(C) an airborne operation or air assault;

(D) an aerial bombardment or blockade;

(E) missile attacks, including rockets, ballistic missiles, cruise missiles, and hypersonic missiles;

(F) a naval bombardment or armed blockade;

(G) a destructive or destabilizing cyberattack against critical infrastructure; and

(H) an attack by a country on any territory controlled or administered by any other independent, sovereign country, including offshore islands controlled or administered by that country.

(10) RUSSIAN PERSON.—The term ''Russian person'' means—

(A) a citizen or national of the Russian Federation; or

(B) an entity organized under the laws of the Russian Federation or otherwise subject to the jurisdiction of the Government of the Russian Federation.

(11) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term ''United States person'' means—

(A) a United States citizen or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence to the United States; or

(B) an entity organized under the laws of the United States or any jurisdiction within the United States, including a foreign branch of such an entity.

SEC. 102. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS ON CERTAIN PERSONS AFFILIATED WITH OR SUPPORTING THE GOVERNMENT OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the President shall—

(1) review any persons and vessels that may be described in subsection (b); and

(2) after conducting that review—

(A) impose the sanctions described in subsection (e) with respect to any persons the President determines are described in subsection (b); and

(B) identify as blocked property any vessels the President determines are described in subsection (b).

(b) PERSONS DESCRIBED.—The persons and vessels described in this subsection are the following:

(1) The following officials of the Government of the Russian Federation:

(A) The President of the Russian Federation.

(B) The Prime Minister of the Russian Federation.

(C) The Minister of Defense of the Russian Federation.

(D) The Chief of the General Staff of the Armed Forces of the Russian Federation.

(E) The Deputy Ministers of Defense of the Russian Federation.

(F) The Commander-in-Chief of the Land Forces of the Russian Federation.

(G) The Commander-in-Chief of the Aerospace Forces of the Russian Federation.

(H) The Commander of the Airborne Forces of the Russian Federation.

(I) The Commander-in-Chief of the Navy of the Russian Federation.

(J) The Commander of the Strategic Rocket Forces of the Russian Federation.

(K) The Commander of the Special Operations Forces of the Russian Federation.

(L) The Commander of Logistical Support of the Armed Forces of the Russian Federation.

(M) The commanders of the Russian Federation military districts.

(N) The Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation.

(O) The Minister of Transport of the Russian Federation.

(P) The Minister of Finance of the Russian Federation.

(Q) The Minister of Industry and Trade of the Russian Federation.

(R) The Minister of Energy of the Russian Federation.

(S) The Minister of Agriculture of the Russian Federation.

(T) The Director of the Foreign Intelligence Service of the Russian Federation.

(U) The Director of the Federal Security Service of the Russian Federation.

(V) The Director of the Main Directorate of the General Staff of the Armed Forces of the Russian Federation.

(W) The Director of the National Guard of the Russian Federation.

(X) The Federal Guard Service of the Russian Federation.

(Y) Any other senior official of the Government of the Russian Federation, as determined by the President.

(2) Any foreign person that the President determines, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act—

(A) knowingly sells, leases, or provides, or facilitates selling, leasing, or providing, goods or services relating to the defense industrial base of the Russian Federation, including—

(i) computer numerical control (CNC) tools and associated machinery, software, and maintenance or upgrade services;

(ii) lubricant additives;

(iii) nitrocellulose, wood cellulose, and associated additives and components necessary for the production of propellant or energetics for munitions;

(iv) chemical coatings;

(v) fiber optic cables with military applications and associated technologies needed to manufacture such cables;

(vi) advanced sensors;

(vii) items on the Common High Priority Items List maintained by the Bureau of Industry and Security of the Department of Commerce; or

(viii) any additional items determined by the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, to be critical to the defense industrial base of the Russian Federation;

(B) knowingly facilitates deceptive or structured transactions to provide the goods and services described in subparagraph (A);

(C) knowingly conducts a significant transaction with the Armed Forces of the Russian Federation;

(D) knowingly engages, directly or indirectly, in activities that—

(i) materially undermine the military readiness of Ukraine;

(ii) seek to overthrow, dismantle, or subvert the Government of Ukraine;

(iii) debilitate the critical infrastructure of Ukraine;

(iv) debilitate cybersecurity systems through malicious electronic attacks or cyberattacks on Ukraine;

(v) undermine the democratic processes of Ukraine;

(vi) undermine the peace, security, political stability, or territorial integrity of Ukraine; or

(vii) involve committing serious abuses of internationally recognized human rights against citizens of Ukraine, including forcible transfers, enforced disappearances, unjust detainment, forced deportation of children, or torture;

(E) is a leader, official, senior executive officer, or member of the board of directors of, or principal shareholder with a controlling or majority interest in, an entity that is operating in the defense industrial base or energy or transportation sectors of the economy of the Russian Federation in support of the Armed Forces of the Russian Federation;

(F) is an oligarch in the Russian Federation who—

(i) has not demonstrated opposition to the Russian Federation's war on Ukraine; or

(ii) continues, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, to benefit from an association with the Government of the Russian Federation;

(G) is responsible for or complicit in, or has directly or indirectly engaged in, for or on behalf of, or for the benefit of, directly or indirectly, the Government of the Russian Federation—

(i) transnational crime, corruption, bribery, extortion, or money laundering;

(ii) assassination, murder, or other unlawful killing of, or infliction of other bodily harm or other crimes against humanity against, a United States person or a citizen or national of an ally or partner of the United States;

(iii) activities that undermine the peace, security, political stability, or territorial integrity of the United States or an ally or partner of the United States; or

(iv) deceptive or structured transactions or dealings that circumvent the application of any sanctions imposed by the United States, including through the use of digital currencies or assets or the use of physical assets; or

(H) is a leader, official, senior executive officer, or member of the board of directors of, or principal shareholder with a controlling or majority interest in, any of the following Russian energy projects:

(i) The Yamal Liquefied Natural Gas Project or a successor project.

(ii) The Arctic 1, 2, and 3 Liquefied Natural Gas Projects or a successor project.

(iii) Projects in the Arctic region carried out after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) Any foreign vessel the President determines, based on credible information, is used by the Government of the Russian Federation or Russian persons to move crude oil, uranium, natural gas, liquefied natural gas, petroleum, petroleum products, petrochemical products, coal, coal products, arms, or other goods for the purpose of circumventing sanctions imposed by the United States or other countries, including any vessel the owner, operator, or manager of which knowingly—

(A) exhibits or engages in unsafe or nonstandard maritime behavior in furtherance of the transportation of crude oil, uranium, natural gas, liquefied natural gas, petroleum, petroleum products, petrochemical products, coal, or coal products that originated in the Russian Federation;

(B) lacks adequate maritime insurance for the transport of goods described in subparagraph (A); or

(C) evades compliance with a price cap for crude oil and petroleum products that originated in the Russian Federation established by—

(i) the international coalition made up of Australia, Canada, the European Union, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, and the United States and known as the ''Price Cap Coalition''; or

(ii) the United States.

(4) Any foreign person that the President determines knowingly—

(A) owns, operates, or manages a vessel described in paragraph (3);

(B) provides underwriting services or insurance or reinsurance necessary for such a vessel;

(C) serves as a captain or senior leadership of the crew of such a vessel; or

(D) transfers to the Russian Federation, or provides for the use of by a Russian person, any vessel designed for the transportation of crude oil, uranium, natural gas, liquefied natural gas, petroleum, petroleum products, petrochemical products, coal, or coal products.

(5) Any foreign vessel that the President determines knowingly—

(A) transports crude oil, uranium, natural gas, liquefied natural gas, petroleum, petroleum products, petrochemical products, coal, or coal products that originated in the Russian Federation;

(B) engages in a ship-to-ship transfer involving crude oil, uranium, natural gas, liquefied natural gas, petroleum, petroleum products, petrochemical products, coal, or coal products that originated in the Russian Federation with a vessel that is subject to sanctions imposed by the United States; or

(C) provides services to a vessel described in subparagraph (A) or (B).

(6) Any foreign person that the President determines is the owner or operator of a foreign port that allows a vessel subject to sanctions imposed by the United States for supporting the Russian Federation to port or otherwise receive services.

(7) Any foreign person, including a foreign person acting on behalf of a person described in this subsection (in this paragraph referred to as the ''sanctioned person''), if the sanctioned person transferred property or an interest in property to the person—

(A) after the date on which the President imposed sanctions with respect to the sanctioned person; or

(B) before that date, if the sanctioned person did so in an attempt to evade the imposition of sanctions.

(c) VESSELS SUBJECT TO SANCTIONS BY THE UNITED KINGDOM OR EUROPEAN UNION.—In determining under subsection (b)(3) if a vessel is a foreign vessel used by the Government of the Russian Federation or Russian persons to move crude oil, uranium, natural gas, liquefied natural gas, petroleum, petroleum products, petrochemical products, coal, coal products, arms, or other goods for the purpose of circumventing sanctions, the President may use as prima facie evidence that the vessel is subject to sanctions imposed by the United Kingdom, the European Union, the Group of 7, or a member of the Five Eyes intelligence alliance.

(d) MAINTENANCE OF CERTAIN SANCTIONS RELATING TO SPECIFIED HARMFUL FOREIGN ACTIVITIES.—Sanctions and other measures provided for under any Executive Order issued to address the national emergency that the President continued on March 24, 2026, with respect to specified harmful foreign activities of the Government of the Russian Federation (91 Fed. Reg. 15515), as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, including with respect to all persons sanctioned under any such Executive Order, shall remain in effect.

(e) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—The sanctions described in this subsection to be imposed with respect to a person described in subsection (b) are the following:

(1) BLOCKING OF PROPERTY.—The President shall exercise all of the powers granted by the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) to block any vessel described in subsection (b), and block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of a person described in subsection (b), if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(2) INELIGIBILITY FOR VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.—

(A) VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.—An alien described in subsection (b) shall be—

(i) inadmissible to the United States;

(ii) ineligible to receive a visa or other documentation to enter the United States; and

(iii) otherwise ineligible to be admitted or paroled into the United States or to receive any other benefit under the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.).

(B) CURRENT VISAS REVOKED.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The visa or other entry documentation of an alien described in subsection (b) shall be revoked, regardless of when such visa or other entry documentation is or was issued.

(ii) IMMEDIATE EFFECT.—A revocation under clause (i) shall—

(I) take effect immediately; and

(II) automatically cancel any other valid visa or entry documentation that is in the possession of the alien.

SEC. 103. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS AFFILIATED WITH THE GOVERNMENT OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall—

(A) impose 2 or more of the sanctions described in subsection (d) with respect to the Central Bank of the Russian Federation (Bank of Russia) and any subsidiary of, or successor entity to, that Bank;

(B) impose all of the sanctions described in subsection (d) with respect to—

(i) Sberbank;

(ii) VTB Bank;

(iii) Gazprombank;

(iv) any other financial institution organized under the laws of the Russian Federation and owned in whole or in part by the Government of the Russian Federation;

(v) any subsidiary of, or successor entity to, any of the financial institutions described in clauses (i) through (iv); and

(vi) except as provided by subsection (c), any foreign financial institution that engages in significant transactions with any of the financial institutions described in clauses (i) through (v); and

(C) impose the sanctions described in section 102(e) with respect to any leaders, officials, senior executive officers, or members of the board of directors of, or any principal shareholders with a controlling or majority interest in, a financial institution described in subparagraph (A) or (B).

(2) UPDATES.—Not later than 210 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the President shall—

(A) review any persons that may be described in paragraph (1); and

(B) if sanctions have not been imposed under this subsection with respect to any person the President determines is described in paragraph (1), impose such sanctions with respect to that person.

(b) PROHIBITION ON TRANSACTIONS BY UNITED STATES PERSONS.—Effective on the date that is 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall prohibit any United States person from engaging in any transaction with a financial institution described in subsection (a)(1)(B).

(c) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.—The President is not required to impose sanctions under subsection (a)(1)(B) with respect to a foreign financial institution described in clause (vi) of that subsection if the Secretary of the Treasury determines that imposing such sanctions is not consistent with the economic or foreign policy interests of the United States.

(d) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—The sanctions described in this subsection to be imposed with respect to a financial institution described in subsection (a) are the following:

(1) BLOCKING OF PROPERTY.—The President shall exercise all of the powers granted to the President under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) to the extent necessary to block and prohibit all transactions in property and interests in property of the financial institution if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(2) CAATSA SANCTIONS.—Two or more of the sanctions described in section 235 of the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act (22 U.S.C. 9529) that are not already imposed.

(3) RESTRICTIONS ON CORRESPONDENT AND PAYABLE-THROUGH ACCOUNTS.—The President shall prohibit the opening, and prohibit or impose strict conditions on the maintaining, in the United States, of a correspondent account or payable-through account by the financial institution.

(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—

(1) TREATMENT OF RETURNS ON IMMOBILIZED RUSSIAN SOVEREIGN ASSETS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A United States or foreign financial institution holding immobilized Russian sovereign assets under the Rebuilding Economic Prosperity and Opportunity for Ukrainians Act (division F of Public Law 118–50; 22 U.S.C. 9521 note) or any other provision of law is not required to return any interest earned on those assets and due to the Russian Federation.

(B) EXCEPTION FOR INTEREST EARNED.—Subparagraph (A) shall not be construed as affecting the treatment of interest earned on the assets of persons the assets of which have been blocked under any provision of law.

(2) LOANS TO UKRAINE USING IMMOBILIZED RUSSIAN SOVEREIGN ASSETS.—Sanctions imposed under this section shall not apply with respect to payments on—

(A) the loans provided by the United States and the Group of 7 or the European Union to Ukraine that are serviced and repaid with the proceeds of immobilized Russian sovereign assets; or

(B) any loans from the United States or countries that are members of the Group of 7 or the European Union made after the date of the enactment of this Act using proceeds from immobilized Russian sovereign assets.

SEC. 104. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO OTHER ENTITIES OWNED OR CONTROLLED BY THE GOVERNMENT OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the President shall—

(1) review any entity—

(A) in which the Government of the Russian Federation may have a controlling or majority ownership interest; or

(B) that may otherwise be affiliated with the Government of the Russian Federation; and

(2) impose the sanctions described in subsection (b) with respect to an entity if the President determines that—

(A) the Government of the Russian Federation has a controlling or majority ownership interest in the entity; or

(B) the entity is otherwise affiliated with the Government of the Russian Federation.

(b) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—The President shall exercise all of the powers granted to the President under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) to the extent necessary to block and prohibit all transactions in property and interests in property of an entity described in subsection (a) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

SEC. 105. PROHIBITION ON TRANSFERS OF FUNDS INVOLVING THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided by subsection (b), effective on the date that is 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, a depository institution (as defined in section 19(b)(1)(A) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 461(b)(1)(A))) or a broker or dealer in securities registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78a et seq.) may not process transfers of funds—

(1) to or from the Government of the Russian Federation, including any entity owned by the Government of the Russian Federation; or

(2) for the direct or indirect benefit of officials of the Government of the Russian Federation.

(b) EXCEPTION.—A depository institution, broker, or dealer described in subsection (a) may process a transfer described in that subsection if the transfer arises from, and is ordinarily incident and necessary to give effect to, an underlying transaction that is authorized by a specific or general license.

SEC. 106. PROHIBITION ON LISTING OR TRADING OF RUSSIAN ENTITIES ON UNITED STATES SECURITIES EXCHANGES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall prohibit the securities of an issuer described in subsection (b) from being traded on a national securities exchange.

(b) ISSUERS.—An issuer described in this subsection is an issuer that is—

(1) an official of or individual affiliated with the Government of the Russian Federation; or

(2) an entity—

(A) in which the Government of the Russian Federation has a controlling or majority ownership interest; or

(B) that is otherwise affiliated with the Government of the Russian Federation.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ISSUER; SECURITY.—The terms ''issuer'' and ''security'' have the meanings given those terms in section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)).

(2) NATIONAL SECURITIES EXCHANGE.—The term ''national securities exchange'' means an exchange registered as a national securities exchange in accordance with section 6 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78f).

SEC. 107. PROHIBITION ON INVESTMENT BY UNITED STATES PERSONS IN THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

Effective on the date that is 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the following are prohibited:

(1) New investment in the Russian Federation by a United States person, wherever located.

(2) The exportation, reexportation, sale, or supply, directly or indirectly, from the United States, or by a United States person, wherever located, of any category of services identified by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to any person located in the Russian Federation.

(3) Any approval, financing, facilitation, or guarantee by a United States person, wherever located, of a transaction by a foreign person if the transaction by that foreign person would be prohibited by this section if performed by a United States person or within the United States.

SEC. 108. PROHIBITION ON ENERGY EXPORTS TO, AND INVESTMENT IN ENERGY SECTOR OF, THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) PROHIBITIONS ON INVESTMENT AND EXPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Effective on the date that is 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the following are prohibited:

(A) Any new investment in the energy sector of the Russian Federation by a United States person.

(B) The export, reexport, or in-country transfer to or in the Russian Federation of any energy or energy product produced in the United States.

(2) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection, the terms ''export'', ''in-country transfer'', and ''reexport'' have the meanings given those terms in section 1742 of the Export Control Reform Act of 2018 (50 U.S.C. 4801).

(b) SANCTIONS.—The President shall impose the sanctions described in section 102(e) with respect to any foreign person that the President determines knowingly sells, supplies, transfers, markets, or otherwise provides goods, services, technology, or other support that facilitates the maintenance or expansion of the production of oil, uranium, natural gas, liquefied natural gas, petroleum, petroleum products, petrochemical products, coal, or coal products for use by any person subject to sanctions under section 102 or 103.

SEC. 109. PROHIBITION ON PURCHASE OF SOVEREIGN DEBT OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION BY UNITED STATES PERSONS.

Upon the enactment of this Act, the purchase of sovereign debt of the Government of the Russian Federation by any United States person (including a United States financial institution) is prohibited.

SEC. 110. PROHIBITION ON PROVISION OF SERVICES TO SANCTIONED FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS BY INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL MESSAGING SYSTEMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the President shall—

(1) review any person that may be described in subsection (b); and

(2) impose sanctions pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) with respect to any person the President determines is described in that subsection.

(b) PERSONS DESCRIBED.—A person described in this subsection is—

(1) any entity that—

(A) operates with the intent to predominantly engage in the business of providing global financial messaging services; and

(B) is determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, as knowingly being used to circumvent any sanctions imposed under section 103 or any other provision of this title; or

(2) a leader, official, senior executive officer, or member of the board of directors of, or principal shareholder with a controlling or majority interest in, any entity described in paragraph (1).

(c) EXCEPTION.—The President may waive the imposition of sanctions under subsection (a) with respect to an entity predominantly engaged in the business of providing global financial messaging services for, directly providing such services to, or enabling or facilitating direct or indirect access to such services for, any financial institution subject to sanctions under section 103 or any other provision of this title if—

(1) the entity—

(A) is subject to a sanctions regime under its governing foreign law that requires it to eliminate the knowing provision of such services to, and the knowing enabling and facilitation of direct or indirect access to such services for, foreign financial institutions identified under such governing foreign law for purposes of that sanctions regime if the President determines that the sanctions regime under governing foreign law is not inconsistent with the economic or foreign policy interests of the United States; and

(B) has, pursuant to that sanctions regime, terminated the knowing provision of such services to, and the knowing enabling and facilitation of direct or indirect access to such services for, foreign financial institutions identified under such governing foreign law for purposes of that sanctions regime; or

(2) the entity provides significant financial messaging services to United States financial institutions, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the authority of the President pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).

SEC. 111. PROHIBITION ON IMPORTING, AND SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO, URANIUM FROM THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) IMPLEMENTATION OF PROHIBITION ON URANIUM IMPORTS FROM THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.—Upon the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall take all necessary steps to implement the requirements of section 3112A(d) of the USEC Privatization Act (42 U.S.C. 2297h–10a(d)) regarding the importation of uranium from the Russian Federation, including the importation of any uranium from Rosatom State Atomic Energy Corporation or any subsidiary or successor entity.

(b) SANCTIONS.—Beginning on the date described in section 3112A(d)(2)(C) of the USEC Privatization Act (42 U.S.C. 2297h–10a(d)(2)(C)), and every 180 days thereafter, the President shall impose sanctions described in section 102(e) with respect to any leaders, officials, senior executive officers, or members of the board of directors of, or principal shareholders with a controlling or majority interest in, Rosatom State Atomic Energy Corporation or any subsidiary or successor entity.

SEC. 112. INCREASE IN DUTIES ON GOODS IMPORTED FROM THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall, notwithstanding any other provision of law, increase the rate of duty for all goods, including oil, natural gas, liquefied natural gas, petroleum, petroleum products, petrochemical products, coal, and coal products, imported into the United States from the Russian Federation to a rate of up to 500 percent ad valorem.

(b) DUTY RATE IN ADDITION TO OTHER DUTIES, FEES, TAXES, EXACTIONS, OR CHARGES.—The rate of duty required under subsection (a) with respect to a good described in that subsection shall be in addition to any other duty, fee, tax, exaction, or charge applicable with respect to the good, including any duty imposed under title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671 et seq.), section 122, 201, or 301 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2132, 2251, and 2411), or section 232 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (19 U.S.C. 1862).

SEC. 113. DUTIES ON COUNTRIES THAT PURCHASE RUSSIAN-ORIGIN CRUDE OIL OR NATURAL GAS OR FACILITATE SANCTIONS EVASION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall, notwithstanding any other provision of law, increase the rate of duty for all goods imported into the United States from a country described in subsection (c) (and only from a country described in subsection (c)) to a rate of up to 100 percent ad valorem.

(b) MODIFICATION TO RATE OF DUTY.—At any time after the initial imposition of duties under subsection (a) or (e), the United States Trade Representative shall modify or adjust any rate of duty imposed under subsection (a) or (e) to a rate greater than zero and up to 100 percent ad valorem upon submitting a written determination to the appropriate congressional committees that a country described in subsection (c) has taken significant steps—

(1) to increase the importation, sale, supply, transfer, or purchase of crude oil or natural gas that originated in the Russian Federation; or

(2) to decrease or cease engaging in the importation, sale, supply, transfer, or purchase of such crude oil or natural gas.

(c) COUNTRY DESCRIBED.—A country described in this subsection is a foreign country that—

(1)(A) knowingly made new purchases of crude oil or natural gas that originated in the Russian Federation on a date that is on or after 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) was among the 5 largest importers, by total volume, of crude oil or natural gas that originated in the Russian Federation during the most recent 12-month period preceding the date of the enactment of this Act; or

(2) was among the top 5 countries facilitating Russian oil sanctions evasion during the most recent 12-month period preceding the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) EXCEPTION.—A duty shall not be imposed under this section with respect to goods imported from a country described in subsection (c)(1) for the importation by that country of natural gas that originated in the Russian Federation if—

(1) that country's total imports of natural gas that originated in the Russian Federation during the 12-month period described in subsection (c)(1)(B) were less than 15 percent of the total annual exports of natural gas from the Russian Federation during that period; and

(2) that country has taken significant steps to reduce its imports of natural gas that originated in the Russian Federation.

(e) SUBSEQUENT DETERMINATIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the initial imposition of duties under subsection (a), and every 180 days thereafter, the United States Trade Representative, in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Energy, shall—

(1) determine, based on the most recent 12-month period preceding the determination, the countries that are—

(A) the 5 largest importers of crude oil, by total volume, originating in the Russian Federation; and

(B) the 5 largest importers of natural gas, by total volume, originating in the Russian Federation; and

(2) impose duties pursuant to subsection (a) with respect to goods imported from those countries.

(f) DUTY RATE IN ADDITION TO OTHER DUTIES, FEES, TAXES, EXACTIONS, OR CHARGES.—A rate of duty imposed under this section with respect to a good imported from a country described in subsection (c) shall be in addition to any other duty, fee, tax, exaction, or charge applicable with respect to the good, including any duty imposed under title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671 et seq.), section 122, 201, or 301 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2132, 2251, and 2411), or section 232 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (19 U.S.C. 1862).

(g) METHODOLOGY, DOCUMENTATION, AND REPORTS.—

(1) REPORTS REQUIRED.—Not later than 10 days before imposing a duty under subsection (a) or (e), or modifying or adjusting the rate of such a duty under subsection (b), the President or the United States Trade Representative shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a written justification for the duty that—

(A) provides a substantive rationale for the determination of the rate of duty imposed under subsection (a) or (e) or the modification or adjustment made pursuant to subsection (b), as the case may be; and

(B) details the methodology used to determine that the country subject to the duty is a country described in subsection (c).

(2) DETERMINATIONS OF IMPORTS OF CRUDE OIL AND NATURAL GAS.—For the purposes of determining whether a country is an importer of crude oil or natural gas described in subsection (c)(1)—

(A) crude oil is the substance described in Harmonized System code 2709; and

(B) natural gas is the substance described in Harmonized System code 2711.

(h) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Notwithstanding section 115, nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize the imposition of duties with respect to goods imported from any country not expressly described in subsection (c) or the Russian Federation.

(i) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(A) the Committee on Finance, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives.

(2) COUNTRIES FACILITATING RUSSIAN OIL SANCTIONS EVASION.—The term ''countries facilitating Russian oil sanctions evasion'' means countries in which foreign persons are located or are operating, or under the laws of which foreign persons are organized, if such foreign persons are knowingly engaging in transactions, activities, or services that circumvent, or assist any third party to circumvent, any sanction related to oil that originated in the Russian Federation, including by—

(A) providing significant financial or other support for the purchase, loading, or shipment of oil that originated in the Russian Federation and is subject to sanctions; and

(B) engaging in any transaction, activity, or service related to a shadow fleet vessel that transported, is transporting, or is attempting to transport oil that originated in the Russian Federation and is subject to sanctions.

(3) NATURAL GAS.—Except as provided by subsection (g)(2), the term ''natural gas'' means natural gas, whether unmixed or any mixture of natural and artificial gas, including liquefied natural gas.

SEC. 114. EXCEPTIONS.

(a) EXCEPTION FOR HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Sanctions and other measures under this title shall not apply to—

(A) the conduct or facilitation of a transaction for the provision of agricultural commodities, food, medicine, medical devices, humanitarian assistance, or for humanitarian purposes; or

(B) transactions that are necessary for, or related to, the activities described in subparagraph (A).

(2) RULE OF INTERPRETATION.—This subsection should be interpreted to apply to an entity carrying out any internationally recognized agreement with the Government of Ukraine for the sale or provision of agricultural commodities, food, medicine, or medical devices to and from Ukraine unless the President determines that the agreement is being used to evade sanctions imposed by the United States, the United Kingdom, the European Union, or the Group of 7.

(3) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY.—The term ''agricultural commodity'' has the meaning given such term in section 102 of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5602).

(B) MEDICAL DEVICE.—The term ''medical device'' has the meaning given the term ''device'' in section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321).

(C) MEDICINE.—The term ''medicine'' has the meaning given the term ''drug'' in section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321).

(b) EXCEPTION FOR INTELLIGENCE AND LAW ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES.—This title shall not apply with respect to activities subject to the reporting requirements under title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3091 et seq.) or to carry out or assist any authorized intelligence or law enforcement activities of the United States.

(c) EXCEPTION TO COMPLY WITH INTERNATIONAL OBLIGATIONS.—Sanctions under this title shall not apply to the admission or parole of an alien into the United States if such admission or parole is necessary to comply with United States obligations under the Agreement between the United Nations and the United States of America regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success June 26, 1947, and entered into force November 21, 1947, or under the Convention on Consular Relations, done at Vienna April 24, 1963, and entered into force March 19, 1967, or other international obligations.

(d) EXCEPTION TO COMPLY WITH CIVILIAN NUCLEAR COOPERATION AGREEMENTS.—This title shall not apply to activities carried out under an agreement for cooperation between the United States and the Russian Federation entered into under section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2153).

(e) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN IMPORTS OF LOW-ENRICHED URANIUM FOR NUCLEAR REACTORS.—This title shall not apply with respect to imports into the United States of low-enriched uranium described in paragraph (1) of section 3112A(d) of the USEC Privatization Act (42 U.S.C. 2297h–10a(d)) or medical isotopes for which a waiver has been issued under paragraph (2) of that section.

(f) EXCEPTION FOR OFFICIAL GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.—This title shall not apply to transactions for the conduct of official business of the United States Government (including transactions necessary for the operation of the United States embassy or United States consulates in the Russian Federation) or the United Nations (including its specialized agencies, programs, funds, and related organizations) by employees, grantees, or contractors thereof.

(g) EXCEPTION FOR NON-RUSSIAN OIL THAT TRANSITS RUSSIAN TERRITORY.—This title shall not apply to oil originating in a country other than the Russian Federation that transits the territory of the Russian Federation, or to any entity that transports such oil, for export to international markets.

(h) GENERAL LICENSES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—This title shall not apply with respect to a United States person that is operating under the terms of a general license issued by the Department of the Treasury before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this title shall be construed to affect the terms of a general license described in paragraph (1), the authority of United States persons to continue to operate under such a license, or the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to extend or issue new general licenses.

(i) EXCEPTION FOR WINDDOWN OPERATIONS.—During the 270-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, sanctions under this title shall not apply with respect to—

(1) an activity related to the winddown or divestiture of operations in the Russian Federation by an entity located in the Russian Federation that is not owned or controlled, directly or indirectly, by a Russian person; or

(2) an entity located in the Russian Federation that is owned or controlled, directly or indirectly, by a United States person if that United States person is engaged in good faith efforts to winddown or divest operations in the Russian Federation, including providing ongoing operational support to wind down or divest operations.

(j) EXCEPTION FOR SAFETY OF VESSELS AND CREW.—Sanctions under this title shall not apply with respect to a person providing provisions to a vessel otherwise subject to sanctions under this title if such provisions are intended—

(1) for the safety and care of the crew aboard the vessel;

(2) for the protection of human life aboard the vessel; or

(3) to avoid any environmental or other significant damage.

(k) EXCEPTION RELATING TO ACTIVITIES OF THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—This title shall not apply with respect to activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this title shall be construed to authorize the imposition of any sanction or other condition, limitation, restriction, prohibition, or other measure, that directly or indirectly impedes the supply by any entity of the Russian Federation of any product or service, or the procurement of such product or service by any contractor or subcontractor of the United States or any other entity, relating to or in connection with any space launch conducted for—

(A) the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; or

(B) any other non-Department of Defense customer.

SEC. 115. WAIVER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President may, subject to subsection (b), waive the application of any sanctions provision with respect to a foreign person, any restriction with respect to a person, or any duty under this title.

(b) REPORTS REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Before issuing a waiver under subsection (a), the President shall submit to Congress—

(A) a certification in writing that the issuance of the waiver is in the national interests of the United States; and

(B) a report explaining the basis for the certification.

(2) CONSOLIDATION OF REPORTS.—If the President is issuing more than one waiver of a section of this title, the President may include, in one report submitted under paragraph (1), the certifications and explanations required by that paragraph with respect to each such waiver, as long as all of such certifications and explanations relate to a waiver of the same section of this title.

(3) FORM OF REPORT.—Each report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

(4) APPLICABILITY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CERTAIN DUTY RATES.—The President is not required to submit a report under paragraph (1) for a modification or adjustment of a rate of duty pursuant to section 113(b). This paragraph does not modify or negate the requirement to submit a written determination required by section 113(b) or a report required by section 113(g)(1).

SEC. 116. SANCTIONS IMPLEMENTATION AND PENALTIES.

(a) IMPLEMENTATION.—The President may exercise all authorities provided under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) to carry out sections 102 through 111.

(b) PENALTIES.—The penalties provided for in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) shall apply to any person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of any prohibition under any of sections 102 through 111, or an order or regulation prescribed under any of such sections, to the same extent that such penalties apply to a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of that section.

SEC. 117. TERMINATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), the President may terminate the application of any sanction with respect to a foreign person, any restriction with respect to a person, or any duty under this title, if the President submits to Congress a report—

(1) certifying in writing that—

(A) in the case of the termination of the application of a sanction, restriction, or duty with respect to a Russian person or the Russian Federation, the Russian Federation has—

(i) signed a peace agreement that is accepted by the free and independent Government of Ukraine; and

(ii) ceased all military hostilities against and any activities to overthrow, dismantle, and subvert the Government of Ukraine; or

(B) in the case of the termination of the application of a sanction, restriction, or duty with respect to any foreign person or foreign country (other than a Russian person or the Russian Federation)—

(i) the foreign person or the government of the foreign country, as the case may be, is not engaging in the activity that was the basis for the sanctions or other measures being terminated; and

(ii) the President has received reliable assurances that the foreign person or the government of the foreign country, as the case may be, will not knowingly engage in activity subject to sanctions or other measures under this title in the future; and

(2) that includes, in the case of a report not relating to the termination of a duty under section 112 or 113, a determination of whether the termination is intended to significantly alter United States foreign policy with regard to the Russian Federation.

(b) PERIOD FOR REVIEW BY CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—During the period of 30 calendar days beginning on the date on which the President submits a report under subsection (a) with respect to the termination of the application of a sanction, restriction, or duty under this title, the termination shall not take effect. If, after the end of that period, a joint resolution of disapproval with respect to the termination has not been enacted into law under subsection (c), the termination may take effect.

(2) CONSIDERATION BY CONGRESS.—During the period described in paragraph (1), the appropriate committee of the Senate and the appropriate committee of the House of Representatives should, as appropriate, hold hearings and briefings and otherwise obtain information in order to fully review the report.

(3) EXCEPTION.—The period for congressional review under paragraph (1) of a report required to be submitted under subsection (a) shall be 60 calendar days if the report is submitted on or after July 10 and on or before September 7 in any calendar year.

(c) JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—

(1) JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ''joint resolution of disapproval'' means only a joint resolution of either House of Congress the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: ''That Congress disapproves of the termination of the application of section ____ of the Lindsey O. Graham Sanctioning Russia and Iran Act of 2026, with respect to which the President submitted a report on ______.'', with the first blank space being filled with the appropriate section number and the second blank space being filled with the appropriate date.

(2) INTRODUCTION.—During the period of 30 calendar days provided for under subsection (b)(1), including any additional period as applicable under the exception provided in subsection (b)(3), a joint resolution of disapproval may be introduced—

(A) in the House of Representatives, by the majority leader or the minority leader; and

(B) in the Senate, by the majority leader (or a designee of the majority leader) or the minority leader (or a designee of the minority leader).

(3) CONSIDERATION IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

(A) REPORTING AND DISCHARGE.—Any committee of the House of Representatives to which a joint resolution of disapproval is referred shall report it to the House of Representatives without amendment not later than 10 calendar days after the date of referral. If a committee fails to report the joint resolution within that period, the committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution and the joint resolution shall be referred to the appropriate calendar.

(B) PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.—After each committee authorized to consider a joint resolution of disapproval reports it to the House of Representatives or has been discharged from its consideration, it shall be in order to move to proceed to consider the joint resolution of disapproval in the House of Representatives. All points of order against the motion are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion. The motion shall not be debatable. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is disposed of shall not be in order.

(C) CONSIDERATION.—The joint resolution of disapproval shall be considered as read. All points of order against the joint resolution of disapproval and against its consideration are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution of disapproval to its passage without intervening motion except 2 hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. A motion to reconsider the vote on passage of the joint resolution of disapproval shall not be in order.

(4) CONSIDERATION IN THE SENATE.—

(A) COMMITTEE REFERRAL.—A joint resolution of disapproval introduced in the Senate shall be referred to the appropriate committee of the Senate.

(B) REPORTING AND DISCHARGE.—If the appropriate committee of the Senate has not reported the joint resolution within 10 calendar days after the date of referral of the joint resolution, that committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution and the joint resolution shall be placed on the appropriate calendar.

(C) PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.—Notwithstanding Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, it is in order at any time after the appropriate committee of the Senate reports a joint resolution of disapproval to the Senate or has been discharged from consideration of such a joint resolution to move to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion to proceed is not debatable. The motion is not subject to a motion to postpone. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. Approval by the Senate of a motion to proceed to a joint resolution of disapproval shall require the affirmative vote of three-fifths of Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn.

(D) CONSIDERATION.—Consideration in the Senate of a joint resolution of disapproval and of all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith shall not exceed a total of 10 hours, which shall be divided equally between the majority and minority leaders or their designees. Any debatable motion or appeal is debatable for not to exceed 1 hour, to be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the motion or appeal.

(E) NO AMENDMENTS OR MOTIONS.—An amendment to a joint resolution of disapproval, a motion to postpone, a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint resolution is not in order.

(F) VOTE ON JOINT RESOLUTION.—If the Senate has voted to proceed to a joint resolution of disapproval, the vote on approval of the joint resolution shall occur immediately following the conclusion of consideration of the joint resolution, and a single quorum call if requested. Approval by the Senate of a joint resolution of disapproval shall require the affirmative vote of three-fifths of Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn.

(G) CONSIDERATION OF VETO MESSAGES.—Consideration in the Senate of any veto message with respect to a joint resolution of disapproval, including all debatable motions and appeals in connection with the joint resolution, shall be limited to 10 hours, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees.

(5) TREATMENT OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION IN SENATE.—

(A) If, before the passage by the Senate of a joint resolution of disapproval, the Senate receives an identical joint resolution from the House of Representatives, the following procedures shall apply:

(i) That joint resolution shall not be referred to a committee.

(ii) With respect to that joint resolution—

(I) the procedure in the Senate shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the House of Representatives; but

(II) the vote on passage shall be on the joint resolution from the House of Representatives.

(B) If the Senate passes a joint resolution of disapproval before receiving a joint resolution of disapproval from the House of Representatives, the joint resolution passed by the Senate shall be held at the desk pending receipt of the joint resolution from the House of Representatives. Upon receipt of a joint resolution from the House of Representatives that is identical to the joint resolution passed by the Senate, the Senate shall proceed to its immediate consideration and the joint resolution shall be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

(C) If a joint resolution of disapproval is received from the House, and no companion joint resolution has been introduced in the Senate, the Senate procedures under this subsection shall apply to the House joint resolution.

(6) RULES OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATE.—This subsection is enacted by Congress—

(A) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such is deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, and supersedes other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent with such rules; and

(B) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

(7) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—The term ''appropriate committee of the House of Representatives'' means—

(i) with respect to the termination of a duty under section 112 or 113, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives;

(ii) with respect to the termination of any sanction or restriction under any of sections 102 through 111 that is intended to significantly alter United States foreign policy with regard to the Russian Federation, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; or

(iii) with respect to the termination of any sanction or restriction under any of sections 102 through 111 that is not intended to significantly alter United States foreign policy with regard to the Russian Federation, the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives.

(B) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE.—The term ''appropriate committee of the Senate'' means—

(i) with respect to the termination of a duty under section 112 or 113, the Committee on Finance of the Senate;

(ii) with respect to the termination of any sanction or restriction under any of sections 102 through 111 that is intended to significantly alter United States foreign policy with regard to the Russian Federation, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; or

(iii) with respect to the termination of any sanction or restriction under any of sections 102 through 111 that is not intended to significantly alter United States foreign policy with regard to the Russian Federation, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

TITLE II—OTHER MATTERS

SEC. 201. EXTENSION OF THE IRAN SANCTIONS ACT OF 1996.

Section 13(b) of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended by striking ''2026'' and inserting ''2031''.

SEC. 202. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this division, or the application of any such provision to any person or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of the provisions of this division, and the application of those provisions to any other person or circumstance, shall not be affected.

SEC. 203. SUNSET.

This division (other than section 201) shall terminate on the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

DIVISION B—SUPPORTING EARLY-CHILDHOOD EDUCATORS' DEDUCTIONS

Amend the title so as to read: ''An Act to impose sanctions and other measures with respect to the Russian Federation, as championed by the late Senator Lindsey O. Graham, and for other purposes.''.

MOTION TO CONCUR

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to concur in the Senate amendments to H.R. 5334 at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. McCaul of Texas moves that the House concur in the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution Number 1530, the motion shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on this measure.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is a critical time in history, a time my friend Lindsey Graham described as a magic moment, a moment that we cannot afford to waste.

America's adversaries—Russia, China, and North Korea—are working together to threaten the free world. Make no mistake, they are watching what we do here today because they know that they will suffer if this bill is passed.

Senator Lindsey Graham understood these global threats well, and that is why we spent more than a year working together on this bill. He brought Republicans and Democrats together and secured the White House's support.

Today, we have a chance to finish his work, to help end this war in Europe, and to project peace through strength around the globe.

I am proud to champion the Lindsey O. Graham Sanctioning Russia and Iran Act of 2026, and I thank Mr. HOYER and our colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their strong support.

For me, this is also personal. Lindsey Graham was my friend and my mentor. We shared a fundamental belief: that America is strongest at home when it projects strength abroad.

This legislation does exactly that. It targets the money that fuels Russia's war machine. It sanctions Russian officials and oligarchs, banks, and financial institutions, and the shadow fleet that helps keep Russian energy moving.

Through precisely targeted tariffs, it also punishes countries providing financial support for the deadliest war in Europe since World War II. Why? Because, as we have heard from President Zelenskyy's team, you can evade sanctions, which the Russians have done for years, but you cannot evade tariffs.

In fact, President Zelenskyy's sanction expert, whom I personally met with in Kyiv, told me: Tariffs are a powerful way to amplify the impact of sanctions. That is why they are the teeth of this bill.

Pursuant to the bill's rule of construction, only the top five importers of Russian oil will be tariffed. If a country falls off of the top-five list, the tariffs are removed. It incentivizes a race to the bottom.

These countries have a choice to make about whether they will continue to sustain Putin's aggression. Putin believes he can keep financing this war indefinitely. We need to change that calculation and bleed his regime economically dry, because the Kremlin has murdered thousands of civilians in cold blood. They've bombed sacred churches and schools. They have kidnapped countless children, tortured and indoctrinated them, and sent them to fight on the front lines against their own country.

We have a moral responsibility here today, Mr. Speaker, to bring an end to this suffering, but this is also a matter of national security. If Putin is rewarded for invading a sovereign nation, if he succeeds, he has already told us he will go further. His army will move into Moldova, to Georgia, and the Baltic states.

Just like Putin wants to bring back the power of the Soviet Union, also President Xi of China wants to restore Imperial China. These dictators must be deterred before it is too late.

This legislation also extends sanctions on Iran, which are set to expire at the end of this year.

Again, this is all tied together, and in 2024, I spoke about the Iranian drones being used by Russia to kill Ukrainians. In return, Russia is reportedly providing target information to the IRGC.

We cannot look at one part of this threat and ignore the others. This bill leverages our economic strength to make it harder for these regimes to finance aggression.

Lindsey Graham once said that this bill would be his greatest achievement. I can think of no better way, Mr. Speaker, to honor his life and his legacy than by passing these tough sanctions, which will force Mr. Putin to the negotiating table.

Evil is on the march. History is calling, and now is the time to act.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise regrettably to oppose the Lindsey O. Graham Sanctioning Russia and Iran Act. Why? It is a magic moment. It is a moment that we need to take right now. It is a moment that we need to move forward with.

Here is why I have to oppose it. Number one, this bill wasn't written by Lindsey Graham. It was written by Donald Trump and Donald Trump's attorneys. We know his attorneys did it because he doesn't know how to write himself, but they wrote this bill.

□ 0920

I say to my Ukrainian friends and to the Ukrainian people: We need to do more.

Just last night, we saw Russia again attack the electric grid of Ukraine. These sanctions that are proposed now, the President of the United States, if this were urgent, could do them right now.

When you look at the facts and the evidence, what has the President done in all of this time to help Ukraine? He has not done one thing from the very beginning, when he told Volodymyr Zelenskyy that he has no cards, to the time that we gave the red carpet to Putin when he came to the United States.

The fact of the matter is, if we just look at recent history, just 2 weeks ago, what did the President do? He took the Finance Minister of Russia to the G20 finance meeting, without any notice to the rest of the Finance Ministers.

He has removed sanctions on Russia. Just last week, he removed some sanctions off of Russia.

I am saying to my Ukrainian friends: I don't want to give you false hope. I want to give you real hope.

Just yesterday, in the Rules Committee, because I wanted to work something out so that we can make sure that we get something done, I asked for some simple things that would give relief to Ukrainians right now. Do you know what would help them right now? Having Patriot missiles to defend themselves from these attacks would help. I put an amendment in. Let's give them $15 billion so that they can purchase and get something that would help themselves and protect their grid.

In fact, this House has passed a bill that would have given the Ukrainians money to fix their grid, money to buy more munitions, and tougher sanctions in this bill. We sent it over to the Senate. Unfortunately, the Senate did nothing but go through Mr. Trump and say: You write the bill, and then we will get it passed in the Senate.

We said let's make sure that our friends in the European Union will not be subject to tariffs. In this bill, my friends from Europe can be tariffed. Even though we have done nothing, no supplemental to Ukraine, they have stood up and made sure that Ukraine had what it needed to continue this war that has been thrust upon them by the Russians. Let's make sure that our allies and friends cannot be tariffed. I said let's put that in the bill. No, that can't happen. I said, okay, let's have stronger waivers. Let's make sure this President, who has done nothing for Ukraine—there are stronger waivers.

We are supposed to be a separate but equal branch of government, not just concede to the executive branch, no matter who is in the White House. Let's make stronger waivers if we really care about the Ukrainian people, so that no President can waive the sanctions that we are putting on Russia. No, can't do that. No secondary tariff.

Now, this is to the American people, because we know what is happening with this economy. The President has said himself, proudly, that he is the tariff man. That is what he calls himself.

We see what is happening to the economy in the United States of America. We see what is happening with our friend and ally to the north of us, Canada. This President has always said he loves tariffs, and we know the history of what he has done with reference to tariffs to our European allies and our allies everywhere.

So, no, I have to come in opposition today to this bill. It does not give the Ukrainians what they need at this moment. They need to have the munitions to protect themselves and continue to do what they are doing to preserve their own country and democracy.

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

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, it is no secret the ranking member and I are good friends. We will disagree with civility.

The President did sanction the VTB Bank, one of the largest banks in Russia, just yesterday.

With respect to broad, sweeping tariff authority, that is absolutely a false argument. The fact is, the rule construction in the bill says: "Nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the imposition of duties . . . from any country not expressly described."

Ambassador Greer, the U.S. Trade Representative, sent a letter to Senator WARNOCK that got his approval in the Senate—an 86–11 vote, by the way. It basically said that, absent legal basis, such duties cannot be maintained. In other words, you cannot go beyond the prescribed language in the statute—the top five importers of Russian energy. This does not provide broad, sweeping tariff authority. That is a fiction.

With respect to support, President Zelenskyy supports this bill. I was at the Ukrainian Embassy last night with the Ukrainian Acting Foreign Minister and the President of the European Commission, so to say that Europe doesn't support this is absolutely false. The EU Ambassador to the United Nations and President Biden's former Ambassador to Ukraine support this, as well as all NATO countries. I would address that, if I could, head-on.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the letter from Ambassador Greer to Senator WARNOCK.

THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
Washington, August 6, 2026.

Hon. RAPHAEL WARNOCK,
U.S. Senate,
Washington DC.

DEAR SENATOR WARNOCK: Regarding our conversation on § 113, the legal basis to maintain, modify, or adjust the rate of duty specified in subsection (a) exists only where a country meets the description in subsection (c), including countries identified in subsequent determinations made pursuant to subsection (e). Absent this legal basis, such duties cannot be maintained.

Sincerely,
AMBASSADOR JAMIESON L. GREER,
United States Trade Representative.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER).

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this critical legislation. I congratulate Representative MCCAUL for his strong advocacy for Ukraine and for bringing this piece of legislation to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, 9,374, that is the number of Ukrainian civilians killed or wounded in the first 6 months of this year by Russia's relentless barrage of missiles and drones—9,374.

Mr. Speaker, 68,147, that is the number of Ukrainian civilians killed or injured since Vladimir Putin launched his full-scale war of aggression in 2022.

For over 4 years, Russia's war has taken a devastating amount of human lives, destroyed cities and communities, displaced families, and destabilized economies far from Russia's borders. The consequences have been felt around the world, from disruptions to critical supply chains to Russian sabotage of operations in Europe that have increasingly threatened NATO security and global stability.

Mr. Speaker, after more than 1.4 million Russian casualties, one fact is clear: Putin has chosen to continue this war regardless of the cost in Russian lives. Russia can only continue fighting because of those who choose to fund Putin's war machine by buying cheap Russian energy. The economic lifelines that keep the Kremlin's war machine running must be restricted.

This legislation gives us the opportunity to strike at those networks and impose real consequences on Russia and those who continue financing Putin's war. Now is the time for action.

As an original cosponsor of this House legislation, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

□ 0930

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

I just want to let my good friend, Mr. MCCAUL, know that, yes, I know that the President did sanction a bank that had already been sanctioned previously, so it was just something for show because this bank had already been sanctioned before yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), the ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, there is very little that the chairman said that I disagree with. However, amnesia apparently has overtaken this debate.

Do we remember the humiliation that President Trump and the Vice President offered to President Zelenskyy in the Oval Office? Is there a moment of clarity here as to whose side we are really on? Every Democrat in this House is supportive of President Zelenskyy and Ukraine.

In memory of Ronald Reagan, can Republicans say today that they are in support of Ukraine, given the position that President Trump has taken with ambiguity as it relates to Ukraine and their heroism?

Remember 5 years ago, President Trump said: I will end that war on the first day that I am President? Well, he couldn't find it in terms of national purpose to even come to their aid with military equipment.

What happened to a Republican Party that was steadfast about Russian aggression? What happened to this notion that, since Truman, we were all on the same side in this institution as it related to Russian aggression?

Standing up to Russia united this institution, united both parties until President Trump said that he could solve the war between Ukraine and Russia and more than once encouraged Vladimir Putin and that aggression that I have just outlined.

We are for Ukraine, and we are for Zelenskyy. What we are not for is giving more tariff authority to this President. There is no guarantee in this legislation that the President could not use these tariffs against Ukraine if he decided to do so. There is no guarantee in this legislation that the President can impose these tariffs on Russia with the enthusiasm that our friends on the other side have offered.

What is stunning about this, this morning, the European Union is offering admittance to Canada to join the European Union.

We don't like the result of a Presidential election in Brazil? We will impose tariffs. We don't like the way somebody across the globe speaks to us? We will impose tariffs.

When Ronald Reagan left the Presidency, the average tariff was 2.7 percent, and these tariffs are driving costs up for everybody in America today. Just go through a supermarket aisle to see what these tariffs have done.

The use of a tariff here at one time was selective and threatening. You used it to make a point. Now it is embedded in American foreign policy based upon our likes and our dislikes.

We are for Ukraine. We are against giving this President more tariff authority.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I know the gentleman does not like the President of the United States, but this is about Congress exercising its Article I authorities pursuant to the Supreme Court's recent ruling that we have the authority to issue tariffs, which are issued in a very targeted manner against Russian energy being imported by the top five countries.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAST), the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman Emeritus McCaul for yielding. I am proud to see him up here managing this bill, proud to see him back at the podium. I thank him for his work on Russian sanctions not just for now, but for a long time. It has been incredible work.

I did walk in just in time to hear the ranking member talk about that this bill doesn't give Ukraine what it needs right now, and that is why they can't vote on it. That couldn't be further from the truth. I will just quote President Zelenskyy right here: ''Very grateful to the U.S. Senate''—the U.S. House—''and to everyone who supports Ukraine. . . . [It] helps increase pressure on the aggressor to bring this insane Russian war against our independence and our people to an end.'' He said he ''appreciates all the support the United States is providing to Ukraine.'' That is just to quote President Zelenskyy.

Apparently, the ranking member doesn't know any more about what Ukraine needs than what the United States of America needs in this respect.

However, the late Senator Graham, I want to talk about his bill right now. He was a stalwart defender of freedom and liberty, and this bill is a very fitting tribute to Senator Graham.

China is very important in this piece of legislation. China is not a bystander in the Russian war against Ukraine. It is helping sustain the machinery that keeps this Russian war of aggression going. China supplies Russia with drone engines, military and commercial drones, missile components, semiconductors, machine tools, ball bearings, explosive precursors, and every other critical industrial good that Russia needs in order to prosecute this war and fight the Ukrainians.

Chinese companies have also provided Russia with satellite imagery, supporting their military operations. At the same time, China has become a critical customer for Russian energy. Last year alone, China purchased nearly $64 billion in Russian oil and gas. That revenue is the revenue that gives the Kremlin the resources it needs to go out there and fight the war. This matters beyond Ukraine.

China is also Iran's largest customer of oil, providing Tehran with a major source of revenue despite U.S. sanctions. Reauthorizing Iran sanctions would preserve the ability of the United States to pressure companies and financial networks that are sustaining Iran's oil exports.

The message should be clear: America will not allow our adversaries to build stronger military partnerships by exploiting our markets or exploiting the United States' financial system. If China wants access to the Western economy, it should not simultaneously help finance and equip governments that threaten that international security.

I do urge swift passage of this bill. In that, I would just say one other thing about the previous administration. Zelenskyy was very clear about the previous administration as well when he said to them: Listen, the fight is here. He meant the fight is in Ukraine. The fight is here, it is in Ukraine.

They need ammunition. They don't need a ride. Democrats were trying to get Zelenskyy to run away from the fight, like they are constantly running away from fights that need to be had. Zelenskyy was standing strong, saying the fight is there, he is not going to run away.

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

Mr. Speaker, I remind the chairman that it was the Republicans that decided that we would not have a supplemental that would keep the Ukrainians armed with what they need.

It was them that decided that we could not put the money in the budget to continue funding them because they said they would not do it. I was in those meetings at that particular time in the White House arguing to get more money for Ukraine.

Let me just say one other thing. The President will be meeting with Mr. Xi next week. Let's see if he talks about sanctioning China for it buying oil from Russia next week. The President has had the power to put sanctions on China right now. We don't need this bill to do it. The President of the United States could put sanctions on China right now. Let's see what he does next week.

I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), a member of the Ukrainian Caucus.

□ 0940

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, the day after Putin's tanks rolled into Ukraine, I filed the very first sanctions legislation against Russia, some of which became law. Most every day since then, I have proudly worn this pin to symbolize the need for Americans and all people around the world concerned with freedom to stand with Ukrainian patriots and fight Russian war criminals.

As Putin has terrorized Ukrainian civilians from kindergarten to nursing homes, no American—no American—has done more to help him than Donald J. Trump. At his insistence, American assistance has been reduced by 99 percent. He withheld hundreds of millions of dollars appropriated by this Congress. He has continually humiliated Zelenskyy. Most recently, he has insisted that the price of diesel isn't caused by the Trump reckless war with Iran, but by Zelenskyy.

As Ukrainian families are now preparing for another cold, deadly winter, what are the Trumps doing?

Donald Trump, Jr., is down on a Bahamian island in a celebration financed by Putin's favorite oligarch whom he has just decorated.

For months this year, Trump suspended any and all sanctions on Russian oil, and now this bill proposes to give him even more power, though he won't use all the power he already has. In fact, for some reason, only Putin, probably the only person in the world whom Trump has not found some reason to criticize, has escaped sanctions. This bill is not about Ukraine, it is about giving Trump the power that the Supreme Court said he used unlawfully.

This is the same tariff authority which this very month Trump said he would use against 99 other countries, not because of their conduct, but if his appointee to the Federal Reserve Board did not lower interest rates instead of doing something about Trumpflation that all of us are beginning to feel.

This bill is a tariff notice with Russia written right there on the memo line, billed to our allies, but it is American families who will be paying for this bill with their groceries, their auto parts, their lumber, and much more.

When it comes to Putin, for some weird reason, Trump's pen always runs dry, but when it comes to tariffs, his favorite word in the dictionary, it never stops. Republicans blocked every single Democratic amendment to make this a genuine Ukrainian bill instead of a bill that helped Trump. They wouldn't tighten the waiver. They wouldn't protect our allies, and they would not strip out the unrelated tariff provisions.

I understand that many Ukrainians have been intimidated and threatened to support this bill or lose the little help the United States is currently providing, but Ukraine does not need a symbolic vote. They need the air defense interceptors Trump won't provide. They need the real economic help that he has delayed. They need the respect and earnest support that will allow them to prevail.

Let's stand with Ukraine, stand up to Putin, and don't hand Trump a trade war weapon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOLDMAN of Texas). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOGGETT. Let's stand with Ukraine. Let's stand up to Putin, and let's not hand Trump another trade war weapon that is dressed up in the beautiful blue and gold Ukrainian colors.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond to my friend from Texas.

The economist, Simon Johnson, the 2024 winner of the Nobel Memorial Prize in Economic Sciences, said: This bill will help reduce global instability, lower energy prices, and make life more affordable. It will end Russia's full-scale invasion of Ukraine. It is entirely within the power of the United States Government to make this happen.

With respect to my good friend, Mr. MEEKS, China is number one in the bull's eye targeted in this bill by terrorists which operate as secondary sanctions.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL), who is the chairman of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. MCCAUL, and I thank Chairman MAST for their work.

Mr. Speaker, for the past decade, and certainly since February 2022, I have consistently advocated for arming the Ukrainians and placing effective sanctions on Russia.

My record of supporting Ukraine is strong.

Unfortunately, today we are, once again, in my view, presented with a bill that certainly could be better designed, and those points have been made. For example, the sanctions provisions in this bill lack full strategic discipline.

The secondary bank sanctions in this bill only target foreign national institutions doing business with sanctioned Russian banks, which can be irrelevant when Russia is clearing energy transactions offshore.

Markets have shown little reaction to the bill in terms of the Urals crude price to the Brent price. I share concerns that the tariffs in the bill could backfire. They could harm our trading partners while sparing the main importers of Russian oil like China.

The risk of the bill is that an important economy like China could be spared, but tariffs could be used aggressively on smaller U.S. allies.

In my view, on these financial points, Congressman NUNN's PEACE Act, which the Financial Services Committee passed virtually unanimously on a bipartisan basis, would be a better design.

The bill would cut off Russian energy revenues and channel billions of Russian money to help Ukrainians.

Despite these design shortcomings I have outlined, I urge a ''yes'' vote today.

I also urge this House floor to bring the PEACE Act up on suspension, and let's really stick it to the Russians. We want to deliver today a loud, resounding message to the Kremlin: End this war. Get out of Ukraine. Focus on rebuilding your shattered international reputation and your destroyed economy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I thank Mr. MCCAUL for his persistent leadership.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. AMO), who is the vice ranking member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. AMO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, Russia invaded Ukraine. Vladimir Putin is waging an illegal war against a democratic nation. Russia should be sanctioned, and Ukraine should be supported, but this bill is not the way to do it.

President Trump already can sanction Russia and the companies, individuals, and vessels funding Putin's war machine. He has chosen not to use that authority, so that means he has had ample opportunity to support Ukraine, but he chooses not to.

In fact, the sanctions in this bill before us can still be waived by the President whenever he wants.

What this bill does is give Trump sweeping new power to impose tariffs. That means it is: power to hike prices on Americans with more erratic tariffs; power to hurt economic growth with more erratic tariffs; and power to further destroy our alliances with more erratic tariffs.

Trump already thinks he has power to impose tariffs on anyone and everything. On so-called liberation day, he hiked illegal tariffs worldwide, including on a remote island of penguins.

Where is the one place he didn't tariff?

It is Russia.

That irony is not lost on me and the Rhode Islanders know who pays for Trump's tariffs: We do.

The last thing Rhode Islanders need is another Trump tariff driving up the cost of groceries, energy, and everyday goods. We can stand with Ukraine without giving President Trump another weapon to raise prices on American families. We don't need to cede more power to ruin alliances, raise prices, and make deals that make his family richer and richer.

We already passed the Ukraine Support Act, a thoughtful bill that both supported Ukraine and sanctioned Russia. That is the kind of legislation we need to punish Putin, stand with Ukraine, and protect families.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''no'' vote.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER).

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Lindsey O. Graham Sanctioning Russia and Iran Act, and I thank our chairman, MICHAEL MCCAUL, for his tireless efforts on this legislation and his support and friendship over these many years.

The largest land war in Europe since World War II must come to an end, Mr. Speaker. Vladimir Putin's hopeless plot to rebuild the Soviet Union must come to an end, and the silent support of the murderous Russian and Iranian regimes must come to a definitive end.

This bill will hold nations accountable for facilitating Russian sanctions evasion and extend crippling sanctions on China and the Islamic Republic of Iran.

There is no better way to honor the late Senator Lindsey Graham, and I urge all my colleagues to support this bill.

□ 0950

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), my friend.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, my friend, who cosponsored the Ukraine Support Act with me. I am sorry that the Senate won't pass that bill, and I am sorry the President won't sign that bill. The President will sign this bill. This is something we can do. I rise in very strong support of the passage of this legislation.

I am, very frankly, in disagreement with the people who have spoken about giving Trump this unfettered power. Trump believes he has unfettered power right now without this bill or any action by the House of Representatives. That is an irrelevant argument.

Three-quarters of the Democrats and 87 Members of the Senate—it was 86 votes but MCCONNELL is back—believe that it simply limits to those who are aiding Russia's war effort to additional tariffs under this bill.

I disagree with my dear friend that it opens up any country. France just endorsed this bill within the last 24 hours. They would be one of those countries subject to adverse action.

We must pass this bill because if we do not pass this bill—

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

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. The fact of the matter is that my friend mentioned a Chamberlain moment or a Churchill moment. Let me suggest to you that if we believe the enemy in this case is Trump, it will be a Chamberlain moment. If we vote for this bill, it will be a Churchill moment because we will tell the President he needs to do something that he doesn't want to do. He may not do it, and we can't force him to do it—I would like to force him to do it—but we can say to him to do it because the Congress wants to do it.

We have been unanimous on this side, and the Republicans have had the majority of votes on your side almost every time we voted to support Ukraine.

If we fail to pass this bill, there will be cheers in the Kremlin and tears in Kyiv. This is a moment when we stand up and say where we are. We can't control where the President is. I disagree with the President, but I agree strongly that it is time for the Members of this House to stand up and say to Russia: You will not continue with this without our adverse action.

Mr. Speaker, this is an anti-Russia/pro-Ukraine bill. Let us pass it.

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

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. KIGGANS).

Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Lindsey O. Graham Sanctioning Russia and Iran Act of 2026.

For far too long, Vladimir Putin has waged unprovoked war against the Ukrainian people, a war that has cost countless lives and threatened our allies across Europe.

This bipartisan legislation ensures the United States has the tools it needs to bring Russia to the table and secure a just and lasting peace.

Oil and gas exports are the lifeblood of the Russian war machine. A significant share of the revenue funding Putin's invasion comes directly from the sale of Russian energy on the global market.

This bill cuts off that funding at the source, mandating sanctions on Russian officials, oligarchs, and the state-owned banks financing the war. It cracks down on Russia's shadow fleet of tankers and shell companies used to evade existing sanctions.

This bill also imposes economic pressure for the largest purchasers of Russian oil and gas, like China and India, which continue tacitly funding Putin's aggression. It does so while protecting our allies that are already working to reduce that dependence.

Winter is approaching, and Ukraine is bracing for what is expected to be one of the most severe seasons of Russian missile and drone strikes yet. Every dollar we deny the Kremlin today is a missile or drone Russia cannot resupply this winter.

Mr. Speaker, as a Navy veteran who deployed to the Persian Gulf, I thank Senator Lindsey Graham for his leadership on this issue. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I will just to say to my friend from Maryland, if this is just a message bill to the President, then why don't we send him a message? Why don't we show the Ukrainians that we want to give them $12 billion to $15 billion so they can have what they need? Why don't we say to the President that we want to make sure that he cannot waive China or India? That would be a message from the United States Congress on behalf of the people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER).

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this well-intentioned but terribly flawed bill.

All of us on our side strongly support Ukraine, but this would do more harm than good for America and Ukraine.

It has three main points: sanctions, tariffs, and symbolism.

The new sanctions on Russia in this bill would be strong and sweeping if they were enforced, but the bill gives Trump the power to simply ignore them. That is what he is very likely to do.

His criticism of Ukraine and his friendliness to Russia have both been rising recently. He is even calling for more Russian energy exports, the very thing this bill is purported to block.

The bill's tariffs are a huge problem. President Trump has abused every Presidential tariff authority—every single one—that Congress has given, often to target our allies.

The bill has a loophole that would allow him to define basically any country as a facilitator of evading Russian sanctions. He could then hit them with tariffs of up to 100 percent with no guardrails or oversight and no expiration. It is a much stronger tariff power than those he has already abused, and it will be much harder to challenge in court.

Giving him this power, when he has shown us over and over again what he will do with it, would be an incredible mistake.

Finally, we are told this bill would be a symbolic win for Ukraine and a show of American support. If this bill passes, I predict Ukraine supporters will regret it. They will be able to say they stood with Ukraine in the immediate aftermath, but when Donald Trump hits our allies with new tariffs and waives sanctions on Russia, the propaganda victory for Putin will be lasting and the damage will be embedded in U.S. law.

Meanwhile, the Ukrainian cause will be tied to Trump's widely hated tariffs, deeply unpopular in America already. Further stressing the American pocketbook is not good for Ukraine's long term.

We can do better. The House has passed a better bill. With negotiation and compromise, we can pass a stronger bill that truly supports Ukraine and tightens the economic screws on Russia without harming Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this misguided bill so we can pass a better one.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BACON), one of the top, if not the top, supporters of Ukraine in the United States House of Representatives and my dear friend.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the leadership here from Mr. MCCAUL, and I appreciate Mr. HOYER's strong words. I stand 100 percent with him today.

This is a chance for the United States House to stand on the right side, to support Ukraine in this invasion by Russia, and to make it clear that we oppose the Russian invasion and that we oppose the Russian dictator.

We are going to put tough tariffs, using our Article I authorities, to say we want tariffs on Russia, the invader. That is our authority. That is what we are doing.

I have opposed other tariffs. We should be wanting to tariff Russia and those who are buying Russian fuel, propping up their economy.

This is our chance to be on the right side.

President Zelenskyy is asking us to pass this bill. I was there this weekend. They were imploring us to please pass this bill. Our NATO allies are asking us to pass this bill. Our Democratic colleagues in the Senate—at that time, a 3–1 ratio—are asking us to pass this bill.

What the other side is saying is that this bill isn't perfect, so don't pass it. Do not let perfection be the enemy of good.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just say to the gentleman that the bill we passed in the House did put sanctions on Russia. We passed a bill that put sanctions on Russia.

What this bill really does—I mean, it puts tariffs on Russia and sanctions on Russia. What this bill does is put tariffs on our allies and our friends.

Let's make sure in an amendment in the Rules Committee that we clarify that the EU could not be tariffed. Unfortunately, my Republican colleagues said no to that. Let's just clarify and say who it is. Why leave it open when we know, in fact, what this President has done and said throughout?

Look at the facts. If this is a message bill, then let's send a message to the Ukrainians that we are for them.

What do they need going into this winter? They need resources to fix the electric grid. They need resources for Patriot missiles. They need resources to make sure that they can fight and have what they need coming back.

□ 1000

Does this tell them that we are ready to stand with them as our European allies who have put their money where their mouths are? Are we saying, as this Congress, that we are ready to put money up to our Ukrainian friends against the Russians? No, we are not. Do we have the opportunity to do that and make that statement? Yes, we do.

That opportunity was in the Rules Committee, an amendment that we put in, an opportunity to tell them. What are we saying to our Ukrainian friends and allies who have bravely stood up for their own democracy? What are we telling them? Oh, we will put up something. It will have waivers in it so that anybody the President wants to sanction he can waive it.

What message are we sending? Oh, we are not giving you any resources.

What message are we sending really to our friends in Ukraine?

I know we say we want to make sure Ukraine has what it needs. At least I hope that is what we are saying. This bill does not say that. This bill does not say that.

Yes, I have been talking to my Ukrainian friends, and I will have a conversation with President Zelenskyy myself next week. We are going to have a meeting at UNGA. I thought that maybe what we should be doing right now, instead of rushing this along, is talking to our friends—we could have waited until after the election—so that we can make sure that we are doing something meaningful.

This is going to be a terrible winter for our friends in Ukraine, terrible winter. Are we doing anything to make sure that it is not? No, we are not. What they need right now, to get through this winter, is resources.

What have our European allies done in our absence of giving them resources?

We could have passed a supplemental. I am ready to do that now. If we want to make sure that our Ukrainian allies, who have fought for 5 years to protect themselves—what they said to me when I visited Ukraine after I took the last codel to Ukraine before the invasion by Russia, what did they say to me. They didn't say to just give them something that is abstract. They said: If you give us the weapons and the artillery that we need, we will fight.

The one thing that we have stopped doing in the United States of America is giving them the resources that they need so that they can fight, not just some kind of message.

We, in this Congress, should put a bill on the President's desk, both the House and the Senate—let the President sign it or reject it—that we want to give the Ukrainians the resources that they need: to help them with humanitarian aid, because humanitarian disasters have taken place in Ukraine; to help them get their children back that were taken by the Russians; to help them fix their grid so that they can have heat during the wintertime; to help them have what they need to defend themselves against this vicious attack from Russia.

Just yesterday, Russia attacked their energy grid. They need help to repair that energy grid, and you can't do that with just words. You have to do it with money.

Put your money where your mouth is. If you are with the Ukrainians and you want to stand up for them, let's put some money in their pockets so they can have what they need, not just talk.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Let me just respond. The gentleman says we have time to wait. I was in Ukraine 3 nights. I was on the front lines but also 3 nights in Kyiv getting shelled every night by ballistic missiles. They just bombed the train that goes from Kyiv to Warsaw just recently, killing innocent civilians.

We do not have time to wait. We need to do this now as Ukraine is under fire every day.

These are targeted tariffs pursuant to the Supreme Court's recent ruling under Article I of Congress' constitutional authority, not the executive. It does not tariff our allies. Let me make that clear. That is why the President of the EU Commission supports this bill. It punishes our adversaries through targeted tariffs on Russia, China, Iran, and North Korea.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK), my dear friend.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. McCAUL for his work.

Mr. Speaker, 86 senators voted for this bill. You cannot get 86 Senators to agree the sky is blue.

Mr. Speaker, 86 senators voted for this bill. Volodymyr Zelenskyy is strongly in support of it, so much so that he flew here to support it.

Vladimir Putin is against it. Should that not tell us all we need to know?

Are we now claiming that we know better than President Zelenskyy about what is in the best interests of Ukraine? Are we saying we don't care that if this bill were to fail there would be celebrations in the Kremlin and there would be devastation in the morale on the front lines of Ukraine? Are we saying we don't care about that?

I have worked with my colleagues across the aisle, my friends across the aisle, on every single Ukraine bill. I signed discharge petitions for your bill. I got my friends and my colleagues to sign that discharge, to vote for that discharge, to get that bill to the Senate.

We cannot allow the perfect to be the enemy of the good. Every single bill that hurts Russia and helps Ukraine we have to support. We owe an obligation to them to support it.

I, too, have been on the front lines. These are people who need us. They need us.

There is not a single pro-Ukraine bill that I will not support on this floor, not a single one.

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

Mr. Speaker, I will just say to the gentleman that we passed a bipartisan bill out of this House. Are you telling me that President Zelenskyy is not for that bill? He is for that bill. He is for that bill. He is for that bill.

So is that bill better because—does that bill give money—the bill coming from the Senate, does it give money to the Ukrainians for what they need? No, it doesn't.

Does it give them what they need? No, it doesn't.

Does that bill have sanctions in it stronger than this bill? Yes, it does.

So if you ask Mr. Zelenskyy, and you put those two bills up side by side, which one would he prefer—

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, no, I can't yield. I don't have enough time left.

If you ask which one he prefers, I am sure he will tell you he prefers the bill that we passed in the House.

Just like we say that we should now do this because the Senate passed a bill—the Senate should do what we did because we passed a bill, and we passed a bill that really helps the Ukrainian people.

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

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I supported that bill. I voted for it, but that is not the bill before us here today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), my dear friend and the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend and distinguished statesman in his own right for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, Vladimir Putin is a tyrant and a war criminal, and we should be clear about what drives him. He fears freedom, so he attacks it. He obscures the truth, so he can peddle lies. He cannot build his power through accomplishments, so he takes it through bloodshed.

None of this is without purpose. Putin seeks to weaken the United States, fracture the West, and undermine democratic institutions.

This isn't rhetoric. It is reality and one I have seen directly.

I recently traveled to Europe on a bipartisan delegation visiting Ukraine and Moldova, our new allies; old friends, Sweden and Finland; and also our historic allies like Great Britain and Denmark. What I witnessed only reinforced the truth.

Putin is a despot waging an illegal and ongoing war against a sovereign nation. Indeed, one of the European leaders I spoke with said Putin's attack on Ukraine is an attack on all of Europe, and that is true. That demands more than just condemnation. It demands consequences.

Today, the House will act to kneecap the Kremlin's war machine and cripple the cash flow fueling its pursuit of imperial dominance.

This bill will implement an economic onslaught against Putin, his cronies, and the Iranian regime. It sanctions major buyers of Russian energy, targets Russia's leadership and financial institutions, closes sanctions loopholes, and strengthens President Trump's leverage for peace.

□ 1010

As Ukraine continues to bravely fight and Russia's economy strains, this bill will further choke Putin's ability to wage war.

This Congress, alongside the White House and our NATO allies, will continue to make clear that, with our help, a free people will defeat a despotic tyrant.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support this bipartisan legislation and honor Senator Lindsey Graham's longstanding legacy of steadfastly defending democracy and American values and interests.

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

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. VINDMAN).

Mr. VINDMAN. Mr. Speaker, I will make sure that it is clear that democratic support for Ukraine is ironclad. Freedom for Ukraine is directly linked to America's national security.

Before the upcoming cold and deadly winter, I am proud to vote for the most serious sanctions package on Russia since this unfair and unprovoked war began. Putin will only back down when there are consequences for his aggression, and when asked what this Congress has done, we can point to this sanctions bill.

We cannot undersell the morale boost that this will provide to Ukrainians before this dark winter. By targeting the revenue and key industries that help sustain Russia's unjust war, we will increase pressure on the Kremlin while continuing to stand with our Ukrainian brothers and sisters.

The legislation we will vote on today is not perfect, but is a vital step in ending the war, supporting Ukraine, and standing up for America's national security.

The President must follow through, and if he doesn't, we will hold him accountable in the next Congress. I just came back from Ukraine. They were blowing up gas stations. They were blowing up trains. They flew drones over our head. In my previous line of work, ''when they hit, we hit back harder.'' They need our help, so let's support them.

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

Mr. Speaker, my opposition today is rooted in one simple reality. After hearing loud and clear from Americans about the impact of the President's disastrous tariff policies and the affordability crises in this country, we cannot grant the President more tariff power that we know he will abuse.

Conservative estimates put the cost of this bill's tariffs at $3,000 on the average American family. That is assuming Trump limits himself to the top five importers of Russian oil and gas, even though the bill will let him go far beyond that.

At a moment when American families are already facing soaring gas prices, rising mortgage rates, and high inflation, why would we hand the tariff man, as he calls himself, new authority to impose even more inflationary tariffs without clear guardrails?

What do the Ukrainians get in return? They will receive no security assistance, no air defense, and no reconstruction support for war-ravaged communities. This bill, as drafted, does not require tougher sanctions on Russia. The historically broad waiver language makes imposing sanctions essentially optional.

Do we really believe that President Trump, on his record, is going to suddenly get serious about punishing Russia?

Let's just look at the facts.

In nearly 2 years, this administration has made just two sanctions designations on Russian entities compared to nearly 1,500 per year during the Biden administration. The few energy sanctions that Trump did impose, he repeatedly waived.

His Treasury Secretary Scott Bessent lifted other sanctions on Russia earlier this month and welcomed the Russian Finance Minister back into the G20 finance meetings in North Carolina for the first time since this invasion.

Just last week, the President sent Steve Witkoff and Jared Kushner to Moscow to entice the Kremlin into a limited peace deal that reportedly included lifting of major U.S. sanctions.

Do these seem like the actions of a President serious about punishing Russia?

My colleagues in both parties know, as I do, that Ukraine needs our help now. The good news is that we do not have to go back to the drawing board. We can make simple, yet critical, changes to this legislation, changes that I, and others, have proposed. Let's send it back to the Senate and then to the President's desk all before the end of this month.

We can support Ukraine. We can hold Russia accountable. We can protect the American people from higher costs at the grocery store and at the pump. We just have to have the courage and the common sense to insist on a better bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EVANS of Colorado). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this legislation in its current form.

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

Mr. Speaker, I was at the Ukraine Embassy last night, and when I announced to them that the rule had passed to allow this bill to go to the floor for final passage, I got a standing ovation. I got a standing ovation from the ambassador and all supporters of Ukraine.

When I chaired the Foreign Affairs Committee, I often said partisanship stops at the water's edge, and I still believe that. Mr. MEEKS and I did pass the emergency wartime supplemental bill that gave Ukraine a lifeline to prevent occupation from Russia so they could advance in their drone technology. I am a bit disheartened by some of my colleagues' remarks here today because they don't reflect that principle.

In fact, it is just all about the President. It is false arguments about an expansion of tariff authority when it is actually limited to our adversaries buying energy from Russia. The premise is that we don't like the President, so let's just do nothing. Let's do nothing as we go into the wintertime when we know the fighting will intensify.

We don't have time to wait. Ukraine doesn't have time to wait. That is precisely why President Zelenskyy told me when I was in Ukraine right after Senator Graham announced this legislation—and I had been working with him for a year on this—that now is the time.

There was excitement in the air. The EU Commissioner supports this bill. Our allies support this bill. We are free to have disagreements. That is democracy. But when we are addressing our adversaries, we need to speak as one, with one voice, as one Nation. They need to know that we are not divided when it comes to our national security.

The Senate, as has been stated, passed this bill 86–11 for God's sake. That is an overwhelming bipartisan support, and now it is time for the House to unite and do the same.

If this bill fails, the message that that will send to our adversaries—Russia, China, Iran, and North Korea, all who want to see this bill go down today—will be celebrating in the streets.

Make no mistake: Putin is watching. President Xi is watching. The Ayatollah is watching. Kim Jong-un is watching. Why? Because they are our adversaries. If the United States can't rally around such broadly supported legislation, what message would that send to them?

This is a critical national security issue, but it also is a moral issue that requires moral courage. When we look back at this moment in time, I want to be able to say that we used all the tools available to end this war, that we understood the threat, that we had the courage to do what was right to stand up to cripple the Russian war machine and turn the tide toward peace, to be on the right side of history.

In his final press conference, Senator Graham said: ''I have never been more optimistic than I am today that we have the formula to end this war.''

This is a formula, this bill, and I couldn't agree more with the late Lindsey Graham, my friend and mentor.

Let me be clear that a vote for this bill is a vote for Ukraine and the free world. A vote against this bill is a vote for Putin and his unholy alliance.

Mr. Speaker, we don't have many votes like this in Congress that impact global geopolitical conflicts. This bill will have a direct impact on the conflict threatening Eastern Europe and NATO itself and can bring this to an end and get Putin to the negotiating table. As President Zelenskyy told me, he is ready for a cease-fire. He is ready to negotiate.

□ 1020

It is Mr. Putin that will not call for a ceasefire. He will not negotiate. This bill will bring him to the table. That is why, Mr. Speaker, it is so important at this time in history.

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

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 1530, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL).

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote, or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2026

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 9497) to provide for improvements to the rivers and harbors of the United States, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 9497

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Water Resources Development Act of 2026''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

SEC. 2. SECRETARY DEFINED.

In this Act, the term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Army.

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. PROGRAM OFFICES WITHIN THE DIRECTORATE OF CIVIL WORKS.

(a) OFFICE OF INLAND NAVIGATION CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish within the Directorate of Civil Works an office to be known as the ''Office of Inland Navigation Construction Management''.

(2) ADMINISTRATION.—In establishing the office under this subsection, the Secretary shall—

(A) designate an Inland Program Manager, who shall head the office and report directly to the Deputy Commanding General for Civil Works and Emergency Operations; and

(B) provide the office with sufficient administrative, technical, and budgetary support to direct, perform, and coordinate the following tasks related to the inland waterways navigation mission of the Corps of Engineers:

(i) Develop and maintain an inland waterway program management plan.

(ii) Oversee inland waterways construction projects and major rehabilitation projects along the inland and intracoastal waterways of the United States, as described in section 206 of the Inland Waterways Revenue Act of 1978 (33 U.S.C. 1804).

(iii) Coordinate, validate, and oversee funding for the projects described in clause (ii), including the transactions of the Inland Waterway Trust Fund.

(iv) Conduct in-progress reviews for individual project designs and construction.

(v) Provide updates at every meeting of the Inland Waterways Users Board established under section 302 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2251).

(vi) Develop and annually update the projects described in clause (ii) in accordance with the capital investment strategy authorized by section 302(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2251).

(3) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate, and make publicly available (including on a publicly available website), a report detailing the results of the status of the implementation of this subsection, including—

(A) the progress of the Secretary in establishing the Office of Inland Navigation Construction Management;

(B) the status of every inland waterway construction project and major rehabilitation project in the most recent capital investment strategy, including any issues related to delays or cost overruns; and

(C) any recommendations related to the operational improvement of the Office of Inland Navigation Construction Management.

(b) OFFICE OF WATER SUPPLY, WATER CONSERVATION, AND DROUGHT RESILIENCY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish within the Directorate of Civil Works an office to be known as the ''Office of Water Supply, Water Conservation, and Drought Resiliency''.

(2) ADMINISTRATION.—In establishing the office under this subsection, the Secretary shall—

(A) designate a Water Supply, Water Conservation, and Drought Resiliency Program Manager, who shall head the office and report directly to the Deputy Commanding General for Civil Works and Emergency Operations;

(B) staff the office with personnel who may reside in any district or division of the Corps of Engineers; and

(C) provide the office with sufficient administrative, technical, and budgetary support to direct, perform, and coordinate the following tasks related to the water supply mission of the Corps of Engineers:

(i) Identify and evaluate opportunities using authorities of the Corps of Engineers to promote water supply, water conservation, and drought resiliency at water resource development projects.

(ii) Provide to the Corps of Engineers, States, and non-Federal interests information on existing policies and guidance documents of the Corps of Engineers related to, and make recommendations on new policies and guidance documents to improve, water supply, water conservation, and drought resiliency, including—

(I) implementation of subtitle B of title I of the Water Resources Development Act of 2024;

(II) the method for the accounting of storage use under water supply storage agreements at Corps of Engineers reservoirs;

(III) the reallocation of storage space at Corps of Engineers reservoirs to water supply;

(IV) the interpretation and implementation of the Water Supply Act of 1958 (43 U.S.C. 390b); and

(V) the interpretation and implementation of section 6 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (33 U.S.C. 708).

(iii) Assist and provide guidance to States and non-Federal interests on accessing programs, services, and other technical and financial assistance made available by the Corps of Engineers related to water supply, water conservation, and drought resiliency efforts related to water resources development projects.

(iv) Coordinate the review and completion of water supply reallocation studies and reports to clear backlogs and ensure new studies and reports are completed in a timely manner.

(v) Act as a liaison between the Corps of Engineers and non-Federal interests for studies, projects, and agreements for water supply, water conservation, and drought resiliency efforts related to water resources development projects, including efforts to—

(I) reallocate storage space in projects to store water for municipal and industrial water supply purposes pursuant to the Water Supply Act of 1958 (43 U.S.C. 390b);

(II) enter into surplus water contracts pursuant to section 6 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (33 U.S.C. 708); and

(III) produce water supply benefits incidental to and consistent with authorized purposes, including by—

(aa) adjusting the timing of releases for other authorized purposes to create opportunities for water supply conservation, use, and storage;

(bb) capturing stormwater;

(cc) releasing water from storage to replenish aquifer storage and recovery;

(dd) releasing water from storage to augment storage at another Federal or non-Federal storage facility; and

(ee) other conservation measures that enhance the use of a Corps of Engineers project for water supply.

(vi) Conduct outreach and workshops for potential non-Federal interests to provide information on the authorities described in clause (i).

(vii) Evaluate budget requests to ensure sufficient resources are requested and allocated by the Directorate to fulfill the tasks described in this subparagraph.

(viii) Cooperate with State, regional, and local government and planning authorities to identify strategies to augment water supplies, enhance drought resiliency, promote contingency planning, and assist in the planning and development of alternative water sources.

(ix) Consult and coordinate with the applicable Federal Power Marketing Administration on the potential effect to hydropower generation.

(x) Other tasks in furtherance of the water supply mission as determined by the Secretary.

(3) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report that describes—

(A) the progress of the Secretary in establishing the Office of Water Supply, Water Conservation, and Drought Resiliency, including a description of the status of implementing paragraph (2)(C);

(B) the number of staff assigned to such Office; and

(C) for each water supply study or project being conducted or implemented by the Corps of Engineers as of the date on which such report is submitted—

(i) the status of each such study or project;

(ii) the date upon which each such study or project commenced;

(iii) the estimated date of completion of each such study or project; and

(iv) any significant impediments or obstacles that may reasonably affect the timeline to complete each such study or project.

(c) OFFICE ON TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND COMMUNITY OUTREACH.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish within the Directorate of Civil Works an office to be known as the ''Office on Technical Assistance and Community Outreach''.

(2) ADMINISTRATION.—In establishing the office under this subsection, the Secretary shall—

(A) designate a Technical Assistance and Community Outreach Manager who shall head the office and report directly to the Deputy Commanding General for Civil Works and Emergency Operations;

(B) staff the office with personnel who may reside in any district or division of the Corps of Engineers; and

(C) provide the office with sufficient administrative, technical, and budgetary support to direct, perform, and coordinate the following tasks:

(i) Assist and provide guidance to non-Federal interests on accessing programs, services, and other technical and financial assistance made available by the Corps of Engineers relating to water resources development projects, including under—

(I) a continuing authority program (as such term is defined in section 7001(c)(1)(D) of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282d));

(II) section 206 of the Flood Control Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 709a), including the Silver Jackets program established pursuant to such section;

(III) section 22 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–16);

(IV) section 203 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (33 U.S.C. 2269);

(V) section 5014 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2201 note);

(VI) section 118 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (33 U.S.C. 2201 note);

(VII) section 165 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (33 U.S.C. 2201 note);

(VIII) the Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (33 U.S.C. 3901 et seq.);

(IX) sections 1148 and 1305 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2024 (138 Stat. 3039; 33 U.S.C. 2201 note);

(X) section 103(m) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213m); and

(XI) section 1148 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2024.

(ii) Coordinate the implementation of public awareness, education, outreach, and engagement requirements under section 8117 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (33 U.S.C. 2281b).

(iii) Identify programs, services, and other assistance made available by other Federal and State agencies relating to water resources development projects for purposes of advising potential non-Federal interests on the best available applicable assistance.

(3) PRIORITIZATION.—In carrying out paragraph (2)(C), to the maximum extent practicable, the Technical Assistance and Community Outreach Manager shall prioritize providing technical assistance and guidance to a non-Federal interest seeking to carry out a water resources development project that will benefit a rural community, a Tribal community, or a community described in the guidance issued by the Secretary pursuant to section 160 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (33 U.S.C. 2201 note).

(4) ELECTRONIC PORTAL.—

(A) DEVELOPMENT.—In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary shall develop an online, interactive portal that—

(i) contains information relating to the programs described in paragraph (2)(C)(i); and

(ii) can be used by a potential non-Federal interest as a succinct guide to accessing such programs for an applicable potential water resources development project.

(B) AVAILABILITY.—The Secretary shall ensure that the portal developed under subparagraph (A) is made available in a prominent location on the public-facing website of the headquarters of the Corps of Engineers and of each district and division of the Corps of Engineers.

(d) OFFICE ON ALTERNATIVE DELIVERY METHODS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish within the Directorate of Civil Works an office to be known as the ‘‘Office on Alternative Delivery Methods’’.

(2) ADMINISTRATION.—In establishing the office under this subsection, the Secretary shall—

(A) designate an Alternative Delivery Manager who shall head the office and report directly to the Deputy Commanding General for Civil Works and Emergency Operations;

(B) staff the office with personnel who may reside in any district or division of the Corps of Engineers; and

(C) provide the office with sufficient administrative, technical, and budgetary support to direct, perform, and coordinate the following tasks:

(i) Assist and provide guidance to non-Federal interests on accessing alternative delivery programs, services, and other technical and financial assistance made available by the Corps of Engineers relating to water resources development projects, including under—

(I) sections 203 and 204 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2231; 2232);

(II) section 1043 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2201 note);

(III) section 1113 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 2326e);

(IV) section 159 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020; and

(V) section 1107(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2024 (33 U.S.C. 2201 note).

(ii) Coordinate with non-Federal interests to establish clear review standards, procedures, and timelines for the review and approval of studies, plans, specifications, and other materials submitted pursuant to the programs described in clause (i).

(iii) Identify opportunities to accelerate project delivery and reduce administrative burdens associated with the use of alternative delivery methods and contributed funds authorities.

(iv) Coordinate across headquarters, divisions, and districts of the Corps of Engineers to ensure the consistent implementation of alternative delivery authorities.

(v) Develop and maintain guidance and best practices for the acceptance and use of contributed funds provided by non-Federal interests to carry out activities related to water resources development projects.

(vi) Provide technical assistance to non-Federal interests regarding the eligibility of expenditures for credit or reimbursement, including expenditures incurred pursuant to written agreements entered into under section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b).

(3) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report that describes—

(A) the progress of the Secretary in establishing the Office on Alternative Delivery Methods;

(B) the number of staff assigned to such Office;

(C) the activities carried out by the Office; and

(D) recommendations for legislative or administrative actions to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of alternative delivery methods.

(e) COORDINATION; FUNDING.—

(1) COORDINATION.—Each office established under subsections (a) through (d) shall coordinate with other offices established under such subsections and with any other office of the Corps of Engineers to ensure consistency across the Corps of Engineers.

(2) FUNDING.—The offices established under subsections (a) through (d) shall be funded using amounts otherwise authorized to be appropriated for the general expenses of the Directorate of Civil Works.

SEC. 102. CONTRACTING EFFICIENCY.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Corps of Engineers should maximize the efficiency of contract actions through the use of multiyear or continuing contracts; and

(2) multiyear or continuing contracts—

(A) provide cost savings by combining work across multiple projects across different accounts of the Corps of Engineers; and

(B) increase reliability of projects constructed or maintained by the Corps of Engineers and ensure realization of the benefits derived from such projects.

(b) REVIEW.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall carry out a review of any considerations relating to and benefits of awarding multiyear or continuing contracts for the construction of authorized water resources development projects carried out by the Secretary.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—In developing the review under paragraph (1), the Comptroller General shall—

(A) describe existing statutory authorities and limitations under which the Corps of Engineers may carry out water resources development projects utilizing a multiyear or continuing contract, including such authorities and limitations under section 10 of the Act of September 22, 1922 (33 U.S.C. 621) and section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (33 U.S.C. 2331);

(B) review—

(i) prior instances in which the Secretary has carried out an authorized water resources development project utilizing a multiyear or continuing contract for the construction;

(ii) prior instances in which the heads of other Federal agencies, including the Secretary of Defense, have carried out large-scale infrastructure or asset construction projects utilizing a multiyear or continuing contract for the construction; and

(iii) the response of the Corps of Engineers to prior recommendations of the Comptroller General related to management of water resources development projects that utilize multiyear or continuing contracts; and

(C) evaluate—

(i) potential cost savings, considerations, and benefits (including accelerated completion of construction) from awarding multiyear or continuing contracts for the construction of authorized water resources development projects; and

(ii) safeguards to minimize the inefficient reprogramming of appropriated funds related to multiyear or continuing contracts.

(3) REPORT.—Upon completion of the review under paragraph (1), the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report on the findings of such review, including any legislative recommendations that result from such review.

SEC. 103. REMOVAL OR REMEDIATION OF CONTAMINATED SEDIMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall not be liable under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.) for the release of a hazardous substance or pollutant or contaminant resulting from any covered activity carried out in accordance with a joint plan developed under this section by the Secretary, in coordination with the non-Federal interest for the covered activity, and approved by the Administrator.

(b) JOINT PLAN.—A joint plan developed under subsection (a) shall—

(1) ensure that the covered activity protects human health and the environment; and

(2) include—

(A) relevant and appropriate requirements of the National Contingency Plan;

(B) a description of the work to be undertaken;

(C) identification of—

(i) the method to be used for dredged material disposal;

(ii) the roles and responsibilities of the Secretary and non-Federal interest; and

(iii) sources of funding; and

(D) such other terms and conditions as the Administrator determines necessary.

(c) CONSULTATION; PUBLIC COMMENT.—In developing a joint plan under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) consult with interested Federal, State, and local government officials; and

(2) provide an opportunity for public comment.

(d) OBLIGATIONS OF THE SECRETARY.—Prior to carrying out any covered activity pursuant to a joint plan developed under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) document any hazardous substance or pollutant or contaminant present in the contaminated sediment to be removed or remediated; and

(2) seek to identify any person potentially responsible for the release of such hazardous substance or pollutant or contaminant.

(e) SAVINGS PROVISIONS.—

(1) COST RECOVERY.—Nothing in this section affects the ability of the Federal Government to seek recovery under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.) from responsible parties of response costs incurred by the Secretary in carrying out a covered activity.

(2) LIABILITY.—Nothing in this section affects—

(A) the liability of any person under section 107 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9607) with respect to any activity that is not a covered activity; or

(B) the liability of any person under such section for costs or damages as the result of negligence on the part of such person in carrying out any activity under section 104(a) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9604(a)).

(3) FEDERAL FACILITY AGREEMENTS.—Nothing in this section affects the application of the requirements of section 120 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9620) to the Secretary when conducting response actions at a site that is subject to an interagency agreement under subsection (e) of such section 120.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term ''Administrator'' means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(2) CONTAMINATED SEDIMENT.—The term ''contaminated sediment'' means sediment in which a hazardous substance or pollutant or contaminant is present.

(3) COVERED ACTIVITY.—The term ''covered activity'' means the removal or remediation of contaminated sediment pursuant to—

(A) a water resources development project specifically authorized by Congress for such purpose; or

(B) section 312(f) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 1272(f)).

(4) HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE.—The term ''hazardous substance'' has the meaning given that term in section 101 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601).

(5) NATIONAL CONTINGENCY PLAN.—The term ''National Contingency Plan'' means the national contingency plan published under section 105 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9605).

(6) POLLUTANT OR CONTAMINANT.—The term ''pollutant or contaminant'' has the meaning given that term in section 101 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601).

SEC. 104. LEVEE OWNERS BOARD.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a Levee Owners Board.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Owners Board shall be composed of eleven members, each of which is a Federal levee system owner-operator, appointed by the Secretary so as to represent various regions of the country, including at least one member from each of the eight divisions of the Corps of Engineers.

(2) TERMS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A member of the Owners Board shall be appointed for a period of 3 years.

(B) REAPPOINTMENT.—A member of the Owners Board may be reappointed to the Owners Board, as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(C) VACANCIES.—A vacancy on the Owners Board shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment was made.

(3) CHAIRPERSON.—The members of the Owners Board shall appoint a chairperson from among the members of the Owners Board.

(4) OBSERVERS.—The Secretary shall designate, and the Administrator may designate, a representative to act as an observer of the Owners Board.

(c) DUTIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Owners Board shall meet not less frequently than semiannually to develop and make recommendations to the Secretary and Congress regarding levee system reliability throughout the United States.

(2) ADVICE AND RECOMMENDATIONS.—The Owners Board shall provide—

(A) prior to the development of the budget proposal of the President for a given fiscal year, advice and recommendations to the Secretary regarding overall levee system reliability;

(B) advice and recommendations to Congress regarding any feasibility report for a flood risk management project that has been submitted to Congress;

(C) not later than 60 days after the date of the submission of the budget proposal of the President to Congress for a given fiscal year, advice and recommendations to Congress regarding flood risk management project construction and rehabilitation priorities and corresponding spending levels;

(D) advice and recommendations to the Secretary and Congress regarding the effectiveness of the levee safety program of the Corps of Engineers, including comments and recommendations on relevant information contained in the reports of Corps of Engineers activities and expenditures provided by the Secretary under subsection (d)(2); and

(E) advice and recommendations to the Secretary, Congress, and the Administrator regarding the effectiveness of the levee safety initiative, including comments and recommendations on relevant information contained in the reports of Corps of Engineers activities and expenditures provided by the Secretary under subsection (d)(2).

(3) INDEPENDENT JUDGMENT.—The Owners Board shall ensure that any advice or recommendations made under paragraph (2) reflect the independent judgment of the Owners Board.

(d) DUTIES OF THE SECRETARY.—The Secretary shall—

(1) designate an Executive Secretary who shall assist the chairperson in administering the Owners Board and ensuring that the Owners Board operates in accordance with chapter 10 of title 5, United States Code;

(2) provide to the Owners Board detailed reports of Corps of Engineers activities and expenditures related to flood risk management and levees, including for the levee safety program of the Corps of Engineers and the levee safety initiative, not less frequently than semiannually; and

(3) submit to the Owners Board a copy of any completed feasibility report for a flood risk management project submitted to Congress.

(e) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Owners Board shall be subject to chapter 10 of title 5, other than section 1013, and with the consent of the appropriate agency head, the Owners Board may use the facilities and services of any Federal agency.

(2) MEMBERS NOT CONSIDERED SPECIAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.—For the purposes of complying with chapter 10 of title 5, United States Code, the members of the Owners Board shall not be considered special Government employees (as defined in section 202 of title 18, United States Code).

(3) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—Non-Federal members of the Owners Board, while engaged in the performance of their duties away from their homes or regular places of business, may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) LEVEE SAFETY INITIATIVE.—The term ''levee safety initiative'' means the levee safety initiative established under section 9005 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 3303a).

(2) NATIONAL LEVEE SAFETY ACT OF 2007 TERMS.—The terms ''Administrator'', ''levee'', ''levee system'', and ''rehabilitation'' have the meanings given those terms in section 9002 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 3301).

(3) OWNERS BOARD.—The term ''Owners Board'' means the Levee Owners Board established by this section.

SEC. 105. CATEGORICAL PERMISSIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 14(a) of the Act of March 3, 1899 (33 U.S.C. 408(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''It shall not be lawful'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be lawful''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) CATEGORICAL PERMISSIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall, by rule, establish categorical permissions for any category of activities for which an application for permission under paragraph (1) may be submitted.

''(B) SCOPE.—In establishing categorical permissions under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall consider the following:

''(i) The type and similarity of activities to be included in any specific category.

''(ii) The geographic area to which the categorical permission will apply.

''(iii) The type and similarity of the public works with respect to which the categorical permission will apply.

''(iv) The effects of the activities to be included in a category on the applicable public works and on environmental and cultural resources.

''(v) Any additional Federal regulatory requirements that apply to the activities to be included in a category.

''(vi) An appropriate period of validity for the categorical permission.

''(C) REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary may only establish a categorical permission under this subsection that the Secretary determines will apply to a category of activities that—

''(i) are similar in nature to activities for which applications for permission are regularly submitted under this section;

''(ii) will cause only minimal adverse environmental effects when carried out separately; and

''(iii) will cause only minimal cumulative adverse environmental effects.

''(D) PUBLIC INPUT.—

''(i) SCOPING PROCESS.—In establishing categorical permissions under this paragraph, the Secretary shall solicit input from non-Federal interests, including landowners, hydropower operators, and resource agencies.

''(ii) COMMENT PERIOD.—The Secretary shall make all draft categorical permissions, including any associated analyses and other documentation, available for public review and comment for not less than 30 days.

''(E) TRANSPARENCY.—The Secretary shall publish all categorical permissions established under this paragraph on an appropriate website of the Corps of Engineers, including, for each categorical permission, identification of—

''(i) the types of activities to which the categorical permission applies;

''(ii) any specific circumstances that, if present, would cause the categorical permission to not apply to an activity of a type identified under clause (i);

''(iii) the geographic area to which the categorical permission applies;

''(iv) the types of public works with respect to which the categorical permission applies; and

''(v) the period for which the categorical permission is valid.

''(F) INCORPORATION INTO APPLICATION PROCESS.—

''(i) IDENTIFICATION IN REQUEST.—A non-Federal entity may identify in an application for permission under this subsection any categorical permission that may apply to the activity for which the permission is requested.

''(ii) INCLUSION IN COMPLETENESS DETERMINATION.—In informing a non-Federal entity whether an application for permission under this subsection is complete under subsection (d)(1), the Secretary shall include an assessment of whether a categorical permission will apply to the activity for which permission is requested, including an evaluation of the applicability of—

''(I) any categorical permission identified by the non-Federal entity in the application; and

''(II) any other categorical permission the Secretary determines appropriate.

''(G) LIMITATIONS.—Nothing in this paragraph affects—

''(i) the authority of the Secretary to grant or deny permission under this section; or

''(ii) any obligation to comply with the provisions of any Federal or State law, including—

''(I) the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.);

''(II) the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.); and

''(III) the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

''(H) DEADLINE FOR PROPOSED RULE.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Water Resources Development Act of 2026, the Secretary shall publish a proposed rule establishing categorical permissions under this paragraph.''.

SEC. 106. CONTRIBUTIONS BY NON-FEDERAL INTERESTS.

Section 902(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2280(b)) is amended to read as follows:

''(b) CONTRIBUTIONS BY NON-FEDERAL INTERESTS.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), in accordance with section 5 of the Act of June 22, 1936 (33 U.S.C. 701h), if the Chief of Engineers makes a determination under section 8155(b)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (33 U.S.C. 2280 note) that an authorized water resources development project has exceeded, or is expected to exceed, its maximum cost under subsection (a), the Secretary may—

''(1) accept funds from the non-Federal interest for such project pursuant to a written agreement under section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b); and

''(2) use such funds to carry out such project, if the use of such funds does not increase the Federal share of the cost of such project.''.

SEC. 107. ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION AND TRACKING OF PERMIT APPLICATIONS.

(a) ELECTRONIC SYSTEM.—Section 2040(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 2345(a)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking ''DEVELOPMENT OF ELECTRONIC'' and inserting ''ELECTRONIC'';

(2) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall implement an electronic system to allow the electronic—

''(A) preparation and submission of applications for permits and requests for jurisdictional determinations under the jurisdiction of the Secretary; and

''(B) tracking of documents related to Federal environmental reviews for projects under the jurisdiction of the Secretary or for which the Corps of Engineers is designated as the lead Federal agency.'';

(3) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (E), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in subparagraph (F), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(G) documents related to Federal environmental reviews for projects under the jurisdiction of the Secretary or for which the Corps of Engineers is designated as the lead Federal agency.''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(5) COORDINATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary shall use the electronic system required under paragraph (1) to enhance interagency coordination in the preparation of documents related to Federal environmental reviews.''.

(b) SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS.—Section 2040(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 2345(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (5)(C), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(6) enable a non-Federal interest for a project to—

''(A) submit information related to the preparation of any Federal environmental review document associated with the project; and

''(B) track the status of a Federal environmental review associated with the project.''.

(c) RECORD RETENTION.—Section 2040(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 2345(d)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking ''RECORD OF DETERMINATIONS'' and inserting ''RECORD RETENTION'';

(2) in paragraph (1), by inserting '', and all Federal environmental review documents included in the electronic system'' before the period at the end; and

(3) in paragraph (2), by inserting ''and all Federal environmental review documents included in the electronic system'' before ''after the 5-year''.

(d) AVAILABILITY OF RECORDS.—Section 2040(e) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 2345(e)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking ''DETERMINATIONS'' and inserting ''RECORDS''; and

(2) in paragraph (1), by inserting '', and all final Federal environmental review documents included in the electronic system,'' before ''available to the public''.

(e) DEADLINE FOR ELECTRONIC SYSTEM IMPLEMENTATION.—Section 2040(f)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 2345(f)(1)) is amended by striking ''2 years after the date of enactment of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022'' and inserting ''1 year after the date of enactment of the Water Resources Development Act of 2026''.

(f) APPLICABILITY.—Section 2040(g) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 2345(g)) is amended by inserting '', and the requirements described in subsections (d) and (e) relating to Federal environmental documents shall apply with respect to Federal environmental review documents that are prepared after the date of enactment of the Water Resources Development Act of 2026'' before the period at the end.

(g) E–NEPA.—Section 2040 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 2345) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(i) CONSISTENCY WITH E–NEPA.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall take into consideration the results of the permitting portal study conducted pursuant to the amendment made by section 321(b) of the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023 (137 Stat. 44).''.

(h) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 2040 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 2345) is amended in the section heading by striking ''**PERMIT APPLICATIONS**'' and inserting ''**PERMIT APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DOCUMENTS**''.

SEC. 108. PROJECT STUDY SCHEDULE AND COST ESTIMATE.

(a) VERTICAL INTEGRATION AND ACCELERATION OF STUDIES.—Section 1001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282c) is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out a feasibility study carried out by the Secretary pursuant to section 905(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2282), the Secretary shall—

''(1) complete the feasibility study as efficiently and expeditiously as practicable;

''(2) align the scope of the feasibility study with the goals of the non-Federal interest, to the extent practicable in accordance with the authorities of the Secretary and statutory requirements relating to water resources development projects;

''(3) carry out the feasibility study in a manner that ensures that personnel from the district, division, and headquarters levels of the Corps of Engineers concurrently conduct the review required under such section 905; and

''(4) include in the report submitted with respect to the study under section 2033(f)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 2282a(f)(2)) sufficient information for Congress to fully review the study, which may be in the form of details relating to any remaining project cost uncertainties as appropriate for the maturity of the project design.'';

(2) in subsection (d)(1), by striking ''the environmental review process under section 1005'' and inserting ''any required environmental review'';

(3) by striking subsections (b), (c), (e), and (f); and

(4) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (b).

(b) DETAILED PROJECT SCHEDULE.—Section 905(g) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2282(g)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking '', to the maximum extent practicable,'';

(2) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

''(3) REQUIREMENTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out paragraph (2), for each feasibility study, the relevant District Engineer shall establish deadlines for milestones, and a total cost estimate for the study, taking into consideration, to the maximum extent practicable—

''(i) the goals of the non-Federal interest;

''(ii) the statutory requirements and authorities of the Corps of Engineers;

''(iii) the complexity of the study; and

''(iv) any other factors identified by the District Engineer and the non-Federal interest.

''(B) COLLABORATION WITH NON-FEDERAL INTEREST.—The District Engineer shall collaborate with the relevant non-Federal interest in establishing deadlines for milestones under subparagraph (A).

''(C) COMPLEXITY.—In determining the complexity of a feasibility study for purposes of subparagraph (A), the District Engineer shall consider, with respect to the project that is the subject of the feasibility study—

''(i) the type, size, location, scope, and overall projected cost of the project;

''(ii) whether the project will use any innovative design or construction techniques;

''(iii) whether the project will require significant action by other Federal, State, or local agencies;

''(iv) whether there is significant public dispute as to the nature or effects of the project; and

''(v) whether there is significant public dispute as to the economic or environmental costs or benefits of the project.

''(D) EXTENSIONS.—At the request of the relevant non-Federal interest, the District Engineer shall extend any deadline established under subparagraph (A).''; and

(3) by striking paragraph (4) and inserting the following:

''(4) CONGRESSIONAL AND PUBLIC NOTIFICATION.—For each fiscal year, the Secretary shall—

''(A) submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate an annual report that includes—

''(i) a list of all detailed project schedules established under paragraph (2) in the fiscal year;

''(ii) a description of any such project schedule that is expected to result in the completion of a final feasibility report more than 4 years after the date on which the Secretary determines the Federal interest for purposes of the report pursuant to section 2033(f) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 2282a(f));

''(iii) a description of any feasibility study for which the maximum Federal cost is expected to exceed $5,000,000, based on the total cost estimate established under paragraph (2), including an explanation of such exceedance; and

''(iv) an explanation of any missed deadlines or extensions; and

''(B) make publicly available (including on a publicly available website) a copy of the annual report described in subparagraph (A) not later than 14 days after the date on which a report is submitted to Congress.''.

(c) APPLICABILITY.—

(1) NEW STUDIES.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to feasibility studies initiated on or after the date of enactment of this section.

(2) ONGOING STUDIES.—For any feasibility study initiated before the date of enactment of this section, but for which a final report of the Chief of Engineers has not been submitted to Congress pursuant to section 2033 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 2282a) on or before such date of enactment, the Secretary shall, upon request from the relevant non-Federal interest, apply the requirements of section 1001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (as amended by this section) and section 905(g) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (as amended by this section) to the feasibility study.

(d) NOTIFICATION TO CONGRESS ON TERMINATED STUDIES.—The Secretary shall provide written notice to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate on any feasibility study terminated or proposed to be terminated, including a summary of the reasons for such termination, and any proposed alternatives the non-Federal interest may pursue in lieu of a feasibility study.

SEC. 109. CONTINUING AUTHORITY PROGRAMS.

(a) PROJECT MODIFICATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENTS TO FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a program to carry out studies and projects for the improvement of covered projects.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—

(A) STUDIES.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may carry out a study of a covered project under this subsection to determine whether there is a need to modify the structure or operations of the covered project in order to—

(I) improve flood risk management; or

(II) meet applicable Federal standards, including levee accreditation standards.

(ii) FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT.—The Secretary shall include in a study carried out under this subsection—

(I) as part of the calculation of benefits and costs, each calculation identified in section 2033(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (33 U.S.C. 2282a(d)); and

(II) an assessment of geographical transfers of, or changes in, flood risk within and beyond the boundaries of the covered project.

(B) PROJECTS.—The Secretary may carry out a project under this subsection to make modifications to the structure or operations of a covered project if the Secretary determines, based on the study of the covered project carried out under subparagraph (A), that—

(i) the modifications—

(I) are feasible and consistent with the authorized purposes of the covered project;

(II) will provide for flood risk management in the public interest; and

(III) are cost effective; and

(ii) any increases in flood risk that may result from the modifications will be offset within the boundaries of the covered project.

(C) COORDINATION.—In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary shall coordinate with appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies.

(D) ITEMS PROVIDED BY THE NON-FEDERAL INTEREST.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The non-Federal interest for a project carried out under this subsection shall provide all land, easements, rights-of-way, and relocations necessary for the project.

(ii) CREDIT.—The value of land, easements, rights-of-way, and relocations provided under clause (i) shall be credited toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project carried out under this subsection.

(E) AGREEMENTS.—Construction of a project under this subsection shall be initiated only after a non-Federal interest has entered into a binding agreement with the Secretary to pay—

(i) the non-Federal share of the costs of construction required under this subsection; and

(ii) 100 percent of any operation, maintenance, replacement, and rehabilitation costs associated with the project, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

(3) COST SHARE.—

(A) STUDY.—Subject to subparagraph (C), the Federal share of the cost of a study carried out under this subsection shall be 50 percent, except that the first $100,000 of the cost of the study shall be at Federal expense.

(B) CONSTRUCTION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (C), the non-Federal share of the cost of construction of a project carried out under this subsection shall be 75 percent.

(ii) IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS.—The non-Federal share of the cost of construction of a project carried out under this subsection may be provided in the form of in-kind contributions, including a contribution of a facility or supply or of a service that is necessary to carry out the project.

(iii) OTHER FEDERAL FUNDS.—Subject to subparagraph (C), the non-Federal share of the cost of construction of a project carried out under this subsection may be provided in the form of funds provided to the non-Federal interest by another Federal agency, if such Federal agency provides written consent to the non-Federal interest for the use of such funds for the project.

(C) LIMITATION.—The total Federal amount expended for a study or project under this subsection shall be not more than $15,000,000.

(4) LIMITATIONS.—

(A) BETTERMENTS.—The Secretary may include in a project under this subsection a modification to the structure or operations of a covered project that is necessary solely for purposes of meeting State or local building, zoning, or other standards only as an element of a locally preferred plan.

(B) DEFERRED MAINTENANCE.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may not include in a project under this subsection any modification to the structure or operations of a covered project to address any operations and maintenance responsibilities of the non-Federal interest for the covered project, including to address any deferred or incomplete maintenance of the covered project by the non-Federal interest.

(ii) BASELINE CONDITION.—The Secretary shall use the as-built condition of a covered project, including the as-built condition of any modifications authorized by the Secretary, as the basis for determining any modifications to the structure or operations of the covered project to be included in a project carried out under this subsection.

(5) COVERED PROJECT DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ''covered project'' means—

(A) a water resources development project constructed by the Secretary for the purpose of flood risk management; and

(B) a project with respect to which the Secretary is authorized to provide assistance under section 5 of the Act of August 18, 1941 (33 U.S.C. 701n).

(6) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this subsection $50,000,000 for each fiscal year.

(b) APPLICABILITY OF EXPENDITURE LIMITS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—With respect to each covered water resources development project, the Secretary shall apply the maximum per-project Federal expenditure limit for the continuing authority program under which the project is authorized, as the provision of

law establishing such limit is in effect on the day after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) CONTINUING AUTHORITY PROGRAM.—The term ''continuing authority program'' has the meaning given that term in section 7001(c)(1)(D)(iii) of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282d(c)(1)(D)(iii)) (as amended by this Act).

(B) COVERED WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT PROJECT DEFINED.—The term ''covered water resources development project'' means a water resources development project authorized pursuant to a continuing authority program, including a water resources development project for which—

(i) an initial construction contract was awarded before January 4, 2025; and

(ii) construction is not complete as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) STUDIES AND PROJECTS FOR DROUGHT RESILIENCY.—Section 155 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (33 U.S.C. 2347c) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 155. STUDIES AND PROJECTS FOR DROUGHT RESILIENCY.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a program to carry out, in partnership with non-Federal interests, studies and projects for drought resiliency.

''(b) REQUIREMENTS.—

''(1) STUDIES.—The Secretary may carry out a study under this section for a project to provide for drought resiliency, including through—

''(A) the implementation of water conservation measures to mitigate and address drought conditions;

''(B) the management of sediment for increased water in the applicable watershed;

''(C) mitigation and monitoring associated with aquatic or riparian nonnative species that exacerbate drought conditions, such as salt cedar;

''(D) the planting of native plant species that will reduce the risk of drought and the incidence of nonnative plant species;

''(E) the construction of small water storage projects;

''(F) groundwater aquifer recharge; or

''(G) other actions that increase drought resiliency and water conservation.

''(2) PROJECTS.—The Secretary may carry out a project under this subsection if the Secretary determines, based on the study for the project carried out under paragraph (1), that the project—

''(A) will provide for drought resiliency, including through actions described in such paragraph;

''(B) is in the public interest; and

''(C) is cost effective.

''(3) USE OF NATURAL AND NATURE-BASED FEATURES.—In carrying out a study or project under this section, the Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, seek to incorporate natural features and nature-based features (as those terms are defined in section 1184(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 2289a(a))).

''(4) ITEMS PROVIDED BY NON-FEDERAL INTEREST.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The non-Federal interest for a project carried out under this section shall provide all land, easements, rights-of-way, and relocations necessary for the project.

''(B) CREDIT.—The value of the land, easements, rights-of-way, and relocations provided under subparagraph (A) shall be credited toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project.

''(5) AGREEMENTS.—Construction of a project under this section shall be initiated only after a non-Federal interest has entered into a binding agreement with the Secretary to pay—

''(A) the non-Federal share of the costs of construction required under this section; and

''(B) 100 percent of any operation, maintenance, replacement, and rehabilitation costs associated with the project, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

''(c) COST-SHARE.—

''(1) STUDIES.—Subject to paragraph (3), the Federal share of the cost of a study carried out under this section shall be 50 percent, except that the first $100,000 of the cost of the study shall be at Federal expense.

''(2) CONSTRUCTION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (3), and except as provided in subparagraph (B), the non-Federal share of the cost of construction of a project carried out under this section shall be 35 percent.

''(B) SMALL WATER STORAGE PROJECTS.—A small water storage project carried out under this section shall be subject to the cost-sharing requirements applicable to construction of projects under section 103 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213), including—

''(i) for municipal and industrial water supply, the non-Federal share of the cost shall be 100 percent;

''(ii) for agricultural water supply, the non-Federal share of the cost shall be 35 percent; and

''(iii) for recreation, including recreational navigation, the non-Federal share of the cost shall be 50 percent of separable costs and, in the case of any harbor or inland harbor or channel project, 50 percent of joint and separable costs allocated to recreational navigation.

''(3) LIMITATION.—The total Federal amount expended for a study or project under this section shall be not more than $10,000,000.

''(d) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary may provide technical assistance to a non-Federal interest necessary to support comprehensive, systemwide approaches, and operations, maintenance, replacement, and rehabilitation activities, that take into account changing conditions from extreme and prolonged weather events.

''(e) FUNDING.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $35,000,000 for each fiscal year.

''(f) SMALL WATER STORAGE PROJECT DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'small water storage project' means a project for water storage that—

''(1) in the case of a new project, has a water storage capacity of not less than 2,000 acre-feet and not more than 30,000 acre-feet; or

''(2) in the case of an enlargement of an existing project, is for an enlargement of not less than 1,000 acre-feet and not more than 30,000 acre-feet.''.

(d) EMERGENCY STREAMBANK AND SHORELINE PROTECTION.—Section 14 of the Flood Control Act of 1946 (33 U.S.C. 701r) is amended by striking ''$50,000,000'' and inserting ''$62,500,000''.

(e) SMALL FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS.—Section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s) is amended, in the first sentence, by striking ''$90,000,000'' and inserting ''$100,000,000''.

(f) REMOVAL OF OBSTRUCTIONS; CLEARING CHANNELS.—Section 2 of the Act of August 28, 1937 (33 U.S.C. 701g) is amended by striking ''$15,000,000'' and inserting ''$19,000,000''.

(g) PROJECT MODIFICATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF ENVIRONMENT OR DROUGHT RESILIENCY.—Section 1135(h) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2309a(h)) is amended by striking ''$62,000,000'' and inserting ''$75,000,000''.

(h) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 7001(c)(1)(D)(iii) of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282d(c)(1)(D)(iii)) is amended—

(1) in subclause (IX), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in subclause (X), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(XI) section 109(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2026; and

''(XII) section 155 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020.''.

SEC. 110. DREDGED MATERIAL MANAGEMENT PLANS.

(a) PLANNING PERIOD.—In developing a dredged material management plan for an authorized water resources development project, the Secretary shall provide for a minimum of 10 years of dredged material placement capacity.

(b) EXCEPTION.—The requirement established under subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to an authorized water resources development project if the Secretary finds that providing for a minimum of 10 years of dredged material placement capacity in the dredged material management plan for the project is not feasible due to complexity, controversy, or other compelling factors.

SEC. 111. DREDGING COORDINATION.

(a) CONSULTATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In determining the scope and performance timeline to be included in a contract entered into on or after the date of enactment of this Act with an entity to carry out maintenance dredging at an authorized water resources development project, the Secretary shall consult with stakeholders, including—

(A) the non-Federal interest for the project;

(B) relevant Federal and State entities; and

(C) to the extent practicable, other non-Federal entities that utilize or rely on the project.

(2) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), if the Secretary determines that an emergency exists or there is an important national interest at stake, the Secretary may determine the scope and performance timeline to be included in a contract described in such paragraph without consulting with stakeholders that are not a party to the contract.

(b) COMMUNICATION.—If the Secretary receives, from an entity carrying out maintenance dredging at an authorized water resources development project under a contract entered into with the Secretary, information about changes with respect to the performance of such maintenance dredging, the Secretary shall, not later than 3 business days after receiving such information—

(1) determine whether such changes are reasonably likely to affect the period of performance of dredging under the contract; and

(2) if the Secretary determines that such changes are reasonably likely to affect such period, notify the applicable non-Federal interest of such changes.

(c) CAPABILITY NUMBERS.—With respect to any maintenance dredging activity, the Secretary shall, upon request, make available to the applicable non-Federal interest the estimate made by the Secretary of the amount of funding that the Secretary could reasonably expend in a fiscal year with respect to such activity.

SEC. 112. FEDERAL STANDARD FOR DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL OR PLACEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall update the regulations under chapter II of title 33, Code of Federal Regulations that are applicable to establishing the Federal standard for dredged material disposal or placement for a water resources development project—

(1) to align the requirements and policy of such regulations with—

(A) section 1130 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2024 (138 Stat. 3018);

(B) section 125(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (33 U.S.C. 2326g), including—

(i) the directive to include the economic benefits and efficiencies from the beneficial use of dredged material in any determination relating to the Federal standard; and

(ii) the national goal established in subsection (a)(1)(B) of such section of beneficially using not less than 70 percent by volume of suitable dredged material obtained from the construction or operation and maintenance of water resources development projects; and

(C) section 1122 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 2326 note); and

(2) taking into consideration—

(A) the capacity of facilities using the confined aquatic disposal methodology to store dredged material, including the available capacity to store contaminated dredged material;

(B) benefits, including monetary value creation, attributable to the beneficial use of dredged material;

(C) any monetary benefits of environmental and coastal resiliency attributable to the beneficial use of dredged material;

(D) the demand on the Corps of Engineers for environmental and ecological restoration projects in coastal areas; and

(E) any incremental cost borne by non-Federal interests in implementing beneficial dredged material placement separately from a project.

(b) INITIATION TIMELINE.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall initiate a rulemaking to carry out subsection (a).

SEC. 113. ALLOCATIONS FROM THE HARBOR MAINTENANCE TRUST FUND.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary should annually allocate all funds (including funds appropriated from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund) made available to the Secretary to pay for operations and maintenance costs of harbors and inland harbors within the United States, including costs of expanded uses carried out at an eligible harbor or inland harbor under section 210(d)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2238(d)(2)), in accordance with the requirements of 102(a)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (33 U.S.C. 2238 note).

(b) AMENDMENTS.—Section 102(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (33 U.S.C. 2238 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(A) by striking ''to the extent practicable,''; and

(B) by striking '', to the extent there are identifiable operations and maintenance needs,''; and

(2) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

''(3) ANNUAL REPORTING.—For each fiscal year, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate an annual report that includes the following:

''(A) The total amount of expenditures made in the fiscal year to pay for projects described in each of subparagraphs (A) through (D) of paragraph (1).

''(B) A list of projects for which such expenditures were made, including the amounts expended for each project.

''(C) An explanation for any failure to make such expenditures in compliance with the requirements of paragraph (1) in the fiscal year, and a corrective plan for the subsequent fiscal year.''.

(c) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by subsection (b)(1) shall apply with respect to funds made available after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 114. SOO LOCKS OPERATOR WAGE RATES.

Notwithstanding any other law, rule, or regulation, nonsupervisory, leader, and supervisory wage employees of the Corps of Engineers at the navigation locks at Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan, who are engaged in operating lock and dam equipment or who repair and maintain navigation lock and dam operating machinery and equipment shall be paid from special wage schedules having rates identical to the regular wage schedule authorized for the Detroit District Office.

SEC. 115. BENEFICIAL USE OF DREDGED MATERIAL FROM HARBORS IN THE STATE OF OHIO.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall expedite the review of a request of a non-Federal interest to enter into a partnership agreement under section 217(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2326a(c)) for the design, construction, or operation of a facility used to demonstrate potential beneficial uses of dredged material from a federally authorized harbor in the State of Ohio.

(b) USER FEES.—An agreement described in subsection (a) and entered into after an expedited review under subsection (a) may provide for the Secretary to reimburse the non-Federal interest for funds provided by such non-Federal interest for activities carried out pursuant to the agreement through the payment of subsequent user fees to the non-Federal interest in a manner consistent with section 217(d)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2326a(d)(2)), as though the non-Federal interest is a private entity under such section.

(c) DREDGED MATERIAL MANAGEMENT PLAN.—In reviewing a request pursuant to subsection (a), if the Secretary determines that timely completion of a dredged material management plan with respect to a federally authorized harbor described in subsection (a) is not feasible due to complexity, controversy, or other compelling factors, and in cases in which capacity is inadequate to accommodate the maintenance dredging needs of the harbor, the Secretary may enter into the agreement prior to completion of such a dredged material management plan.

(d) PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES.—Prior to entering into an agreement reviewed pursuant to subsection (a), the Secretary may apply the practices and procedures described in part 337 of title 33, Code of Federal Regulations, to the facility that is proposed to be subject to the requested agreement.

SEC. 116. MINIMUM REAL ESTATE INTEREST.

(a) POLICY AND GUIDANCE UPDATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall revise or update the policy and guidance documents of the Corps of Engineers related to identifying and approving the appropriate minimum interest in real property necessary to support a water resources development project, including Chapter 12 of Engineering Regulation 405–1–12, entitled Real Estate Handbook, consistent with section 1104 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2024 (33 U.S.C. 598b).

(2) PUBLICATION.—The Secretary shall make publicly available (including on a publicly available website) the changes to any policy or guidance documents made pursuant to this section.

(b) DELEGATION OF APPROVAL AUTHORITY.—Section 1104 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2024 (33 U.S.C. 598b) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(f) DELEGATION OF APPROVAL AUTHORITY.—The Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, delegate approval of the minimum interest in real property identified under subsection (b) necessary to support a specific water resources development project to the District Commander of the district of the Corps of Engineers in which the project is located.''.

SEC. 117. REAL ESTATE APPRAISAL VALIDITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 210 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall—

(1) complete a review of policies and guidance of the Corps of Engineers that are applicable to the real estate appraisal process for civil works projects for purposes of identifying efficiencies that may be incorporated into such process, including guidance related to review and approval of such appraisals; and

(2) based on such review, issue revisions to such policies and guidance to ensure efficient project delivery and avoid delays during feasibility study review and approval, to the extent practicable.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary shall develop—

(1) guidelines for determining the validity of an appraisal at any time during the period beginning on the date on which the Secretary receives the appraisal and ending on the date on which the certification of a total project cost estimate for the applicable project expires; and

(2) standard—

(A) timeframes for review of appraisals; and

(B) delegations of authority to approve appraisals, for use at the discretion of the Secretary.

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 30 days after completion of the review under subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report that—

(1) describes the findings of the review;

(2) identifies any revisions to policy and guidance made as a result of the review; and

(3) identifies any additional recommendations for legislative action to further improve the real estate appraisal process.

SEC. 118. WATERSHED AND RIVER BASIN ASSESSMENTS.

Section 729 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2267a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(5), by inserting ''(including projected water supply needs for municipal, domestic, industrial, and agricultural purposes)'' after ''supply''; and

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (17), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in paragraph (18), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(19) Eightmile River Watershed, Connecticut;

''(20) Central Florida watersheds;

''(21) Pensacola Bay System Watershed, Florida.

''(22) Muskegon River Watershed, Michigan;

''(23) Great Egg Harbor River Watershed, New Jersey;

''(24) Middle Rio Grande Watershed, New Mexico;

''(25) the Upper Ohio River Basin;

''(26) the Rio Grande Basin, Texas; and

''(27) the Great Salt Lake Basin.''.

SEC. 119. PROHIBITION ON DIVERSION OF WATER FROM MISSOURI RIVER.

(a) APPROVAL BY GOVERNORS FOR DIVERSION OF WATER.—No water may be diverted or exported from any portion of the Missouri River, or from any tributary of the Missouri River, for use outside of a Missouri River State unless such diversion or export is approved by the Governor of each of the Missouri River States.

(b) APPROVAL OF GOVERNORS FOR DIVERSION STUDIES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may not undertake any study, or expend any Federal funds to contract for any study, of the feasibility of diverting or exporting water from any portion of the Missouri River, or from any tributary of the Missouri River, for use outside the Missouri River States, unless such study or expenditure is approved by the Governor of each of the Missouri River States.

(c) PREVIOUSLY AUTHORIZED DIVERSIONS.—The prohibition on diverting or exporting water under subsection (a) shall not apply to any diversion or export of water from the Missouri River that is authorized with respect to express or implied Federal reserved water rights on or before January 1, 2025.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) MISSOURI RIVER.—The term ''Missouri River'' means the portions of the Missouri River within the United States.

(2) MISSOURI RIVER STATE.—The term ''Missouri River State'' means the States of Colorado, Minnesota, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Wyoming.

SEC. 120. LAW ENFORCEMENT AT WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.

Section 120(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1976 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5d(b)) is amended by striking ''$10,000,000'' and inserting ''$20,000,000''.

SEC. 121. DISASTER DEBRIS REMOVAL.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the standard terms and provisions used by the Corps of Engineers in emergency debris removal contracts should facilitate effective and expedient removal of disaster-generated debris that poses a risk to public safety while maximizing the value to the taxpayer and minimizing the risk of unnecessary debris removal that harms property, natural systems, or wildlife.

(b) EVALUATION.—In determining the standard terms and provisions that the Corps of Engineers should use in emergency debris removal contracts, the Secretary shall evaluate—

(1) the various contract and fee structures utilized by the Corps of Engineers and the impact of each such structure on total cost and work quality, including an assessment of such structures that is tied to the volume of debris removed;

(2) the addition of terms requiring coordination between the Corps of Engineers, the contractor, Federal, State, and local agencies and officials and other relevant experts prior to removing debris to ensure protection of healthy vegetation, important habitats, and vulnerable wildlife; and

(3) other terms and measures to protect private property, habitat, and wildlife during emergency debris removal activities.

SEC. 122. WILDFIRE CONTINGENCY STRATEGIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—At the request of the non-Federal interest for a water resources development project, the Secretary shall develop a wildfire contingency strategy for identifying both wildfire risks and possible wildfire mitigation with respect to such project.

(b) CONTENTS.—In developing a strategy under subsection (a), the Secretary shall include a—

(1) wildfire risk assessment; and

(2) wildfire mitigation plan.

(c) WILDFIRE RISK ASSESSMENT.—In the wildfire risk assessment described in subsection (b)(1) for a project, the Secretary shall identify—

(1) risks to such project from wildfires—

(A) that may affect the operation of and ability to carry out the authorized purposes of the project, including navigation, flood control, irrigation, hydropower, water supply, recreation, and fish and wildlife conservation; and

(B) that may affect life and private property in the vicinity of the project; and

(2) risks of sediment, debris, and associated runoff into the project that may occur after a wildfire.

(d) WILDFIRE MITIGATION PLAN.—In the wildfire mitigation plan described in subsection (b)(2) for a project, the Secretary shall develop—

(1) a strategy that identifies actions the Secretary or non-Federal interest may take to reduce or eliminate adverse impacts to the project from a wildfire, including—

(A) hazardous fuels management;

(B) fuel or fire breaks;

(C) treatments for invasive species and vegetation;

(D) aquatic ecosystem restoration activities to increase wildfire resistance; and

(E) operational changes, including updates to water control manuals or associated water control plans;

(2) a summary of resources and capabilities to implement such plan;

(3) a timeline to implement such plan; and

(4) any other information determined necessary by the Secretary.

(e) CONSULTATION.—In developing strategies under subsection (a), the Secretary shall, as applicable, consult with other Federal agencies, States, Tribal governments, local governments, and relevant stakeholders.

(f) PRIORITIZATION.—In responding to requests for wildfire contingency strategies from non-Federal interests pursuant to this section, the Secretary shall prioritize developing strategies for projects located in areas where there is considerable risk of wildfire or that has been subject to recent wildfires.

(g) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report on the status of implementation of this section.

SEC. 123. RESERVOIR SEDIMENT PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish, using available funds, a pilot program under which the Secretary may accept services provided by a State for the removal of sediment captured behind a project for the purpose of restoring the authorized storage capacity of the project.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall—

(1) review the services of the State to ensure that the services are consistent with the authorized purposes of the project;

(2) ensure that the State will indemnify the United States for, or has entered into an agreement approved by the Secretary to address, any adverse impact to the project as a result of such services; and

(3) require the State, prior to initiating the services and upon completion of the services, to conduct sediment surveys to determine the sediment profile and quality before and after the completion of such services.

(c) LIMITATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may not accept services under subsection (a) if the Secretary, after consultation with the Chief of Engineers, determines that accepting the services is not advantageous to the United States.

(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—If the Secretary makes a determination under paragraph (1) that accepting services is not advantageous to the United States, the Secretary shall provide to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate written notice describing the reasoning for the determination.

(d) AGREEMENT.—Prior to accepting services under subsection (a), the Secretary shall enter into a written agreement with the State and the non-Federal interest for the project that authorizes the Secretary to provide credit to the non-Federal interest for operation and maintenance of the project for the value of the services provided under subsection (a) that the Secretary determines are integral to the project.

(e) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—Prior to accepting services provided by a State under subsection (a), the Secretary shall provide to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate written notice that the Secretary intends to accept the services.

(f) PRIORITIZATION.—In carrying out the pilot program under subsection (a), the Secretary shall prioritize accepting services for projects in the following locations:

(1) John Redmond Reservoir, Kansas, authorized pursuant to section 204 of the Flood Control Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 173).

(2) Kanopolis Lake, Kansas, and the surrounding lands managed by the Corps of Engineers.

(3) Tuttle Creek Lake, Kansas, authorized pursuant to section 2 of the Act of June 28, 1938 (chapter 795, 52 Stat. 1218).

(4) Sardis Lake reservoir, Oklahoma, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1187; 95 Stat. 1137).

(g) PROJECT DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''project'' means a dam owned or operated by the United States and under the jurisdiction of the Secretary.

(h) TERMINATION.—This pilot program shall terminate on the date that is 10 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 124. ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING.

Section 8127(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3716) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(6) The project for navigation, Ipswich River, Massachusetts, authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 731).''.

SEC. 125. EXPENSES FOR CONTROL OF AQUATIC PLANT GROWTHS AND INVASIVE SPECIES.

Section 104(a) of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (33 U.S.C. 610(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(4) INDIRECT COSTS.—Funds made available to carry out this section may be used to pay reasonable and necessary indirect costs associated with activities carried out under this section, including administrative expenses, overhead, and other costs not directly attributable to a specific project.''.

SEC. 126. FEASIBILITY STUDIES; REVIEW OF SHORELINE AND STREAMBANK PROTECTION.

Section 116(b) of Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (33 U.S.C. 2282 note) is amended by inserting '', shoreline protection, or emergency streambank protection'' after ''reduction''.

SEC. 127. HARMFUL ALGAL BLOOM DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.

Section 128 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (33 U.S.C. 610 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (15), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in paragraph (16), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(17) Putnam Lake, New York;

''(18) Ross Island Lagoon, Oregon;

''(19) Lakes and reservoirs in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, including Blue Marsh Lake; and

''(20) Rio Grande River Basin, Texas.''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(h) ANNUAL UPDATE TO COMMITTEES.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall provide to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate an update on the status of the demonstration program carried out under subsection (a).''.

SEC. 128. SHORELINE AND RIVERINE PROTECTION AND RESTORATION.

Section 212(e)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (33 U.S.C. 2332(e)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(N) Shoreline of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

''(O) Blackstone River, Rhode Island.

''(P) Rio Grande bordering counties, Texas.

''(Q) Passumpsic River watershed, Vermont.''.

SEC. 129. FISH AND OYSTER HABITAT RESTORATION.

Section 704(b)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2263(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (D)(v), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following:

''(E) the restoration and rehabilitation of habitat for fish, including native oysters, in the East River, Flushing Bay and River, and Bronx River, New York, including—

''(i) the construction of oyster bars and reefs;

''(ii) the rehabilitation of existing marginal habitat and oyster reef sites;

''(iii) the use of appropriate alternative substrate material in oyster bar and reef construction;

''(iv) the construction and upgrading of oyster hatcheries; and

''(v) activities relating to increasing the output of native oyster broodstock for seeding and monitoring of restored sites to ensure ecological success; and

''(F) the restoration and rehabilitation of habitat for fish in the Choctawhatchee Bay and off the coast in the vicinity of Okaloosa County, Florida.''.

SEC. 130. BENEFITS AND COSTS ATTRIBUTABLE TO CERTAIN MEASURES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the evaluation by the Secretary of benefits and costs of an authorized water resources development project, the Secretary shall treat benefits attributable to measures that utilize a natural feature or nature-based feature (as such terms are defined in section 1184(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 2289a(a)) to be at least equal to the costs of such measures.

(b) CONSIDERATIONS.—

(1) APPLICABILITY.—The Secretary shall utilize the authority under subsection (a) on not more than 10 projects that utilize a natural feature or nature-based feature, including the projects specified under paragraph (2).

(2) PRIORITY PROJECTS.—The Secretary shall utilize the authority under subsection (a) on—

(A) the project for flood and storm damage reduction, New York and New Jersey Harbor and Tributaries, New York and New Jersey, as authorized by the Act of June 15, 1955 (chapter 140, 69 Stat. 132; 134 Stat. 2676; 138 Stat. 3152); and

(B) the development of a recommendation for mitigation of hot spot erosion on an authorized coastal storm risk management project in the State of New Jersey developed under section 1217 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2024 (138 Stat. 3081).

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate, and make publicly available (including on a publicly available website), a report detailing the results of each evaluation of benefits and costs carried out using the authority under this section.

(d) SUNSET.—The authority of the Secretary to initiate an evaluation under subsection (a) shall terminate on the date that is 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 131. POLICY ON UTILIZATION OF ALL CORPS AUTHORITIES AND MISSIONS.

(a) POLICY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It is the policy of the United States for the Corps of Engineers, consistent with applicable statutory authorities, to—

(A) fully utilize the programmatic, technical and planning assistance, and project-specific authorities provided by Congress in addressing the mission areas described in paragraph (2);

(B) maximize using the full array of authorities and mission areas described in paragraph (2) to comprehensively address local water resources challenges, consistent with the goals of the applicable non-Federal interest;

(C) fully identify and analyze national economic development benefits, regional economic development benefits, environmental quality benefits, and other societal effects of proposed water resource development activities and projects;

(D) ensure that the Corps of Engineers receives and allocates sufficient funding to address the varied local water resources challenges of diverse geographic regions of the United States; and

(E) maximize the development, evaluation, and recommendation of project alternatives for water resources development projects that produce comprehensive project benefits.

(2) MISSION AREAS DESCRIBED.—The mission areas described in this paragraph are the following:

(A) Navigation, including coastal and inland waterways navigation.

(B) Flood risk management and coastal storm risk management (including nonstructural, natural, or nature-based features, and efforts to control, retain, and reuse stormwater).

(C) Environmental and ecosystem restoration and protection.

(D) Municipal, industrial, and agricultural water supply, water conservation, and drought resiliency.

(E) Recreation, including recreational navigation.

(F) Hydropower.

(G) Aquatic plant and species control.

(H) Emergency response.

(I) Research and development.

(b) FULL CONSIDERATION.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary shall give full consideration to requests and proposals from non-Federal interests that are in alignment with the authorized programmatic, technical and planning assistance, and project-specific authorities and mission areas described in subsection (a).

SEC. 132. COMPREHENSIVE FEASIBILITY STUDIES AND APPROACHES FOR FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT AND COASTAL STORM RISK MANAGEMENT.

(a) CLARIFICATION OF FEDERAL POLICY RELATED TO COMPREHENSIVE FLOODING AND NONSTRUCTURAL APPROACHES.—

(1) DECLARATION OF POLICY.—Section 1 of the Act of June 22, 1936 (33 U.S.C. 701a) is amended—

(A) by striking the section designation and heading and all that follows through ''recognized'' and inserting the following:

''SECTION 1. DECLARATION OF POLICY.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—It is recognized'';

(B) by inserting '', other water bodies, and shorelines'' after ''the rivers'';

(C) by inserting ''that such destructive floods can originate or be augmented by the isolated or combined impacts of water from a variety of drivers, such as riverine discharges, extreme weather events, coastal and tidal flooding, sea level rise, subsidence, and stormwater;'' after ''national welfare;'';

(D) by inserting ''(including the reduction of comprehensive flood risk from the isolated and compound effects of any of the drivers identified in section 8106(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (33 U.S.C. 2282g(a)))'' before ''is a proper activity'';

(E) by inserting ''(including the study and implementation of water resources development projects that provide comprehensive flood risk reduction)'' before ''are in the interest of the general welfare''; and

(F) by adding at the end the following:

''(b) NONSTRUCTURAL APPROACHES.—It is the sense of Congress that—

''(1) structural features and nonstructural features should be given equal consideration in every feasibility study conducted by the Chief of Engineers for flood risk management or hurricane and storm damage risk reduction; and

''(2) the implementation of nonstructural features determined by the Chief of Engineers to align with the policy established by section 2031(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 1962–3) is part of the primary mission of the Corps of Engineers for flood risk management and hurricane and storm damage risk reduction.''.

(2) DEFINITION OF FLOOD CONTROL.—Section 2 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (33 U.S.C. 701a–1) is amended by inserting ''and the reduction of comprehensive flood risk from the isolated and compound effects of any of the drivers identified in section 8106(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (33 U.S.C. 2282g(a));'' after ''damages,''.

(b) CLARIFICATION ON SCOPE OF FEASIBILITY STUDIES FOR COMPREHENSIVE FLOOD RISK.—Section 8106(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (33 U.S.C. 2282g(a)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''shall formulate'' and inserting ''shall include in the study any effects within the geographic scope of the study of, and formulate'';

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking ''frequency'' and inserting ''frequency, including flooding associated with stormwater that flows at a rate of less than 800 cubic feet per second for the 10-percent flood'';

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (10) as clauses (A) through (J), respectively, and adjusting the margins accordingly;

(4) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), as so redesignated, by striking ''In carrying out'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out''; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) RECOMMENDATION OF COMPREHENSIVE FLOOD RISK REDUCTION ALTERNATIVE.—If the Secretary determines that a project alternative identified by the non-Federal interest pursuant to paragraph (1) is feasible, the Secretary shall incorporate such alternative in the recommended plan for the project as a project feature the costs of which are shared as construction.''.

SEC. 133. REALIGNMENT OF CERTAIN CORPS OF ENGINEERS DISTRICTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall realign the following districts of the Corps of Engineers as follows:

(1) Atchison County, Missouri, and Holt County, Missouri, shall be transferred to the Kansas City District.

(2) Northeast Missouri shall be transferred from the Rock Island District to the St. Louis District.

(3) The counties of Arkansas, Clay, Greene, Independence, Jackson, Lawrence, Lonoke, Randolph, and Woodruff, Arkansas, shall be transferred to the Memphis District.

(4) Desha County, Arkansas, and Lincoln County, Arkansas, shall be transferred to the Vicksburg District.

(b) REQUIREMENT WITH RESPECT TO REALIGNMENT ACTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (a), the Secretary may not carry out any action to modify a geographic boundary of the Corps of Engineers unless the Secretary submits to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a notification not later than 30 days in advance of such modification.

(2) CONSULTATION AND PUBLIC COMMENT.—In developing the notification required under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall, to the extent practicable, consult with and accept comments from affected stakeholders in the geographic boundary affected by the proposed modification to the geographic boundary of the Corps of Engineers, including—

(A) State, Tribal, or local governments;

(B) non-Federal interests;

(C) the workforce of the Corps of Engineers (including any organizations representing such workforce); and

(D) other entities, as determined appropriate by the Secretary.

(3) CONTENTS.—In the notification required under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall include—

(A) a justification for a modification to the geographic boundary of the Corps of Engineers;

(B) a description of the effects of such modification on—

(i) the ability of the Corps of Engineers to execute its mission;

(ii) the finances of the Corps of Engineers;

(iii) the workforce of the Corps of Engineers; and

(iv) stakeholders (including State agencies, conservation districts, and the public); and

(C) a summary of any comments received under paragraph (2) and the Secretary's response to such comments.

SEC. 134. UPDATE OF CORPS POLICY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise specifically provided by this Act, not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall—

(1) issue any new policy or guidance document necessary to implement this Act; and

(2) revise or update any policy or guidance document of the Corps of Engineers in effect on the date of enactment of this Act to be in compliance with this Act, including the amendments made by this Act.

(b) REVOCATION OF PRIOR POLICY AND GUIDANCE.—Effective on the date that is 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, any policy or guidance document of the Corps of Engineers that is not in compliance with this Act, including the amendments made by this Act, is revoked.

SEC. 135. AVAILABILITY OF PROJECT INFORMATION.

(a) COMMUNICATION.—The Corps of Engineers, including each district of the Corps of Engineers, shall have open communications with each office of a Member of Congress.

(b) IN GENERAL.—At the request of any Member of Congress, the Secretary and the Chief of Engineers shall provide, as expeditiously as possible, information or technical assistance relating to water resources development projects, including information relating to feasibility studies, Chief's Reports, project justification and scope, authorization and implementation status, estimated project costs and schedules, operational capabilities, and other information relating to such projects.

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to grant any authority to the Secretary or the Chief to deny a request for information related to a water resources development project.

(d) MEMBER OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''Member of Congress'' includes a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to Congress.

SEC. 136. FISH AND WILDLIFE MITIGATION.

Section 906 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2283) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''shall not submit'' and all that follows through ''unless such report contains'' and inserting ''may not approve any proposal related to a water resources project unless the Secretary has prepared a report relating to the project that contains'';

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking ''The Secretary'' and inserting the following:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary''; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) IDENTIFICATION.—The Secretary shall consult with the non-Federal interest for a water resources project, and other stakeholders, to the maximum extent practicable—

''(i) to identify mitigation implementation practices or accepted assessment methodologies used in the region of the water resources project and incorporate such practices and methodologies into the mitigation plan for such project; and

''(ii) to identify projects that have not been constructed, or concepts described in mitigation plans for other water resources projects, that may be used to meet the restoration or mitigation needs of the water resources project.''; and

(C) in paragraph (3)(B)(iv)(I), by inserting ''or a description of the requirements for a third-party mitigation instrument that would be developed in the case that a contract for future delivery of credits will be used'' after ''to be used'';

(2) in subsection (i)(1)(A)—

(A) in clause (i), by inserting '', for immediate delivery or future delivery to be identified in the mitigation instrument'' after ''banks''; and

(B) in clause (ii), by inserting '', for immediate delivery or future delivery to be identified in the mitigation instrument'' after ''programs''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(l) SEPARABLE ELEMENTS.—Mitigation of fish and wildlife losses required under this section that is provided in the form of credit shall be considered a separable element of a project without requiring further evaluation.

''(m) TRANSPARENCY.—The Secretary shall ensure that—

''(1) the mitigation requirements for each water resources project—

''(A) are made publicly available (including on a publicly available website of the headquarters of the Corps of Engineers); and

''(B) include the location of the project, the anticipated schedule for mitigation, the type of mitigation required, the amount of mitigation required, and the remaining mitigation needs;

''(2) the mitigation plan for such project is made publicly available, as applicable;

''(3) the information described in paragraph (1) is updated regularly; and

''(4) carrying out the requirements of this subsection with respect to each water resources project is considered a project expense.

''(n) COORDINATION.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary shall ensure that the project delivery team and regulatory team of the Corps of Engineers work in coordination to successfully carry out mitigation efforts.''.

SEC. 137. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING EVALUATION OF FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT PROJECTS.

It is the sense of Congress that, for each flood risk management project completed by the Corps of Engineers prior to the date of enactment of this Act for which an interest in real property is required, the Secretary should—

(1) review and, if necessary, update the minimum real estate interest necessary for the project, based on the As-built Drawings approved by the Secretary with respect to the project—

(A) to maintain project benefits pursuant to applicable guidance of the Corps of Engineers;

(B) to comply with the requirements of the manual prepared under section 5(c)(1) of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941 (33 U.S.C. 701n(c)(1)); and

(C) to be able to receive any permissions under section 14 of the Act of March 3, 1899 (33 U.S.C. 408), required for any anticipated construction, operation and maintenance, repair, rehabilitation, or replacement of the project;

(2) provide a summary of the review under paragraph (1) to the non-Federal interest for, or levee operator of, the project, including with the review, if applicable, identification of any additional interest in real property that the non-Federal interest must acquire to meet the minimum real estate interest determined necessary in the review; and

(3) develop a streamlined process through which the Secretary, upon request of a non-Federal interest, may update project boundaries to reflect any update to the minimum real estate interest necessary for the project, as determined by a review under paragraph (1).

SEC. 138. RECREATIONAL ACCESS.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary should, when a public recreational amenity, including a park, trail, green space, recreational waterway, or other public open space available for recreational opportunities, is affected by the construction of a water resources development project—

(1) maintain a level of recreational access to such public recreational amenity that is equivalent to the level provided when the public recreational amenity is not affected by such construction, including by providing alternative access where necessary to ensure continued recreational opportunities during such construction; and

(2) minimize temporary disruptions to such access through project planning and coordination with affected communities.

(b) RECREATIONAL ACCESS PRESERVATION PLAN.—To the maximum extent practicable, as part of a feasibility study for a water resources development project, the Secretary shall—

(1) review the potential impact of construction of the project on existing public recreational amenities, including facilities for hiking, biking, walking, and waterborne recreation; and

(2) include in any final recommendation for such project a plan to minimize disruptions and maintain recreational access, as described in subsection (a), to such amenities during and after construction of the project.

SEC. 139. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON MUNITIONS DISPOSAL.

It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary should collaborate with the Secretary of Defense to identify the agency responsible for remediation of explosive ordnance and unexploded ordnance disposal in accordance with the authority provided in section 1027 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 426e–2).

SEC. 140. CORPS OF ENGINEERS WORKFORCE.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON CORPS OF ENGINEERS WORKFORCE NEEDS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Corps of Engineers should maintain a professional workforce capable of addressing the varied statutory responsibilities entrusted to the Corps of Engineers in a timely manner, including—

(A) the technical expertise necessary to design and deliver complex projects for navigation, flood and storm risk reduction, ecosystem restoration, water supply and water conservation, hydropower, and recreation;

(B) the ability to partner with State and local governments and Indian Tribes in providing technical and planning assistance to communities in addressing local water resources challenges; the personnel required to meet its emergency response authorities; and

(C) the regulatory expertise to administer statutory reviews and approvals; and

(2) the Corps of Engineers should—

(A) improve its recruiting efforts;

(B) offer clear paths to Federal internships for students from high school through postgraduate school;

(C) offer clear paths to Federal careers for recent graduates;

(D) promote the appropriate utilization of volunteers; and

(E) provide meaningful training, mentoring, and career development opportunities, including apprenticeships, to ensure that future Corps of Engineers workforce needs are met.

(b) EVALUATION OF CORPS OF ENGINEERS WORKFORCE NEEDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall seek to contract with the National Academy of Public Administration to carry out a comprehensive review of workforce demands and needs of the Corps of Engineers, which shall include—

(A) an evaluation of the professional workforce needs of the Corps of Engineers necessary to meet the statutory responsibilities of the Corps of Engineers, including—

(i) ensuring the full staffing of positions that support missions, projects, or operations, including such positions that are—

(I) inherently governmental or related to public safety, navigational capacity, or national security; or

(II) necessary for the review and resolution of statutory reviews and approvals in a timely manner; and

(ii) challenges facing the Corps of Engineers related to recruitment, retention, reductions-in-force, retirements, credentialing, professional development, on-the-job training, and other readiness-related gaps;

(B) an evaluation of how increased use of public-private partnerships and other efforts by non-Federal interests to carry out responsibilities related to the study, planning, design, and construction of authorized water resources development projects affect future Corps of Engineers workforce needs;

(C) an assessment of the existing technology used by the Corps of Engineers, the effects of any inefficiencies in the use of technology by the Corps of Engineers, and recommendations for improved technology or tools to accomplish the missions and responsibilities of the Corps of Engineers; and

(D) recommendations based on the review under this paragraph to improve the capacity and preparedness of the Corps of Engineers workforce to ensure that such responsibilities are fully and competently addressed in a timely manner and increase the efficiency of the Corps of Engineers project delivery.

(2) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which the Secretary receives the findings of the review under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report that includes—

(A) a copy of such findings; and

(B) a detailed response to such findings, including any recommendations the Secretary plans to implement to ensure that the statutory responsibilities of the Corps of Engineers are fully and competently addressed and ensure the efficiency of project delivery.

SEC. 141. REPORTING AND OVERSIGHT.

(a) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Environment and Public Works and Appropriations of the Senate a report that includes for each report described in paragraph (2) the following:

(A) A summary of the status of the report, including if the report has been initiated.

(B) The amount of funds that—

(i) have been made available to carry out each such report; and

(ii) the Secretary requires to complete each such report.

(C) A detailed summary of the resources and procedures the Secretary intends to use to complete the report, including the expected timeline for completion of the report.

(D) Any other information regarding the report that the Secretary determines may be relevant to such committees in understanding the status, timing, and progress towards completion of the report.

(2) REPORTS DESCRIBED.—The reports described in this paragraph are the following:

(A) The initial report required under section 1150(a)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2024 (138 Stat. 3040).

(B) The report on turbidity in the Willamette Valley, Oregon, required under section 1205(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2024 (138 Stat. 3071).

(C) The report on ice jam prevention and mitigation required under section 1205(k) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2024 (138 Stat. 3075).

(D) The report on excess lands for Whittier Narrows Dam, California, required under section 8213 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3758).

(E) The report on recreational boating in the Great Lakes basin required under section 8218 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3761).

(F) The report on the disposition study on hydropower in the Willamette Valley, Oregon, required under section 8220(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3762).

(G) The report on the status of the implementation of real estate administrative fees required under section 1120 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2024 (138 Stat. 3014).

(H) The report summarizing comparisons of the benefit-cost ratios of projects in covered communities required under section 1148(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2024 (138 Stat. 3039).

(I) The report on dredge capacity required under section 8205 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3754).

(J) The report identifying opportunities for potential exchange of land or flowage easements associated with the Lake O' the Pines, Texas, project, as required under section 1222 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2024 (138 Stat. 3082).

(b) PRIOR GUIDANCE.—Not later than 45 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue guidance regarding each of the following:

(1) Section 103(m) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213(m)).

(2) Section 444 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3747; 113 Stat. 286; 138 Stat. 3149).

(3) Section 8132 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (33 U.S.C. 2238e).

(4) Section 1129 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2024 (138 Stat. 3018).

(5) Section 1148 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2024 (138 Stat. 3039).

SEC. 142. ABILITY TO PAY.

Section 1139(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2024 (138 Stat. 3026) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting ''and studies'' after ''projects''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(17) The project for flood risk management, Big Island Local Flood Protection Project, Illinois, authorized pursuant to section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 742).

''(18) The feasibility study for the project for flood risk management, including riverbank stabilization and bluff stabilization, Columbus and Hickman, Kentucky, authorized by section 8201(a)(28) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3746) (as modified by this Act).

''(19) The project for shoreline erosion management, Hickman Bluff Stabilization, Kentucky, authorized by section 3071 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1124).

''(20) The study for the project for ecosystem restoration, Lower Osage River Basin, Missouri, authorized by section 201 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (134 Stat. 2670).

''(21) The project for ecosystem restoration, Lower Blackstone River, Rhode Island, described in section 8361 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3804).

''(22) The study for the reallocation of water supply storage, Aquilla Lake, Texas, carried out in accordance with section 301 of the Water Supply Act of 1958 (43 U.S.C. 390b), authorized by section 202(e) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (134 Stat. 2675).

''(23) The study to modify the project for hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, Norfolk Coastal Storm Risk Management, Virginia, authorized by section 401(3) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (134 Stat. 2738).''.

SEC. 143. PILOT PROGRAM PRIORITIZATION.

Section 118(h) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (33 U.S.C. 2201 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(10) The project for flood risk management, Big Island Local Flood Protection Project, Illinois, authorized pursuant to section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 742).

''(11) The feasibility study for the project for flood risk management, including riverbank stabilization and bluff stabilization, Columbus and Hickman, Kentucky, authorized by section 8201(a)(28) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3746) (as modified by this Act).

''(12) The project for shoreline and riverine protection and restoration, Passumpsic River watershed, Vermont, authorized by section 212 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (33 U.S.C. 2332).''.

SEC. 144. VESSEL REMOVAL BY CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

Section 19(b)(4) of the Act of March 3, 1899 (33 U.S.C. 414(b)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)(i), by inserting ''under section 4711 of title 46, United States Code'' after ''Commandant of the Coast Guard''; and

(2) in subparagraph (B)(iii)(I), by inserting ''under section 4711 of title 46, United States Code'' after ''Commandant of the Coast Guard''.

SEC. 145. SENSE OF CONGRESS RELATED TO EVERGLADES AGRICULTURAL AREA PROJECT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary should, to the maximum extent practicable—

(1) meet the expedited construction outlined in the July 18, 2025 Memorandum of Agreement between the State of Florida and Department of the Army for Expediting and Advancing the Restoration of America's Everglades, for the Everglades Agricultural Area Reservoir, authorized by section 1308 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (132 Stat. 3819; 134 Stat. 2709);

(2) incorporate other components of the Central Everglades Planning Project to fully utilize investment and restore the flow of water through the central Everglades and Everglades National Park to Florida Bay; and

(3) prepare for and take all necessary steps to review and implement opportunities for expedited construction timelines and operations for remaining everglades restoration projects to achieve objectives, goals, and regional benefits including but not limited to eliminating harmful transfers to the St. Lucie Estuary, and reducing harmful transfers to the Caloosahatchee River Estuary and the Lake Worth Lagoon without causing harm to Lake Okeechobee, Everglades or southern regions, while also protecting and meeting water supply goals south of the lake consistent with congressionally authorized project purposes.

(b) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Nothing in this Sense of Congress is intended to, nor shall it be construed or interpreted as altering, amending, prioritizing or supplementing any authorized project purpose. Furthermore, nothing stated here shall be construed as expanding Federal authority or oversight over State waters or environmental programs.

TITLE II—STUDIES AND REPORTS

SEC. 201. AUTHORIZATION OF PROPOSED FEASIBILITY STUDIES.

(a) NEW PROJECTS.—The Secretary is authorized to conduct a feasibility study for the following projects for water resources development and conservation and other purposes, as identified in the reports titled ''Report to Congress on Future Water Resources Development'' submitted to Congress pursuant to section 7001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282d) or otherwise reviewed by Congress:

(1) AFRICATOWN, ALABAMA.—Project for ecosystem restoration in the vicinity of the community of Africatown in Mobile County, Alabama.

(2) BIG CREEK LAKE, ALABAMA.—Project for ecosystem restoration, Big Creek Lake, Mobile County, Alabama.

(3) MOBILE COUNTY, ALABAMA.—Project for ecosystem restoration in Mobile County, Alabama, in the vicinity of Chickasaw Creek, Hog Bayou, Three Mile Creek, and Mobile River.

(4) GALENA, ALASKA.—Project for flood risk management, City of Galena, Alaska.

(5) RUSSIAN CREEK, ALASKA.—Project for flood risk management, including riverbank stabilization, Russian Creek, Kodiak Island Borough, Alaska, in the vicinity of the community of Bell Flats.

(6) SCOW BAY, ALASKA.—Project for navigation, Scow Bay, Borough of Petersburg, Alaska.

(7) SITKA, ALASKA.—Project for coastal storm risk management, City and Borough of Sitka, Alaska.

(8) DUDLEYVILLE, ARIZONA.—Project for flood risk management, Dudleyville, Arizona.

(9) CARMEL RIVER, CALIFORNIA.—Project for flood risk management and ecosystem restoration, Carmel River, Monterey County, California.

(10) EL MONTE, CALIFORNIA.—Project for flood risk management and ecosystem restoration, City of El Monte, California.

(11) HAYWARD, CALIFORNIA.—Project for coastal storm risk management and ecosystem restoration, City of Hayward, California, in the vicinity of the Water Resource Recovery Facility.

(12) PASADENA, CALIFORNIA.—Project for flood risk management, ecosystem restoration, and recreation, Lower Arroyo Seco, City of Pasadena, California.

(13) REDWOOD CITY, CALIFORNIA.—Project for flood risk management, Redwood City, California.

(14) SAN CLEMENTE SHORELINE, CALIFORNIA.—Project for coastal storm risk management, including shoreline erosion protection, City of San Clemente, California.

(15) SWEETWATER RESERVOIR, CALIFORNIA.—Project for flood risk management, including sediment management, in the vicinity of the Sweetwater Reservoir, including its spillways and dikes, San Diego County, California.

(16) CAPITOL REGION, CONNECTICUT.—Project for flood risk management in proximity to the Connecticut River, Capitol Region, Connecticut.

(17) COGINCHAUG RIVER, CONNECTICUT.—Project for flood risk management and ecosystem restoration, Coginchaug River, towns of Durham and Middlefield, Connecticut.

(18) DELAWARE RIVER, DELAWARE.—Project for flood risk management, including shoreline damage prevention and mitigation, recreation, and ecosystem restoration, Delaware River, Delaware.

(19) NEW CASTLE, DELAWARE.—Project for flood risk management, City of New Castle, Delaware.

(20) BOGGY CREEK WATERSHED, FLORIDA.—Project for flood risk management and ecosystem restoration, including sediment and debris management, Boggy Creek Watershed, Florida.

(21) BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA.—Project for flood risk management, coastal storm risk management, and ecosystem restoration, in the back bay system of Broward County, Florida.

(22) EATONVILLE, FLORIDA.—Project for flood risk management and ecosystem restoration, town of Eatonville, Florida, in the vicinity of Lake King.

(23) FLAGLER COUNTY, FLORIDA.—Project for coastal storm risk management, including effects on back bays and open-coast shorelines, Flagler County, Florida.

(24) HORSESHOE BEACH, FLORIDA.—Project for coastal storm risk management, including shoreline damage prevention and mitigation, town of Horseshoe Beach, Florida.

(25) LAKE HART WATERSHED, FLORIDA.—Project for flood risk management and ecosystem restoration, including sediment and debris management, Lake Hart Watershed, Florida.

(26) LITTLE WEKIVA WATERSHED, FLORIDA.—Project for flood risk management, ecosystem restoration, and recreation, including sediment management, and shoreline erosion, Little Wekiva Watershed, Orange County, Florida, including Lake Lawne and Lake Orlando.

(27) LOWER WITHLACOOCHEE RIVER WATERSHED, FLORIDA.—Project for ecosystem restoration, Lower Withlacoochee River watershed, Florida.

(28) PASCO COUNTY, FLORIDA.—Project for ecosystem restoration and water supply, Pasco County, Florida.

(29) SHINGLE CREEK WATERSHED, FLORIDA.—Project for flood risk reduction and ecosystem restoration within the Shingle Creek Watershed, including Lake Fran and Lake Richmond, Florida.

(30) ST. PETERSBURG, FLORIDA.—Project for flood risk management, coastal storm risk management, and ecosystem restoration, city of St. Petersburg, Florida, including canals in the city of St. Petersburg.

(31) ELKHORN LAKE, LETCHER COUNTY, KENTUCKY.—Project for flood risk management and water supply at Elkhorn Lake, Letcher County, Kentucky.

(32) GWINNETT COUNTY, GEORGIA.—Project for flood risk management, Gwinnett County, Georgia.

(33) SOUTH RIVER WATERSHED, GEORGIA.—Project for flood risk management and ecosystem restoration, South River watershed, Georgia.

(34) HONOLULU, HAWAII.—Project for flood risk management and coastal storm risk management, including shoreline erosion protection, in the vicinity of the Waikīkī Natatorium War Memorial, Kaimana and Waikīkī beaches, City and County of Honolulu, Hawaii.

(35) PORT ALLEN, KAUAʻI COUNTY, HAWAII.—Project for flood risk management, navigation, and coastal storm risk management, Port Allen, Kauaʻi County, Hawaii.

(36) LITTLE SOAP CREEK WATERSHED, IOWA.—Project for flood risk management and ecosystem restoration, Little Soap Creek Watershed, Appanoose and Davis Counties, Iowa.

(37) LOWER DES MOINES RIVER WATERSHED, IOWA.—Project for flood risk management and ecosystem restoration, Lower Des Moines River Watershed, Appanoose, Davis, Marion, Monroe, and Wapello Counties, Iowa.

(38) COMITE RIVER, LOUISIANA.—Project for flood risk management and ecosystem restoration, including sediment and debris management, in the vicinity of East Baton Rouge Parish and East Feliciana Parish, Comite River, Louisiana.

(39) SAINT CHARLES PARISH, LOUISIANA.—Project for flood risk management and ecosystem restoration, including water and sediment management, Saint Charles Parish, Louisiana.

(40) SCOTT'S BLUFF, LOUISIANA.—Project for flood risk management and ecosystem restoration, including shoreline erosion prevention along the Mississippi River, Scott's

Bluff, City of Baton Rouge, Louisiana, which the Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, carry out utilizing and incorporating existing work, including analysis provided pursuant to section 22 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–16).

(41) ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND.—Project for flood risk management, City of Rockville, Maryland, in the vicinity of the Rockville Water Treatment Plant.

(42) ISLAND END RIVER, MASSACHUSETTS.—Project for flood risk management and coastal storm risk management in the vicinity of Island End River, cities of Chelsea and Everett, Massachusetts.

(43) PROVINCETOWN, MASSACHUSETTS.—Project for coastal storm risk management, including shoreline damage prevention and mitigation, Town of Provincetown, Massachusetts.

(44) WINTHROP, MASSACHUSETTS.—Project for navigation in the vicinity of Winthrop Town Pier, Town of Winthrop, Massachusetts.

(45) BAY CITY, MICHIGAN.—Project for flood risk management, Saginaw River, Bay City, Michigan.

(46) GLADWIN AND MIDLAND COUNTIES, MICHIGAN.—Project for ecosystem restoration and streambank erosion prevention, Gladwin and Midland Counties, Michigan.

(47) OAKLAND COUNTY, MICHIGAN.—Project for flood risk management and ecosystem restoration along the Caddell Drain, Oakland County, Michigan.

(48) WAYNE COUNTY, MICHIGAN.—Project for flood risk management and coastal storm risk management, Wayne County, Michigan, in the vicinity of the seawall along Lakeshore Drive.

(49) MISSISSIPPI SOUND BEACHES, MISSISSIPPI.—Project for ecosystem restoration and coastal storm risk management, including shoreline damage prevention and mitigation, Mississippi Sound beaches in Hancock, Harrison, and Jackson Counties, Mississippi.

(50) ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI.—Project for flood risk management, navigation, recreation, and ecosystem restoration in the vicinity of Laclede's Landing, city of St. Louis, Missouri.

(51) BERGEN COUNTY, NEW JERSEY.—Project for flood risk management in Bergen County, New Jersey.

(52) BOGOTA, NEW JERSEY.—Project for flood risk management, borough of Bogota, New Jersey.

(53) CAMDEN AND GLOUCESTER COUNTIES, NEW JERSEY.—Project for flood risk management and ecosystem restoration in riverine areas stemming from the Delaware River, Camden and Gloucester Counties, New Jersey.

(54) CRESSKILL, NEW JERSEY.—Project for flood risk management, Borough of Cresskill, New Jersey.

(55) GARWOOD, NEW JERSEY.—Project for flood risk management, Borough of Garwood, New Jersey.

(56) GLOUCESTER CITY, NEW JERSEY.—Project for flood risk management and coastal storm risk management in the vicinity of Proprietors Park, Gloucester City, New Jersey.

(57) OVERPECK CREEK WATERSHED, NEW JERSEY.—Project for flood risk management, including debris management, Overpeck Creek watershed, Borough of Tenafly, New Jersey.

(58) PASCACK BROOK, NEW JERSEY.—Project for flood risk management, including debris management, in the vicinity of Pascack Brook, boroughs of Montvale and Park Ridge, New Jersey.

(59) PASCACK VALLEY, NEW JERSEY.—Project for flood risk management along the Hackensack River, Pascack Brook, and Musquapsink Brook in the Pascack Valley, Bergen County, New Jersey.

(60) WEST ORANGE, NEW JERSEY.—Project for flood risk management, township of West Orange, New Jersey.

(61) RIO GRANDE BASIN, NEW MEXICO.—Project for water supply and ecosystem restoration, Rio Grande Basin, New Mexico.

(62) AMITY HARBOR, NEW YORK.—Project for flood risk management and coastal storm risk management, Amity Harbor, New York.

(63) ATLANTIC BEACH, NEW YORK.—Project for flood risk management and coastal storm risk management, Village of Atlantic Beach, New York.

(64) BAYPORT, NEW YORK.—Project for coastal storm risk management, including shoreline erosion protection, Bayport, New York.

(65) DAVIS PARK, FIRE ISLAND, NEW YORK.—Project for flood risk and coastal storm risk management, including shoreline erosion protection, Davis Park, Fire Island, New York.

(66) LAWRENCE, NEW YORK.—Project for flood risk management, coastal storm risk management, and navigation, in the vicinity of Bannister Bay and Village of Lawrence, New York.

(67) MATTITUCK INLET, SOUTHOLD, NEW YORK.—Project for navigation, coastal storm risk management, and ecosystem restoration, in Mattituck Inlet, Town of Southold, New York.

(68) MOHAWK RIVER AND ERIE CANAL, NEW YORK.—Project for ecosystem restoration, including aquatic invasive species management, Mohawk River and Erie Canal in the vicinity of the City of Rome, New York.

(69) NISSEQUOGUE RIVER, NEW YORK.—Project for flood risk management, coastal storm risk management, navigation, ecosystem restoration, and recreation, in the vicinity of Stony Brook Harbor, Nissequogue River, New York.

(70) PECONIC BAY, NEW YORK.—Project for navigation and coastal storm risk management, including shoreline damage prevention and mitigation, Peconic Bay and connected harbors and inlets, New York.

(71) POINT O' WOODS, FIRE ISLAND, NEW YORK.—Project for flood risk management, coastal storm risk management, including shoreline damage protection and mitigation, and ecosystem restoration, Point O' Woods, Fire Island, New York.

(72) PORT WASHINGTON, NEW YORK.—Project for navigation, in the vicinity of Tom's Point, Port Washington, New York.

(73) SOUTH SHORE, LONG ISLAND, NEW YORK.—Project for ecosystem restoration, flood risk management, coastal storm risk management, and navigation, Nassau and Suffolk Counties, New York.

(74) SPRING VALLEY, NEW YORK.—Project for flood risk management in the vicinity of Memorial Park, Village of Spring Valley, New York.

(75) CAPE FEAR RIVER, NORTH CAROLINA.—Project for water supply and ecosystem restoration, Cape Fear River in the vicinity of Cumberland County, North Carolina.

(76) FAYETTEVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA.—Project for flood risk management and ecosystem restoration, Cross Creek, Fayetteville, North Carolina.

(77) TOPSAIL BEACH, NORTH CAROLINA.—Project for flood risk management, Town of Topsail Beach, North Carolina.

(78) WHITEVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA.—Project for flood risk management, City of Whiteville, North Carolina.

(79) WHITEVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA.—Project for flood risk management, Waccamaw River basin, City of Whiteville, North Carolina.

(80) MAUMEE RIVER, OHIO.—Project for flood risk management, including riverbank stabilization, ecosystem restoration, and recreation, Maumee River, in the vicinity of Glass City Riverwalk, Ohio.

(81) HOOD RIVER COUNTY, OREGON.—Project for flood risk management and ecosystem restoration, including sediment management, Hood River County, Oregon.

(82) SAUCON CREEK, PENNSYLVANIA.—Project for flood risk management, Saucon Creek, in the vicinity of the Borough of Hellertown, Pennsylvania.

(83) CEIBA, PUERTO RICO.—Project for coastal storm risk management, including shoreline damage prevention and mitigation, and ecosystem restoration, Ceiba, Puerto Rico.

(84) FAJARDO, PUERTO RICO.—Project for coastal storm risk management, including shoreline damage prevention and mitigation, and ecosystem restoration, Fajardo, Puerto Rico.

(85) LOÍZA, PUERTO RICO.—Project for coastal storm risk management, including shoreline damage prevention and mitigation, and ecosystem restoration, Loíza, Puerto Rico.

(86) NAGUABO, PUERTO RICO.—Project for coastal storm risk management, including shoreline damage prevention and mitigation, and ecosystem restoration, Naguabo, Puerto Rico.

(87) RÍO ANTÓN RUÍZ, PUERTO RICO.—Project for flood risk management and ecosystem restoration along the Río Antón Ruíz and adjacent levees in Humacao, Puerto Rico.

(88) VEGA BAJA, PUERTO RICO.—Project for flood risk management and coastal storm risk management, including sediment management, Puerto Nuevo Lagoon (also known as ''Quintín Valle Lagoon''), Vega Baja, Puerto Rico.

(89) YABUCOA, PUERTO RICO.—Project for coastal storm risk management, including shoreline damage prevention and mitigation, and ecosystem restoration, Yabucoa, Puerto Rico.

(90) EASTON POND, RHODE ISLAND.—Project for coastal storm risk management, ecosystem restoration, and water supply, Easton Pond, City of Newport, Rhode Island.

(91) WEST RIVER WATERSHED, RHODE ISLAND.—Project for flood risk management, West River watershed, Rhode Island.

(92) CUMBERLAND COUNTY, TENNESSEE.—Project for water supply, Cumberland County, Tennessee.

(93) DUCK RIVER, TENNESSEE.—Project for flood risk reduction, ecosystem restoration, water supply, and recreation, Duck River, Tennessee.

(94) ENKA DAM, TENNESSEE.—Project for ecosystem restoration, Enka Dam, in the vicinity of Newport, Tennessee.

(95) ARROYO COLORADO RIVER, TEXAS.—Project for flood risk management and ecosystem restoration, including shoreline erosion protection, along the Arroyo Colorado River in the City of Rio Hondo, Texas.

(96) BELL AND MCLENNAN COUNTIES, TEXAS.—Project for water supply, Bell and McLennan Counties, Texas.

(97) CAMERON COUNTY, TEXAS.—Project for flood risk management, water supply, and ecosystem restoration, in the vicinity of Sweeney Lake and Resaca de los Fresnos, Cameron County, Texas.

(98) ESCOBARES, TEXAS.—Project for flood risk management, City of Escobares, Texas.

(99) NUECES COUNTY SHORELINE, TEXAS.—Project for coastal storm risk management, including shoreline erosion protection, Nueces County, Texas.

(100) ODESSA, TEXAS.—Project for water supply in the City of Odessa, Texas.

(101) PARKER COUNTY, TEXAS.—Project for water supply, Parker County, Texas.

(102) ROMA, TEXAS.—Project for flood risk management, City of Roma, Texas.

(103) UPPER SAN JACINTO RIVER BASIN, TEXAS.—Project for flood risk management and water supply, Upper San Jacinto River

basin, in the vicinity of Liberty, Montgomery, and San Jacinto Counties, Texas.

(104) WINN PARK, TEXAS.—Project for flood risk management, Winn Park, City of Farmers Branch, Texas.

(105) LOWER SPANISH FORK RIVER, UTAH.—Project for ecosystem restoration, lower Spanish Fork River, Utah.

(106) CLINCH RIVER, VIRGINIA.—Project for flood risk management and ecosystem restoration, along the Clinch River, Town of Richlands, Virginia.

(107) NOOKSACK RIVER, WASHINGTON.—Project for flood risk management and ecosystem restoration, including shoreline erosion, Nooksack River, Whatcom County, Washington.

(b) PROJECT MODIFICATIONS.—The Secretary is authorized to conduct a feasibility study for the following project modifications:

(1) LOWELL CREEK TUNNEL, SEWARD, ALASKA.—Modifications to the project for flood diversion in Lowell Canyon, Seward, Alaska, authorized by section 5032 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1205; 134 Stat. 2719; 138 Stat. 3136), for environmental mitigation.

(2) MORRO BAY, CALIFORNIA.—Modifications to the project for harbor development, Morro Bay, California, authorized by section 2 of the Act of March 2, 1945 (59 Stat. 21), for navigation improvements and ecosystem restoration.

(3) NAUGATUCK RIVER, TORRINGTON, CONNECTICUT.—Modifications to the project for structural flood damage reduction, Naugatuck River, Connecticut, authorized pursuant to the first section of the Act of December 22, 1944 (33 U.S.C. 701–1), to improve flood risk management and reduce erosion within the Naugatuck River Flood Damage Reduction System.

(4) ASSAWOMAN CANAL, DELAWARE.—Modifications to the project for navigation, Assawoman Canal, Delaware, authorized pursuant to section 9 of the Act of July 5, 1884 (chapter 229, 23 Stat. 149), for flood risk management.

(5) INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, FLORIDA.—Modification to the project for navigation, Intracoastal Waterway from Jacksonville, Florida, to Miami, Florida, authorized by section 2 of the Act of March 2, 1945 (chapter 19, 59 Stat. 16), to include the navigation channel at Jupiter Inlet, Florida.

(6) PENSACOLA HARBOR, FLORIDA.—Modifications to the project for navigation, Pensacola Harbor, Florida, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1174), for recreation and for additional deepening to 40 feet and widening.

(7) TAMPA HARBOR, FLORIDA.—Modifications to the project for navigation, Tampa Harbor, Pinellas and Hillsborough Counties, Florida, authorized by section 1401(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2024 (138 Stat. 3167), for additional deepening to 47 feet.

(8) LAKE SIDNEY LANIER, GWINNETT COUNTY, GEORGIA.—Modifications to the project for flood protection, power production, water supply, navigation, recreation, and fish and wildlife management at Lake Sidney Lanier, Gwinnett County, Georgia, authorized pursuant to the first section of the Act of July 24, 1946 (chapter 595, 60 Stat. 635), to improve flood risk management, navigation safety, hydropower reliability, and water supply.

(9) CHICAGO HARBOR LOCK, ILLINOIS.—Modifications to the project for navigation, Chicago Harbor Lock, Illinois, authorized pursuant to section 1 of the Act of July 11, 1870 (chapter 240, 16 Stat. 226; 21 Stat. 182; 37 Stat. 217; 40 Stat. 1283; 76 Stat. 1176), to add recreation as an authorized purpose.

(10) SAYLORVILLE RESERVOIR, IOWA.—Modifications to the project for flood control, Saylorville Reservoir, Iowa, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 310), to include water supply and sediment management.

(11) LAWRENCE, ON KANSAS RIVER, KANSAS.—Modifications to the project for flood protection, Lawrence, on Kansas River, Kansas, authorized pursuant to section 5 of the Act of June 22, 1936 (chapter 688, 49 Stat. 1588), to study raising levees on the Kansas River in Lawrence, Kansas, north of Bowersock Dam.

(12) BUCKHORN LAKE, LESLIE AND PERRY COUNTIES, KENTUCKY.—Modifications to the project for flood control and other purposes authorized pursuant to section 4 of the Act of June 28, 1938 (chapter 795, 52 Stat. 1217), to include sediment and debris management at Buckhorn Lake in Leslie and Perry Counties, Kentucky.

(13) LOUISVILLE METROPOLITAN FLOOD PROTECTION SYSTEM RECONSTRUCTION, JEFFERSON AND BULLITT COUNTIES, KENTUCKY.—Modifications to the project for flood risk management, Louisville Metropolitan Flood Protection System Reconstruction, Jefferson and Bullitt Counties, Kentucky, authorized by section 401(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (134 Stat. 2735), to expand project scope and incorporate features identified in the document prepared for the non-Federal interest for the project, issued in June 2017, and titled ''20–Year Comprehensive Facility Plan, Critical Repair and Reinvestment Plan, Volume 4: Ohio River Flood Protection''.

(14) PORT OF IBERIA, LOUISIANA.—Modifications to the project for navigation, Port of Iberia, Louisiana, authorized by section 1001(25) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1053; 128 Stat. 1351), to improve navigation in the Federal navigation channel of the Freshwater Bayou by deepening the channel south of the Freshwater City Lock up to 32 feet, including the Freshwater Bayou lock bypass channel as part of the Federal project, and deepening and widening the bypass channel.

(15) CURTIS CREEK CHANNEL, MARYLAND.—Modifications to the project for navigation, Baltimore Harbor and Channels, Maryland, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 297), to expand the Federal channel to include the Curtis Creek Channel to a depth of 29 feet.

(16) BOSTON HARBOR, MASSACHUSETTS.—Modifications to the project for navigation, Boston Harbor, Massachusetts, authorized by the first section of the Act of March 2, 1867 (chapter 144, 14 Stat. 420; 104 Stat. 4607; 128 Stat. 1365), for additional deepening and widening.

(17) GRENADA LAKE, YAZOO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MISSISSIPPI.—Modifications to the project for flood control of the Yazoo River and Tributaries, Mississippi, authorized by section 10 of the Act of May 15, 1928 (chapter 569, 45 Stat. 538), to add recreation as a project purpose on the Yalobusha River, including at Grenada Lake.

(18) NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NEW JERSEY.—Modifications to the project for navigation for the New Jersey Intracoastal Waterway, New Jersey, authorized pursuant to section 2 of the Act of March 2, 1945 (59 Stat. 13; 100 Stat. 4181) to reroute the New Jersey Intracoastal Waterway near Ventnor City, New Jersey.

(19) RAHWAY RIVER BASIN, NEW JERSEY.—Modifications to the project for hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, Rahway River Basin, New Jersey, authorized by section 401(3) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (134 Stat. 2737; 136 Stat. 3736; 138 Stat. 3066), to improve flood risk management for municipalities within the basin that are subject to repetitive flooding.

(20) PORT OF NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY, NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY.—Modifications to the project for navigation, Port of New York and New Jersey, New York and New Jersey, authorized by section 101 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2576), to improve navigation south of the Elizabeth Port Authority Marine Terminal.

(21) ALLEGHENY RIVER, PENNSYLVANIA.—Modifications to the project for navigation and ecosystem restoration, Allegheny River, Pennsylvania, authorized pursuant to the first section of the Act of July 25, 1912 (chapter 253, 37 Stat. 216; 46 Stat. 928; 49 Stat. 1035), to add recreation as a project purpose.

(22) DELAWARE AND SCHUYLKILL RIVERS, PENNSYLVANIA.—Modifications to the project for navigation, Delaware River, Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania (including Philadelphia to the Sea), authorized by section 1 of the Act of June 25, 1910 (chapter 382, 36 Stat. 637; 46 Stat. 921; 52 Stat. 803; 59 Stat. 14; 68 Stat. 1249; 72 Stat. 297) and the project for navigation, Schuylkill River, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, authorized by section 1 of the Act of August 8, 1917 (40 Stat. 252; 46 Stat. 921; 60 Stat. 635), to improve navigation for large commercial vessels in the vicinity of the confluence of the Delaware and Schuylkill Rivers.

(23) CHARLESTON PENINSULA, SOUTH CAROLINA.—Modifications to the project for coastal storm risk management, Charleston Peninsula, South Carolina, authorized by section 8401(3) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3842), to include features for tidal- and inland-related flood risk management measures.

(24) LAKE AQUILLA, BRAZOS RIVER BASIN, TEXAS.—Modifications to the project for water supply, flood risk management, and recreation, Lake Aquilla, Brazos River Basin, Texas, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 741), for reallocation of water supply storage.

(25) JAMES RIVER, VIRGINIA.—Modifications to the project for navigation, James River, Virginia, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1174; 102 Stat. 4045), to include additional portions at the Appomattox River and add flood risk management as a purpose.

(26) NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS, VIRGINIA.—Modifications to the project for navigation, Norfolk Harbor and Channels, Virginia, authorized by section 201 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4090; 132 Stat. 3840; 136 Stat. 3763), to improve navigation in the Eastern Branch of the Elizabeth River.

SEC. 202. EXPEDITED COMPLETION.

(a) FEASIBILITY STUDIES.—The Secretary shall expedite the completion of a feasibility study or general reevaluation report (as applicable) for each of the following projects, and if the Secretary determines that the project is justified in a completed report, may proceed directly to preconstruction planning, engineering, and design of the project:

(1) Project for storm damage prevention and reduction, coastal erosion, and ice and glacial damage in the State of Alaska, authorized by section 8315 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3783).

(2) Project for reallocation of water supply storage, Greers Ferry Lake, Arkansas, authorized pursuant to section 301 of the Water Supply Act of 1958 (43 U.S.C. 390b).

(3) Project for flood control and allied purposes, Homer Navigation Improvements, Alaska, authorized pursuant to section 204 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1181).

(4) Project for navigation, Port of Nome Modifications, Alaska, authorized by section 401(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (134 Stat. 2733).

(5) Project for flood risk management, Cave Buttes Dam, Phoenix, Arizona, authorized by section 1201(a)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (132 Stat. 3802).

(6) Project for flood risk management, McMicken Dam and Trilby Wash, Maricopa County, Arizona, authorized by section 8201 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3744; 138 Stat. 3065).

(7) Project for ecosystem restoration, Rio Salado Oeste, Phoenix, Arizona, authorized pursuant to section 6 of the Act of June 28, 1938 (chapter 795, 52 Stat. 1225).

(8) Project for flood risk management, Yavapai County, in the vicinity of the City of Cottonwood, Arizona, authorized by section 1201(a)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2024 (138 Stat. 3050).

(9) Project for flood control and other purposes, Calaveras River and Littlejohn Creek and tributaries, California, authorized by section 10 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (chapter 665, 58 Stat. 902; 138 Stat. 3058).

(10) Project for flood risk management, water supply, and ecosystem restoration, Chowchilla River, Ash Slough, and Berenda Slough, Madera County, California, authorized by section 6 of the Act of June 22, 1936 (chapter 688, 49 Stat. 1595; 52 Stat. 1225; 138 Stat. 3059).

(11) Project for flood control, water conservation, environmental restoration, water supply, and related purposes, Coyote Valley Dam, California, authorized by section 204 of the Flood Control Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 177; 130 Stat. 1682; 132 Stat. 3803; 134 Stat. 2672; 136 Stat. 3835; 138 Stat. 3065).

(12) Project for ecosystem restoration and water supply conservation and recharge, Eastman Lake, California, authorized by section 1201(a)(4) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2024 (138 Stat. 3050).

(13) Project for flood control, environmental restoration, and recreation, Murrieta Creek, California, authorized by section 103 of title I of appendix B of Public Law 106–377 (114 Stat. 1441A–65; 136 Stat. 3786).

(14) Project for ecosystem restoration, City of Petaluma, California, authorized by section 8201(a)(6) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3745).

(15) Project for ecosystem restoration, water supply, and recreation, Pine Flat Dam, Fresno County, California, authorized by section 1201(a)(7) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2024 (138 Stat. 3050).

(16) Project for flood control, Redbank and Fancher Creeks, California, authorized by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4112).

(17) Project for flood risk management and ecosystem restoration, Salinas River, California, authorized by section 1201(a)(9) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2024 (138 Stat. 3050).

(18) Project for flood risk management, including sea level rise, San Diego Bay, California, authorized by section 1201(a)(12) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2024 (138 Stat. 3050).

(19) Project for flood risk management, including stormwater runoff reduction, City of San Mateo, California, authorized by section 1201(a)(14) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2024 (138 Stat. 3051).

(20) Project for ecosystem restoration, Central and South Florida, Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Program, Lake Okeechobee Watershed Restoration, Florida, authorized pursuant to section 601(d)(2)(B) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2680; 121 Stat. 1179; 134 Stat. 2673; 136 Stat. 3761; 138 Stat. 3067).

(21) Project for flood risk management, water supply, ecosystem restoration, recreation, and related purposes, Lake Istokpoga, Florida, authorized pursuant to section 8214 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3759).

(22) Project for ecosystem restoration, Lake Runnymede, Florida, authorized by section 8201(a)(16) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3745).

(23) Project for ecosystem restoration and flood risk management, Lake Tohopekaliga, Florida, authorized by section 8201(a)(19) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3745).

(24) Project for hurricane and storm damage risk reduction and ecosystem restoration in the vicinity of MacDill Air Force Base, City of Tampa, Florida, authorized by section 1201(a)(37) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2024 (138 Stat. 3052).

(25) Project for hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, Port Tampa Bay, Florida, including McKay Bay, authorized by section 8201(a)(18) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3745).

(26) Project for flood risk management, ecosystem restoration, and water storage, Shingle Creek and Kissimmee River, Osceola County, Florida, authorized by section 201(a)(5) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (134 Stat. 2670; 136 Stat. 3749).

(27) Project for hurricane and storm damage risk reduction and coastal storm risk management, Volusia County, Florida, authorized by the resolution of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives, dated February 16, 2000, and required to be expedited by section 1203(a)(14) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2024 (138 Stat. 3065).

(28) Project for local flood protection, Hanapēpē River, island of Kaua‘i, Hawaii, authorized by section 10 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (chapter 665, 58 Stat. 903; 138 Stat. 3060).

(29) Project for flood risk management, Kaiaka-Waialua watershed, O‘ahu, Hawaii, authorized pursuant to section 1201(a)(45) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2024 (138 Stat. 3052).

(30) Project for flood risk management and coastal storm risk management, County of Kaua‘i, Hawaii, authorized pursuant to section 1201(a)(46) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2024 (138 Stat. 3052).

(31) Project for flood risk management and ecosystem restoration, County of Maui, Hawaii, authorized by section 1201(a)(47) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2024 (138 Stat. 3052).

(32) Project for flood control and allied purposes, Wailupe Stream, ‘Āina Haina, Honolulu, Hawaii, authorized pursuant to section 209 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1197).

(33) Project for flood risk management, Waimea River, County of Kaua‘i, Hawaii, authorized pursuant to section 216 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (84 Stat. 1830).

(34) Project for flood risk management, Hoosic River, Massachusetts, authorized pursuant to the resolution of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives adopted on December 2, 2010 (docket number 2828) for environmental restoration, streambank stabilization, flood risk management, watershed management, floodplain management, and other allied purposes.

(35) Project for navigation, Saginaw River, Michigan, authorized pursuant to section 456 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 332).

(36) Project for flood risk management and ecosystem restoration, Tittabawassee River, Chippewa River, Pine River, and Tobacco River, Michigan, authorized by section 8201(a)(46) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3747).

(37) Project for flood control of the Mississippi River in its alluvial valley and for its improvement from the Head of the Passes to Cape Girardeau, Missouri, authorized by the first section of the Act of May 15, 1928 (chapter 569, 45 Stat. 534; 138 Stat. 3060).

(38) Project for flood risk management, Berry's Creek, New Jersey, authorized by section 1201(a)(91) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2024 (138 Stat. 3055).

(39) Project for storm damage reduction and shoreline protection, including the engineering documentation report, Brigantine Inlet to Great Egg Harbor Inlet, Absecon Island, New Jersey, authorized by section 101(b)(13) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3668).

(40) Project for flood risk management, Fleischer Brook, New Jersey, authorized by section 1201(a)(92) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2024 (138 Stat. 3055).

(41) Project for flood risk management and hydropower, Great Falls Raceway, Paterson, New Jersey, authorized by section 1201(a)(93) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2024 (138 Stat. 3055).

(42) General reevaluation report for the project for flood risk management, Green Brook Sub-basin, Raritan River Basin, New Jersey, authorized by section 401 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4119; 134 Stat. 2671; 138 Stat. 3066).

(43) General reevaluation report for the project for hurricane and storm damage, Hereford Inlet to Cape May Inlet, Cape May County, New Jersey, authorized by section 1401(3) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (130 Stat. 1712).

(44) Project for flood risk management, Ho-Ho-Kus Brook and Saddle River, Village of Ridgewood, New Jersey, authorized by section 1201(a)(98) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2024 (138 Stat. 3055).

(45) Project for flood risk management and ecosystem restoration, Passaic River Basin, Bergen, Essex, Hudson, Morris, and Passaic Counties, New Jersey, authorized by section 1201(a)(95) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2024 (138 Stat. 3055).

(46) Project for navigation and flood risk management, Passaic River, Paterson, New Jersey, authorized by section 1201(a)(96) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2024 (138 Stat. 3055).

(47) Project for navigation, Borough of Paulsboro, New Jersey, authorized by section 1201(a)(97) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2024 (138 Stat. 3055).

(48) Project for flood risk management along the Peckman River Basin in the townships of Verona (and surrounding area), Cedar Grove, and West Caldwell, New Jersey, authorized by section 8201(a)(58) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3747).

(49) Project for flood risk management, Whippany River Watershed, Morris County, New Jersey, authorized by section 8201(a)(59) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3747).

(50) Project for flood risk management, Wolf Creek, New Jersey, authorized by section 1201(a)(99) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2024 (138 Stat. 3055).

(51) Project for storm damage reduction, to include additional replacement of beach groins, Long Beach, New York, authorized by section 101(a)(21) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3665; 138 Stat. 3061).

(52) Project for ecosystem restoration, Great Salt Lake, Utah, authorized by section 8201(a)(88) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3749).

(53) Project for coastal storm risk management, Virginia Coastal Storm Risk Management, authorized pursuant to the Act of June 15, 1955 (chapter 140, 69 Stat. 132).

(b) STUDY REPORTS.—The Secretary shall expedite the completion of a final report of the Chief of Engineers or other decision document, as applicable, for each of the following projects for the project to be considered for authorization:

(1) Project for flood risk management, Selma Flood Risk Management and Bank Stabilization, Alabama, authorized by section 8401(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3839).

(2) Project for ecosystem restoration, Salt River (Va Shly'Ay Akimel), Maricopa County, Arizona, as authorized by section 6 of the Act of June 28, 1938 (chapter 795, 52 Stat. 1225).

(3) Study for repairs to recontour and stabilize the slope at Dardanelle Lock and Dam, Arkansas, authorized pursuant to section 7 of the Act of July 24, 1946 (chapter 595, 60 Stat. 640).

(4) Project for ecosystem restoration and recreation, Los Angeles River, California, as authorized by section 1407(7) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (130 Stat. 1714).

(5) Project for flood risk reduction, San Francisco Bay, California, authorized by section 142 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1976 (90 Stat. 2930; 100 Stat. 4158; 134 Stat. 2672; 138 Stat. 3136).

(6) Project for ecosystem restoration, Central and South Florida, Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Program, Central Everglades Planning Project, Florida, authorized pursuant to section 601(d)(2)(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2684; 110 Stat. 3767; 114 Stat. 2680; 121 Stat. 1052; 128 Stat. 1369; 130 Stat. 1713; 132 Stat. 3819; 136 Stat. 3791; 138 Stat. 3067).

(7) Project for navigation, Port Everglades, Florida, authorized by section 1401(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (130 Stat. 1709; 136 Stat. 3792).

(8) Project for flood risk management and resiliency, Lower Missouri Jefferson City L–142 Flood Risk Management Study, Lower and Upper Missouri River Comprehensive Flood Protection, Missouri, authorized by section 2 of the Act of August 18, 1941 (chapter 377, 55 Stat. 646; 58 Stat. 897; 134 Stat. 2687).

(9) Project for flood and storm damage reduction, New York and New Jersey Harbor and Tributaries, New York and New Jersey, as authorized by the Act of June 15, 1955 (chapter 140, 69 Stat. 132; 134 Stat. 2676; 138 Stat. 3152).

(10) Project for coastal storm risk management, Nassau County Back Bays, New York, authorized pursuant to the Act of June 15, 1955 (chapter 140, 69 Stat. 132).

(11) Project for navigation, Matagorda Ship Channel Improvement Project, Port Lavaca, Texas, authorized by section 401(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (134 Stat. 2734; 138 Stat. 3083).

(12) Project for hurricane and storm damage reduction, navigation, and ecosystem restoration, Chincoteague Island, Virginia, authorized by section 1201(27) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (130 Stat. 1683).

(c) WATERSHED AND RIVER BASIN ASSESSMENTS.—The Secretary shall expedite the completion of an assessment under section 729 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2267a) for Lower Rouge River Watershed, Michigan.

(d) DREDGED MATERIALS MANAGEMENT PLANS.—The Secretary shall expedite the completion of a dredged material management plan for each of the following projects:

(1) Homer Small Boat Harbor, Homer, Alaska, authorized pursuant to section 204 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1181).

(2) Ashtabula Harbor, Ohio, authorized by the first section of the Act of June 3, 1896 (chapter 314, 29 Stat. 209).

(3) Cleveland Harbor, Ohio, authorized by the first section of the Act of August 14, 1876 (chapter 267, 19 Stat. 133; 100 Stat. 4095; 101 Stat. 1329–107).

(e) WATER CONTROL MANUALS.—The Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, expedite completion of updates to the water control manuals at the Terminus Dam and Lake Kaweah Project, Kaweah River, California, authorized by section 10 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (chapter 665, 58 Stat. 901).

(f) ISSUES EVALUATION STUDIES.—The Secretary shall expedite the completion of the Issues Evaluation Study for Black Butte Lake, Stoney Creek, California, authorized pursuant to the Act of December 22, 1944 (chapter 665, 58 Stat. 900).

(g) NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY HARBOR AND TRIBUTARIES.—

(1) SCHEDULE.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the non-Federal interests for the project described in subsection (b)(9), shall provide to such non-Federal interests and congressional delegations a schedule for completion of the final report of the Chief of Engineers and other project decision documents including—

(A) the remaining study, review, decision milestones, and budget;

(B) any separable elements, actionable elements, phases, reaches, or features expected to be advanced and the anticipated timeline for any such advancements for the duration of the project until completion;

(C) the status of responses to public comments received on the 2022 Draft Integrated Feasibility Report and Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement and Tentatively Selected Plan; and

(D) any impediments to completion of the final report of the Chief of Engineers and any other decision document.

(2) BRIEFINGS.—Until completion of the final report of the Chief of Engineers and other decision documents described in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall brief the non-Federal interests and congressional delegations not less frequently than once per quarter on the status of the project, including progress toward the milestones identified under paragraph (1).

(3) CONGRESSIONAL REPORTS.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter for a period of 5 years, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report detailing the progress on the schedule for completion required under this subsection.

SEC. 203. EXPEDITED MODIFICATION OF EXISTING FEASIBILITY STUDIES.

(a) UNALASKA (DUTCH HARBOR), ALASKA MODIFICATION.—The feasibility study for navigation, Unalaska (Dutch Harbor) Channels, Alaska, authorized by section 401(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (134 Stat. 2734) is modified to authorize the Secretary to include in the study coastal storm risk management and shoreline erosion protection.

(b) COLUMBUS AND HICKMAN, KENTUCKY.—The feasibility study for the project for flood risk management, including riverbank stabilization, Columbus, Kentucky, authorized by section 8201(a)(28) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3746), is modified to authorize the Secretary to include in the study bluff stabilization as an authorized purpose and to include in the study area the City of Hickman, Kentucky.

(c) ALEXANDRIA TO THE GULF OF MEXICO, LOUISIANA.—The feasibility study for flood control, navigation, wetland conservation and restoration, wildlife habitat, commercial and recreational fishing, saltwater intrusion, freshwater and sediment diversion, and other purposes, in the area drained by the intercepted drainage system of the West Atchafalaya Basin Protection Levee, from Alexandria, Louisiana to the Gulf of Mexico, being carried out under Committee Resolution 2535 of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives, adopted July 23, 1997, as authorized by section 1202(4) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2024 (138 Stat. 3064), is modified to include Vermilion Bay.

(d) MAURICE RIVER, NEW JERSEY.—The feasibility study for the project for navigation and for beneficial use of dredged materials for hurricane and storm damage risk reduction and ecosystem restoration, Maurice River, New Jersey, authorized by section 8201(a)(53) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3747), is modified to authorize the Secretary to include streambank erosion and shoreline protection and to include in the study area the East Point Lighthouse.

(e) EXPEDITED COMPLETION.—The Secretary shall expedite the completion of the feasibility studies described in subsections (a) through (d), as modified by such subsections, and if the Secretary determines that a project that is the subject of the feasibility study described in subsection (a), (b), (c), or (d) is justified in the completed report, may proceed directly to preconstruction planning, engineering, and design of the project.

SEC. 204. EXPEDITED COMPLETION OF OTHER FEASIBILITY STUDIES.

(a) CEDAR PORT NAVIGATION AND IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT CHANNEL DEEPENING PROJECT, BAYTOWN, TEXAS.—The Secretary shall expedite the review and coordination of the feasibility study for the project for navigation, Cedar Port Navigation and Improvement District Channel Deepening Project, Baytown, Texas, under section 203(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2231(b)).

(b) RAYMONDVILLE DRAIN PROJECT, TEXAS.—The Secretary shall expedite the review and coordination of the feasibility study for the project for flood control, Raymondville Drain Project, Lower Rio Grande Basin, Texas, under section 203(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2231(b)).

(c) SABINE-NECHES WATERWAY NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENT PROJECT, TEXAS.—The Secretary shall expedite the review and coordination of the feasibility study for the project for navigation, Sabine-Neches Waterway, Texas, under section 203(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2231(b)).

(d) SOUTHERN FLORIDA WATER MANAGEMENT DISTRICT, CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA FLOOD RESILIENCY STUDY (BROWARD BASINS), FLORIDA.—The Secretary shall expedite the review and coordination of the Central and Southern Florida Resiliency Study—Broward Basins for the project for flood risk management, Southern Florida Water Management District, Florida, under section 203(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2231(b)).

SEC. 205. CORPS OF ENGINEERS REPORTS.

(a) REPORT ON THE FORMULATION OF FUTURE WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and biennially thereafter for a period of 10 years, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report describing the use of the procedures under part 234 of title 33, Code of

Federal Regulations, issued pursuant to section 110 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (42 U.S.C. 1962–4), with respect to ongoing feasibility studies for water resources development projects.

(2) INCLUSION.—The Secretary shall include in the report submitted under paragraph (1)—

(A) a project-by-project identification of any feasibility study carried out in accordance with the procedures described in paragraph (1) and an identification of, and rationale for, any study carried out during the period applicable to the report that was not developed using such procedures;

(B) an evaluation of the outcomes of such procedures on the formulation, evaluation, and recommendations for a proposed water resources development project; and

(C) a summary of stakeholder engagement and public input received related to the formulation, evaluation, and recommendation of the project.

(b) REPORT ON IMPACTS OF COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL WATER SUPPLY USERS ON WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report describing the effects of new commercial and industrial water users on water resources development projects authorized for the purpose of water supply or water conservation.

(c) REPORT ON FORECAST-INFORMED RESERVOIR OPERATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report detailing the implementation of forecast-informed reservoir operations at any reservoir constructed, owned, or operated by the Secretary, including a reservoir for which the Secretary is authorized to prescribe regulations for the use of storage allocated for flood control or navigation pursuant to section 7 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (33 U.S.C. 709).

(2) CONTENTS.—The Secretary shall include in the report submitted under paragraph (1)—

(A) a list of projects at which forecast-informed reservoir operations have been implemented or evaluated and, with respect to any project for which such operations were evaluated but not implemented, a rationale for why the operations were not implemented at each such project;

(B) a list of projects at which the viability of using airborne snow observatory flights has been implemented or evaluated for use in forecast-informed reservoir operations and, with respect to any project for which such operations were evaluated but not implemented, a rationale for why the operations were not implemented at each such project;

(C) an assessment of the effectiveness of such operations in improving water supply and flood risk management, and other authorized project purposes;

(D) any barriers to implementation of forecast-informed reservoir operations, including technical, operational, or legal constraints; and

(E) recommendations for any modifications to existing authorities to expand or improve such operations.

(d) RECREATIONAL ACCESS FOR FLOATING CABINS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report on floating cabins, including—

(A) a summary of any authorities and procedures the Secretary uses to manage activities or permissions relating to floating cabins;

(B) identification of any laws, regulations, administrative barriers, or other limitations that prohibit or inhibit greater use of, or installation of new, floating cabins;

(C) recommendations of the Secretary with respect to changes the Secretary may implement to facilitate greater use of, or installation of new, floating cabins; and

(D) with respect to each recommendation identified under subparagraph (C)—

(i) the estimated cost to the Corps of Engineers to implement, and operate under, such change; and

(ii) a detailed description of any effects, including benefits, that such change is expected to have on—

(I) any operations at water resources development projects operated and maintained by the Corps; and

(II) the mission of the Corps as it relates to recreation.

(2) FLOATING CABIN DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ''floating cabin'' means a floating cabin, as such term is defined in section 1035 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (128 Stat. 1234), that is located on waters subject to the jurisdiction of the Secretary, including Federal water resources reservoirs or lake projects administered by the Secretary.

(e) REPORT ON EASEMENTS FOR HURRICANE AND STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION PROJECTS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report describing the implementation of authorities granted in section 1145(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2024 (33 U.S.C. 598c(d)), including—

(1) an assessment of any administrative actions taken (including any guidance issued, policy changes made, or process improvements implemented) by the Secretary to implement such section;

(2) a summary of the use of each authority used by the Secretary in carrying out a project pursuant to such section, including—

(A) the number and types of projects for which each such authority was used;

(B) the status of any easement acquisition, easement relocation, or easement modification activity carried out using each such authority; and

(C) any reduction in project delays or costs, or any reduction in administrative burdens, attributable to the use of each such authority; and

(3) identification of any additional legislative authorities the Secretary determines are necessary to improve project delivery under such section.

(f) BENEFICIAL USE OF DREDGED MATERIAL; MANAGEMENT PLANS REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate the strategic plan required by section 8130(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3717), developed in accordance with the national goal described in section 125(a)(1)(B) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (33 U.S.C. 2326g(a)(1)(B)).

(2) FAILURE TO MEET DEADLINE.—If the Secretary fails to submit the strategic plan described in paragraph (1) by the deadline established by such paragraph, the Secretary shall, not later than 225 days after the date of enactment of this Act, submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate—

(A) a detailed explanation of why the Secretary failed to submit the strategic plan by the deadline;

(B) a summary of the status of the development of the strategic plan, including whether it has been initiated; and

(C) a projected date for submission of the strategic plan.

(g) REPORT ON THE APPLICABILITY OF ARCHITECTURAL AND ENGINEERING FEE CAPS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report on any statutory, regulatory, or policy limitation on architectural and engineering service fees applicable to water resources development projects carried out under the civil works program of the Corps of Engineers.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall include in the report submitted under paragraph (1)—

(A) a description of any limitation applied by the Secretary to architectural and engineering service fees for such projects, including, where applicable, the identification of the authority for the limitation; and

(B) an assessment of the effects of any limitations applied by the Secretary to such fees on the ability of the Secretary to carry out such projects, including a list of projects the cost or schedule of which was affected by such limitations.

(h) REPORT ON REALIGNMENT OF CORPS DIVISIONS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report detailing the implications and feasibility of realigning the divisions of the Corps to transfer the responsibilities of the Little Rock District to the Mississippi Valley Division.

SEC. 206. REPORT ON THE INLAND WATERWAYS SYSTEM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a comprehensive study to evaluate the condition and reliability of water resources development projects within inland and intracoastal waterways of the United States.

(b) COMPONENTS.—In carrying out the study required under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) examine inland and intracoastal waterways of the United States and the ability of such waterways to meet the needs of the United States, including emergency and defense needs;

(2) investigate the reliability and effectiveness of water resources development projects within such waterways with respect to commerce, navigation, environment, and recreation;

(3) assess the condition of flood control structures (including locks, levees, and dams) along such waterways to determine the structural importance and identify any necessary repairs to maintain future reliability of such waterways;

(4) assess the effectiveness of ecosystem restoration and mitigation efforts within such waterways;

(5) evaluate water resources development projects (including separable elements) within such waterways that will reduce recurring dredging requirements to maintain authorized navigation dimensions of such waterways and prevent channel migration;

(6) assess the funding needed to improve the reliability and effectiveness of water resources development projects within such waterways; and

(7) identify components of water resources development projects that, in case of failure, would likely have significant impacts on the function of such waterways.

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report on the study required under subsection (a).

(d) INLAND AND INTRACOASTAL WATERWAYS OF THE UNITED STATES DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''inland and intracoastal waterways of the United States'' means the inland and intracoastal waterways described in section 206 of the Inland Waterways Revenue Act of 1978 (33 U.S.C. 1804).

SEC. 207. COASTAL STORM RISK MANAGEMENT TRUST FUND STUDY.

The Secretary shall conduct a study on the creation of a Coastal Storm Risk Management Trust Fund, including identification of potential sources of funding for such a trust fund.

SEC. 208. ASSESSMENT OF EMERGING HARBOR MAINTENANCE BACKLOG.

(a) ASSESSMENT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall conduct an assessment of federally authorized emerging harbors that have experienced deferred maintenance, inadequate operations and maintenance funding, or recurring navigation deficiencies.

(b) CONTENTS.—In conducting the assessment under subsection (a), the Secretary shall identify, for each emerging harbor—

(1) the authorized dimensions and current condition of the harbor and associated Federal navigation features;

(2) the extent of deferred maintenance and dredging needs;

(3) the economic, public safety, emergency response, commercial fishing, Tribal, and recreational impacts associated with deferred maintenance;

(4) whether the harbor has been unable to receive regular maintenance because of current benefit-cost methodologies or other Federal policies;

(5) whether the harbor has not received Federal operations and maintenance funding for a period of not less than 10 years and the impacts of such lack of maintenance on navigation, safety, and local economic activity;

(6) recommendations for addressing identified maintenance backlogs; and

(7) a determination of—

(A) the interest of State, local, and Tribal governments, and port authorities, in assuming responsibility for the operation and maintenance of the emerging harbor; and

(B) any legal, financial, or operational barriers to such assumption of responsibility.

(c) CONSULTATION.—In conducting the assessment under this section, the Secretary shall consult with State, local, Tribal, and port authorities regarding—

(1) the potential deauthorization of federally authorized emerging harbors;

(2) the interest of non-Federal public entities in assuming responsibility for the operation and maintenance of such harbors; and

(3) the authorities, funding mechanisms, and technical assistance that may be necessary to facilitate such transfers.

(d) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report containing the results of the assessment conducted under this section and recommendations for administrative or legislative actions to address any identified backlogs, including any recommendations regarding the transfer of operation and maintenance responsibilities to interested non-Federal entities.

(2) PRIORITY LIST.—The Secretary shall include in the report under paragraph (1) a prioritized list of emerging harbor maintenance projects based on economic importance, public safety, commercial fishing activity, Tribal reliance, emergency access needs, and the extent of deferred maintenance.

(e) EMERGING HARBOR DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''emerging harbor'' has the meaning given the term in section 210(f)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2238(f)(2)).

SEC. 209. GAO STUDIES.

(a) STUDY ON COST-SHARING EFFORTS FOR RECREATION FACILITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall initiate a review of the efforts of the Secretary to share with non-Federal public entities and private nonprofit entities the cost of managing recreation facilities and natural resources at water resource development projects under the jurisdiction of the Secretary.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—In conducting the review under paragraph (1), the Comptroller General shall—

(A) describe the actions the Secretary is taking, or plans to take, to implement section 225 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (33 U.S.C. 2328);

(B) evaluate the use of joint management agreements, including cooperative agreements under subsection (b)(1) of such section, and other partnership authorities, that allow the Secretary to share responsibilities with, or transfer or delegate responsibilities to, non-Federal public entities and private nonprofit entities, for the operation and management of recreation facilities and natural resources;

(C) assess the effectiveness of such agreements in reducing Federal costs, improving facility conditions, and maintaining or enhancing public access;

(D) identify any legal, regulatory, or administrative barriers to the expanded use of such agreements; and

(E) develop recommendations for legislative or administrative actions to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of such partnership authorities.

(3) REPORT.—Upon completion of the review required under paragraph (1), the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report that contains the results of such review, including any recommendations developed under paragraph (2)(E).

(b) STUDY ON BEACH RENOURISHMENT EFFORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall initiate an analysis that includes—

(A) the statutory authorities and programs used by, and available to, the Secretary to support beach renourishment cycles, including initial construction, periodic renourishment, and emergency renourishment activities;

(B) an evaluation of financial, regulatory, and technical barriers that contribute to delays in carrying out beach renourishment activities;

(C) a description of the Corps of Engineers process for evaluating the beneficial use of dredged material for beach renourishment activities, including procuring materials from other projects carried out by the Corps of Engineers; and

(D) recommendations for legislative, regulatory, or administrative actions to address barriers identified under subparagraph (B) and to improve the efficiency, predictability, and effectiveness of the beach renourishment efforts of the Corps of Engineers.

(2) REPORT.—Upon completion of the analysis required under paragraph (1), the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report on the findings of such analysis.

(c) STUDY ON ARCHITECTURAL AND ENGINEERING DESIGN SERVICES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall initiate a review of the methods by which the Corps of Engineers performs architectural and engineering design services, including—

(A) an analysis of the procurement of such services through contracts with private sector firms;

(B) an assessment of the extent to which employees of the Corps of Engineers carry out such services; and

(C) a comparative assessment of the benefits and costs of the methods described in subparagraphs (A) and (B).

(2) REPORT.—Upon completion of the review required under paragraph (1), the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report on the findings of such review.

(d) REVIEW OF COMPLIANCE WITH STATE FISH AND WILDLIFE RECOMMENDATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall initiate a review of the compliance of the Secretary with any requirements under, and incorporation of any recommendations submitted to the Secretary pursuant to, the following:

(A) Section 2 of the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 U.S.C. 662), including technical recommendations related to evaluating impacts to fish and wildlife resources.

(B) State management programs approved under section 306 of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1455).

(C) State comprehensive plans approved under section 4 of the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669c).

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—In conducting the review under paragraph (1), the Comptroller General shall—

(A) assess the extent to which the Corps of Engineers incorporates any recommendation submitted by a Federal or State agency pursuant to the statutes identified in paragraph (1) in developing a feasibility study for the construction or modification of a water resources development project or an operations or mitigation plan for a water resources development project; and

(B) to the extent that any recommendation is not incorporated, provide a detailed explanation and legal justification as to why such recommendation was not incorporated.

(3) REPORT.—Upon completion of the review required under paragraph (1), the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report on the findings of such review.

SEC. 210. INSPECTOR GENERAL REPORTS.

(a) REPORT ON INHERENTLY GOVERNMENTAL FUNCTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Engineer Inspector General of the Corps of Engineers shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report on the policies of the Corps of Engineers related to identifying the inherently governmental function status of Corps of Engineers park rangers.

(2) CONTENTS.—In the report submitted under paragraph (1), the Engineer Inspector General shall include—

(A) an assessment of—

(i) the policies, guidance, and practices of the Corps of Engineers for identifying and classifying functions and duties related to environmental management, public safety, and enforcement duties for projects; and

(ii) the extent to which such policies, guidance, and practices comply with the requirements of the Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act of 1998 (31 U.S.C. 501 note) and other applicable laws, regulations, and guidance governing inherently governmental functions;

(B) an assessment of any risks to environmental management, public safety, enforcement duties, or governmental decisionmaking resulting from the potential misclassification of park ranger functions;

(C) an assessment of Corps of Engineers policies and procedures for distinguishing functions that must be performed by Federal employees from functions that may appropriately be performed by contractors;

(D) an assessment of any potential deficiencies in Corps of Engineers policies, procedures, internal controls, staffing practices, or organizational structures that may impair compliance with applicable requirements governing inherently governmental functions and the effective performance of environmental management, public safety, and enforcement duties; and

(E) any recommendations for administrative or legislative actions necessary to improve compliance with requirements governing inherently governmental functions and the performance of park ranger responsibilities.

(b) REPORT ON TRIBAL POLICIES AND PROGRAMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Engineer Inspector General of the Corps of Engineers shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report on the implementation of policies and programs of the Corps of Engineers relating to Tribal communities, including the uniformity of application of such policies and programs across all districts of the Corps of Engineers.

(2) CONTENTS.—In the report submitted under paragraph (1), the Engineer Inspector General shall include—

(A) an assessment of the Tribal Liaison position (as established by section 8112 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (33 U.S.C. 2281a)), including a description of how each applicable district office has implemented the position and the responsibilities of such position;

(B) the implementation status of—

(i) section 203 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (33 U.S.C. 2269);

(ii) section 1141 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2024 (33 U.S.C. 2269 note); and

(iii) section 8115 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (33 U.S.C. 2281b note);

(C) an assessment of the Secretary's alignment with requirements of subsections (c) and (d) of section 112 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (33 U.S.C. 2356) with respect to Tribal communities;

(D) an assessment of the alignment of the Secretary's guidance, guidelines, and policies with clearly stated congressional intent with respect to Tribal communities; and

(E) an evaluation of barriers within the Corps of Engineers that hinder or prohibit successful Tribal engagement, consultation, or partnership.

(c) REPORT ON LOWER PEARL RIVER RESTORATION PROJECT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Engineer Inspector General of the Corps of Engineers shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report on the failure and degradation of the weir constructed at Wilson's Slough, near Walkiah Bluff, Mississippi, as part of the project for flood damage reduction, Pearl River Basin, including Shoccoe, Mississippi, authorized by section 401(e)(3) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4132; 121 Stat. 1134).

(2) CONTENTS.—The report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) an assessment of the design, construction, operation, and maintenance of the weir;

(B) a determination, to the extent practicable, of whether the failure or degradation of the weir was primarily attributable to structural deficiencies, inadequate operations or maintenance, natural events, or a combination thereof; and

(C) any recommendations for administrative or legislative actions necessary to restore functionality of the Lower Pearl River Restoration project or prevent similar failures in future environmental restoration projects.

SEC. 211. ACCELERATION OF EMERGENCY INLAND NAVIGATION PROJECTS.

In carrying out any authorized inland navigation project, the Secretary shall expedite completion of any modification, repair, or rehabilitation that is subject to an emergency declaration issued by the Secretary, including a non-breach emergency, to ensure continued navigation functionality and structural integrity, including by expediting the completion of investigations, engineering and design, and construction activities necessary to resolve emergency conditions.

SEC. 212. ASSESSMENT OF COMMERCIAL FISH LANDINGS DATA.

Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall provide to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate the results of the corrective action plan developed by the Secretary in response to the report of the Comptroller General of the United States, published on April 28, 2025, and titled ''Army Corps of Engineers: Commercial Fishing Data Could Help Inform Budget Process'' (GAO–25–107447).

SEC. 213. ASSESSMENTS OF DRYLAND STREAM TECHNOLOGIES AND SHORELINE STABILIZATION TECHNOLOGIES.

(a) ASSESSMENT OF NATURAL INFRASTRUCTURE IN DRYLAND STREAMS TECHNOLOGIES AND APPROACHES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Director of the Engineer Research and Development Center, shall carry out research and development activities on, and test the effectiveness of, natural infrastructure in dryland streams technologies and approaches to using such technologies in arid, semi-arid, and drought-prone areas.

(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Secretary shall, to the extent practicable—

(A) ensure that the locations where research and development activities and tests are carried out are geographically diverse;

(B) undertake research and development activities and tests that include human-made infrastructure that mimics natural infrastructure, such as rock check dams, beaver dam analogs, gabions, and weirs; and

(C) based on information collected from the carrying out and completion of research and development activities and tests described in subparagraph (B), assess the potential uses and effectiveness of such human-made infrastructure with respect to restoring dryland ecosystems, enhancing flood risk reduction efforts, and enhancing water supply, water conservation, and drought resiliency efforts.

(3) CONSULTATION.—In carrying out a research and development activity or test under paragraph (1), the Secretary may consult with—

(A) the heads of other Federal agencies;

(B) Indian Tribes; and

(C) appropriate State government agencies in States with arid or semi-arid areas.

(4) GUIDANCE.—Not later than 1 year after the completion of the activities and testing described in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall publish guidance for the utilization of natural infrastructure in dryland streams technologies in civil works projects.

(5) SUMMARY TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall provide to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate, and make publicly available (including on a publicly available website), a written summary of the activities and tests carried out, and the guidance published, under this subsection.

(b) ASSESSMENT OF SHORELINE STABILIZATION AND EROSION CONTROL TECHNOLOGIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Director of the Engineer Research and Development Center and, as appropriate, in consultation with other Federal agencies and coastal States, shall carry out research and development activities on, and test the effectiveness of, shoreline stabilization, erosion control, and wave energy reduction technologies applicable to coastal areas exposed to flooding and erosion, including flooding and erosional impacts associated with tidally influenced portions of rivers, bays, and estuaries that are hydrologically connected to the coastal water body.

(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

(A) to the maximum extent practicable, ensure that research and development activities and testing are carried out in diverse geographic locations; and

(B) carry out research and development activities and testing of natural features and nature-based features (as those terms are defined in section 1184(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 2289a(a))), including the use of engineered technologies that mimic natural processes or structures, or approaches that combine natural and engineered elements.

(3) SUMMARY TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall provide to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate, and make publicly available (including on a publicly available website) a written summary of the activities carried out under this subsection.

SEC. 214. ASSESSMENT OF NONSTRUCTURAL APPROACHES TO FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT AND HURRICANE AND STORM RISK REDUCTION.

Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report on the status of the following projects:

(1) The project for flood risk management and ecosystem restoration, Bergen, Essex, Hudson, Morris, and Passaic Counties, New Jersey, including as it relates to buyouts in the Township of Wayne, Passaic County, New Jersey, authorized pursuant to section 101(a)(18) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 4607).

(2) The project for flood risk management, Township of Denville, New Jersey, being carried out pursuant to section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s).

(3) The project for flood control, Green Brook Sub-basin, Raritan River Basin, New Jersey, authorized by section 401 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4119; 134 Stat. 2671).

(4) The project for hurricane and storm damage reduction, New Jersey Back Bays, Cape May, Ocean, Atlantic, Monmouth, and Burlington Counties, authorized by resolutions of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate, approved in December 1987.

(5) The project for hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point, New York, authorized by section 401(3) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (134 Stat. 2738).

(6) The project for coastal storm risk management, Nassau County Back Bays, New York, authorized pursuant to the Act of June 15, 1955 (chapter 140, 69 Stat. 132).

SEC. 215. POST-DISASTER WATERSHED ASSESSMENT FOR IMPACTED AREAS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out a post-disaster watershed assessment under section 3025 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2267b) for the following areas:

(1) Areas of Catron and Grant Counties, New Mexico, impacted by the June 2025 wildfires.

(2) Areas of Valencia County, New Mexico, impacted by the June 2025 wildfires.

(3) Areas near Ruidoso, New Mexico, impacted by the June 2024 wildfires.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report on the status of the post-disaster watershed assessments carried out under subsection (a).

SEC. 216. UPDATED PLAN ON FEDERAL HOPPER DREDGE RECAPITALIZATION.

Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall—

(1) with respect to Federal hopper dredges identified in the analysis of the Corps of Engineers titled ''Hopper Dredge Recapitalization Analysis'' (published June 20, 2017) and owned and operated by the Corps of Engineers as of the date of enactment of this Act, update the plan and timeline for recapitalization of such Federal hopper dredges that is included in such analysis; and

(2) submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate such updated plan and timeline.

SEC. 217. CHOCTAWHATCHEE AND PEA RIVER BASINS, ALABAMA AND FLORIDA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of carrying out the study of improvements for flood control, water quality, water supply, drought management, and fish and wildlife enhancement authorized by the Congressional Committee Resolution adopted April 24, 1990, by the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate (relating to the Choctawhatchee and Pea River Basins, Alabama and Florida, as described in House Document 242, 72d Congress, 1st session), and any related review conducted pursuant to the Congressional Committee Resolution adopted August 1, 1990, by the Committee on Public Works and Transportation of the House of Representatives (relating to the Pea River watershed, Alabama), the Secretary shall—

(1) develop a scope of work, including a communications plan, in collaboration with the non-Federal interest, that is in accordance with the intent of such authorizing documents and, to the extent practicable, meets the objectives of the non-Federal interest;

(2) include in the study area the entire Choctawhatchee River basin and Pea River basin, and all hydrologically connected downstream receiving waters, in the States of Alabama and Florida; and

(3) coordinate, as practicable, with relevant State, local, and Tribal entities in Alabama and Florida and with appropriate Federal agencies.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—This section shall apply to any feasibility study carried out pursuant to the authorizations described in subsection (a).

SEC. 218. MOBILE HARBOR LAND USE ASSESSMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out an assessment of the long-term viability of existing dredged material placement areas for Mobile Harbor, including State-owned upland dredged materials disposal facilities.

(b) BENEFICIAL USE.—In carrying out the assessment under subsection (a), the Secretary shall include recommendations for the beneficial use of dredged materials from Mobile Harbor, including the viability of using such dredged materials at locations on Pinto Island and Blakeley Island in Mobile, Alabama.

SEC. 219. EXPEDITED AFTER-ACTION REVIEW OF LAKE OKEECHOBEE RECOVERY OPERATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall expedite the completion of an After-Action Review for the Lake Okeechobee Recovery Operations that occurred between December 2024 and June 2025.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than December 31, 2026, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report on the After-Action Review described in subsection (a), including—

(1) a description of the rationale of the Secretary, including identification of any factors and any processes used by the Secretary, in deciding to implement the Lake Okeechobee Recovery Operations that occurred between December 2024 and June 2025;

(2) an assessment by the Secretary of such Recovery Operations, including identification and assessment of the effects, if any, of such Recovery Operations on—

(A) the subaquatic vegetation and fauna in and around Lake Okeechobee;

(B) the ecology of estuaries and lagoons that received water transfers from Lake Okeechobee, including effects on subaquatic vegetation, adult oyster populations, and oyster reproduction rates in such estuaries and lagoons;

(C) congressionally authorized project purposes of flood protection, water supply, protection of fish and wildlife resources, and navigation; and

(D) the total quantity of water, measured in cubic-feet, transferred through congressionally authorized or funded projects;

(3) the identification of any periods during the 18-month period beginning on June 30, 2025, of water excess or water shortage in Lake Okeechobee, a canal used for navigation in the vicinity of Lake Okeehcobee, or sources of water for drinking or other consumption located in the area south of Lake Okeechobee;

(4) an assessment of the ability of the Corps of Engineers to undertake Lake Okeechobee Recovery Operations again during the 5-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(5) an assessment of whether or not there may have been any adverse effects to water supply or other Congressionally authorized purposes, included but not limited to flood protection, protection of fish and wildlife resources, and navigation as a result of Lake Okeechobee Recovery Operations.

(c) LIMITATION.—In the report under subsection (b), the Secretary may not recommend—

(1) expanding Federal authority or oversight over waters or environmental programs of a State; or

(2) anything contrary to the original goals, priorities, or authorizations of the project for ecosystem restoration, Central and South Florida, Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Program, Lake Okeechobee Watershed Restoration, Florida, authorized pursuant to section 601(d)(2)(B) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2680; 121 Stat. 1179; 134 Stat. 2673; 136 Stat. 3761; 138 Stat. 3067).

SEC. 220. HONOLULU HARBOR, HAWAII.

Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate an update describing the status of the study to modify the project for navigation, Honolulu Harbor, Hawaii, authorized by the first section of the Act of March 3, 1905 (chapter 1482, 33 Stat. 1146; 136 Stat. 3750; 138 Stat. 3064), including the status of the assessment of the benefits of the project modification on disaster resiliency and enhanced national security from utilization of the harbor by the Department of Defense authorized by section 1202(3) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2024 (138 Stat. 3064).

SEC. 221. CHICAGO AREA WATERWAY SYSTEM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall provide to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate an assessment of the Calumet Harbor Dredged Material Disposal Facility, also known as the Chicago Area Confined Disposal Facility, authorized pursuant to section 123 of the River and Harbor Act of 1970 (84 Stat. 1823).

(b) INCLUSION.—The Secretary shall include in the assessment under subsection (a)—

(1) a description of work related to the ongoing and future dredging of the Calumet River and Harbor;

(2) a plan for carrying out activities related to the closure of the Chicago Area Confined Disposal Facility, not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, including remediation, capping, seeding, and other measures necessary to stabilize the facility and ensure that the site of the facility is prepared for the authorized use of such site after such closure;

(3) a plan of actions to be taken to ensure conveyance of the Chicago Area Confined Disposal Facility to the Chicago Park District in a timely fashion after the completion of closure activities carried out pursuant to the plan under paragraph (2); and

(4) a plan of actions to be taken to ensure the Secretary coordinates with State and local governments in carrying out this section.

SEC. 222. GREAT LAKES AND MISSISSIPPI RIVER INTERBASIN PROJECT, BRANDON ROAD, WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report that includes—

(1) the results of an assessment to identify any contaminated sediments associated with the project for ecosystem restoration, Great Lakes and Mississippi River Interbasin Study – Brandon Road, Will County, Illinois, authorized by section 401(5) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (134 Stat. 2740); and

(2) a plan, developed in coordination with the non-Federal interest for such project, to remediate such sediments simultaneously with construction of the project.

SEC. 223. COLUMBIA LOCK AND DAM, LOUISIANA.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report regarding the Columbia Lock and Dam, Louisiana, authorized by the first section of the Act of June 13, 1902 (chapter 1079, 32 Stat. 357), that includes—

(1) a description of the nature and extent of the structural concerns that resulted in the declaration by the Secretary in August, 2024, of a non-breach emergency at the lock and dam;

(2) a summary of actions taken by the Corps of Engineers to address such concerns, including interim operational or emergency measures;

(3) recommended permanent remedial actions necessary to ensure continued navigation functionality and structural integrity;

(4) an evaluation of whether such recommended permanent remedial actions may be implemented as discrete, segmented projects or phases, including an assessment of—

(A) the technical feasibility of such segmentation;

(B) potential cost efficiencies or risk reduction associated with phased implementation; and

(C) the extent to which segmentation could accelerate completion of critical repairs; and

(5) an estimated schedule and cost range for implementation of such recommended permanent remedial actions, including any segmented or phased approach identified based on the evaluation under paragraph (4).

SEC. 224. LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMPREHENSIVE MANAGEMENT STUDY.

The Secretary shall expedite completion of the Lower Mississippi River Comprehensive Management Study, authorized by section 213 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (134 Stat. 2684; 136 Stat. 3795).

SEC. 225. DISPOSITION STUDY FOR CAPE COD CANAL, MASSACHUSETTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out a disposition study under section 216 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (33 U.S.C. 549a) for the deauthorization of a portion of the project for navigation, Cape Cod Canal, Massachusetts, authorized by the first section of the Act of August 30, 1935 (chapter 831, 49 Stat. 1029), that the Secretary determines—

(1) is not needed to carry out the authorized purposes of the project; and

(2) could be conveyed to the Town of Sandwich or the Town of Bourne, Massachusetts, for the construction of a new wastewater treatment plant.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report on the status of the disposition study required under subsection (a).

SEC. 226. NEW ENGLAND REGIONAL CONFINED AQUATIC DISPOSAL FACILITIES.

(a) EXPEDITE ASSESSMENT.—The Secretary shall expedite the completion of the assessment of the availability of confined aquatic disposal facilities in the New England District region required under section 8128(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3716).

(b) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—Upon completion of the assessment under subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate the results of such assessment.

(c) STUDY AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary is authorized to conduct—

(1) a study for the construction of confined aquatic disposal facilities in the Massachusetts Bay and Ipswich Bay region for the disposal of contaminated dredged material in such region; and

(2) any other study recommended by the Secretary in the assessment under subsection (a).

SEC. 227. ASSATEAGUE ISLAND, MARYLAND AND VIRGINIA.

Section 534(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3775) is amended by striking ''$35,000,000'' and inserting ''$45,000,000''.

SEC. 228. BIG SANDY LAKE, MINNESOTA.

(a) SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PLAN.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish a shoreline management plan for the Big Sandy Lake project.

(b) SHORELINE USE PERMITS.—Upon the establishment of a shoreline management plan under subsection (a), the Secretary is authorized to issue to an owner of land adjacent to the Big Sandy Lake project, upon request by the owner and consistent with the shoreline management plan, a shoreline use permit for activities relating to an existing structure or a new structure on land that is held by the Corps of Engineers for the project and adjacent to the land of the owner.

(c) DISPOSITION STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out a disposition study under section 216 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (33 U.S.C. 549a) for the release, transfer, conveyance, or exchange of excess easements, or the conveyance of excess land, held for the Big Sandy Lake project.

(2) SCOPE.—In carrying out the disposition study under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

(A) for each segment of shoreline property owned by the Corps of Engineers at the Big Sandy Lake project that corresponds to the width of an adjacent plot of private property, identify—

(i) the appraised value of the segment of shoreline property; and

(ii) a legal description and the acreage of the segment of shoreline property; and

(B) develop recommendations for any restrictions or conditions on any shoreline property at the Big Sandy Lake project that is owned by, or subject to an easement held by, the Corps of Engineers that would be necessary to sustain the authorized purposes of the Big Sandy Lake project if the shoreline property were to be conveyed to, or the easement were to be released, transferred or conveyed to, or exchanged with, a non-Federal entity.

(3) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report on the status of the disposition study required under paragraph (1).

(d) BIG SANDY LAKE PROJECT DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''Big Sandy Lake project'' means the Sandy Lake dam and reservoir, located in Aitkin County, Minnesota, originally authorized as one of the six Mississippi River Headwater reservoirs authorized by the first section of the Act of June 14, 1880 (chapter 211, 21 Stat. 193; 22 Stat. 203).

SEC. 229. UPPER MISSOURI RIVER BASIN SEDIMENTATION.

(a) COMPREHENSIVE STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a comprehensive study to identify the core sedimentation issues in the Upper Missouri River Basin.

(2) RECOMMENDATIONS.—In conducting the study under this subsection, the Secretary may develop recommendations for—

(A) the construction of a water resources development project;

(B) the structural or operational modification of existing water resources development projects, except as provided in subsection (f);

(C) monitoring or adaptive management measures for water resources development projects to respond to changing conditions in the Upper Missouri River Basin;

(D) additional studies focusing on specific geographic areas within the Upper Missouri River Basin;

(E) management plans and actions, to be carried out by responsible Federal agencies, to address or reduce sedimentation in the Upper Missouri River Basin; and

(F) further research on issues with respect to which data or current technology does not allow for immediate solutions.

(b) CONTINUATION OF STUDY.—The following studies shall be considered a continuation of the study conducted under subsection (a):

(1) Any study recommended to be carried out in a report that the Chief of Engineers prepares for the study conducted under subsection (a).

(2) Any additional study recommended under subsection (a)(2).

(3) Any study spun off from the study conducted under subsection (a), or from an additional study recommended under paragraph (2) of such subsection, before the completion of such study.

(c) USE OF EXISTING DATA.—In conducting the study under subsection (a), and in carrying out any study pursuant to subsection (b), the Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable and where appropriate, make use of existing data provided to the Secretary by any applicable Federal, State, and local agency, Indian Tribe, non-Federal interest, or other stakeholder, or from any relevant multistate monitoring program.

(d) COSTS.—

(1) LIMITATION.—The total cost of the study conducted under subsection (a) shall not exceed $25,000,000.

(2) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of the study conducted under subsection (a) and any study carried out pursuant to subsection (b) shall be 65 percent.

(e) DEADLINE.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report that contains the results of the study conducted under subsection (a), including any recommendations developed under paragraph (2) of such subsection.

(f) PROHIBITION.—In conducting the study under subsection (a), and in carrying out any study pursuant to subsection (b), the Secretary may not consider any changes to the Missouri River Basin Mainstem Reservoir System Master Water Control Manual.

SEC. 230. TABLE ROCK LAKE DISPOSITION STUDY, MISSOURI AND ARKANSAS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out a disposition study under section 216 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (33 U.S.C. 549a) for the release, transfer, conveyance, or exchange of excess easements, or the exchange of excess land, held for flood risk management and operation of the Table Rock Lake project of the Corps of Engineers, located in Missouri and Arkansas, authorized as one of the multipurpose reservoir projects in the White River Basin by section 4 of the Act of June 28, 1938 (chapter 795, 52 Stat. 1218).

(b) ACTIONS.—In carrying out the study required under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) ensure that the relevant non-Federal interest for the Table Rock Lake project is provided right of first refusal for any potential release, transfer, conveyance, or exchange of excess easements; and

(2) work alongside such non-Federal interest in identifying opportunities for land exchanges, where possible.

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report of the status of the disposition study required under subsection (a).

SEC. 231. TABLE ROCK LAKE, MISSOURI AND ARKANSAS.

Section 1323 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2024 (138 Stat. 3143) is amended—

(1) by striking subsections (a) and (b) and inserting the following:

''(a) STRUCTURES.—The Secretary shall permit the ongoing presence of an eligible structure at the Table Rock Lake project until the abandonment of the eligible structure.

''(b) SEWER OR SEPTIC SYSTEMS.—The Secretary shall permit the ongoing presence of an eligible sewer or septic system at the Table Rock Lake project until the abandonment or imminent failure of the eligible sewer or septic system.'';

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''eligible structure, means the allowance of the structure'' and inserting ''eligible structure or eligible sewer or septic system, means the allowance of the structure or sewer or septic system'';

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (4) and (6), respectively;

(C) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

''(2) ELIGIBLE SEWER OR SEPTIC SYSTEM.—The term 'eligible sewer or septic system' means a privately owned sewer or septic system that—

''(A) as of the date of enactment of the Water Resources Development Act of 2026, is located on fee land or land subject to a flowage easement held by the United States; and

''(B) does not impact the reservoir level, water quality, or operations of the Table Rock Lake project.

''(3) ELIGIBLE STRUCTURE.—The term 'eligible structure' means a structure for human habitation, shed, retaining wall, deck, patio, gazebo, driveway, fence, or similar structure, that, as of the date of enactment of the Water Resources Development Act of 2026, is located—

''(A) on fee land or land subject to a flowage easement held by the United States; and

''(B) higher than the elevation contour of 936 feet above mean sea level.''; and

(D) by inserting before paragraph (6), as so redesignated, the following:

''(5) IMMINENT FAILURE.—The term 'imminent failure' means, with respect to an eligible sewer or septic system, a final order by the applicable unit of local government to the owner of an eligible sewer or septic system that such system be replaced.''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(d) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in the section shall prevent the Secretary from issuing a shoreline use permit, other applicable permit, easement, or outgrant, consistent with a shoreline management plan or other applicable policy, for a structure, sewer system, or septic system proposed to be built or modified after the date of enactment of the Water Resources Development Act of 2026 at the Table Rock Lake project.''.

SEC. 232. EVALUATION OF ATOMIC CONTAMINATION AT COCHITI LAKE, SANDOVAL COUNTY, NEW MEXICO.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in coordination with the Secretary of Energy and the People of Cochiti Pueblo, shall initiate an evaluation of the area including the lands adjacent to and including the Cochiti Lake in relation to the early atomic energy program of the United States, including the Manhattan Engineering District, to determine whether the area is eligible to be added to the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program of the Corps of Engineers.

(b) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall notify the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate of the results of the evaluation initiated under subsection (a), including—

(1) whether the area referred to in subsection (a) contains contamination that resulted from the early atomic energy program;

(2) whether further remedial action in the area is needed; and

(3) if eligible, the timeline for adding the area to the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program.

SEC. 233. NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES STUDY ON UPPER RIO GRANDE BASIN.

Section 1230 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2024 (138 Stat. 3086) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) IMPLEMENTATION UPDATES.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, and annually thereafter until the report prepared under subsection (a) is completed, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate an update describing the status of the implementation of this section.''.

SEC. 234. ARBUCKLE-TIMBERED HILLS, OKLAHOMA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), the Secretary, in coordination with relevant Federal and State agencies and non-Federal interests, may conduct a study on water supply, water storage capacity, and drought resiliency for the regions overlaying the Arbuckle-Timbered Hills Aquifer, Oklahoma.

(b) COMPONENTS.—In carrying out a study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall identify infrastructure needs to support increased water storage in and around the Arbuckle-Timbered Hills Aquifer.

SEC. 235. DISPOSITION AND COST ALLOCATION STUDY OF WILLAMETTE VALLEY, OREGON.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall issue the report required by section 8220 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3762), as modified by this section.

(b) COST ALLOCATION.—The Secretary shall include in the report described in subsection (a)—

(1) a review of the cost allocation for capital investments for fish passage, and associated monitoring facilities, constructed or proposed after September 30, 2025, and for operation and expenses related to such capital investments, at the dams, reservoirs, and related facilities of the Willamette Valley hydropower project; and

(2) a description of the relative public value of continued hydropower operations at the Willamette Valley hydropower project compared to flood control and other authorized purposes.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''Willamette Valley hydropower project'' has the meaning given that term in section 8220(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3762).

SEC. 236. FOSTER JOSEPH SAYERS RESERVOIR AND DAM, PENNSYLVANIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out a disposition study under section 216 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (33 U.S.C. 549a) for the release, transfer, conveyance, or exchange of excess easements, or the exchange of excess land, held for flood risk management and operation of the Foster Joseph Sayers Reservoir and Dam project, located in Pennsylvania and constructed as one of the flood risk management reservoir projects in the plan for flood protection on the West Branch of the Susquehanna River, Pennsylvania and New York, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 1257).

(b) SCOPE.—The disposition study required by subsection (a) shall include—

(1) identification of the minimum real property required for the operation or maintenance of the Foster Joseph Sayers Reservoir and Dam project;

(2) evaluation of the potential effects of the release, transfer, conveyance, or exchange of excess property interests on flood control and recreation missions of the Corps of Engineers; and

(3) identification of the exact legal description and acreage of the property interests, including easements, suitable for conveyance.

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report of the status of the disposition study required under subsection (a).

SEC. 237. HUMPHREYS COUNTY, TENNESSEE.

The Secretary shall coordinate with representatives of the Natural Resources Conservation Service to expedite completion of watershed planning assistance to Humphreys County, Tennessee, pursuant to the agreement entered into between the Secretary and the Chief of the Natural Resources Conservation Service on November 30, 2022, for such assistance.

SEC. 238. SAM RAYBURN RESERVOIR, TEXAS.

(a) JOINT ASSESSMENT.—Upon request of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Chief of the Forest Service, shall jointly assess the condition of the Harvey Creek boat ramp at Sam Rayburn Reservoir, San Augustine County, Texas, to identify any repairs to the boat ramp that may be necessary.

(b) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO THE FOREST SERVICE.—Upon request of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary shall provide technical and design assistance to the Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Chief, for any repairs to the boat ramp described in subsection (a) that the Secretary of Agriculture determines necessary based on an assessment under subsection (a).

SEC. 239. COLUMBIA RIVER, WASHINGTON.

(a) TRI-CITIES DISPOSITION STUDY.—The Secretary shall carry out a disposition study under section 216 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (33 U.S.C. 549a) for the conveyance of covered lands to a covered entity for a public purpose.

(b) LAND INTO TRUST DISPOSITION STUDY.—The Secretary shall carry out a disposition study under section 216 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (33 U.S.C. 549a) for the transfer of covered lands to the Secretary of the Interior to be taken into trust for the benefit of a covered Tribal entity.

(c) CONSULTATION.—To identify the exact location, acreage, and boundaries of the covered lands to be included in a disposition study under this section, the Secretary shall consult with covered entities, covered Tribal entities, and other stakeholders, as applicable.

(d) CONTENTS.—In carrying out a disposition study under this section, the Secretary shall—

(1) review and describe the effects, if any, on the authorized purpose of each Corps of Engineers project expected to be affected by a conveyance or transfer, as applicable, of covered lands that are the subject of the study;

(2) identify all Federal easements on such covered lands;

(3) identify all federally owned flood risk management and flood control infrastructure on such covered lands;

(4) identify and describe each new authority needed, if any, to convey or transfer, as applicable, such covered lands;

(5) for each parcel of land within such covered lands, identify and describe any rights-of-way, access easements, flood easements, and other similar legal instruments, agreements, or encumbrances needed to operate and maintain all flood control infrastructure operated and maintained by the Corps of Engineers;

(6) identify and describe any current agreements entered into by the Corps of Engineers and a non-Federal entity for use of, or access to, such covered lands; and

(7) identify any restrictions or conditions on lands proposed for conveyance that the Secretary recommends and determines to be necessary to sustain the authorized purposes of each Corps of Engineers project expected to be affected by a conveyance or transfer, as applicable, of such covered lands.

(e) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report on the status of each disposition study required under this section.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COVERED ENTITY.—The term ''covered entity'' means—

(A) the City of Kennewick, Washington;

(B) the City of Pasco, Washington;

(C) the City of Richland, Washington;

(D) Benton County, Washington;

(E) Franklin County, Washington; and

(F) the Port Commission of the Port of Pasco, located in the City of Pasco, Washington.

(2) COVERED LANDS.—The term ''covered lands'' means the shoreline and adjacent lands located along the Columbia River within in the following areas of land owned by the Corps of Engineers:

(A) With respect to the disposition study required in subsection (a)—

(i) the area of approximately 370 acres in Benton County, Washington;

(ii) the area of approximately 465 acres in the City of Kennewick, Washington;

(iii) the area of approximately 350 acres in the City of Pasco, Washington;

(iv) the area of approximately 640 acres in the City of Richland, Washington;

(v) the area of approximately 8 acres within the Port of Pasco, Washington; and

(vi) the area of approximately 520 acres in Franklin County, Washington.

(B) With respect to the disposition study required in subsection (b)—

(i) the area of approximately 200 acres within the Umatilla Indian Reservation;

(ii) the area of approximately 160 acres within the Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation; and

(iii) any additional areas, as determined by the Secretary.

(3) COVERED TRIBAL ENTITY.—The term ''covered Tribal entity'' means—

(A) the Confederated Tribes of Umatilla Indian Reservation;

(B) the Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation; and

(C) other federally recognized Indian Tribes, as determined appropriate by the Secretary.

SEC. 240. TRI-CITIES AREA, WASHINGTON.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall expedite the property conveyances authorized under section 501(i) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3752).

(b) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—If the Secretary fails to convey any property to the appropriate non-Federal entity pursuant to section 501(i) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 within 18 months of the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall notify the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate—

(1) which property has not been conveyed;

(2) why such property has not been conveyed; and

(3) of the timeline to convey such property.

TITLE III—DEAUTHORIZATIONS AND MODIFICATIONS

SEC. 301. DEAUTHORIZATION OF INACTIVE PROJECTS.

Section 301 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (33 U.S.C. 579d–2) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) to address the backlog of water resources development projects that the Secretary is authorized to construct.'';

(2) in subsection (b)(1)(A), by striking ''Water Resources Development Act of 2024'' and inserting ''Water Resources Development Act of 2026'' each place it appears; and

(3) in subsection (c), by adding at the end the following:

''(3) UPDATES.—After submission of the final deauthorization list and appendix under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

''(A) review and update the list and appendix as necessary; and

''(B) not less than every six months, beginning after the date of such submission—

''(i) provide to the committees described in paragraph (1)(A) the updated list and appendix; and

''(ii) publish the updated list and appendix in the Federal Register.''.

SEC. 302. GENERAL REAUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) LAKES PROGRAM.—Section 602 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4148; 138 Stat. 3164) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (38), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in paragraph (39), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(40) Gap Creek, Okaloosa County, Florida, for removal of silt and aquatic growth, stump removal, and other material to carry out environmental cleanup;

''(41) Lake Waumpi, Orange County, Florida;

''(42) Lake Becerra, Glendale Heights, Illinois;

''(43) Electric Lake (Mill Pond), Park Ridge, New Jersey;

''(44) Pondside Park pond, Harrington Park, New Jersey; and

''(45) Putnam Lake, Putnam County, New York.''; and

(2) in subsection (e), by striking ''$40,000,000'' and inserting ''$60,000,000''.

(b) CHESAPEAKE BAY OYSTER RECOVERY PROGRAM.—Section 704(b)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2263) is amended, in the second sentence, by striking ''$120,000,000'' and inserting ''$150,000,000''.

(c) CIVIL WORKS RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—Section 7(c)(8) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1988 (33 U.S.C. 2313) is amended by striking ''2028'' and inserting ''2030''.

(d) REHABILITATION OF CORPS OF ENGINEERS CONSTRUCTED DAMS.—Section 1177(f) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 467f–2 note) is amended by striking ''$60,000,000'' and inserting ''$80,000,000''.

(e) CHATTAHOOCHEE RIVER PROGRAM.—Section 8144(k) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3724) is amended by striking ''$40,000,000'' and inserting ''$50,000,000''.

(f) COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN.—Section 8309(c)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3780; 138 Stat. 3043) is amended by striking ''2026 and 2027'' and inserting ''2026 through 2030''.

(g) LOWER MISSOURI RIVER STREAMBANK EROSION CONTROL EVALUATION AND DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.—Section 8350(f) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3798) is amended by striking ''5 years'' and inserting ''8 years''.

(h) NON-FEDERAL IMPLEMENTATION OF FEASIBILITY STUDIES.—Section 1043(a) of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2201 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (7), by striking ''terminates on the date that is 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act'' and inserting ''terminates on September 30, 2030''; and

(2) in paragraph (8), by striking ''2019'' and inserting ''2030''.

(i) ACEQUIAS IRRIGATION SYSTEM.—Section 1113(e) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4232; 110 Stat. 3719; 136 Stat. 3781; 138 Stat. 3161) is amended by striking ''$90,000,000'' and inserting ''$120,000,000''.

(j) MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT PROGRAM FOR SALINE LAKES IN THE GREAT BASIN.—Section 8143(f) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3724) is amended by striking ''$10,000,000'' and inserting ''$12,500,000''.

(k) NON-FEDERAL INTEREST DREDGING AUTHORITY.—Section 1113(g) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 2326e) is amended by striking ''10'' and inserting ''14''.

SEC. 303. CONVEYANCES.

(a) GENERALLY APPLICABLE PROVISIONS.—

(1) SURVEY TO OBTAIN LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—The exact acreage and the legal description of any real property to be conveyed under this section shall be determined by a survey that is satisfactory to the Secretary.

(2) APPLICABILITY OF PROPERTY SCREENING PROVISIONS.—Section 2696 of title 10, United States Code, shall not apply to any conveyance under this section.

(3) COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.—An entity to which a conveyance is made under this section shall be responsible for all reasonable and necessary costs, including real estate transaction and environmental documentation costs, associated with the conveyance.

(4) LIABILITY.—An entity to which a conveyance is made under this section shall hold the United States harmless from any liability with respect to activities carried out, on or after the date of the conveyance, on the real property conveyed. The United States shall remain responsible for any liability with respect to activities carried out, before such date, on the real property conveyed.

(5) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require that any conveyance under this section be subject to such additional terms and conditions as the Secretary considers necessary and appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(b) CITY OF CORONA, CALIFORNIA.—

(1) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary may convey, without consideration, to the City of Corona, California, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the real property described in paragraph (2), for the purpose of public water reclamation, wastewater treatment, environmental management, or related municipal purposes.

(2) PROPERTY.—The property to be conveyed under this subsection is the approximately 48 acres of land, including improvements located at 2205 Railroad Street, Corona, California.

(3) RESERVATION OF RIGHTS.—In carrying out the conveyance under this subsection, the Secretary shall, after consultation with the City of Corona, reserve and retain from the conveyance under this subsection such easements, rights-of-way, and other interests that the Secretary determines to be necessary and appropriate to ensure the continued operation of the Prado Dam Basin flood control project, authorized pursuant to section 5 of the Act of June 22, 1936 (chapter 688, 49 Stat. 1589; 100 Stat. 4113).

(4) REVERSION.—If the Secretary determines at any time that the property conveyed under this subsection is not in accordance with the purpose specified in paragraph (1), all right, title, and interest in and to the property shall revert, at the discretion of the Secretary, to the United States.

(c) TOWN OF DUCK, NORTH CAROLINA.—

(1) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary shall convey, without consideration, to the Town of Duck, North Carolina, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the real property described in paragraph (2), for the purpose of housing a fire station and public safety facility.

(2) PROPERTY.—The property to be conveyed under this subsection is the approximately 4.02 acres of land, with approximately 330 linear feet of road frontage and approximately 530 linear feet of depth, including improvements on that land, located at 1259 Duck Road, Duck, North Carolina.

(3) REVERSION.—If the Secretary determines at any time that the property conveyed under this subsection is not in accordance with the purpose specified in paragraph (1), all right, title, and interest in and to the property shall revert, at the discretion of the Secretary, to the United States.

(d) CITY OF TOLEDO, OHIO.—

(1) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary may convey, without consideration, to the City of Toledo, Ohio, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the real property described in paragraph (2), for the purpose of public benefit, including parks and recreation.

(2) PROPERTY.—The property to be conveyed under this subsection is the small land mass known as Grassy Island, including any improvements on that land, located in Maumee Bay at the mouth of Maumee River in Ohio.

(3) REVERSION.—If the Secretary determines at any time that the property conveyed under this subsection is not in accordance with the purpose specified in paragraph (1), all right, title, and interest in and to the property shall revert, at the discretion of the Secretary, to the United States.

(e) COUNTY OF UMATILLA, OREGON.—

(1) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary may convey to the County of Umatilla, Oregon, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the real property described in paragraph (2), for the purpose of public benefit.

(2) PROPERTY.—The property to be conveyed under this subsection is approximately 25 acres of Federal land, including improvements on that land, in Umatilla County, Oregon, and described as follows:

(A) All of Tax Lot 1301.

(B) Approximately 12 acres of Tax Lot 1001.

(3) RESERVATION OF RIGHTS.—The Secretary shall, after consultation with the County of Umatilla, reserve and retain from the conveyance under this subsection such easements, rights-of-way, licenses, and other interests that the Secretary determines to be necessary and appropriate to the project for flood control and other purposes, John Day Dam, Columbia River, Washington and Oregon, authorized under section 204 of the Flood Control Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 179).

(4) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall—

(A) identify all agreements and other encumbrances entered into with a non-Federal entity on the property to be conveyed under this subsection; and

(B) in a form and manner determined by the Secretary, transfer any such agreements and encumbrances identified under subparagraph (A) to the County of Umatilla, as appropriate.

(5) DEED.—The Secretary shall convey the property under this subsection by quitclaim deed under such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(6) CONSIDERATION.—The County of Umatilla shall pay to the Secretary an amount that is not less than the fair market value of the property conveyed under this subsection, as determined by the Secretary.

SEC. 304. LAND EXCHANGE, WALTON AND BAY COUNTIES, FLORIDA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Upon conveyance, by warranty deed acceptable to the Secretary, by The St. Joe Company to the United States of all right, title, and interest in and to the non-Federal land, the Secretary shall release, by quitclaim deed, to The St. Joe Company, all interests held by the United States in any easements on the covered land other than the interests described in the covered easement.

(b) CONSIDERATION.—As consideration for the conveyance and release of interests under subsection (a), The St. Joe Company shall pay to the Secretary an amount equal to the difference between the fair market value of the interests the Secretary is releasing under subsection (a) and the fair market value of the non-Federal land, as determined by an appraised value mutually agreed upon by the Secretary and The St. Joe Company.

(c) DEADLINE.—The conveyance and release of interests under subsection (a) shall be completed not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) APPLICABILITY OF PROPERTY SCREENING PROVISIONS.—Section 2696 of title 10, United States Code, shall not apply to any conveyance under this section.

(e) COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.—The St. Joe Company shall be responsible for all reasonable and necessary costs, including real estate transaction and environmental documentation costs, associated with any conveyance or release of easements under this section.

(f) LIABILITY.—The St. Joe Company shall hold the United States harmless from any liability with respect to activities carried out, on or after the date of the conveyance, on the real property conveyed under this section. The United States shall remain responsible for any liability with respect to activities carried out, before such date, on the real property conveyed.

(g) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require that any conveyance or release of interests under this section be subject to such additional terms and conditions as the Secretary considers necessary and appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COVERED EASEMENT.—The term ''covered easement'' means any non-exclusive, perpetual easement on the covered land, which grants the Secretary the right, to maintain the following easements as set forth in the nonstandard estate language:

(A) The channel maintenance and operations easement.

(B) The ingress and egress easement.

(C) The drainage trench easement.

(2) COVERED LAND.—The term ''covered land'' means the approximately 79.60 acres of land in Bay County and Walton County, Florida, as generally depicted on the map entitled ''Boundary Survey Giles Land Swap Intracoastal Waterway Parcel Bay County and Walton County, Florida'', prepared by Dewberry Engineers, Inc., and dated January 26, 2021, under Project Number 50135600.

(3) NON-FEDERAL LAND.—The term ''non-Federal land'' means the approximately 103.49 acres of land in Bay County, Florida, as generally depicted as Parcel B on the map entitled ''Description Sketch Land Exchange (USACE/SJC) East Bay Parcel SEC. 13, T–5–S, R–12–W Bay County, Florida'', prepared by Dewberry Engineers, Inc., and dated September 28, 2021, under Project Number 50145235.

(4) THE ST. JOE COMPANY.—The term ''The St. Joe Company'' means The St. Joe Company, headquartered in Panama City Beach, Florida, originally incorporated in 1936, and previously known as the St. Joe Paper Company.

SEC. 305. PORT CANAVERAL, FLORIDA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—On receipt of a written request from the Canaveral Port Authority, the Secretary shall—

(1) review the covered land, including any easements on such land, and determine whether any portion of such land or easements are no longer required for the purposes of the Canaveral Harbor project;

(2) identify any portion of the covered land that the Secretary determines is no longer required under paragraph (1) and that would be suitable for conveyance or exchange with the Canaveral Port Authority; and

(3) as appropriate—

(A) convey, at fair market value to, or through exchange for real property of not less than equal value with, the Canaveral Port Authority any portion of the covered land that the Secretary determines is no longer required under paragraph (1); and

(B) grant to the Canaveral Port Authority any easement on the covered land that the Secretary determines under paragraph (1) is no longer required and will not adversely impact the operation of the Canaveral Harbor project.

(b) ACTIONS.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) determine the exact acreage and the legal description of any real property interest to be conveyed under this section based on a survey that is satisfactory to the Secretary and completed by the non-Federal interest of the Canaveral Harbor project;

(2) coordinate with the Canaveral Port Authority in identifying opportunities for land exchanges, where possible; and

(3) ensure that any conveyance, grant of easements, or exchange of land carried out under this section, does not interfere with any Federal navigation project that has been constructed or is authorized to be constructed as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) DEED.—The Secretary shall convey any property described in subsection (a)(3)(A) under this section by quitclaim deed under such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(d) APPLICABILITY OF REAL PROPERTY SCREENING REQUIREMENTS.—Section 2696 of title 10, United States Code, shall not apply to the conveyance of property under this section.

(e) COSTS OF CONVEYANCE OR GRANT OF AN EASEMENT.—The Canaveral Port Authority shall be responsible for all reasonable and necessary costs, including real estate transaction and environmental documentation costs, associated with a conveyance or grant of an easement under this section.

(f) LIABILITY.—An entity to which a conveyance or grant of an easement is made under this section shall hold the United States harmless from any liability with respect to activities carried out, on or after the date of the conveyance or grant of an easement, on the real property conveyed, or with respect to which an easement is granted. The United States shall remain responsible for any liability with respect to activities carried out, before such date, on the real property conveyed or with respect to which an easement is granted.

(g) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require that any conveyance or grant of an easement under this section be subject to such additional terms and conditions as the Secretary considers necessary and appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CANAVERAL HARBOR PROJECT.—The term ''Canaveral Harbor project'' means the project for navigation, Canaveral Harbor, Port Canaveral, Florida, authorized by section 2 of Act of March 2, 1945 (chapter 19, 59 Stat. 16).

(2) COVERED LAND.—The term ''covered land'' means the land owned and known as ''USACOE TRACT 100'' that is held by the United States for the Canaveral Harbor project.

SEC. 306. SPECIFIC DEAUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) DEAUTHORIZATION OF DESIGNATED PORTIONS OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CALIFORNIA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The portion of the project for flood risk management, Los Angeles County Drainage Area, California, authorized by section 5 of the Act of June 22, 1936 (chapter 688, 49 Stat. 1589; 50 Stat. 167; 52 Stat. 1215; 55 Stat. 647; 64 Stat. 177; 104 Stat. 4611; 136 Stat. 3785; 138 Stat. 3019), consisting of the flood channels described in paragraph (2), is no longer authorized beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) FLOOD CHANNELS DESCRIBED.—The flood channels referred to in paragraph (1) are the following flood channels operated and maintained by the Los Angeles County Flood Control District, as generally defined in Corps of Engineers operations and maintenance manuals:

(A) Alhambra Wash Channel (Valley Blvd. to Rio Hondo).

(B) Arcadia Wash Channel.

(C) Ballona Creek Channel (La Salle Ave. to Vista Del Mar).

(D) Ballona Creek Channel (Redondo Blvd. to Washington Blvd.).

(E) Benedict Canyon Channel.

(F) Burbank Western Channel (Roscoe Blvd. to Victory Blvd.).

(G) Caballero Creek Channel.

(H) Centinela Creek Channel.

(I) Compton Creek Channel (Main St. to 122nd St.).

(J) Compton Creek Channel (Southern Pacific Rail Yard to Los Angeles River).

(K) Coyote Creek Channel (Valley View St. to San Gabriel River).

(L) Eaton Wash Channel.

(M) Grandview Ave Channel.

(N) Haines Canyon Channel (Plainview Ave. to Tujunga Wash).

(O) Kenter Canyon Channel.

(P) Lopez Canyon Diversion Channel.

(Q) Los Angeles River (Owensmouth Ave. to Sepulveda Flood Control Basin).

(R) Los Angeles River (Sepulveda Flood Control Basin to Lankershim Blvd.).

(S) Los Angeles River (Stewart and Grey Rd. to Pacific Ocean).

(T) North Fork Channel.

(U) Pacoima Wash Channel.

(V) Rio Hondo Channel (Lower Azusa Rd. to Rosemead Blvd.).

(W) Rio Hondo Channel (500 ft. south of Whittier Narrows Dam to Union Pacific Rail Yard).

(X) Rubio Wash Channel.

(Y) San Gabriel River Channel (Santa Fe Flood Control Basin to Thienes Ave.).

(Z) San Gabriel River Channel (Whittier Narrows Dam to Pacific Ocean).

(AA) San Jose Creek Channel (Thomas Creek to San Jose Creek Diversion).

(BB) Santa Anita Wash Channel.

(CC) Sawpit Wash Channel.

(DD) Sawtelle–Westwood Channel.

(EE) Sycamore Wash Channel.

(FF) Tujunga Wash Channel (436 ft. south of Hansen Dam to Los Angeles River).

(GG) Verdugo Wash Channel (Verdugo Debris Basin to San Fernando Rd.).

(3) REPEAL.—The following are repealed:

(A) Subsections (c) and (d) of section 8320 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3785).

(B) Paragraphs (3) and (4) of section 1302(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2024 (138 Stat. 3109).

(b) LOWER SAN JOAQUIN RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, CALIFORNIA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The portion of the project for flood protection on the Lower San Joaquin River and tributaries, California, authorized by section 10 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (chapter 665, 58 Stat. 901), consisting of the 3.76 mile Dos Rios Levee along the right bank of the San Joaquin River between River Mile 88 and River Mile 85, is no longer authorized beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) REPEAL.—Section 1302(p) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2024 (138 Stat. 3114) is repealed.

(c) UPPER ST. ANTHONY FALLS LOCK AND DAM, MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA.—Section 2010 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (128 Stat. 1270; 132 Stat. 3812; 136 Stat. 3795) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(h) CLARIFICATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the requirements of section 356(f) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (134 Stat. 2724; 138 Stat. 3141), the Secretary shall retain ownership of, and operation and maintenance responsibility for, the underwater cutoff wall constructed by the Secretary on the riverbed in the vicinity of St. Anthony Falls, Minnesota.

''(2) ASSESSMENT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall complete and transmit to the State of Minnesota and to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate an assessment of the condition of the underwater cutoff wall described in paragraph (1).''.

(d) HARLEM RIVER FEDERAL NAVIGATION CHANNEL, NEW YORK.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the project for navigation, Harlem River, New York, authorized by the first section of the Act of June 18, 1878 (chapter 264, 20 Stat. 158) is modified to deauthorize the portion of the project consisting of the areas described in paragraph (2).

(2) AREAS DESCRIBED.—The areas referred to in paragraph (1) are—

(A) the area that is a closed polygon formed by straight lines connecting, in the order listed, the following points, and thence extending landward to the existing physical shoreline—

(i) beginning at a point on the shoreline north of the Macombs Dam Bridge at N244191.72, E1002503.69;

(ii) running south-southwesterly approximately 59.5 feet to a point at N244133.98, E1002489.25;

(iii) running south-southwesterly approximately 579.8 feet to a point at N243572.61, E1002344.44;

(iv) running southerly approximately 173.9 feet to a point at N243399.67, E1002326.56;

(v) running southerly approximately 189.0 feet to a point at N243212.20, E1002302.50;

(vi) running southerly approximately 354.4 feet to a point at N242858.69, E1002277.63;

(vii) running southerly approximately 292.3 feet to a point at N242566.45, E1002281.31;

(viii) running southerly approximately 791.2 feet to a point at N241778.27, E1002350.13;

(ix) running southerly approximately 254.5 feet to a point at N241525.84, E1002382.88;

(x) running southerly approximately 56.6 feet to a point at N241469.61, E1002389.06;

(xi) running southerly approximately 190.2 feet to a point at N241280.22, E1002406.69;

(xii) running southwesterly approximately 93.6 feet to a point at N241209.59, E1002345.25; and

(xiii) running southwesterly approximately 15.4 feet terminating at a point on the shoreline at N241197.95, E1002335.13; and

(B) the area that is a closed polygon formed by straight lines connecting, in the order listed, the following points, and thence extending landward to the existing physical shoreline—

(i) beginning at a point on the shoreline south of the Macombs Dam Bridge at N240595.14, E1002396.69;

(ii) running south-southeasterly approximately 30.5 feet to a point at N240569.30, E1002412.94;

(iii) running south-southeasterly approximately 97.5 feet to a point at N240486.75, E1002464.88;

(iv) running southerly approximately 477.6 feet to a point at N240010.61, E1002502.81;

(v) running southerly approximately 60.4 feet to a point at N239950.33, E1002506.19;

(vi) running southerly approximately 39.5 feet to a point at N239910.88, E1002506.94;

(vii) running southerly approximately 137.3 feet to a point at N239773.63, E1002509.38;

(viii) running southerly approximately 97.9 feet to a point at N239676.67, E1002523.13;

(ix) running southerly approximately 58.1 feet to a point at N239618.58, E1002524.19;

(x) running southerly approximately 289.1 feet to a point at N239330.02, E1002541.31;

(xi) running southerly approximately 331.3 feet to a point at N238999.31, E1002560.94;

(xii) running southerly approximately 583.2 feet to a point at N238416.61, E1002585.50;

(xiii) running southerly approximately 387.8 feet to a point at N238029.20, E1002602.56;

(xiv) running southerly approximately 120.0 feet to a point at N237909.23, E1002603.81;

(xv) running west-northwesterly approximately 42 feet to a point at N237919.38, E1002563.06; and

(xvi) running west-northwesterly approximately 1 foot to a point on the shoreline at N237919.63, E1002562.06.

(e) HUDSON RIVER CHANNEL PARTIAL DEAUTHORIZATION, NEW YORK.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the project for navigation, Hudson River Channel, New York, authorized by the first section of the Act of March 4, 1913 (chapter 144, 37 Stat. 804), is modified to deauthorize the portion of the channel consisting of the area described in paragraph (2).

(2) AREA DESCRIBED.—The area referred to in paragraph (1) is the area bounded by the following coordinates:

(A) W 740004.90, N 404615.84.

(B) W 735957.24, N 404612.68.

(C) W 740015.09, N 404601.62.

(D) W 740007.71, N 404558.52.

(f) NEWTOWN CREEK FEDERAL NAVIGATION CHANNEL, NEW YORK.—

(1) DEFINITION OF NEWTOWN CREEK, NEW YORK PROJECT.—In this subsection, the term ''Newtown Creek, New York project'' means the project for navigation, Newtown Creek, New York and associated tributaries, authorized by the first section of the Act of March 2, 1919 (chapter 95, 40 Stat. 1276; 46 Stat. 920; 50 Stat. 845; 138 Stat. 3113).

(2) MODIFICATION.—Beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Newtown Creek, New York project is modified to reduce, in part, the authorized dimensions of the project, such that the remaining authorized depths are as follows:

(A) A 20-foot deep channel with a center line beginning at point North 40.735668 and West 73.942159, thence to a point North 40.733648 and West 73.940546.

(B) An 18-foot deep channel with a center line beginning at point North 40.733648 and West 73.940546, thence to a point North 40.722214 and West 73.925873.

(C) An 18-foot deep turning basin southwest of a line formed by points North 40.726201 and West 73.927288; and North 40.723507 and West 73.924712.

(D) A 16-foot-deep channel with a center line beginning at a point North 40.722214 and West 73.925873, thence to a point North 40.718066 and West 73.923931.

(E) A 16-foot-deep channel with a center line beginning at a point North 40.718663 and West 73.924175, thence to a point North 40.717538 and West 73.927437.

(F) A 14-foot-deep channel with a center line beginning at a point North 40.717538 and West 73.927437, thence to a point North 40.716610 and West 73.929278.

(G) A 12-foot-deep channel with a center line beginning at a point North 40.716610 and West 73.929278, thence to a point North 40.713164 and West 73.931352.

(3) DEAUTHORIZATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The portions of the Newtown Creek navigation project described in subparagraph (B) are deauthorized beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

(B) PORTIONS DESCRIBED.—The portions referred to in subparagraph (A) are—

(i) the portion of the project adjacent to the turning basin consisting of—

(I) the area east of a line formed by points North 40.726201 and West 73.927288; and North 40.723507 and West 73.924712; and

(II) the area containing Maspeth Creek;

(ii) the upstream portion of English Kills consisting of the area—

(I) beginning at a point North 40.713164 and West 73.931352; and

(II) extending upstream to the project boundary; and

(iii) Dutch Kills, consisting of the area—

(I) beginning at a point North 40.737623 and West 73.946809; and

(II) extending upstream to the project boundary.

(g) CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA.—

(1) DEAUTHORIZATION.—Upon completion of the sale of the Union Pier marine terminal property and cessation of commercial port operations at the Union Pier marine terminal by the South Carolina Ports Authority, the project for navigation, Charleston Harbor, South Carolina, authorized by section 1401(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (130 Stat. 1708) consisting of the area described in paragraph (2) is no longer authorized.

(2) PORTION DESCRIBED.—The area referred to in paragraph (1) is the portion of the Federal channel located within Charleston Harbor bounded by the following coordinates: 32° 47' 14.4485'' N, 79° 55' 23.8699'' W; to 32° 46' 39.2931'' N, 79° 55' 23.1766'' W; to 32° 46' 39.4002'' N, 79° 55' 15.564'' W; to 32° 47' 5.2545'' N, 79° 55' 16.0734'' W; to 32° 47' 9.6725'' N, 79° 55' 10.8883'' W; thence back to 32° 47' 14.4485'' N, 79° 55' 23.8699'' W.

(h) SHOT POUCH CREEK, SOUTH CAROLINA.—The project for snagging and clearing, Shot Pouch Creek, South Carolina, authorized by section 2 of August 28, 1937 (33 U.S.C. 701g), consisting of 2.15 miles of Shot Pouch Creek from the Sumter Bypass to Swan Lake, is no longer authorized beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 307. ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE.

(a) CONSISTENCY WITH REPORTS.—Congress finds that the projects and project modifications described in this subsection are in accordance with the reports submitted to Congress by the Secretary under section 7001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282d), titled ''Report to Congress on Future Water Resources Development'', or have otherwise been reviewed by Congress.

(b) NEW PROJECTS.—Section 219(f) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 138 Stat. 3115) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(599) AUBURN, ALABAMA.—$3,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in the city of Auburn, Alabama.

''(600) EDWARDSVILLE, ALABAMA.—$4,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in the town of Edwardsville, Alabama.

''(601) GADSDEN, ALABAMA.—$12,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply and distribution systems, in the city of Gadsden, Alabama.

''(602) LOWER ALABAMA, ALABAMA.—$40,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, environmental restoration, and surface water protection, in Barbour, Bullock, Butler, Conecuh, Crenshaw, Macon, Mobile, Monroe, Montgomery, Pike, Russell, and Washington Counties, Alabama.

''(603) MOBILE, ALABAMA.—$10,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including ecosystem restoration and resiliency, in the city of Mobile, Alabama.

''(604) SOUTHSIDE, ALABAMA.—$4,200,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including distribution systems, in the city of Southside, Alabama.

''(605) NELSON LAGOON, ALASKA.—$3,300,000 for water infrastructure, including water supply and storage, in the Native Village of Nelson Lagoon, Alaska.

''(606) SITKA, ALASKA.—$7,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including reclamation and storage, in the city and borough of Sitka, Alaska.

''(607) SOLDOTNA, ALASKA.—$1,300,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water reclamation and storage, in the city of Soldotna, Alaska.

''(608) LEE COUNTY, ARKANSAS.—$50,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in Lee County, Arkansas.

''(609) COTTONWOOD, ARIZONA.—$10,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water reclamation, distribution systems, and stormwater management, in the city of Cottonwood, Arizona.

''(610) GILA COUNTY, ARIZONA.—$24,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water reclamation, treatment, and distribution systems, in Gila County, Arizona.

''(611) GILA RIVER INDIAN COMMUNITY, ARIZONA.—$10,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply and conservation, in the Gila River Indian Community, Arizona.

''(612) MARICOPA, ARIZONA.—$10,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water reclamation, distribution systems, and stormwater management, in the city of Maricopa, Arizona.

''(613) PIMA COUNTY, ARIZONA.—$7,500,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water reclamation and distribution systems and environmental restoration, in Pima County, Arizona.

''(614) SANTA CRUZ COUNTY, ARIZONA.—$30,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water reclamation and distribution systems and environmental restoration, in Santa Cruz County, Arizona.

''(615) ARTESIA, CALIFORNIA.—$1,200,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management and environmental infrastructure, in the city of Artesia, California.

''(616) ATASCADERO, CALIFORNIA.—$20,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply, in the city of Atascadero, California.

''(617) BELMONT, SAN CARLOS, REDWOOD CITY, AND WEST BAY SANITARY DISTRICT, CALIFORNIA.—$9,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including environmental restoration, in the cities of Belmont, San Carlos, and Redwood City and the West Bay Sanitary District, California.

''(618) BURBANK, CALIFORNIA.—$20,000,000 for water infrastructure, including water distribution systems, in the city of Burbank, California.

''(619) BUTTE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.—$1,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in Butte County, California.

''(620) CERRITOS, CALIFORNIA.—$16,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply, in the city of Cerritos, California.

''(621) COACHELLA, CALIFORNIA.—$10,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply, in the city of Coachella, California.

''(622) CONTRA COSTA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.—$6,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in Contra Costa County, California.

''(623) EL MONTE, CALIFORNIA.—$18,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the city of El Monte, California.

''(624) EL SEGUNDO, CALIFORNIA.—$1,500,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the city of El Segundo, California.

''(625) ELSINORE VALLEY, CALIFORNIA.—$5,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in the city of Lake Elsinore, California.

''(626) ENCINITAS, CALIFORNIA.—$44,250,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, drainage systems, and environmental restoration, in the city of Encinitas, California.

''(627) IRVINE, CALIFORNIA.—$20,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply, in the city of Irvine, California.

''(628) LA CAÑADA FLINTRIDGE, CALIFORNIA.—$29,024,625 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply and storage capacity, in the city of La Cañada Flintridge, California.

''(629) LAGUNA BEACH, CALIFORNIA.—$10,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply and stormwater management, in the city of Laguna Beach, California.

''(630) LOMPOC, CALIFORNIA.—$6,300,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the city of Lompoc, California.

''(631) MANHATTAN BEACH, CALIFORNIA.—$2,000,000 for water and water supply infrastructure in the city of Manhattan Beach, California.

''(632) MISSION VIEJO, RANCHO SANTA MARGARITA, AND SAN CLEMENTE, CALIFORNIA.—$20,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply, water recycling, and stormwater management in the cities of Mission Viejo, Rancho Santa Margarita, and San Clemente, California.

''(633) MODESTO, CALIFORNIA.—$30,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including facility relocation, in the city of Modesto, California.

''(634) MONTEREY COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.—$27,500,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in Monterey County, California.

''(635) MORGAN HILL, CALIFORNIA.—$17,500,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in the city of Morgan Hill, California.

''(636) OJAI, CALIFORNIA.—$25,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the city of Ojai, California.

''(637) REDWOOD CITY, CALIFORNIA.—$3,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the city of Redwood City, California.

''(638) SACRAMENTO RIVER BASIN, CALIFORNIA.—$155,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including environmental restoration and surface water protection in the Sacramento River Basin, California, including the counties of Shasta, Tehama, Butte, Glenn, Colusa, Sutter, Yuba, Sacramento, and Yolo, California.

''(639) SAN BERNARDINO AND RIVERSIDE COUNTIES, CALIFORNIA.—$67,500,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply, distribution systems, stormwater management, and environmental restoration, in San Bernardino and Riverside Counties, California.

''(640) SAN FERNANDO, CALIFORNIA.—$28,000,000 for water infrastructure, including water supply and distribution systems, in the city of San Fernando, California.

''(641) SAN MATEO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.—$30,665,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply and water reuse and related facilities, in San Mateo County, California.

''(642) SANTA BARBARA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.—$3,200,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in Santa Barbara County, California.

''(643) SANTA CRUZ, CALIFORNIA.—$3,500,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water reclamation, distribution systems, and supply, in the city of Santa Cruz, California.

''(644) SEASIDE, CALIFORNIA.—$14,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply, stormwater management, and water reclamation and distribution systems, in the city of Seaside, California.

''(645) SOLVANG, CALIFORNIA.—$2,000,000 for water and water supply infrastructure, including distribution systems, in the city of Solvang, California.

''(646) SONOMA AND MARIN COUNTIES, CALIFORNIA.—$60,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply, stormwater management, surface water protection, and environmental restoration, in Sonoma and Marin Counties, California.

''(647) SUTTER, CALIFORNIA.—$3,350,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in the county of Sutter, California.

''(648) TURLOCK, CALIFORNIA.—$20,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in the city of Turlock, California.

''(649) VENTURA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.—$23,459,000 for water infrastructure, including water supply and water storage, in Ventura County, California.

''(650) WEST COVINA, CALIFORNIA.—$2,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the city of West Covina, California.

''(651) AURORA, COLORADO.—$15,600,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the city of Aurora, Colorado.

''(652) CUSTER COUNTY, COLORADO.—$20,000,000 for water and water infrastructure, including water supply, in Custer County, Colorado.

''(653) NORTHERN COLORADO.—$22,500,000 for water infrastructure, including water supply and environmental restoration, in Boulder, Broomfield, Larimer, Logan, Morgan, Sedgwick, Washington, and Weld Counties, Colorado.

''(654) CONNECTICUT RIVER VALLEY, CONNECTICUT.—$12,500,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management and environmental restoration, in the towns of Andover, Avon, Berlin, Bloomfield, Bolton, Canton, Columbia, Coventry, East Granby, East Hartford, East Windsor, Ellington, Enfield, Farmington, Glastonbury, Granby, Hartford, Hebron, Manchester, Mansfield, Marlborough, New Britain, Newington, Plainville, Rocky Hill, Simsbury, Somers, South Windsor, Southington, Stafford, Suffield, Tolland, Vernon, West Hartford, Wethersfield, Willington, Windsor, and Windsor Locks, and the cities of Hartford and New Britain, Connecticut.

''(655) DANBURY, CONNECTICUT.—$32,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply and water storage and distribution systems, in the city of Danbury, Connecticut.

''(656) HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT.—$50,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the city of Hartford, Connecticut.

''(657) LOWER CONNECTICUT RIVER VALLEY, CONNECTICUT.—$12,500,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management and environmental restoration, in the towns of Chester, Clinton, Cromwell, Deep River, Durham, East Haddam, East Hampton, Essex, Haddam, Killingworth, Lyme, Middlefield, Old Lyme, Old Saybrook, Portland, and Westbrook, and the city of Middletown, Connecticut.

''(658) NEW BRITAIN, CONNECTICUT.—$5,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the city of New Britain, Connecticut.

''(659) NORTHEASTERN CONNECTICUT.—$12,500,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management and environmental restoration, in the towns of Ashford, Brooklyn, Canterbury, Chaplin, Eastford, Hampton, Killingly, Plainfield, Pomfret, Putnam, Scotland, Sterling, Thompson, Union, Voluntown, and Woodstock, Connecticut.

''(660) SOUTHEASTERN CONNECTICUT.—$12,500,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management and environmental restoration, in the towns of Bozrah, Colchester, East Lyme, Franklin, Griswold, Groton, Lebanon, Ledyard, Lisbon, Montville, North Stonington, Preston, Salem, Sprague, Stonington, Waterford, and Windham, the boroughs of Jewett City and Stonington, and cities of Groton, New London, and Norwich, Connecticut.

''(661) THOMASTON, CONNECTICUT.—$8,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the town of Thomaston, Connecticut.

''(662) WATERBURY, CONNECTICUT.—$5,000,000 for water infrastructure, including water supply and distribution systems, in the city of Waterbury, Connecticut.

''(663) ALTAMONTE SPRINGS, FLORIDA.—$4,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply, stormwater management, and water reclamation, in the city of Altamonte Springs, Florida.

''(664) BUNNELL, FLORIDA.—$16,600,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in the city of Bunnell, Florida.

''(665) COLUMBIA AND SUWANNEE COUNTIES, FLORIDA.—$39,300,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in Columbia and Suwannee Counties, Florida.

''(666) ESCAMBIA, WALTON, OKALOOSA, AND SANTA ROSA COUNTIES, FLORIDA.—$50,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in

Escambia, Walton, Okaloosa, and Santa Rosa Counties, Florida.

''(667) GILCHRIST COUNTY, FLORIDA.—$200,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in Gilchrist County, Florida.

''(668) HERNANDO COUNTY, FLORIDA.—$29,600,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management and environmental restoration, in Hernando County, Florida.

''(669) HOLLYWOOD, FLORIDA.—$46,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in the city of Hollywood, Florida.

''(670) NORTH MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA.—$50,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including distribution systems, monitoring infrastructure, stormwater management, and environmental restoration, in the cities of Aventura, Miami Gardens, North Miami Beach, and Sunny Isles Beach, the town of Golden Beach, and Miami-Dade County, Florida.

''(671) PASCO COUNTY, FLORIDA.—$400,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including distribution systems, in Pasco County, Florida.

''(672) RIVIERA BEACH, FLORIDA.—$30,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply, distribution systems, and stormwater management, in the city of Riviera Beach, Florida.

''(673) SANFORD, FLORIDA.—$3,800,000 for water infrastructure, including water supply, in the city of Sanford, Florida.

''(674) TAMPA BAY, FLORIDA.—$100,000,000 for water infrastructure, including water supply, in Hillsborough, Pasco, and Pinellas Counties and the cities of New Port Richey, St. Petersburg, and Tampa, Florida.

''(675) WINTER PARK, FLORIDA.—$25,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the city of Winter Park, Florida.

''(676) AVONDALE ESTATES, GEORGIA.—$4,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the city of Avondale Estates, Georgia.

''(677) FAIRBURN, GEORGIA.—$5,670,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply and distribution systems, in the city of Fairburn, Georgia.

''(678) GARDEN CITY, GEORGIA.—$4,300,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in the city of Garden City, Georgia.

''(679) NEWTON COUNTY, GEORGIA.—$23,900,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply and distribution systems, in Newton County, Georgia.

''(680) ADDISON, ILLINOIS.—$50,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the village of Addison, Illinois.

''(681) EAST MOLINE, ILLINOIS.—$15,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply, in the city of East Moline, Illinois.

''(682) PORT BYRON, ILLINOIS.—$1,500,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in the village of Port Byron, Illinois.

''(683) SHANNON, ILLINOIS.—$1,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including distribution systems, in the village of Shannon, Illinois.

''(684) SOUTH PEKIN, ILLINOIS.—$8,000,000 for water infrastructure, including water supply, in the village of South Pekin, Illinois.

''(685) BALTIMORE, MARYLAND.—$25,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the city of Baltimore, Maryland.

''(686) HOLYOKE, MASSACHUSETTS.—$50,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the city of Holyoke, Massachusetts.

''(687) BAY REGION, MICHIGAN.—$50,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply, stormwater management, and surface water protection, in Bay, Midland, Saginaw, Genesee, and Tuscola Counties, Michigan.

''(688) KENT COUNTY, MICHIGAN.—$20,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management and surface water resource protection, in Kent County, Michigan.

''(689) LAPEER, MACOMB, OAKLAND, AND ST. CLAIR COUNTIES, MICHIGAN.—$50,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in Lapeer, Macomb, Oakland, and St. Clair Counties, Michigan.

''(690) MUSKEGON COUNTY, MICHIGAN.—$15,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management and surface water resource protection, in Muskegon County, Michigan.

''(691) OTTAWA COUNTY, MICHIGAN.—$15,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management and surface water resource protection, in Ottawa County, Michigan.

''(692) OWOSSO, MICHIGAN.—$47,000,000 for water infrastructure, including water supply and desalination, in the city of Owosso, Michigan.

''(693) WESTPHALIA, MICHIGAN.—$3,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply, in the village of Westphalia, Michigan.

''(694) COKATO, MINNESOTA.—$4,500,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply, in the city of Cokato, Minnesota.

''(695) NORWOOD YOUNG AMERICA, MINNESOTA.—$21,500,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply, in the city of Norwood Young America, Minnesota.

''(696) SARTELL, MINNESOTA.—$24,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply, stormwater management, and surface water protection, in the city of Sartell, Minnesota.

''(697) BRANDON, MISSISSIPPI.—$10,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in the city of Brandon, Mississippi.

''(698) CHOCTAW COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI.—$10,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in Choctaw County, Mississippi.

''(699) FOREST, MISSISSIPPI.—$5,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in the city of Forest, Mississippi.

''(700) GRENADA, MISSISSIPPI.—$3,500,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the city of Grenada, Mississippi.

''(701) LUCEDALE, MISSISSIPPI.—$3,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the city of Lucedale, Mississippi.

''(702) SARDIS, MISSISSIPPI.—$3,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the city of Sardis, Mississippi.

''(703) WEST POINT, MISSISSIPPI.—$10,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in the city of West Point, Mississippi.

''(704) KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI.—$45,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management and water supply, in Kansas City, Missouri.

''(705) NEW LONDON, NEW HAMPSHIRE.—$15,000,000 for water infrastructure, including water supply, in the town of New London, New Hampshire.

''(706) SULLIVAN COUNTY, NEW HAMPSHIRE.—$1,500,000 for water infrastructure, including water supply, in Sullivan County, New Hampshire.

''(707) BERGEN COUNTY, NEW JERSEY.—$25,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in Bergen County, New Jersey.

''(708) CAMDEN COUNTY, NEW JERSEY.—$45,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including environmental restoration, in Camden County, New Jersey.

''(709) DEMAREST, NEW JERSEY.—$2,310,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the borough of Demarest, New Jersey.

''(710) JERSEY CITY, NEW JERSEY.—$1,300,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management and water supply, in Jersey City, New Jersey.

''(711) PALMYRA, NEW JERSEY.—$5,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in the borough of Palmyra, New Jersey.

''(712) DOÑA ANA COUNTY, NEW MEXICO.—$25,000,000 for water infrastructure, including water supply and desalination, in Doña Ana County, New Mexico.

''(713) LOS ALAMOS COUNTY, NEW MEXICO.—$1,500,000 for water infrastructure, including water supply, in Los Alamos County, New Mexico.

''(714) VALENCIA COUNTY, NEW MEXICO.—$25,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in Valencia County, New Mexico.

''(715) BRONX COUNTY, NEW YORK.—$90,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in Bronx County, New York.

''(716) BROOKHAVEN, NEW YORK.—$20,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the town of Brookhaven, New York.

''(717) FREEPORT, NEW YORK.—$3,300,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the village of Freeport, New York.

''(718) GARDEN CITY, NEW YORK.—$11,000,000 for water infrastructure, including water supply, in the village of Garden City, New York.

''(719) LAWRENCE, NEW YORK.—$130,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the village of Lawrence, New York.

''(720) LONG BEACH, NEW YORK.—$25,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply, in the city of Long Beach, New York.

''(721) LONG ISLAND, NEW YORK.—$65,570,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in Nassau and Suffolk Counties, New York.

''(722) NASSAU COUNTY, NEW YORK.—$20,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, water reclamation, and environmental restoration, in Nassau County, New York.

''(723) NORTH SALEM AND LEWISBORO, NEW YORK.—$600,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the towns of North Salem and Lewisboro, New York.

''(724) OSSINING, NEW YORK.—$40,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in the village of Ossining, New York.

''(725) PORT JEFFERSON, NEW YORK.—$50,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the village of Port Jefferson, New York.

''(726) RICHMOND COUNTY, NEW YORK.—$50,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in Richmond County, New York.

''(727) WESTCHESTER COUNTY, NEW YORK.—$49,400,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply and storage, in Westchester County, New York.

''(728) ASHEVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA.—$50,000,000 for water infrastructure, including water supply, in the city of Asheville, North Carolina.

''(729) DURHAM, NORTH CAROLINA.—$20,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply, in the city of Durham, North Carolina.

''(730) GRANVILLE COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA.—$6,350,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply, in Granville County, North Carolina.

''(731) HARNETT COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA.—$35,670,500 for water and wastewater infrastructure in Harnett County, North Carolina.

''(732) HILLSBOROUGH, NORTH CAROLINA.—$6,820,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply and distribution systems, in the town of Hillsborough, North Carolina.

''(733) JOHNSTON COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA.—$7,979,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply, in Johnston County, North Carolina.

''(734) PITT COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA.—$15,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in Pitt County, North Carolina.

''(735) WHITE LAKE, NORTH CAROLINA.—$40,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the town of White Lake, North Carolina.

''(736) CLERMONT COUNTY, OHIO.—$3,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in Clermont County, Ohio.

''(737) JACKSON COUNTY, OHIO.—$8,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in Jackson County, Ohio.

''(738) LYNCHBURG, OHIO.—$6,380,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, in the village of Lynchburg, Ohio.

''(739) NEW HOLLAND, OHIO.—$2,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply, in the village of New Holland, Ohio.

''(740) WAVERLY, OHIO.—$12,995,750 for water and wastewater infrastructure in the village of Waverly, Ohio.

''(741) CHICKASAW NATION, OKLAHOMA.—$45,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in the territory under the jurisdiction of the Chickasaw Nation, Oklahoma.

''(742) KLAMATH COUNTY, OREGON.—$37,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply and water recycling and reuse systems, in Klamath County, Oregon.

''(743) MILTON-FREEWATER, OREGON.—$13,000,000 for water infrastructure, including water supply, in the city of Milton-Freewater, Oregon.

''(744) SALEM, OREGON.—$75,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply, distribution systems, and environmental restoration, in the city of Salem, Oregon.

''(745) BETHLEHEM, PENNSYLVANIA.—$2,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the city of Bethlehem, Pennsylvania.

''(746) BLAIR COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA.—$2,500,000 for water infrastructure, including water supply and distribution systems, in Blair County, Pennsylvania.

''(747) CAMBRIA COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA.—$3,500,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply, in Cambria County, Pennsylvania.

''(748) CARBON AND SCHUYLKILL COUNTIES, PENNSYLVANIA.—$2,500,000 for water infrastructure, including water supply and water storage, in Carbon and Schuylkill Counties, Pennsylvania.

''(749) CHAMBERSBURG, PENNSYLVANIA.—$12,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in the borough of Chambersburg, Pennsylvania.

''(750) JIM THORPE, PENNSYLVANIA.—$5,175,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply and distribution systems, in the borough of Jim Thorpe, Pennsylvania.

''(751) LAUREL MOUNTAIN, PENNSYLVANIA.—$4,500,000 for water infrastructure, including water supply and distribution systems, in the borough of Laurel Mountain, Pennsylvania.

''(752) MCCALMONT TOWNSHIP, PENNSYLVANIA.—$60,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in the McCalmont Township, Pennsylvania.

''(753) MERCERSBURG, PENNSYLVANIA.—$3,375,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in the borough of Mercersburg, Pennsylvania.

''(754) MEYERSDALE, PENNSYLVANIA.—$3,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the borough of Meyersdale, Pennsylvania.

''(755) MONTGOMERY COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA.—$1,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management and environmental restoration, in Montgomery County, Pennsylvania.

''(756) PAINT BOROUGH, PENNSYLVANIA.—$600,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in Paint Borough, Pennsylvania.

''(757) PUNXSUTAWNEY, PENNSYLVANIA.—$1,500,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the borough of Punxsutawney, Pennsylvania.

''(758) SHIPPENSBURG, PENNSYLVANIA.—$2,400,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in the borough of Shippensburg, Pennsylvania.

''(759) SPRINGHILL TOWNSHIP, PENNSYLVANIA.—$1,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply, in Springhill Township, Pennsylvania.

''(760) WINDBER, PENNSYLVANIA.—$2,600,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply, in the borough of Windber, Pennsylvania.

''(761) COROZAL, PUERTO RICO.—$10,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply, in the municipality of Corozal.

''(762) BURRILLVILLE, RHODE ISLAND.—$10,000,000 for water infrastructure, including water supply and distribution systems, in the town of Burrillville, Rhode Island.

''(763) COVENTRY, RHODE ISLAND.—$10,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, in the town of Coventry, Rhode Island.

''(764) NARRAGANSETT, RHODE ISLAND.—$10,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in the town of Narragansett, Rhode Island.

''(765) NORTH KINGSTOWN, RHODE ISLAND.—$10,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including distribution systems, in the town of North Kingstown, Rhode Island.

''(766) PAWTUCKET, RHODE ISLAND.—$16,600,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the city of Pawtucket, Rhode Island.

''(767) WARWICK, RHODE ISLAND.—$10,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including distribution systems, in the city of Warwick, Rhode Island.

''(768) BEAUFORT, SOUTH CAROLINA.—$6,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply and distribution systems, in the City of Beaufort, South Carolina.

''(769) BERKELEY COUNTY, SOUTH CAROLINA.—$14,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply and distribution systems, in Berkeley County, South Carolina.

''(770) GEORGETOWN, SOUTH CAROLINA.—$4,275,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the city of Georgetown, South Carolina.

''(771) HILTON HEAD ISLAND, SOUTH CAROLINA.—$10,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the town of Hilton Head Island, South Carolina.

''(772) ISLE OF PALMS, SOUTH CAROLINA.—$10,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the city of Isle of Palms, South Carolina.

''(773) BRAZORIA, FORT BEND, AND GALVESTON COUNTIES, TEXAS.—$5,000,000 for water infrastructure, including water supply, in Brazoria, Fort Bend, and Galveston Counties, Texas.

''(774) BURLESON, TEXAS.—$12,000,000 for water infrastructure, including water supply and distribution systems, in the city of Burleson, Texas.

''(775) GRANBURY, TEXAS.—$8,000,000 for water infrastructure, including water supply, in the city of Granbury, Texas.

''(776) GRANDVIEW, TEXAS.—$10,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the city of Grandview, Texas.

''(777) HARRIS COUNTY, TEXAS.—$5,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure in Harris County, Texas.

''(778) JIM HOGG COUNTY, TEXAS.—$7,500,000 for water infrastructure, including distribution systems, in Jim Hogg County, Texas.

''(779) KEMAH, TEXAS.—$5,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the city of Kemah, Texas.

''(780) KINGSVILLE, TEXAS.—$19,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, in the city of Kingsville, Texas.

''(781) LAREDO, TEXAS.—$25,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply, storage, distribution systems, environmental restoration, and stormwater management, in the city of Laredo, Texas.

''(782) MERCEDES, TEXAS.—$10,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply and reuse systems, in the city of Mercedes, Texas.

''(783) MIDLAND COUNTY, TEXAS.—$25,000,000 for water infrastructure, including water supply, in Midland County, Texas.

''(784) ODESSA, TEXAS.—$25,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply and storage, in the city of Odessa, Texas.

''(785) PORT OF BROWNSVILLE, TEXAS.—$18,700,000 for water infrastructure, including water supply and water reuse systems, in the Port of Brownsville, Texas.

''(786) STARR COUNTY, TEXAS.—$7,500,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply and distribution systems, in Starr County, Texas.

''(787) CENTERVILLE, UTAH.—$20,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply and distribution systems, in the city of Centerville, Utah.

''(788) EPHRAIM, UTAH.—$20,000,000 for water infrastructure, including water supply, in the city of Ephraim, Utah.

''(789) FAIRFAX AND PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTIES, VIRGINIA.—$20,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management and water reclamation infrastructure, in Fairfax and Prince William Counties, Virginia.

''(790) HENRICO COUNTY, VIRGINIA.—$25,000,000 for water infrastructure, including water supply and distribution systems, in Henrico County, Virginia.

''(791) ORANGE COUNTY, VIRGINIA.—$50,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply and distribution systems, in Orange County, Virginia.

''(792) ARLINGTON, WASHINGTON.—$50,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply, in the city of Arlington, Washington.

''(793) MOSES LAKE, WASHINGTON.—$50,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply and distribution systems, in the city of Moses Lake, Washington.''.

(c) MODIFICATIONS.—

(1) FLAGSTAFF, ARIZONA.—Section 219(f)(407) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 138 Stat. 3116) is amended by striking ''$5,000,000'' and inserting ''$13,888,889''.

(2) TUCSON, ARIZONA.—Section 219(f)(412) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 138 Stat. 3116) is amended by striking ''$30,000,000'' and inserting ''$57,013,889''.

(3) WINSLOW, ARIZONA.—Section 219(f)(413) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 138 Stat. 3116) is amended by striking ''$3,000,000'' and inserting ''$9,000,000''.

(4) ALAMEDA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.—Section 219(f)(278) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 136 Stat. 3808) is amended—

(A) by striking ''$20,000,000'' and inserting ''$116,000,000''; and

(B) by inserting ''including water supply,'' after ''infrastructure,''.

(5) CALAVERAS COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.—Section 219(f)(86) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 121 Stat. 1259; 136 Stat. 3816; 138 Stat. 3127) is amended by striking ''$16,300,000'' and inserting ''$27,000,000''.

(6) CAMBRIA, CALIFORNIA.—Section 219(f)(48)(A) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 114 Stat. 2763A–220; 121 Stat. 1208) is amended—

(A) by striking ''$10,300,000'' and inserting ''$17,800,000''; and

(B) by inserting ''water and wastewater infrastructure,'' before ''desalination''.

(7) COLTON, CALIFORNIA.—Section 219(f)(424) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 138 Stat. 3117) is amended by striking ''$20,000,000'' and inserting ''$40,000,000''.

(8) EAST PALO ALTO, CALIFORNIA.—Section 219(f)(89) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 121 Stat. 1259) is amended—

(A) by striking ''$4,000,000'' and inserting ''$37,000,000''; and

(B) by striking ''a new pump station and stormwater management and drainage system'' and inserting ''water and wastewater infrastructure, including water storage, water supply, and stormwater management''.

(9) EAST SAN FERNANDO VALLEY, CALIFORNIA.—Section 219(f)(425) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 138 Stat. 3117) is amended by striking ''$50,000,000'' and inserting ''$72,000,000''.

(10) FONTANA, CALIFORNIA.—Section 219(f)(286) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 136 Stat. 3809) is amended—

(A) by striking ''$16,000,000'' and inserting ''$56,000,000''; and

(B) by striking ''stormwater management infrastructure'' and inserting ''wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management, and water supply and distribution systems''.

(11) INLAND EMPIRE, CALIFORNIA.—Section 219(f)(288) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 336; 136 Stat. 3809) is amended by striking ''$60,000,000'' and inserting ''$65,000,000''.

(12) LAKE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.—Section 219(f)(432) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 138 Stat. 3117) is amended by striking ''$20,000,000'' and inserting ''$30,000,000''.

(13) LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.—Section 8319(e)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3784, 138 Stat. 3128) is amended by striking ''$100,000,000'' and inserting ''$200,000,000''.

(14) LOS OLIVOS, CALIFORNIA.—Section 219(f)(440) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 138 Stat. 3117) is amended by striking ''$4,000,000'' and inserting ''$30,000,000''.

(15) ORANGE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.—Section 219(f)(98) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 121 Stat. 1259) is amended—

(A) by striking ''$10,000,000'' and inserting ''$18,000,000'';

(B) by inserting ''and environmental restoration'' after ''water related infrastructure''; and

(C) by inserting ''including water supply,'' before ''Anaheim''.

(16) PERRIS, CALIFORNIA.—Section 219(f)(100) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 121 Stat. 1260) is amended—

(A) by striking ''$3,000,000'' and inserting ''$28,000,000''; and

(B) by striking ''recycled water transmission infrastructure'' and inserting ''water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management and recycled water''.

(17) SALINAS, CALIFORNIA.—Section 219(f)(450) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 138 Stat. 3118) is amended—

(A) by striking ''$20,000,000'' and inserting ''$25,000,000''; and

(B) by inserting ''and stormwater management'' after ''water supply''.

(18) SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.—Section 219(f)(101), Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 121 Stat. 1260; 138 Stat. 3128) is amended—

(A) by striking ''$24,000,000'' and inserting ''$84,000,000''; and

(B) by inserting ''including water supply and stormwater management,'' after ''infrastructure,''.

(19) SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.—Section 219(f)(453) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 138 Stat. 3118) is amended by striking ''$200,000,000'' and inserting ''$211,500,000''.

(20) SANTA MONICA, CALIFORNIA.—Section 219(f)(103) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 121 Stat. 1260) is amended—

(A) by striking ''$3,000,000'' and inserting ''$15,000,000''; and

(B) by striking ''improving'' and inserting ''water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management and improvements to''.

(21) SOUTH GATE, CALIFORNIA.—Section 219(f)(454) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 138 Stat. 3118) is amended by striking ''$5,000,000'' and inserting ''$6,000,000''.

(22) TORRANCE, CALIFORNIA.—Section 219(f)(307) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 136 Stat. 3810) is amended by striking ''$100,000,000'' and inserting ''$133,000,000''.

(23) WASHINGTON, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.—Section 219(f)(316) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 136 Stat. 3810) is amended—

(A) by striking ''$1,000,000'' and inserting ''$201,000,000''; and

(B) by inserting ''distribution systems'' after ''stormwater management''.

(24) DELTONA, FLORIDA.—Section 219(f)(470) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 138 Stat. 3119) is amended by striking ''$31,200,000'' and inserting ''$50,000,000''.

(25) MARION COUNTY, FLORIDA.—Section 219(f)(472) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 138 Stat. 3119) is amended by striking ''$10,000,000'' and inserting ''$20,500,000''.

(26) ORANGE COUNTY, FLORIDA.—Section 219(f)(321) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 136 Stat. 3810) is amended—

(A) by striking ''$50,000,000'' and inserting ''$125,000,000''; and

(B) by inserting '', stormwater management,'' after ''reclamation''.

(27) OVIEDO, FLORIDA.—Section 219(f)(473) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 138 Stat. 3119) is amended by striking ''$10,000,000'' and inserting ''$15,000,000''.

(28) SARASOTA COUNTY, FLORIDA.—Section 219(f)(126) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 121 Stat. 1261) is amended by striking ''$10,000,000'' and inserting ''$50,000,000''.

(29) GEORGIA.—Section 219(f)(322) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 136 Stat. 3811) is amended by striking ''$75,000,000'' and inserting ''$125,000,000''.

(30) ATLANTA, GEORGIA.—Section 219 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 110 Stat. 3757; 113 Stat. 334; 136 Stat. 3817; 138 Stat. 3129) is amended—

(A) in subsection (c)(2), by striking ''A combined'' and inserting ''Water and wastewater infrastructure, including stormwater management and a combined''; and

(B) in subsection (e)(5), by striking ''$100,000,000'' and inserting ''$142,000,000''.

(31) EAST POINT, GEORGIA.—Section 219(f)(136) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 121 Stat. 1261; 136 Stat. 3817; 138 Stat. 3129) is amended—

(A) by striking ''$20,000,000'' and inserting ''$24,000,000''; and

(B) by inserting '', water supply,'' after ''stormwater management''.

(32) GUAM.—Section 219(f)(323) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 136 Stat. 3811; 138 Stat. 3129) is amended by striking ''$35,000,000'' and inserting ''$45,000,000''.

(33) COOK COUNTY AND LAKE COUNTY, ILLINOIS.—Section 219(f)(54) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 114 Stat. 2763A–221; 138 Stat. 3129) is amended by striking ''$149,000,000'' and inserting ''$249,000,000''.

(34) ROCKFORD, ILLINOIS.—Section 219(f)(488) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 138 Stat. 3120) is amended by striking ''$4,000,000'' and inserting ''$7,000,000''.

(35) MARYLAND.—Section 219(f)(341), of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 136 Stat. 3812) is amended by striking ''$100,000,000'' and inserting ''$225,000,000''.

(36) HAVERHILL, MASSACHUSETTS.—Section 219(f)(337) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 136 Stat. 3812; 138 Stat. 3130) is amended by striking ''$30,000,000'' and inserting ''$50,000,000''.

(37) LOWELL, MASSACHUSETTS.—Section 219(f)(339) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 136 Stat. 3812; 138 Stat. 3130) is amended by striking ''$30,000,000'' and inserting ''$40,000,000''.

(38) MICHIGAN.—Section 219(f)(157) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 121 Stat. 1262; 136 Stat. 3818; 138 Stat. 3130) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''$160,000,000'' and inserting ''$225,000,000''; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by inserting ''(including stormwater management)'' after ''wastewater treatment and related facilities''.

(39) SOUTHEAST MICHIGAN.—Section 219(f)(500) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 138 Stat. 3121) is amended by striking ''$58,000,000'' and inserting ''$93,000,000''.

(40) NORTHEASTERN MINNESOTA.—Section 569 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 368; 136 Stat. 3820) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by inserting ''Lake of the Woods,'' after ''Lake,''; and

(B) in subsection (h), by striking ''$80,000,000'' and inserting ''$120,000,000''.

(41) BILOXI, MISSISSIPPI.—Section 219(f)(163) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 121 Stat. 1263; 138 Stat. 3130) is amended—

(A) by striking ''$10,000,000'' and inserting ''$48,000,000''; and

(B) by inserting ''including stormwater management and water supply,'' after ''infrastructure,''.

(42) DESOTO COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI.—Section 219(f)(30) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 114 Stat. 2763A–220; 119 Stat. 282; 119 Stat. 2257; 122 Stat. 1623; 134 Stat. 2718; 138 Stat. 3130) is amended by striking ''$170,000,000'' and inserting ''$175,000,000''.

(43) DIAMONDHEAD, MISSISSIPPI.—Section 219(f)(505) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 138 Stat. 3121) is amended by striking ''$7,000,000'' and inserting ''$10,000,000''.

(44) HARRISON COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI.—Section 219(f)(166) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 121 Stat. 1263) is amended—

(A) by striking ''$5,000,000'' and inserting ''$8,000,000''; and

(B) by inserting ''including stormwater management, drainage systems, and surface water protection,'' after ''infrastructure,''.

(45) JACKSON, MISSISSIPPI.—Section 219(f)(167) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 121 Stat. 1263; 138 Stat. 3131) is amended—

(A) by striking ''$139,000,000'' and inserting ''$154,000,000''; and

(B) by inserting ''water supply, stormwater management, and'' after ''including''.

(46) MERIDIAN, MISSISSIPPI.—Section 219(f)(352) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 136 Stat. 3813) is amended by striking ''$26,000,000'' and inserting ''$50,000,000''.

(47) OLIVE BRANCH, MISSISSIPPI.—Section 219(f)(510) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 138 Stat. 3122) is amended by striking ''$10,000,000'' and inserting ''$20,000,000''.

(48) OXFORD, MISSISSIPPI.—Section 219(f)(353) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 136 Stat. 3813) is amended by striking ''$10,000,000'' and inserting ''$25,000,000''.

(49) PEARL, MISSISSIPPI.—Section 219(f)(511) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 138 Stat. 3122) is amended—

(A) by striking ''$7,000,000'' and inserting ''$14,000,000''; and

(B) by inserting ''water supply, water storage,'' after ''systems,''.

(50) PICAYUNE, MISSISSIPPI.—Section 219(f)(512) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 138 Stat. 3122) is amended by striking ''$5,000,000'' and inserting ''$8,000,000''.

(51) STARKVILLE, MISSISSIPPI.—Section 219(f)(513) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 138 Stat. 3122) is amended by striking ''$6,000,000'' and inserting ''$10,000,000''.

(52) LAKE TAHOE BASIN RESTORATION, NEVADA AND CALIFORNIA.—Section 108(c) of division C of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005 (118 Stat. 2942; 136 Stat. 3820) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (3), by striking ''and'';

(B) in paragraph (4), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(5) aquatic invasive species identification, containment, mitigation, and eradication.''.

(53) ESSEX AND SUSSEX COUNTIES, NEW JERSEY.—Section 219(f)(358) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 136 Stat. 3813) is amended by striking ''$60,000,000'' and inserting ''$85,000,000''.

(54) MORRIS COUNTY, NEW JERSEY.—Section 219(f)(363) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 136 Stat. 3813) is amended by striking ''$30,000,000'' and inserting ''$55,000,000''.

(55) NEW HAMPSHIRE.—Section 219(f)(518) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 138 Stat. 3122) is amended—

(A) by striking ''$25,000,000'' and inserting ''$106,000,000''; and

(B) by striking ''including water and wastewater infrastructure'' and inserting ''including water and wastewater infrastructure (including water supply and stormwater management), environmental restoration, drought resiliency, and surface water protection''.

(56) FARMINGTON, NEW MEXICO.—Section 219(f)(372) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 136 Stat. 3814) is amended—

(A) by striking ''$15,500,000'' and inserting ''$17,500,000''; and

(B) by inserting ''and stormwater management'' after ''supply''.

(57) DUTCHESS COUNTY, NEW YORK.—Section 219(f)(530) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 121 Stat. 1258; 136 Stat. 3808; 138 Stat. 3123) is amended by striking ''$10,000,000'' and inserting ''$15,000,000''.

(58) KIRYAS JOEL, NEW YORK.—Section 219(f)(184) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 121 Stat. 1264; 138 Stat. 3131) is amended by striking ''$25,000,000'' and inserting ''$30,000,000''.

(59) NEWTOWN CREEK, NEW YORK.—Section 219(f)(535) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 138 Stat. 3123) is amended by striking ''$25,000,000'' and inserting ''$75,000,000''.

(60) ORANGE COUNTY, NEW YORK.—Section 219(f)(537) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 138 Stat. 3123) is amended by striking ''$10,000,000'' and inserting ''$15,000,000''.

(61) QUEENS, NEW YORK.—Section 219(f)(377) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 136 Stat. 3814; 138 Stat. 3131) is amended by striking ''$190,000,000'' and inserting ''$261,000,000''.

(62) ULSTER COUNTY, NEW YORK.—Section 219(f)(539) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 138 Stat. 3123) is amended by striking ''$10,000,000'' and inserting ''$15,000,000''.

(63) MOORESVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA.—Section 219(f)(195) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 121 Stat. 1264) is amended by striking ''$4,000,000'' and inserting ''$20,000,000''.

(64) KELLEYS ISLAND, OHIO.—Section 219(f)(558) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 138 Stat. 3125) is amended by striking ''$1,000,000'' and inserting ''$16,500,000''.

(65) STARK COUNTY, OHIO.—Section 219(f)(563) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 138 Stat. 3125) is amended by striking ''$24,000,000'' and inserting ''$49,000,000''.

(66) SUMMIT COUNTY, OHIO.—Section 219(f)(562) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 138 Stat. 3125) is amended by striking ''$25,000,000'' and inserting ''$50,000,000''.

(67) TOLEDO AND OREGON, OHIO.—Section 219(f)(565) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 138 Stat. 3125) is amended—

(A) by striking ''$10,500,000'' and inserting ''$45,000,000''; and

(B) by inserting '', including stormwater management, water supply, and environmental restoration,'' after ''wastewater infrastructure''.

(68) MIDWEST CITY, OKLAHOMA.—Section 219(f)(231) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 121 Stat. 1266; 134 Stat. 2719; 138 Stat. 3132) is amended—

(A) by striking ''$15,000,000'' and inserting ''$20,000,000''; and

(B) by striking ''improvements to water related infrastructure'' and inserting ''water and wastewater infrastructure, including water supply''.

(69) PENNSYLVANIA ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE.—Section 1349(e)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2024 (138 Stat. 3159) is amended by striking ''$25,000,000'' and inserting ''$75,000,000''.

(70) CHESTER COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA.—Section 219(f)(574) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 138 Stat. 3125) is amended by striking ''$7,000,000'' and inserting ''$20,500,000''.

(71) PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA.—Section 219(f)(243) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 121 Stat. 1266; 138 Stat. 3132) is amended by striking ''$3,000,000'' and inserting ''$53,000,000''.

(72) SOUTH CENTRAL PENNSYLVANIA.—Section 313(g)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4845; 109 Stat. 407; 110 Stat. 3723; 113 Stat. 310; 121 Stat. 1146; 134 Stat. 2719; 136 Stat. 3821) is amended by striking ''$410,000,000'' and inserting ''$415,000,000''.

(73) SOUTHEASTERN PENNSYLVANIA AND DELAWARE RIVER BASIN.—Section 566 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3786; 113 Stat. 352; 136 Stat. 3821) is amended—

(A) by striking the section heading and inserting ''**SOUTHEASTERN PENNSYLVANIA AND DELAWARE RIVER BASIN.**'';

(B) in subsection (a), by striking ''Lower'';

(C) in subsection (b), by striking ''Lower'';

(D) by amending subsection (g) to read as follows:

''(g) AREAS DEFINED.—In this section:

''(1) DELAWARE RIVER BASIN.—The term 'Delaware River Basin' means the Schuylkill Valley, Upper Estuary, Lower Estuary, and Delaware Bay Watersheds and the East Branch Delaware, Lackawaxen, Lehigh, Middle Delaware–Mongaup–Brodhead, Middle Delaware–Musconetcong, and Upper Delaware subwatersheds of the Delaware River Basin in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the States of New Jersey, New York, and Delaware.

''(2) SOUTHEASTERN PENNSYLVANIA.—The term 'southeastern Pennsylvania' means Philadelphia, Bucks, Chester, Delaware, and Montgomery Counties, Pennsylvania.''; and

(E) in subsection (h)—

(i) by striking ''Lower''; and

(ii) by striking ''$20,000,000'' and inserting ''$92,690,000''.

(74) COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO.—Section 219(f)(246) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 121 Stat. 1267) is amended—

(A) by striking ''$35,000,000'' and inserting ''$75,000,000''; and

(B) by inserting '', including stormwater management, surface water protection, and environmental restoration,'' after ''infrastructure''.

(75) FLORENCE COUNTY, SOUTH CAROLINA.—Section 219(f)(580) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 138 Stat. 3126) is amended—

(A) by striking ''$40,000,000'' and inserting ''$75,000,000''; and

(B) by inserting '', including water supply,'' after ''infrastructure''.

(76) LAKES MARION AND MOULTRIE, SOUTH CAROLINA.—Section 219(f)(25) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 114 Stat. 2763A–220; 117 Stat. 1838; 130 Stat. 1677; 132 Stat. 3818; 134 Stat. 2719; 136 Stat. 3818; 138 Stat. 3132) is amended by striking ''$235,000,000'' and inserting ''$295,000,000''.

(77) TIPTON COUNTY, TENNESSEE.—Section 219(f)(582) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 138 Stat. 3126) is amended by striking ''$35,000,000'' and inserting ''$85,000,000''.

(78) TIPTON, HAYWOOD, AND FAYETTE COUNTIES, TENNESSEE.—Section 219(f)(583) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 138 Stat. 3126) is amended by striking ''$50,000,000'' and inserting ''$100,000,000''.

(79) PORTLAND, TENNESSEE.—Section 219(f)(394) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 136 Stat. 3815) is amended—

(A) by striking ''$1,850,000'' and inserting ''$19,850,000''; and

(B) by inserting ''and stormwater management'' after ''water supply''.

(80) AMARILLO, TEXAS.—Section 219(f)(585) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 138 Stat. 3126) is amended by striking ''$38,000,000'' and inserting ''$56,000,000''.

(81) BROWNSVILLE, TEXAS.—Section 219(f)(586) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 138 Stat. 3126) is amended—

(A) by striking ''$40,000,000'' and inserting ''$42,300,000''; and

(B) by inserting ''including regional water and water reuse infrastructure,'' after ''infrastructure,''.

(82) ZAPATA COUNTY, TEXAS.—Section 219(f)(591) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 138 Stat. 3126) is amended—

(A) by striking ''$20,000,000'' and inserting ''$30,000,000''; and

(B) by inserting ''and distribution systems'' after ''water supply''.

(83) PORT ANGELES, WASHINGTON.—Section 219(f)(402) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335; 136 Stat. 3815) is amended by striking ''$7,500,000'' and inserting ''$12,000,000''.

(84) WESTERN RURAL WATER.—Section 595 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 383; 117 Stat. 139; 117 Stat. 142; 117 Stat. 1836; 118 Stat. 440; 121 Stat. 1219; 123 Stat. 2851; 128 Stat. 1316; 130 Stat. 1681; 134 Stat. 2719; 136 Stat. 3822; 138 Stat. 3133) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b), by inserting ''Colorado,'' before ''rural Idaho'';

(B) in subsection (c), by inserting ''Colorado,'' before ''Idaho''; and

(C) in subsection (i)—

(i) in paragraph (1)—

(I) by striking ''$850,000,000'' and inserting ''$890,000,000''; and

(II) by striking ''and'' at the end; and

(ii) in paragraph (2)—

(I) by striking ''$250,000,000'' and inserting ''$351,598,000'';

(II) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(III) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) $150,000,000 for Colorado.''.

(d) REIMBURSEMENT UNDER ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE ASSISTANCE.—Section 219 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(g) FORM OF FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of any project, or separable element of a project, for which assistance is provided under this section may be provided in the form of reimbursement of project costs incurred by the non-Federal interest, subject to funds being made available for such project.''.

SEC. 308. FORECAST-INFORMED RESERVOIR OPERATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the assessment required under section 1162(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2024 (33 U.S.C. 2319 note), the Secretary shall include an assessment of New Hogan Dam and Lake, Calaveras River, California, authorized pursuant to the section 10 of December 22, 1944 (chapter 665, 58 Stat. 902), and Shasta Dam and Lake, Sacramento River, California, authorized pursuant to section 2 of the Act of August 26, 1937 (chapter 832, 50 Stat. 850; 54 Stat. 1199).

(b) ADDITIONAL UTILIZATION.—Section 1222(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (132 Stat. 3811; 134 Stat. 2661; 136 Stat. 3777) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''and the Apalachicola Chattahoochee Flint River Basin'' and inserting ''the Apalachicola Chattahoochee Flint River Basin, and the Pend Oreille River Basin''; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ''or the Apalachicola Chattahoochee Flint River Basin'' and inserting ''the Apalachicola Chattahoochee Flint River Basin, or the Pend Oreille River Basin'' each place it appears.

SEC. 309. FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT SERVICES.

(a) ELIGIBILITY.—Section 206 of the Flood Control Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 709a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking ''and to provide advice'' and inserting ''to support State efforts to establish and implement integrated floodplain management programs that both reduce flood risk and protect and restore floodplain functions; and to provide advice''; and

(2) in subsection (e), by striking ''The Secretary of the Army is authorized to expend not to exceed'' and inserting ''AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated''.

(b) PRIORITIZING FLOOD RISK RESILIENCY TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—Section 111(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (33 U.S.C. 709a note) is amended by striking ''or communities'' and inserting '', rural communities, or communities''.

SEC. 310. PLANNING ASSISTANCE TO STATES.

Section 22(a)(2)(B) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-16(a)(2)(B)) is amended to read as follows:

''(B) TYPES OF ASSISTANCE.—Technical assistance under this paragraph may include—

''(i) provision and integration of hydrologic, economic, and environmental data and analyses;

''(ii) assessment of the structural integrity of a water resources development project;

''(iii) development of integrated floodplain management programs that both reduce flood risk and protect and restore floodplain functions; and

''(iv) title research for abandoned structures.''.

SEC. 311. MAINTENANCE OF NAVIGATION CHANNELS.

Section 509(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3759; 113 Stat. 339; 114 Stat. 2679; 136 Stat. 3779; 138 Stat. 3164) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(28) Bayport East Turning Basin and Channel Expansion of Houston Ship Channel, Texas.''.

SEC. 312. MOBILE HARBOR, ALABAMA.

The undesignated paragraph under the heading ''Mobile Harbor, Alabama'' in section 201(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4090; 110 Stat. 3711) is amended by striking '', after compliance with applicable laws and after opportunity for public review and comment, may consider alternatives to disposal of such material in the Gulf of Mexico, including environmentally acceptable alternatives for beneficial uses of dredged material and environmental restoration.'' and inserting ''shall prohibit the use of thin layer placement of dredged material unless such disposal is necessary for emergency use, to prevent draft restrictions, or the creation of living shorelines or brackish marsh habitats. The Secretary shall establish, in coordination with the Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, a multi-year restoration program utilizing suitable dredged material to protect, conserve, and restore the Mobile Bay estuary.''.

SEC. 313. MENDENHALL GLACIER OUTBURST FLOODING, ALASKA.

The Secretary shall—

(1) expedite the completion of the Mendenhall Glacier outburst flooding technical report, authorized pursuant to section 8315 of the Water Resource Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3783; 138 Stat. 3147); and

(2) develop a recommendation that provides permanent and resilient flood control mitigation for glacial lake outburst floods that emanate from Suicide Basin and Lake Mendenhall and that affect Juneau, Alaska.

SEC. 314. HANSEN DAM, LOS ANGELES–SAN GABRIEL RIVER BASIN, CALIFORNIA.

In evaluating and implementing the water control manual for the Hansen Dam project, Los Angeles–San Gabriel River Basin and Ballona Creek, California, authorized by section 5 of the Act of June 22, 1936 (chapter 688, 49 Stat. 1589; 55 Stat. 647), the Secretary shall—

(1) coordinate with the City of Los Angeles to identify new or expanded recreational opportunities on lands that are leased or could be leased by the City for recreation;

(2) undertake necessary background studies to support the authorized purposes of the project, including recreation; and

(3) ensure that the water quality parameters for the project are sufficient to meet authorized project purposes.

SEC. 315. MORRO BAY, CALIFORNIA.

In carrying out operations and maintenance activities for the project for harbor development, Morro Bay, California, authorized by section 2 of the Act of March 2, 1945 (chapter 19, 59 Stat. 21), the Secretary shall carry out any necessary repair or maintenance activities on a breakwater, revetment, or seawall constructed as part of the project in such a manner as to ensure each such activity is sufficient to meet the authorized purpose of the project.

SEC. 316. OCEANSIDE, CALIFORNIA.

In carrying out the study for the project for shoreline protection, Oceanside, California, authorized pursuant to section 414 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2636; 121 Stat. 1176; 134 Stat.

2672; 138 Stat. 3077), the Secretary shall coordinate with the city of Oceanside, California, on the development of a recommendation that—

(1) is feasible;

(2) maximizes the use of natural features and nature-based features (as those terms are defined in section 1184(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 2289a(a)));

(3) utilizes updated sediment sampling and analysis; and

(4) is acceptable to the city of Oceanside.

SEC. 317. PAJARO RIVER, CALIFORNIA.

At the request of the non-Federal interest, the Secretary is authorized to acquire any interest in real property required for the project for flood protection on the Pajaro River, California, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1966 (80 Stat. 1421), in fee simple title.

SEC. 318. ARKANSAS VALLEY CONDUIT, COLORADO.

Public Law 87–590 (76 Stat. 389; 123 Stat. 1320) is amended—

(1) in the first section—

(A) in subsection (c), in the second sentence, by striking ''or in the case of the Arkansas Valley Conduit, payment in an amount equal to 35 percent of the cost of the conduit that is comprised of revenue generated by payments pursuant to a repayment contract and revenue that may be derived from contracts for the use of Fryingpan-Arkansas project excess capacity or exchange contracts using Fryingpan-Arkansas project facilities,''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(d) ARKANSAS VALLEY CONDUIT.—

''(1) REPAYMENT CONTRACT.—To provide domestic water supplies to communities and households that do not have reliable access to domestic water supplies, the contract for the Arkansas Valley Conduit shall provide for payment in an amount equal to 35 percent of the cost of the conduit, notwithstanding the reclamation laws or any other provision of this Act. The contract payments shall consist of—

''(A) funding provided during construction from any entity other than the Secretary; and

''(B) based on a demonstration of financial hardship, as determined by the Secretary, repayment of the balance not covered under subparagraph (A) for a period of not more than 75 years with simple interest at a rate that is equal to 50 percent of the interest rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury under section 2(c), including revenue derived from contracts for the use of excess capacity or exchange contracts using Fryingpan-Arkansas project facilities.

''(2) OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE.—The contract for the Arkansas Valley Conduit shall provide for the assumption by the contracting parties of the care, operation, maintenance, and replacement of the conduit.''; and

(2) in section 2(b)(3)(A), by striking ''this section'' and inserting ''subsection (d) of the first section''.

SEC. 319. RIO GRANDE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PROGRAM, COLORADO, NEW MEXICO, AND TEXAS.

Section 5056 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1213) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking ''construction'' and all that follows through ''enhancement'' and inserting ''construction, and design of water resource protection and restoration projects''; and

(B) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

''(2) USE OF EXISTING INFORMATION.—In carrying out the program authorized by paragraph (1)(A), the Secretary shall consider data and analyses developed under paragraph (1)(B) and any relevant Federal, State, and local water resource planning efforts in the Rio Grande Basin.

''(3) PROJECTS.—In carrying out the program authorized by paragraph (1)(A), the Secretary shall include projects for—

''(A) drought, wildfire, flooding, and other natural disaster resiliency mitigation, including through the use of measures utilizing a natural feature or nature-based feature (as those terms are defined in section 1184(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (33 U.S.C. 2289a));

''(B) the protection and restoration of fish and wildlife habitat;

''(C) addressing the impacts of excess sedimentation and salinity on surface and groundwater availability;

''(D) improvements or rehabilitation of water-resources related infrastructure;

''(E) the prevention and control of the spread of aquatic invasive species; and

''(F) other water resource protection and restoration activities determined appropriate by the Secretary.'';

(2) in subsection (f), by striking ''$15,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2029'' and inserting ''$20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2026 through 2030''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(g) REPORTS.—Not later than December 31, 2027, and every 5 years thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report that—

''(1) contains an evaluation of the program carried out under subsection (b)(1)(A), including a description of all projects carried out under such program;

''(2) contains a description of future projects planned to be carried out under such program;

''(3) provides updates of a systemic habitat needs assessment and an assessment of needs for other related purposes in the Rio Grande Basin, including flood damage reduction, wildfire risk mitigation, and drought mitigation; and

''(4) identifies any needed adjustments in the authorization of such program.''.

SEC. 320. MIAMI HARBOR, MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with the Act of October 15, 1940 (33 U.S.C. 701h–1), the Secretary shall repay the non-Federal interest for the Federal share of any advanced funds contributed by the non-Federal interest for the project for navigation, Miami Harbor, Miami-Dade County, Florida, authorized by section 1001(17) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1052).

(b) APPLICATION OF CORPS POLICY.—In providing the repayment required under subsection (a), the Secretary may not require a new start determination for a project before providing such repayment.

SEC. 321. MISSISSIPPI RIVER-GULF OUTLET, LOUISIANA.

In carrying out the project for ecosystem restoration, Mississippi River-Gulf Outlet, Louisiana, authorized by section 7013(a)(4) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1281), notwithstanding any requirement of the plan described in such section that the non-Federal interest provide land for the project in fee in order to satisfy the property rights requirements of the project, the Secretary shall, where feasible, allow the non-Federal interest to provide easements on the land for the project in order to satisfy such property rights requirements.

SEC. 322. PILOTTOWN ANCHORAGE AREA, LOUISIANA.

Pursuant to section 106 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (33 U.S.C. 635), the Secretary is authorized to operate and maintain, at Federal expense, the Pilottown anchorage area, Mississippi River above Head of Passes, Louisiana, extending from River Mile 6.7 above Head of Passes to Mile 1.5 above Head of Passes established by the United States Coast Guard.

SEC. 323. JACK HUBBARD MEMORIAL BREAKWATER, BURT TOWNSHIP, MICHIGAN.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The breakwater at the Grand Marais Harbor, Michigan, authorized pursuant to section 1 of the Act of June 14, 1880 (chapter 211, 21 Stat. 190; 64 Stat. 166), shall hereafter be known and designated as the ''Jack Hubbard Memorial Breakwater''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the breakwater referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the Jack Hubbard Memorial Breakwater.

SEC. 324. SARDIS LAKE, PANOLA COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI.

Section 8377(e) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3824) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''The Secretary is authorized to'' and inserting ''Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Water Resources Development Act of 2026, the Secretary shall''; and

(2) in paragraph (3)(A), by striking ''subsection such easements'' and inserting ''subsection the minimum easements''.

SEC. 325. HYDRAULIC EVALUATION OF UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER.

Section 8219 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (33 U.S.C. 652 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) COORDINATION WITH UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER SYSTEM FLOOD RISK AND RESILIENCY STUDY.—The Federal Emergency Management Agency may only use information developed under subsection (a) with respect to any area of the Upper Mississippi River in accordance with a congressionally authorized project described in a final report of the Chief of Engineers for a study conducted with respect to such area under section 1227 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2024 (138 Stat. 3084) (including any study described in subsection (d)(2) of such section).''.

SEC. 326. LOWER MISSOURI RIVER COMPREHENSIVE FLOOD PROTECTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may carry out a project for flood risk management in the Lower Missouri River, as identified in the System Plan, if the Secretary determines that the project is feasible.

(b) ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES.—

(1) PROJECTS INCLUDED IN SYSTEM PLAN.—For any project identified in the System Plan as a System Plan component, the Secretary may carry out flood risk management measures for such project in accordance with the design criteria and guidelines of the System Plan.

(2) COMPATIBLE MEASURES.—The Secretary may include in a flood risk management project authorized under this section compatible measures for environmental improvements and recreation, if the Secretary determines the compatible measures are—

(A) feasible;

(B) consistent with System Plan recommendations;

(C) beneficial to the community;

(D) not detrimental to flood protection; and

(E) supported by State and local partners.

(c) SPINOFF STUDIES.—Any project or spinoff studies identified in the System Plan may be considered a continuation of the Lower Missouri Basin study and studied and designed in accordance with section 216(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (134 Stat. 2681).

(d) COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall coordinate activities carried out pursuant to this section with other activities carried out by the Secretary in the Missouri River Basin.

(e) SYSTEM PLAN UPDATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to update the System Plan, as necessary and in accordance with section 216 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (134 Stat. 2681), as additional data is developed, and projects are implemented pursuant to this section.

(2) PROJECTS NOT INCLUDED IN SYSTEM PLAN.—For any project not identified in the System Plan as a System Plan component, the Secretary is authorized to study such project and, if the Secretary determines that such project is feasible and consistent with the flood risk management measures identified in the feasibility report for such study and the goals identified in the System Plan, the Secretary shall update the System Plan pursuant to paragraph (1) so that the System Plan includes such project.

(f) COST LIMITATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Secretary may not expend more than $60,000,000 in Federal funds for a single project carried out under this section in the State of Missouri.

(2) EXCEPTION.—With respect to a project under this section in the State of Missouri for which the Federal share of costs is expected to exceed $60,000,000 or a project within the scope of the Lower Missouri Basin study, the Secretary may carry out the project if—

(A) the Secretary submits to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate the determination that the project is feasible; and

(B) construction of the project, to be carried out substantially in accordance with the System Plan and subject to the conditions described in such determination, is specifically authorized by Congress.

(g) LIMITATION FOR INCOMPLETE OR DEFERRED MAINTENANCE OR UPKEEP.—The Secretary may not carry out a project under this section to address deferred, or incomplete, maintenance or upkeep of such project, except if such maintenance or upkeep is—

(1) attributable to changed conditions or design standards; and

(2) in compliance with such project with respect to which the Secretary is authorized to provide assistance under section 5 of the Act of August 18, 1941 (33 U.S.C. 701n).

(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) LOWER MISSOURI BASIN STUDY.—The term ‘‘Lower Missouri Basin study’’ has the meaning given such term in section 216(a)(10) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (134 Stat. 2681).

(2) SYSTEM PLAN.—The term ‘‘System Plan’’ means the Lower Missouri Flood Risk and Resiliency System Plan prepared pursuant to section 216(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (134 Stat. 2681).

SEC. 327. MISSOURI RIVER RECOVERY IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE.

Section 5018 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1199) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by adding at the end the following:

‘‘(6) CHAIR.—The Chair of the Committee shall be elected by the members of the Committee.’’; and

(2) in subsection (c), by striking ‘‘The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.)’’ and inserting ‘‘Chapter 10 of title 5, United States Code,’’.

SEC. 328. GREAT LAKES COMMISSION.

There is authorized to be appropriated to the Executive Director of the Great Lakes Commission established under Article IV of the Great Lakes Basin Compact (82 Stat. 414) to support water resources development efforts related to the execution of the Compact, and carried out in collaboration with the Secretary, $5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2027 through 2030.

SEC. 329. GREAT LAKES FISHERY AND ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION.

Section 506 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–22) is amended by adding at the end the following:

‘‘(g) LIMITATION.—The total Federal amount expended for a project carried out under this section shall be not more than $20,000,000.’’.

SEC. 330. TRUCKEE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NEVADA.

Beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the features within the State of Nevada of the project for flood protection on Truckee River and tributaries, California and Nevada, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1954 (68 Stat.1264), are no longer authorized.

SEC. 331. COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS, NEW MEXICO.

Section 3117 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1137) is amended by striking ‘‘to assist in carrying out any operation or maintenance activity associated with the flood control project’’ and inserting ‘‘to assist in carrying out any operation, maintenance, recreational management, or related stewardship activities associated with the flood control project, including activities that improve recreational access, visitor use management, public safety, or natural and cultural resources stewardship’’.

SEC. 332. KINZUA DAM SAFETY MODIFICATION STUDY, ALLEGHENY RIVER, NEW YORK AND PENNSYLVANIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the dam safety modification study pursuant to section 8 of the National Dam Safety Program Act (33 U.S.C. 467f) for the project for the Kinzua Dam and Allegheny Reservoir, New York and Pennsylvania, authorized pursuant to section 5 of the Act of June 22, 1936 (chapter 688, 49 Stat. 1586; 52 Stat. 1217), the Secretary shall identify any real property associated with such project that the Secretary determines is not needed to carry out the authorized purposes of the project.

(b) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—Upon completion of the dam safety modification study described in subsection (a), the Secretary may convey, without consideration, to the Seneca Nation of Indians, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the real property identified as excess under such subsection.

(c) REVERSION.—If the Secretary determines that the property conveyed under this section is not used for a public purpose, all right, title, and interest in and to the property shall revert, at the discretion of the Secretary, to the United States.

SEC. 333. SURF CITY AND NORTH TOPSAIL BEACH, NORTH CAROLINA.

The project for hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, Surf City and North Topsail Beach, North Carolina, authorized by section 7002(3) of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (128 Stat. 1367) is modified to deauthorize the portion of the project known as North Topsail Beach, in accordance with the Supplemental Report of the Chief of Engineers dated December 9, 2025.

SEC. 334. MASSILLON LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, TUSCARAWAS RIVER, OHIO.

Pursuant to section 133 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (33 U.S.C. 2327a), the Secretary shall carry out rehabilitation efforts at the sluice gates of the Massillon Local Protection Project, Tuscarawas River, Ohio, authorized by section 6 of the Act of June 22, 1936 (chapter 688, 49 Stat. 1592; 50 Stat. 879).

SEC. 335. TOUSSAINT RIVER FEDERAL NAVIGATION PROJECT, CARROLL TOWNSHIP, OHIO.

The cost share for operation and maintenance activities for the Toussaint River Federal navigation project, Carroll Township, Ohio, authorized pursuant to section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577), shall be in accordance with the cost share described in section 101(b)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2211(b)(1)).

SEC. 336. RIO PUERTO NUEVO FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT PROJECT, SAN JUAN, PUERTO RICO.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the project for flood control, Rio Puerto Nuevo, Puerto Rico, authorized by section 204(b) of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (84 Stat. 1828; 100 Stat. 4127; 132 Stat. 76), the Secretary shall conduct a general reevaluation report to reconsider natural and nature-based approaches to flood control as alternatives to the construction of each project element described in subsection (b).

(b) PROJECT ELEMENTS DEFINED.—For purposes of subsection (a), the project elements to be reconsidered are—

(1) Contract No. 4 for the Central Río Piedras and Las Américas Bridges;

(2) Contract No. 5A for the Notre Dame Bridge;

(3) Contract No. 6A for the Upper Río Piedras;

(4) Contract No. 6B for Quebrada Buena Vista;

(5) Contract No. 7B for Quebradas Doña Ana and Contract No. 7A and 7C for Quebradas Josefina; and

(6) Contract No. 5B for the West Piñero Avenue Bridge.

(c) INCLUSIONS IN GENERAL REEVALUATION REPORT.—In conducting the reevaluation report under subsection (a) the Secretary shall include in such report the following data and analyses, updated to reflect conditions as of the date of enactment of this Act:

(1) Hydrologic and hydraulic data;

(2) A review of local acceptability and economic conditions in the project area.

(3) Any real estate costs analysis.

(4) Cost apportionment analysis, including in such updated analysis a detailed description of projected operation and maintenance responsibilities associated with the completed project and the estimated cost to complete the project.

(d) CONSIDERATION; CONSULTATION.—In reevaluating the project elements under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) consider the use of natural and nature-based features;

(2) consult with the heads of applicable Federal agencies, agencies of Puerto Rico, and community stakeholders within the geographic scope of the project;

(3) validate any findings through an external review process that is independent and outside of the Corps of Engineers; and

(4) develop a process for public participation through which the Secretary shall—

(A) regularly publish any findings; and

(B) hold public hearings and regular consultation meetings to give ample opportunity for public comment on the findings.

(e) INTERIM PROGRESS REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall transmit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate an interim status report with respect to the reevaluation report required under subsection (a), and include in such interim status report—

(1) any conclusions and recommendations made, and activities carried out, pursuant to subsection (a);

(2) identification of any additional, site-specific areas within the geographic scope of the project for which the Secretary recommends any additional reevaluation; and

(3) any interim actions taken by the Secretary to reduce comprehensive flood risk within the geographic scope of the project while carrying out the reevaluations under subsection (a), including if applicable, the cost of each such action.

(f) EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION.—The Secretary shall expedite the completion of each reevaluation of a project element under subsection (a).

SEC. 337. BUFFALO BAYOU TRIBUTARIES AND RESILIENCY STUDY, TEXAS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall expedite completion of the Buffalo Bayou Tributaries and Resiliency Study, Texas, carried out pursuant to title IV of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 (132 Stat. 76; 138 Stat. 3082), any review required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) as part of the study, and the report of the Chief of Engineers for the study.

(b) REPORTS.—The report of the Chief of Engineers for the study described in subsection (a) shall contain recommendations for carrying out a comprehensive project as described in subsection (c), and is not required to include further evaluation of alternatives to the comprehensive project that are not acceptable to the non-Federal interest for the project.

(c) COMPREHENSIVE PROJECT.—For purposes of subsection (b), a comprehensive project is a project—

(1) to be carried out by the Secretary, in partnership with the Harris County Flood Control District, as part of the project in Buffalo Bayou and its tributaries, Texas, authorized by the Act of June 20, 1938 (chapter 535, 52 Stat. 804);

(2) designed considering any prior studies and information provided to the Corps of Engineers by the Harris County Food Control District;

(3) which shall include an analysis of a subterranean tunnel conveyance system; and

(4) that, carried out pursuant to a comprehensive benefits plan developed by the Secretary and determined acceptable by the non-Federal interest—

(A) is capable of conveying, at an appropriate rate, the volume of water in the Buffalo Bayou and Tributaries Study area, based on an analysis that includes conveyance during a storm event equivalent to Hurricane Harvey;

(B) is designed to avoid, or minimize to the extent practicable, any adverse effects on the environment and community; and

(C) is designed to promote infrastructure resiliency, including infrastructure necessary for reservoir operations.

(d) DEADLINE.—The Secretary shall prioritize Federal funding for the completion of the Buffalo Bayou and Tributaries Resiliency Study pursuant to subsection (a) in the first submission after the date of enactment of this Act of each of the following:

(1) A budget submission.

(2) A submission of a work plan to Congress pursuant to the joint explanatory statement for an annual appropriations Act or as part of the submission of a spend plan to Congress for a supplemental appropriations Act under which the Corps of Engineers receives funding.

(e) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate the report of the Chief of Engineers for the study described in subsection (a), regardless of design maturity status of the project covered by the report.

(f) COMPREHENSIVE BENEFITS PLAN DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''comprehensive benefits plan'' means a comprehensive benefits plan developed pursuant to the policies described in the memorandum relating to ''Policy Directive – Comprehensive Documentation of Benefits in Decision Document'', dated January 5, 2021, and signed by the Assistant Secretary for Civil Works.

SEC. 338. CHAMBERS, GALVESTON, AND HARRIS COUNTIES, TEXAS, EXPEDITED REAL ESTATE TRANSFERS.

Section 1327(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2024 (138 Stat. 3144) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''(including the portions of Spilman Island and Pelican Island owned by, or subject to an easement held by, the United States), to determine whether any such land or easements are no longer required for project purposes'' before ''; and''; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by inserting ''under such paragraph'' before ''are no longer''.

SEC. 339. COASTAL VIRGINIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out an analysis of a measure benefitting Federal land under the administrative jurisdiction of the head of another Federal agency as part of the feasibility study for flood risk management, ecosystem restoration, and navigation, Coastal Virginia, authorized by section 1201(9) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2018 (132 Stat. 3802), the Secretary may use, for any portion of the cost of such analysis, funds—

(1) made available to the Secretary after the date of enactment of this Act for water resources development investigations; or

(2) contributed by such agency head (subject to the availability of future appropriations).

(b) FEDERAL EXPENSE REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary shall carry out each analysis described in subsection (a) at Federal expense, except that, with respect to an analysis described in subsection (a) to the extent it relates to formulation of measures to reduce risk to a military installation, upon request of the non-Federal interest for the project described in subsection (a), the Secretary may use funds contributed by the non-Federal interest pursuant to the terms and conditions of the agreement between the Secretary and the non-Federal interest for the project that relate to sharing the cost of the study.

(c) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Nothing in this section affects any cost-sharing requirement applicable to the head of a Federal agency, other than the Secretary, for the construction of an authorized water resources development project, or a separable element of such project, resulting from the study described in subsection (a).

SEC. 340. NORFOLK COASTAL STORM RISK MANAGEMENT, VIRGINIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out an analysis of a measure benefitting Federal land under the administrative jurisdiction of the head of another Federal agency as part of the feasibility study for the modification of the project for hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, Norfolk Coastal Storm Risk Management, Virginia, authorized by section 401(3) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (134 Stat. 2738), the Secretary may use, for any portion of the cost of such analysis, funds—

(1) made available to the Secretary after the date of enactment of this Act for water resources development investigations; or

(2) contributed by such agency head (subject to the availability of future appropriations).

(b) FEDERAL EXPENSE REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary shall carry out each analysis described in subsection (a) at Federal expense, except that, with respect to an analysis described in subsection (a) to the extent it relates to formulation of measures to reduce risk to a military installation, upon request of the non-Federal interest for the project described in subsection (a), the Secretary may use funds contributed by the non-Federal interest pursuant to the terms and conditions of the agreement between the Secretary and the non-Federal interest for the project that relate to sharing the cost of the study.

(c) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Nothing in this section affects any cost-sharing requirement applicable to the head of a Federal agency, other than the Secretary, for the construction of an authorized water resources development project, or a separable element of such project, resulting from the study described in subsection (a).

SEC. 341. PUGET SOUND AND ADJACENT WATERS RESTORATION, WASHINGTON.

Section 544(f) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2675; 132 Stat. 3826) is amended to read as follows:

''(f) LIMITATION.—The total Federal amount expended for a critical restoration project under this section (including a critical restoration project for which an agreement was entered into pursuant to this section before the date of enactment of the Water Resources Development Act of 2026 and construction is not complete as of such date of enactment) shall not be more than $20,000,000.''.

SEC. 342. LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER.

The total cost of constructing dredged material stabilization and retaining structures related to maintenance dredging for the project for navigation, Lower Willamette and Columbia Rivers, from Portland, Oregon, to the sea, authorized by the first section of the Act of June 18, 1878 (chapter 264, 20 Stat. 157) shall be considered eligible operation and maintenance costs assigned to commercial navigation for the purpose of section 210(a)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2238(a)(2)).

SEC. 343. LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION ASSESSMENT.

The Secretary shall conduct an assessment of the lower Columbia River Basin to identify opportunities to carry out cost-effective projects and measures to support salmon and steelhead restoration by—

(1) restoring, improving, and reconnecting aquatic and riparian habitat; and

(2) providing cold water refugia for native anadromous fish species.

SEC. 344. PUGET SOUND NEARSHORE ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, WASHINGTON.

In carrying out the project for ecosystem restoration, Puget Sound, Washington, authorized by section 1401(4) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (130 Stat. 1713; 136 Stat. 3806), the Secretary shall consider the removal, relocation, and replacement of the following sites to be a project feature the costs of which are shared as construction:

(1) Highway 101 causeway and bridge over the Lilliwaup Estuary of the Hood Canal site.

(2) NE North Shore Road roadway and bridge over the Tahuya Estuary of the Hood Canal site.

(3) Highway 101 causeway and bridge over the Snow Creek and Salmon Creek (at the head of Discovery Bay) site.

(4) County and local roads and bridges over the Nooksack and Lummi Rivers and Tennant Creek at the Nooksack Estuary of the Northern Puget Sound site.

SEC. 345. WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA, WASHINGTON, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, MARYLAND, AND VIRGINIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the feasibility study for the project for water supply, Washington, District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia, authorized by section 8201(a)(14) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3745; 138 Stat. 3160), the Secretary shall carry out a second phase of the study focused on the identification of a secondary water source and additional water storage capability or other long-term and large-scale backup water supply solutions necessary to meaningfully reduce the structural water supply risk of the region.

(b) TREATMENT OF STUDY.—In carrying out the second phase of the study under this section, the Secretary—

(1) shall treat such study as a continuation of the first phase of the study carried out under section 8201(a)(14) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022; and

(2) shall continue such study without a new investment decision.

SEC. 346. FEDERAL TRIANGLE AREA, WASHINGTON, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out an analysis of a measure benefitting Federal land under the administrative jurisdiction of the head of another Federal agency as part of the feasibility study for the project for flood risk management, Federal Triangle Area, Washington, District of Columbia, authorized by section 8201(a)(12) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3745), the Secretary may use, for any portion of the cost of such analysis, funds—

(1) made available to the Secretary for water resources development investigations; or

(2) contributed by such agency head.

(b) FEDERAL EXPENSE REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary shall carry out each analysis described in subsection (a) at Federal expense.

(c) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Nothing in this section affects any cost-sharing requirement applicable to the head of a Federal agency, other than the Secretary, for the construction of an authorized water resources development project, or a separable element of such project, resulting from the study described in subsection (a).

TITLE IV—WATER RESOURCES INFRASTRUCTURE

SEC. 401. PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS.

The following projects for water resources development and conservation and other purposes, as identified in the reports titled ‘‘Report to Congress on Future Water Resources Development’’ submitted to Congress pursuant to section 7001 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2282d) or otherwise reviewed by Congress, are authorized to be carried out by the Secretary substantially in accordance with the plans, and subject to the conditions, described in the respective reports or decision documents designated in this section:

(1) NAVIGATION.—

A. State	B. Name	C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers	D. Estimated Costs
1. MS	Gulfport Harbor, Gulfport, Deep Draft Navigation	June 23, 2026	Federal: $411,114,000 Non-Federal: $137,102,000 Total: $548,216,000
2. WA & OR	Columbia River Turning Basins Navigation Improvements	September 26, 2025	Federal: $16,408,000 Non-Federal: $5,489,000 Total: $21,897,000

(2) FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT.—

A. State	B. Name	C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers	D. Estimated Costs
1. KY	Kentucky River, Beattyville Flood Risk Management Project, Lee County	March 24, 2026	Federal: $7,979,000 Non-Federal: $4,562,000 Total: $12,541,000
2. NY, NJ	New York–New Jersey Harbor and Tributaries Study, East Riser, New Jersey Actionable Element	July 6, 2026	Federal: $180,916,000 Non-Federal: $97,417,000 Total: $278,333,000

(3) ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION.—

A. State	B. Name	C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers	D. Estimated Costs
1. MO	Lower Osage River Basin, Miller, Osage, and Cole Counties, Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration	July 6, 2026	Federal: $95,334,000 Non-Federal: $51,333,000 Total: $146,667,000
2. WY	Little Goose Creek, Sheridan	June 4, 2026	Federal: $45,333,000 Non-Federal: $35,601,000 Total: $80,934,000

(4) HURRICANE AND STORM DAMAGE RISK REDUCTION.—

A. State	B. Name	C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers	D. Estimated Costs
1. NC	Surf City, Onslow and Pender Counties, North Carolina, Coastal Storm Risk Management	July 15, 2025	Initial Federal: $121,750,000 Initial Non-Federal: $76,863,000 Total: $198,613,000 Renourishment Federal: $171,007,000 Renourishment Non-Federal: $191,297,000 Renourishment Total: $362,304,000

(5) MODIFICATIONS AND OTHER PROJECTS.—

A. State	B. Name	C. Date of Decision Document	D. Estimated Costs
1. AZ	Rio de Flag, Flagstaff	June 12, 2026	Total: $244,633,000
2. CA	Port of Long Beach Deep Draft Navigation project, Los Angeles County	June 11, 2026	Total: $255,811,000
3. FL	Central and Southern Florida, Canal 111 (C-111) South Dade Project	October 14, 2025	Federal: $477,280,500 Non-Federal: $477,280,500 Total: $954,561,000
4. FL	Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan, Central Everglades Planning Project	June 16, 2026	Federal: $6,160,809,000 Non-Federal: $6,160,809,000 Total: $12,321,618,000
5. KY	Kentucky Lock Addition, Lower Cumberland and Tennessee Rivers	June 11, 2026	Federal: $2,056,161,750 Non-Federal: $685,387,250 Total: $2,741,549,000
6. MS	Memphis Metropolitan Stormwater – North DeSoto County Feasibility Study, DeSoto County	March 10, 2026	Federal: $47,341,000 Non-Federal: $25,491,000 Total: $72,832,000
7. TN	Chickamauga Lock Replacement Project, Chickamauga Lake, Hamilton County	June 11, 2026	Federal: $1,175,090,250 Non-Federal: $391,696,750 Total: $1,566,787,000

SEC. 402. EXPEDITED COMPLETION OF PROJECTS AND ACTIVITIES.

(a) CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROGRAMS.—The Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, expedite completion of the following projects:

(1) Projects for emergency streambank erosion and shoreline protection under section 14 of the Flood Control Act of 1946 (33 U.S.C. 701r) for the following areas:

(A) County Creek, Bartlett, Illinois.

(B) Ohio River, Brandenberg, Kentucky.

(C) Falmouth, Massachusetts, in the vicinity of Menauhant Road.

(D) Muskegon Heights, Michigan.

(E) Old Mission Peninsula, Michigan.

(F) Salt Brook, Summit, New Jersey.

(G) Euclid Creek, Euclid, Ohio.

(H) Little Miami River, Milford, Ohio.

(I) Mountain Creek, Macungie, Pennsylvania.

(2) Projects for beach erosion and hurricane and storm damage reduction under section 3 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (33 U.S.C. 426g) for the following areas:

(A) Micro Beach and Makaka Beach, Garapan, Saipan, Northern Mariana Islands.

(B) Bolongo Bay, St. Thomas, United States Virgin Islands.

(3) Projects for flood control under section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s) for the following areas:

(A) Ak-Chin Levee, Pinal County, Arizona.

(B) Lower Santa Cruz River, Arizona.

(C) McCormick Wash, Globe, Arizona.

(D) Rose and Palm Garden Washes, Douglas, Arizona.

(E) Palermo, Butte County, California.

(F) Beseck Lake, Connecticut.

(G) Woodbridge, Connecticut.

(H) Little Wekiva River, Florida.

(I) Peachtree and Nancy Creek watersheds, Atlanta, Georgia.

(J) Golconda, Illinois.

(K) Traverse City, Michigan.

(L) Marshall County, Minnesota.

(M) Peckman River, Verona, New Jersey.

(N) Third River, Clifton, New Jersey.

(O) Nanny Hagen Brook, Pleasantville, New York.

(P) McKenzie River, Springfield, Oregon.

(Q) 42nd Street Levee, Springfield, Oregon.

(R) Medina Colonia, Zapata County, Texas.

(4) Projects for navigation under section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577) for the following areas:

(A) Kodiak Harbor, Kodiak, Alaska.

(B) Laupahoehoe Harbor, Hawaii.

(C) Black River and Lake Huron, Alcona Township, Michigan.

(5) Project for beneficial uses of dredged material, New Jersey Meadowlands (also known as Hackensack Meadowlands), New Jersey, under section 204 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (33 U.S.C. 2326).

(6) Projects for aquatic ecosystem restoration under section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2330) for the following areas:

(A) El Corazón de los Tres Ríos del Norte, Pima County, Arizona.

(B) North Haven, Connecticut.

(C) Savannah River below Augusta, Georgia.

(D) Waimea 400 Wetlands, Kaua'i, Hawaii.

(E) Marshall County, Minnesota.

(F) Polk Swamp, Dorchester County, South Carolina.

(G) Ficklen Island Dam, Fredericksburg, Virginia.

(7) Projects to modify projects for improvement of the environment or drought resiliency under section 1135 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2309a) for the following areas:

(A) Wayne County, Iowa.

(B) Wild Rice River, Minnesota.

(C) Lower Pearl River, Mississippi.

(D) Rio Chama and Rio Grande between the Abiquiu and Cochiti Reservoirs, New Mexico.

(8) Projects to control, retain, and reuse stormwater associated with flood control efforts under section 1108 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2024 (138 Stat. 3006) for the following areas:

(A) Jonesboro, Arkansas.

(B) Klondike Canyon, Rancho Palos Verdes, California.

(C) City of Lompoc, California.

(D) Sutter County, California, including Yuba City and Robbins.

(E) Lake Avondale, Avondale Estates, Georgia.

(F) Falmouth, including Woods Hole, Massachusetts.

(G) Waveland, Mississippi.

(9) Project for removal of obstructions and clearing channels for flood control, City of Chico, California, under section 2 of the Act of August 28, 1937 (33 U.S.C. 701g).

(b) OTHER PROJECTS AND ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, expedite completion of the following:

(1) Project for flood risk management, Little Colorado River, Navajo County, Arizona, authorized by section 401(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (134 Stat. 2735).

(2) Project for flood damage reduction, Rio de Flag, Flagstaff, Arizona, authorized by section 101(b)(3) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2576; 121 Stat. 1107; 130 Stat. 1716; 136 Stat. 3833; 138 Stat. 3067) (as modified by this Act).

(3) Project for ecosystem restoration, Tres Rios, Arizona, authorized by section 101(b)(4) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 2577).

(4) Project for beach erosion, Surfside Sunset and Newport Beach, Orange County, California, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1177).

(5) Project for flood risk management, Westminster, East Garden Grove, California Flood Risk Management, authorized by section 401(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (134 Stat. 2735).

(6) Maintenance dredging at the Greenwich Harbor, Connecticut.

(7) Maintenance dredging at the Southport Harbor, Connecticut.

(8) Project for ecosystem restoration, water supply, flood control, and protection of water quality, Central and Southern Florida, Indian River Lagoon, Florida, authorized by section 1001(14) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 1051).

(9) Comprehensive plan for the purpose of restoring, preserving, and protecting the Northern Estuaries Ecosystem, Florida, authorized by section 8215 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2022 (136 Stat. 3760; 138 Stat. 3138).

(10) Operations and maintenance activities necessary as of the date of enactment of this Act for the project for navigation, Chicago Harbor Lock, Chicago, Illinois, authorized pursuant to the first section of the Act of July 11, 1870 (chapter 240, 16 Stat. 226; 21 Stat. 182; 37 Stat. 217; 40 Stat. 1283; 76 Stat. 1176).

(11) Project for navigation, Port of Iberia, Louisiana, authorized by section 1001(25) of the Water Resources Control Act of 2007 (121 Stat 1053; 128 Stat 1351).

(12) Project for ecosystem restoration, Naval Weapons Station Earle Oyster Reef Restoration, Monmouth County, New Jersey, pursuant to the Hudson-Raritan Estuary Ecosystem Restoration project authorized by section 401(5) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2020 (134 Stat. 2740).

(13) Project for navigation, Times Beach dike wall repair, Buffalo Harbor, New York, authorized by the Act of May 20, 1826 (chapter 78, 4 Stat. 175).

(14) Maintenance dredging of the project for navigation, Tillamook Bay, Oregon, authorized by the first section of the Act of July 27, 1912 (chapter 254, 37 Stat. 220).

(15) Project for periodic beach nourishment, Presque Isle Peninsula, Erie, Pennsylvania, authorized by section 101 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1976 (90 Stat. 2918).

(16) Project for ecosystem restoration, Lower Blackstone River, Rhode Island, authorized pursuant to section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2330; 136 Stat. 3804).

(17) Maintenance dredging at Two Rivers Harbor, Two Rivers, Wisconsin, authorized pursuant to the Act of March 3, 1871 (chapter 118, 16 Stat. 538; 34 Stat. 1101; 49 Stat. 1035; 72 Stat. 298).

(c) TRIBAL PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM.—The Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, expedite completion of the Pima-Maricopa Irrigation Project, associated with the Gila River Indian Community, Arizona, authorized pursuant to section 203 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (33 U.S.C. 2269).

TITLE V—DAM SAFETY

SEC. 501. NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM AMENDMENTS.

The National Dam Safety Program Act (33 U.S.C. 467 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 8(e)(4), by striking ''2'' and inserting ''7'';

(2) in section 8A(j)(4), by striking ''2026'' and inserting ''2031''; and

(3) in section 14(a)(2)(A)(ii)—

(A) in subclause (I), by striking ''and low-head dams''; and

(B) in subclause (II), by striking ''and low-head dams''.

SEC. 502. STUDY ON HIGH HAZARD POTENTIAL DAM PRIORITIZATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall complete a study to identify the issues and concerns that prevent States from prioritizing projects that will have the greatest community benefit under section 8A of the National Dam Safety Program Act (33 U.S.C. 467f–2) and produce recommendations on how to address such issues and concerns.

(b) TIMELINE.—The Administrator shall begin the study required under subsection (a) on the date of enactment of this Act and shall submit to Congress a status report on such study not later than 1 year after such date of enactment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) and the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. SCHOLTEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRAVES. 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 in the record on H.R. 9497.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in strong support of H.R. 9497, the Water Resources Development Act of 2026, or WRDA 2026.

As chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, it has been an honor to continue the biennial tradition of enacting a WRDA bill, delivering critical water resource infrastructure improvements across America.

The 119th Congress marks the seventh consecutive Congress to consider WRDA legislation since returning to the regular 2-year schedule in 2014.

In July, we unanimously reported WRDA 2026 out of committee, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, with 66 ''yea'' votes and no ''nay'' votes.

I thank Ranking Member LARSEN, Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee Chairman COLLINS, and Subcommittee Ranking Member FREDERICA WILSON for all of their hard work in developing this legislation and guiding it through committee and now to the House floor.

I also thank all of the nearly 350 Members that submitted requests for this year's WRDA project.

WRDA is a Member-driven bill, with over 2,000 project and policy submissions. These were an essential part in developing a well-rounded, bipartisan bill that comprehensively addresses the water resources needs of our entire country.

This bipartisan legislation maximizes the Corps' ability to partner with local communities and project sponsors to study and construct projects.

WRDA 2026 streamlines Corps processes by empowering the local communities and enhancing infrastructure resilience across the Nation.

This bill makes historic investments in both our inland and coastal water systems, authorizing the construction of projects from Florida to Washington State and everywhere in between.

In my home State of Missouri, the bill authorizes implementation of the Lower Missouri River Flood Risk and Resiliency System Plan to move much needed flood control projects forward.

The bill also takes an important first step in addressing sedimentation in the upper Missouri River by authorizing a comprehensive study to manage it.

Through WRDA 2026, we ensure that navigators, levy districts, and other stakeholders have a stronger voice in the Missouri River Recovery Implementation Committee.

Additionally, I am proud of the legislation's commitment to the inland waterway system. WRDA 2026 takes action to strengthen flood control features along our inland waterways and provides expanded resources for levy owners to work with the Corps to make resilient improvements to flood risk infrastructure.

WRDA 2026 authorizes a comprehensive study on the inland and intercoastal waterways to help the Corps identify necessary improvements to prepare for the future and to solidify the inland waterways system, which is the economic backbone of our country.

WRDA 2026 makes targeted and commonsense reforms to allow the Corps to deliver infrastructure effectively and efficiently.

The Army Corps has been building resilient water resource infrastructure for 200 years, and this bill authorizes the Corps to continue making important investments and to prepare for the next 200 years.

These are just a few of the very important ways that this bill delivers for all Americans, Mr. Speaker, and I urge support of the legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to strongly support H.R. 9497, the Water Resources Development Act of 2026, a bipartisan bill adopted by Chair GRAVES, Ranking Member LARSEN, the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee Chair COLLINS, Subcommittee Ranking Member WILSON and members of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

As this may be one of my last times managing the floor with Chairman GRAVES, I would like to take a point of personal privilege to thank him for his leadership over this and so many other bills. It has been an honor to serve under his leadership on the committee.

As vice ranking member of the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, I know how important it is that we work across the aisle to address the water infrastructure needs facing communities across the country.

In Michigan, water is a way of life. The Great Lakes define our State and are fundamental to our economy. Our ports and waterways support manufacturing and agriculture, move goods to market, sustain tourism and recreation, and support good-paying jobs throughout Michigan. That is why WRDA matters.

This bill is about making sure communities can afford the infrastructure that they need, protecting families and businesses from flooding and other threats, and investing in the water infrastructure that keeps our communities and our economy moving.

WRDA 2026 is a jobs bill. It invests in the ports, harbors, inland waterways, and other infrastructures that American businesses rely on to compete.

In West Michigan, our waterways are not just water resources—they are economic resources. From commercial navigation and manufacturing to tourism, fishing, and recreation, healthy and reliable waterways support communities and jobs across our State.

This bill reinforces our commitment to harbor maintenance and ensures that the Corps manages projects in collaboration with local partners.

This is critical for communities like Grand Haven back home in my district, the small workhorse harbor that supports nearly 500 jobs and generates $88 million in economic impact.

□ 1030

WRDA 2026 will help businesses compete, strengthen our supply chains, and create more jobs at home.

This bill isn't only about major ports and navigation projects. WRDA 2026 is an affordability bill. It is about whether communities can afford to provide the basic water infrastructure that their residents depend on every single day.

WRDA 2026 authorizes over $6 billion in environmental infrastructure assistance nationwide. As part of that investment, I am so proud that this bill authorizes $115 million between Kent, Ottawa, and Muskegon Counties back home in my district, as well as throughout the State of Michigan, to help communities address watershed and wastewater needs.

We need to make sure that smaller communities can actually access these programs. The bill creates a new office of technical assistance and community outreach as a one-stop shop with particular attention to rural, Tribal, and disadvantaged communities.

WRDA 2026 is an environmental bill. WRDA helps communities prepare for tomorrow instead of simply paying to recover after a disaster strikes.

Michigan has seen firsthand the consequences of flooding, shoreline erosion, harmful algal blooms, invasive species, and aging water infrastructure. Back home, H.R. 9497 authorizes a critical watershed study for the Muskegon River, as well as expedites the completion of a streambank erosion and shoreline protection project in Muskegon Heights.

Building resilience means anticipating these risks and giving communities tools to address them before they become emergencies. These investments will save folks time and money.

WRDA 2026 also creates new authorities for drought resilience and flood control structures and expands the Corps' use of natural and nature-based solutions for flood and coastal storm risk reduction.

WRDA 2026 is a data center accountability bill. As new industries like data centers place new demands on our water supplies, the bill includes language from my Data Center Resource Disclosure Act requiring the Corps to assess how those major water users affect Corps projects and consider water consumption in watershed planning.

Resilience ultimately comes back to affordability, too. Every dollar we spend planning ahead can help communities avoid much greater costs when infrastructure fails or disaster strikes. These priorities are backed by substantial new work for the Corps.

WRDA authorizes 10 projects that have completed the Corps' rigorous study process and over 100 new feasibility studies, including 24 studies to modify existing projects.

For Michigan, the case for WRDA is straightforward. It supports jobs, helps to keep essential water infrastructure affordable, and makes our communities more resilient.

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

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman GRAVES for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee, I am proud of the work we have done putting together the Water Resources Development Act of 2026. Every 2 years, Congress reauthorizes the United States Army Corps of Engineers' civil works programs, and WRDA 2026 continues that bipartisan tradition.

With this bill, we aim to strengthen the Corps' ability to achieve its mission, including safe navigation of America's inland and coastal waterways and improving flood control systems.

During my time as subcommittee chairman, I have had the opportunity to travel across the country to see how important the Corps' work is to our Nation. I have heard directly from project sponsors, local communities, and the Corps itself about the things that are working and things we need to fix.

I learned about our Nation's critical lock and dam infrastructure by touring key projects, like the Wilson Lock in Alabama and the Chickamauga Lock in Tennessee. When visiting the Houston Ship Channel in Texas and the Ports of Savannah and Brunswick in my home State of Georgia, I saw how regular dredging ensures America's maritime communities can safely and efficiently deliver for Americans and grow our economy.

Every Congress, both sides of the aisle work together to ensure one of America's greatest gifts, our inland and coastal waterways, is working for all Americans. That is exactly what this WRDA does. It is the product of over 2,000 policy and project submissions from my colleagues in this Chamber on behalf of their constituents.

Under President Trump's leadership, the Army Corps of Engineers has been cutting red tape and working harder than ever to build and maintain our vital water infrastructure, and this bill further empowers the Corps to get that job done.

WRDA 2026 expands the Corps' ability to pursue alternative delivery methods and gives project sponsors more flexibility so that projects move faster. This bill modernizes contracting processes and ensures that projects meet congressionally authorized schedules and costs.

WRDA 2026 holds the Corps accountable to deliver long-overdue reports that are necessary for Congress to plan and invest taxpayers' money wisely.

It does these and so many other things to make the Corps more efficient as it works to achieve its mission for the American people.

I thank everyone who has worked with us on this legislation and for bringing it to the floor of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Ms. SCHOLTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN).

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I stand to support H.R. 9497, the Water Resources Development Act of 2026, a bill that I jointly cosponsored with Chair Sam Graves, the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee Chair MIKE COLLINS, and Subcommittee Ranking Member FREDERICA WILSON.

This bipartisan bill addresses local water resource needs across the country, incorporating feedback from nearly 300 House Members, as well as local communities and stakeholders.

As the seventh consecutive WRDA that the committee has produced since 2014, this bill builds on the ongoing bipartisan efforts to ensure the efficiency and effectiveness of ports, harbors, and inland waterways; the resiliency of communities; and the protection of natural resources. WRDA 2026 is a product that all Members can be proud of.

I thank Chair GRAVES, Subcommittee Chair COLLINS, and Subcommittee Ranking Member WILSON for their partnership, insight, and collaboration in developing this important legislation.

At the outset of this year's WRDA, I laid out three goals for the bill: sticking to regular bipartisan order, addressing affordability, and enhancing resiliency across Army Corps infrastructure. WRDA 2026 checks each of these boxes and delivers hundreds of other Member priorities, as well.

WRDA 2026 sticks to the regular order by continuing to authorize the next generation of Corps projects and studies. The bill authorizes the construction of 14 new and updated projects and provides over $6 billion in new and modified environmental infrastructure authorities to address local water and wastewater needs.

The bill also authorizes over 100 new feasibility studies to initiate future water resources development projects and another 24 studies to modify existing projects.

In addition, this bill reauthorizes or increases funding for existing Corps programs and focuses on project-specific fixes to efficiently complete projects.

WRDA 2026 also provides technical support and expands initiatives to assist non-Federal partners, making projects more accessible for all communities. The office of technical assistance and community outreach will help communities navigate the Corps' processes, as well as ensure that existing technical assistance programs are implemented and running smoothly.

Changes to the feasibility study process will empower communities by putting them in the driver's seat to address their specific needs and priorities without unnecessarily constraining timelines or impacting projects.

The climate crisis poses significant threats to water resources infrastructure, and WRDA 2026 continues to develop the tools needed to face these challenges, from enhancing drought resilience to combating harmful algal blooms and assessing wildfire risk.

The bill recognizes how reusing dredged materials can be a commonsense solution for coastal communities. It also encourages communities to partner with the Corps to ensure their levees and other flood risk reduction infrastructure are ready for bigger storms and higher water levels.

My district in northwest Washington State was hit by a devastating flood last year, and I am pleased that this bill takes steps to empower local communities like the ones I represent to address long-term flood concerns.

This bill also supports habitat restoration in the Puget Sound, ensuring that my State can continue to partner with the Corps to protect our State's natural resources and build resilient infrastructure.

Finally, WRDA 2026 supports economic growth by investing in projects that create jobs, bolster local economies, and enhance U.S. competitiveness and supply chains.

Ensuring sustained Federal investment in harbor-deepening projects will strengthen supply chains and ensure our ports and harbors can accommodate the world's largest ships.

The Water Resources Development Act of 2026 is a comprehensive and bipartisan bill that strengthens our water resource infrastructure, empowers communities, responds to climate threats, and supports economic growth.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this critical legislation and look forward to productive conversations with our Senate counterparts to get a final bill to the President's desk before the end of this Congress.

□ 1040

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman GRAVES for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 9497, the Water Resources Development Act of 2026, otherwise known as WRDA.

In southern Ohio, many communities continue to face challenges in affording the necessary water infrastructure to supply running water in their communities. I am proud to say that this bill authorizes over $32 million across southern Ohio, which would help communities in my district upgrade their water supply, storage, and wastewater treatment plants.

I am also proud to support the creation of categorical permissions, which will allow for commonsense projects to be constructed without the lengthy bureaucratic permitting process.

This bill is especially important, as portions of my district continue to respond to recent flooding. Our communities shouldn't have to wait to protect their people from flooding, and this bill helps undo the burdensome permission process.

That is why I was proud to support this bill when it passed the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. I applaud Chairman GRAVES and the work of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee for their role in crafting this legislation.

This bill helps communities get access to clean drinking water, protects against floods, and maintains our critical waterways for commerce.

All in all, this WRDA bill delivers for the American people. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. SCHOLTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS).

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today also in support of the Water Resources Development Act of 2026, WRDA.

This past summer, Lake Mead and Lake Powell, two reservoirs in the Southwest, reached historic lows. Projections show that they will continue to decline in the years to come.

At the same time, the Trump administration has issued a planning document that could cut 70 percent of southern Nevada's water supply. That would just decimate the economy and lifestyle and the lives and livelihoods of people in southern Nevada, so we need to use all the tools that we have available to us to conserve water and mitigate such a crisis.

I believe that WRDA 2026 does just that. It includes provisions that I championed to create an office of water supply, water conservation, and drought resilience. It directs the Army Corps to consider the impact of data centers, a growing issue in this country, on water supply and conservation projects. This is especially important in the Southwest because if you look at the plans for these data centers, about two-thirds of those on the books coming up are slated to be built in regions that are experiencing drought.

The bill also includes provisions I championed to create a pilot program using natural infrastructure in dryland streams. These are in arid and drought-prone areas. The pilot program would benefit Nevada, where 88 percent of our streams are ephemeral. That includes our Amargosa River, which was recently labeled one of America's most endangered rivers.

I believe with these provisions and others you have heard mentioned, WRDA 2026 is a major step forward for water policy, and I am proud to have played a role as a member of the T&I Committee in helping draft it and getting it passed. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HURD).

Mr. HURD of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the 2026 Water Resources Development Act.

Congress has enacted a bipartisan WRDA every 2 years since 2014. At a time when this institution too often struggles to find agreement, that record is worth noting. This is basic governing, identifying real infrastructure needs and working across party lines to address them.

I am particularly pleased that this bill includes important provisions for

Colorado. It adds Colorado to the Western Rural Water Program and authorizes up to $150 million for projects in our State. Colorado is a headwaters State, yet until now, it has not been eligible for the same program available to other Western States. This provision can help communities in rural Colorado address flood risk, wastewater infrastructure, drought resilience, and other water needs.

The bill also addresses the Arkansas Valley Conduit by giving southeastern Colorado communities greater flexibility in repaying the government. Congress has already spoken clearly on this issue. The underlying legislation previously passed both Chambers unanimously. My Colorado colleagues and I have kept pushing because these communities have waited decades for the Federal Government to keep its commitment.

Water infrastructure is not abstract in rural Colorado. It means whether small towns can manage floods, whether communities have reliable water systems, and whether longstanding commitments to communities are actually honored.

I thank Chairman GRAVES, Ranking Member LARSEN, Chairman COLLINS, Ranking Member WILSON, and their staffs for their bipartisan work on this legislation.

Ms. SCHOLTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STANTON).

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I also rise today in support of the Water Resources Development Act, and I personally thank Ranking Member LARSEN, Chairman GRAVES, and the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee for their important work on this legislation.

I particularly thank Chairman GRAVES. I have served on the committee for four terms, and he has always been a sincere bipartisan partner. That is very much appreciated.

My home State of Arizona has faced more than a quarter century of drought. Water stewardship and conservation are a core part of our culture. Despite our leadership, Arizona is now being asked to shoulder a disproportionate amount of the cuts for Colorado River water. Federal support in this critical moment is absolutely essential.

I am fortunate to be the only Arizonan on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. I worked very hard to make sure that Arizona priorities were fully included in this important bill.

The bill advances key drought resiliency measures, including a new office of water supply and drought resilience at the U.S. Army Corps to work hand in hand with local communities facing severe drought and a new continuing authority program allowing the Corps to work on drought resiliency proposals. It also provides new authorities to restore water storage capacity in the Colorado River Basin.

The bill also fast-tracks 30 Arizona-specific water infrastructure projects, moving forward the city of Phoenix's Tres Rios ecosystem restoration work, flood control efforts in Pinal County, and key Tribal partnerships.

To help more communities and Tribal nations facing increasing uncertainty over their water supply, we have added $151 million to Arizona's own Environmental Infrastructure Authority, a program I created 6 years ago to help rural Arizonans and Tribal organizations do better with drought resilience.

The authority has already funded more than 20 water conservation and reuse projects across Arizona—water lines, wells, wastewater systems, and aquifer recharge projects—helping us to get the most out of every drop of water.

Arizona is already doing more with less. These Federal investments are mission critical to help us ensure reliable water services for our residents and businesses. I urge my colleagues to support this critical bill.

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN).

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 9497, the Water Resources Development Act of 2026.

This bipartisan bill reflects Congress' longstanding commitment to investing in America's ports, waterways, flood control systems, and infrastructure.

This legislation hits close to home, as I represent the Port of Houston, the Houston Ship Channel, and Cedar Port, some of our Nation's most critical and busiest maritime assets.

I am especially proud of how this bill delivers for southeast Texas and for the greater Houston region. It clarifies the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund allocation requirements for donor and energy transfer ports. It also authorizes the review of excess Federal lands in Chambers, Galveston, and Harris Counties and expedites the Cedar Port feasibility study.

□ 1050

These provisions will help move critical projects forward, strengthen our ports and our waterways, and ensure that southeast Texas remains a critical engine of American commerce.

As the senior Texan serving on the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee under the able leadership of Chairman GRAVES, I have seen firsthand how our Nation's waterways and ports support thousands of jobs, strengthen our Nation's energy security, and help keep American commerce moving.

I greatly appreciate the work that Chairman GRAVES has put into ensuring this WRDA bill continues to deliver lasting benefits to our communities nationwide, and I look forward to seeing it advancing out of the House.

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. GALLAGHER).

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, this is an example of great bipartisan leadership. It is delivering on the issue of water. Water is the lifeblood of our communities, it feeds our farms, and it provides drinking water. It is critical. We in this House, Congress, and this Republican majority are delivering for California.

In this WRDA bill is $155 million for water and wastewater infrastructure in the Sacramento River Basin. We direct the Army Corps of Engineers to conduct forecast-based operations at Shasta Dam. That means we are going to store more water, and we are going to manage our water better.

There is $3.5 million to be used for Sutter County to replace sewer mains in the small town of Robbins. We are delivering for rural California.

This WRDA directs the Corps to prevent and mitigate impacts to water resources from wildfires, which we have seen far too many in California.

This WRDA prioritizes water supply missions for the Corps and encourages the Corps to work with non-Federal interests to advance water supply projects.

It expedites flood control for the city of Chico. We are delivering and making sure that we improve our flood control projects to keep people safe and making culvert repairs or replacements in Sutter County.

Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of leadership we need, and I urge the passage of this important legislation.

Ms. SCHOLTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. FIGURES).

Mr. FIGURES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of the Water Resources Development Act, which you and I had the opportunity to work on directly together as members of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Safe and clean water is a right in this country, and it is our responsibility to provide the resources that are essential to make this a reality for communities across America.

For my district, this bill represents meaningful investments that enhance our water infrastructure, protect our communities, and strengthen our economy.

I fought for this bill alongside you, Mr. Speaker, to make sure we were bringing resources to our communities that they need. I secured approval for $50 million in water infrastructure projects across the counties of my district, the Second District of Alabama.

As the sole member of Alabama on the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, I am proud to secure these wins for my State and for my district to ensure our communities receive the Federal attention and investments that they deserve.

From infrastructure issues plaguing Prichard, Alabama, and sewer issues in the Black Belt, to aging water treatment equipment in east Alabama, cities and towns in rural areas will be able to access the type of funding that they need to make critical updates to their infrastructure.

My district is one of the least economically prosperous districts in the country, and they face immediate infrastructure needs.

The $40 million that we secured for various projects will make a real life-changing difference for so many of my constituents and can help towns and cities throughout the Second District, from persistent stormwater management issues in Russell County to aging and overburdened sewer infrastructure in Montgomery County; critical water infrastructure needs in places like Bullock, Butler, and Macon Counties; and in Prichard, which I mentioned earlier, where currently residents lose about 60 percent of their fresh drinking water before it ever reaches a tap, is unacceptable.

This is something that with the resources secured here, we can start fixing those problems or continue fixing those problems.

I also have parts of my district that need real help with their sewer infrastructure. There are areas in the Second District that are too rural for public sewer service, yet the soil concentration is not conducive to traditional septic systems, so they are left to literally run sewer lines into parts of the woods in some areas of my district.

As you can imagine, Mr. Speaker, this leads to environmental and health safety concerns. The residents of Alabama's Second Congressional District deserve better than this. All Americans deserve better than this.

These are real challenges in both rural and urban communities where long-delayed infrastructure replacement and upgrades are difficult to achieve without strong Federal support and partnership.

Whether it is Mobile, Montgomery, Phenix City, Troy, Tuskegee, or Union Springs, every person in Alabama deserves reliable water infrastructure, and this bill moves us in that direction.

I am proud of the work that we have done to get here on WRDA, and I strongly urge my colleagues to vote in support of it.

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. BOEBERT).

Ms. BOEBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for working so diligently on this WRDA bill for this year.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 9497, the Water Resources Development Act of 2026.

In Colorado we have an old rule: Whiskey is for drinking, and water is for fighting.

For 64 years, families in the Arkansas Valley have been fighting and waiting for clean water that they were promised in 1962. This bill includes provisions of my Finish the Arkansas Valley Conduit Act, which is a 130-mile pipeline from Pueblo Reservoir to Lamar that will serve more than 50,000 Coloradans in 39 communities.

Seventeen of those old systems are already under State enforcement orders. Their wells carry naturally occurring uranium and radium.

Six of the 10 worst radium systems in America are in southeast Colorado. Water is the difference between a town that grows and a town that watches its children leave forever. Construction started in 2023, pipe is in the ground, but local districts cannot absorb exploding costs alone.

From Morgan County to the southeast of Colorado, I have been proud to serve 53 of our 64 counties in Colorado over the years, and every family that I have represented and beyond deserves water that they can trust.

I thank Chairman GRAVES for bringing this bipartisan bill to the floor and including my Finish the Arkansas Valley Conduit Act in this year's WRDA bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to pass this bill and keep a 64-year-old promise.

Ms. SCHOLTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 9497 will continue longstanding, bipartisan traditions of responding to local water resource needs. We have heard from Members across the aisle who are advocating for their communities demanding these changes.

WRDA 2026 is a jobs bill. It is an environmental bill. It is a data center responsibility bill.

It will create jobs, address rising costs, and safeguard our most precious resource, our water.

I am proud to support this bipartisan effort to ensure that generations to come can enjoy an affordable, resilient water future.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 9497, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to emphasize the importance of regularly considering bipartisan infrastructure bills like WRDA. For the last seven Congresses, the committee has worked together to enact a WRDA bill that addresses water resource needs across this country, allowing the Corps of Engineers to make necessary improvements to flood control infrastructure, ports, harbors, and inland waterways.

This legislation would not be possible without the input of my colleagues. With their input, we were able to make meaningful improvements to Army Corps projects, policies, and programs that are important to all of our constituents.

WRDA 2026 builds for the future, authorizing the Corps to construct resilient water infrastructure projects across the country, from Gulfport, Mississippi, to the Columbia River in Washington.

WRDA 2026 makes commonsense reforms to Corps policies, empowering non-Federal interests and expediting project delivery.

Our ports, harbors, and inland waterways are the backbone of our Nation's economy, and this legislation gives the Army Corps the tools it needs to effectively and efficiently deliver for all Americans.

As my colleagues know, these bills could not be done without the hard work and countless hours our staff put into this process.

I thank my Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee staff: Ryan Hambleton, Heather Eilers-Bowser, Kyle Lombardi, Jen Brancho, Patrick Boyle, and Dasha McDonald.

I also thank my full committee staff: Nick Christensen, Abby Wenk, Meghan Holland, Jake Lutz, Jimmy Ballard, Will Wallace, Drew Moore, Justin Harclerode, Payton Palazzolo, Tyler Micheletti, and Rachel Sakrisson, as well as the minority staff director, Kathy Dedrick, and subcommittee staff director Ryan Sieger.

□ 1100

Mr. Speaker, before I yield back, I would also like to take just a moment to acknowledge a longtime staffer who is leaving the Hill. Abby started off as my staff assistant in my personal office and is ending her career as the committee's deputy staff director. For over a decade, Abby has been an integral member of my team, a trusted adviser, and a very good friend.

Abby has played a pivotal role in driving our committee's agenda and building support for each of the committee's major legislative actions, whether it was surface reauthorization, FAA reauthorization, multiple WRDAs, reconciliation, and everything in between. She has been an effective advocate for our committee's work with stakeholders, whipping votes and collaborating with leadership.

Throughout her time here, Members—and me in particular—have been able to depend on Abby for absolutely anything and everything that we do.

Not only has she been instrumental in so many ways in shaping and advancing our legislative agenda, but she has ensured that the Transportation Committee has operated smoothly and effectively. Whether it was an event, a hearing, a roundtable, or travel, Abby has had a hand in making sure that it came off without a hitch.

I have often said, and I have heard from many other Members who say it as well, that the T&I Committee is one of the best committees in Congress, and I firmly believe that one of the reasons it is the best committee is because of the work that Abby has done here in the last 8 years.

As Abby moves on to the next phase of her career, I wish her and her family well. She will be missed on the T&I Committee, and we are better off having had Abby on staff. She has brought a deep level of commitment and expertise and also a lot of fun to the committee.

Mr. Speaker, although Abby is leaving me, I thank her for her invaluable service and dedication to the committee, Congress, and the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of the bill and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Chair and Ranking Member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee for bringing this bipartisan Water Resources Development Act of 2026 (WRDA 2026) to the House floor for consideration to address the needs of our communities in the water resources, ecosystem restoration, flood control, navigation and water supply arenas.

Together with the Corps of Engineers (Corps) and our local partners at the city, county and state levels are working to improve the quality of life for our communities. The Texas Congressional delegation representing San Antonio and Bexar County has worked diligently with our local partners, the San Antonio River Authority (SARA), and the Corps to bring forward a series of critical ecosystem restoration projects that are so much more than the sum of their parts. The Mission Reach and Westside Creeks Ecosystem Restoration Projects are reviving the river habitat's health and functionality, including the flood control benefits of the previously channelized river. A 2024 economic impact analysis report that included the Mission Reach Project states that the project is contributing an annual economic impact of $117.5 million and creating nearly 780 jobs. Similarly, for the Westside Creeks Project area footprint, over $10 billion in public and private investments have been made or announced in the last ten years in anticipation of the project.

In the WRDA 2024, in fulfillment of the wishes of our community for equal treatment for all four creeks, the legislation included direction to the Corps to carry out Alternative 7 of the Westside Creeks Project in accordance with the final General Reevaluation Report for the project, dated January 2014, which detailed the traditional cost sharing for the project at 65 percent federal and 35 percent non-federal. This cost sharing is also included in SARA's Project Partnership Agreement with the Corps for the construction of the Westside Creeks Project. We are asking Congress to support our ongoing work with the Corps in moving forward with construction of the Westside Creeks Project in keeping with the original intent of the WRDA 2024 Act in applying the traditional cost sharing to the construction of Alternative 7 of the Westside Creeks Project.

I look forward to continuing to partner with federal, state, and local stakeholders to help restore the natural beauty of our communities and invest in critical water resources infrastructure across the country.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, first, I want to thank Chairman GRAVES, Chairman COLLINS, Ranking Member LARSEN, and Ranking Member WILSON for their leadership in seeking to maintain the regular two-year Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) cycle. I speak today in support of Sections 101(b) and 132, two provisions that elevate the role of water supply within the United States Army Corps of Engineers.

Reliable water supply is essential to our Nation's economy, our manufacturers, our communities, and our future. In Georgia, we understand that firsthand. From Allatoona Lake in my district to Corps reservoirs across this country that provide drinking water to millions of Americans, water is one of our Nation's most valuable resources. These provisions help ensure the Corps has the tools to support growing communities, strengthen our economy, and secure America's water future.

For anyone who has worked with the Corps of Engineers, it is common knowledge that projects can take decades to move forward. These provisions help change that.

Section 101(b) creates a dedicated Office of Water Supply, Water Conservation, and Drought Resiliency to coordinate policy, improve communication with local partners, and help ensure the Corps fully implements the important water supply authorities Congress enacted in Subtitle B of WRDA 2024.

Section 132 reinforces the need to maximize the use of existing authorities while explicitly recognizing municipal, industrial, and agricultural water supply, water conservation, and drought resiliency alongside the Corps' other missions.

Together, these sections help turn the vision of WRDA 2024 into action. They elevate water supply in the national conversation, make the Corps a better partner to communities across the country, and ensure we are using every available tool to strengthen American prosperity.

We all rely on the dedication and professionalism of the staff here and particularly appreciate Ryan Hambleton and his team at Water Resources and Nick Christensen and the full committee staff. And of course, my own Legislative Director, Jason Murphy, who has advised Georgia Republicans for years on water policy matters.

I thank the Committee for their bipartisan leadership, and I urge my colleagues to support these important provisions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 9497, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. GRAVES. 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 motion will be postponed.

STOPPING POLITICAL DISCRIMINATION IN DISASTER ASSISTANCE ACT

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1342) to prohibit discrimination based on political affiliation in granting disaster assistance, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1342

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 ‘‘Stopping Political Discrimination in Disaster Assistance Act’’.

SEC. 2. NONDISCRIMINATION IN DISASTER ASSISTANCE.

Section 308(a) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5151(a)) is amended by striking ‘‘or economic status’’ and inserting ‘‘economic status, or political affiliation’’.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GALLAGHER). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STANTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material into the RECORD on H.R. 1342.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES), the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1342.

This legislation is simple, but it is a very necessary fix. It ensures that when the Federal Government responds to a crisis, disaster victims are helped regardless of their political affiliation. This may seem like common sense, but both the work of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and the Department of Homeland Security's Office of Inspector General revealed that this body needs to act affirmatively on this issue.

I am grateful to Mr. PERRY for his leadership on this topic, both in this Congress and the last.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take just a moment of personal privilege to honor another staffer who is departing the committee.

Hunter Presti has worked for the committee in various capacities for well over a decade. He is an expert in aviation law, playing key roles in both the 2018 and 2024 FAA reauthorization bills.

For the 2024 bill, Hunter led our team and was a fierce negotiator. I trusted him to execute throughout that process, and I am extremely proud of the bill that we were able to get signed into law.

This Congress, he stepped into a new role as the policy director, leading our highways team and spearheading the surface transportation bill. He was a very critical component to negotiating the BUILD America 250 Act and getting it favorably reported by the committee.

Being policy director couldn't keep Hunter away from aviation. As we crafted the reconciliation bill, hunter's expertise was also integral in providing the $12.5 billion downpayment for air traffic control modernization efforts at the FAA.

Throughout my time leading the committee, Hunter has served as a trusted policy expert and dedicated staffer, devoting countless hours and weekends to advancing the committee's agenda.

I recognize the toll that such dedication takes on one's family. I extend my sincere gratitude to Hunter for these sacrifices, as well as to his family for their support.

As Hunter heads toward the next step in his career, I wish him well. He will be greatly missed. From drafting legislative text to shepherding bills from conception through negotiation at the committee level and with the Senate, and to seeing that those bills are signed into law, Hunter has left his mark on the committee's work.

I am very grateful for his service. I wish him and his family the best of luck in their next chapter.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time, and I urge support of this legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1342, the Stopping Political Discrimination in Disaster Assistance Act, amends the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to include a prohibition on discrimination based on political affiliation.

Currently, the Stafford Act makes it clear that FEMA should not discriminate on the basis of race, color, religion, nationality, sex, age, disability, English proficiency, or economic status. This bill adds political affiliation to that list.

Following Hurricanes Helene and Milton, there were alarming reports that FEMA workers were skipping homes impacted by those disasters based on political signs that supported President Trump. In fact, the recent inspector general audit found homes were, in fact, skipped following Hurricane Milton due to political signage. FEMA crews failed to offer assistance because homes displayed signs supporting then-Presidential candidate Donald Trump.

Not only did this violate FEMA policy and the Hatch Act, but it is absolutely and obviously totally unacceptable.

□ 1110

The inspector general found that, ''This situation eroded public trust in FEMA's ability to treat everyone impartially, offer unbiased and consistent assistance, and ensure equal access to resources and tools.''

Victims and the American taxpayer—and victims who are the American taxpayer—must have confidence that when disaster strikes, they won't be discriminated against because of the political sign that they place in their yard or the things that they believe in.

This legislation is a simple, yet crucial step that we can take to rebuild the public's trust in this great and wide-ranging institution. Each of us in this body can affirm that no matter an American's political stance, if a disaster strikes, FEMA's response should be impartial, aiding those who need help, period.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1342, the Stopping Political Discrimination in Disaster Assistance Act, introduced by Representative PERRY.

This bill amends a nondiscrimination provision of the Robert T. Stafford Act to prohibit political discrimination in the administration of FEMA assistance.

I could not agree more: Politics has no place in disaster assistance. Unfortunately, President Trump has weaponized disaster declarations, rewarding States that voted for him and punishing those that did not.

Sadly, the numbers tell the story. He has approved more than 75 percent of the disaster declaration requests for States that voted for him in 2024, but less than half from States that did not. That is not speculation. The President has told us himself that politics factors into these decisions.

On the campaign trail, while discussing water policy with Governor Newsom, he said, if California did not divert more water to farmers, ''we won't give him money to put out all his fires.''

Announcing aid for Alaska last October, he did not talk about the damage. He talked about the politics, referring to Alaska as a State he ''won big three times in 2016, 2020, and 2024.'' He said the same when approving aid for North Dakota, twice.

In that same stretch, he praised Missouri's residents as ''incredible patriots'' while approving their disaster declaration request, and then subsequently denying requests from Illinois, Maryland, and Vermont.

When a disaster declaration does not come, real people suffer. Survivors cannot get money to repair their homes, find temporary housing, or access disaster case management. States and cities cannot rebuild schools, roads, or hospitals. Communities get left behind, not because they did not properly qualify for the aid, but because of political differences. That is not patriotism. That is reckless behavior.

Mr. PERRY is right: We need to keep politics out of disasters. I support H.R. 1342, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

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

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER).

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank both the chair of the subcommittee and the ranking member for their work on this bill. I am proud to be here in support of the Perry initiative. I also want to congratulate all the staff members, as the full chair congratulated them, for their service.

When disaster strikes, Americans come together. Americans should be able to count on their government and their Federal Government, regardless of their political affiliations or the politics of the State they call home.

That principle is increasingly important as natural disasters become more frequent and costly. From 2020 through 2024, the United States experienced an average of 23 billion-dollar weather and climate disasters every year, more than 2½ times the annual average since 1980.

My home State of California understands these costs, unfortunately, all too well. We face wildfires, floods, severe storms, droughts, earthquakes. Mr. Speaker, 18 of California's 20 most destructive wildfires have occurred since 2000.

Yet, at a time when communities increasingly need Federal assistance, we have seen troubling disparities, that have just been talked about by the ranking member and the chair. An analysis of FEMA data found that, during Trump's second term, 80 percent of disaster requests from Republican Governors have been approved, compared with only 60 percent from Democratic Governors. That is from FEMA. States that supported President Trump in 2024 have had more than three-quarters of their requests approved, compared with less than half for States that did not.

California has experienced this uncertainty. More than a year and a half after the devastating Los Angeles wildfires, communities are still waiting for additional long-term Federal recovery funding to rebuild homes, schools, businesses, and critical infrastructure.

Regardless of who occupies the White House, no community should have to wonder whether its politics will affect the Federal Government's response when disaster strikes.

That is why H.R. 1342 is important. It makes it clear that political affiliation cannot be a basis for discrimination in the delivery of Federal disaster assistance. Disaster relief should be based on need, not politics.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. RAMIREZ).

Mrs. RAMIREZ. Mr. Speaker, as you heard my colleague mention a few moments ago, it is clear that States with Republican Governors are more likely to have their disaster declarations approved than Democratic Governors. Now, if we look at the numbers, as you heard them mentioned just a moment ago, they are 80 percent to less than 60 percent, respectively.

Do you know how I personally know this? Coming from the State of Illinois, when my State asked for Federal assistance from FEMA after terrible summer storms, they were denied. They weren't just denied once. They were actually denied twice.

In August 2025, severe storms led to 60- to 70-mile-an-hour winds, 8 inches of rain, flooded homes and impacted infrastructure across Boone, Cook, Kane, McHenry, and Will Counties.

In September, Illinois declared a disaster and requested Federal assistance. We were denied, denied, denied. The administration said: ''Supplemental Federal assistance under the Stafford Act is not warranted for this incident.'' When we appealed, we were denied again. While thousands of families across the entire State needed assistance, our President turned his back on our communities due to political retribution.

It comes as no surprise that the President wants to take responsibility for caring from Americans facing emergencies, but he wants to use assistance to curry favor, to reward loyalists, and to privatize services so that people can profit off of pain.

When families need support to rebuild their lives, we can't politicize it. We should not be using politics. We should be making sure that these Federal dollars are getting to our communities as quickly as possible. Politics should have no role in whether we show up for each other.

That is why this bill is so important. That is why it is critical that we pass H.R. 1342, so that we make sure that FEMA can actually realize its mission to help people before, during, and after disasters.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes.''

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Ms. MEJIA).

□ 1120

Ms. MEJIA. Mr. Speaker, I also rise today in support of H.R. 1342, the Stopping Political Discrimination in Disaster Assistance Act. Disaster relief should be driven by human need, not political malice.

Like my colleagues before me, I stand appalled that we even have to say this. I look no further than my home State of New Jersey. In February, a brutal blizzard battered our communities. It caused nearly $100 million in damages, knocked out power for 127,000 residents, and tragically claimed 15 lives.

Regional FEMA and NOAA experts reviewed our request and concluded that New Jersey met every single Federal requirement for $84 million in disaster relief assistance, yet President Trump personally overruled his career experts and rejected our aid, dismissing a deadly storm as routine snow removal. Why? Because New Jersey voters voted against him in the 2024 elections.

Under this administration, disaster declarations from Republican Governors, as you have heard, are approved nearly 90 percent of the time, while Democratic Governors' pleas are rejected nearly three-quarters of the time.

This is not fiscal responsibility. This is, frankly, political extortion. Sadly, shamefully, we are failing our own people. New Jersey taxpayers pay thousands more per person into the Federal Government than most red States. We are not counting. We are asking for fairness.

We are denied because of our State's politics. Actually, no. We are denied because of the political choices of our people, the American people. Disasters don't check voter registrations, and Federal aid shouldn't either.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill and end the weaponization of FEMA once and for all. The work we do in this Chamber is supposed to be in service of our constituents, our communities, and our country.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1342, the Stopping Political Discrimination in Disaster Assistance Act, amends the nondiscrimination portion of the Robert T. Stafford Act to prohibit political discrimination in the administration of FEMA assistance.

Frankly, it is shocking that we even have to pass this bill in the United States Congress, but we must. Let's pass this bill and send the unambiguous message that politics has no place in disaster assistance.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I begin by thanking my good friend and colleague from Arizona, Mr. STANTON, for being a good partner in things that are good for our country and the policy that drives that.

Politics has no place in disasters, but I will say to my colleagues that competence does. This isn't about Republican or Democrat Governors. This isn't about this State or that State. It is about doing the right thing and being prepared. All across the country, taxpayers are forced to pay these bills, but they oftentimes, quite honestly, don't have any opportunity to choose the leadership and the competence and the responsible decisions for which they are then held accountable for in the taxes they pay and the money that is sent out on their behalf.

If States choose to allow bad things to happen in their State, that is their business, and it should be their business. I believe in the 10th Amendment, and I think that they should do those things they see as best for their people.

When it comes to the incompetence that causes these disasters or the effect of these disasters for failure to pass policy that is reasonable, that averts and diverts from the disaster, the rest of the American people should not be forced to pay for those things. Those are the decisions that are made, and that is how they are made. It is no more complicated than that.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for his partnership and support on this. Let's take politics out of everything altogether. Let's have competent leadership at the top level, at the Federal Government, and at each State level. Let's not reward incompetence, bad decisions, or poor judgment.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage and adoption, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1342.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING EMOTIONAL ASSISTANCE WITH RELIEF AND LOVE ACT

Mr. VAN EPPS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 9327) to establish in U.S. Customs and Border Protection a pilot program to adopt dogs from local animal shelters to be trained as support dogs, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 9327

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 ''Providing Emotional Assistance with Relief and Love Act'' or the ''PEARL Act''.

SEC. 2. CBP SUPPORT DOG PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security, acting through the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP), shall establish in CBP a pilot program to adopt dogs from local animal shelters to be trained as support dogs for CBP's Support Canine Program.

(b) DURATION.—The pilot program under subsection (a) shall terminate three years after the date of its establishment.

(c) NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS.—No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FULLER). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. VAN EPPS) and the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. MAGAZINER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VAN EPPS. 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 H.R. 9327.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 9327, the Providing Emotional Assistance with Relief and Love Act, or PEARL Act.

This bill would create a 3-year pilot program within CBP to provide for the adoption of dogs from local animal shelters to be trained and used as therapy dogs for frontline agents and officers.

The bill is named after a yellow Labrador retriever named Pearl, who was the first canine support dog introduced to CBP in the Laredo sector, where she served the department faithfully until her retirement in April 2025.

The frontline heroes of CBP operate in challenging conditions and face overwhelming stress day in and day out as they work to secure the homeland. The canine support program has been extremely popular. It helps to provide emotional support to the CBP workforce.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 9327, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 9327, the Providing Emotional Assistance with Relief and Love Act, or the PEARL Act.

The men and women of the U.S. Customs and Border Protection face high levels of stress and exposure to trauma in their day-to-day operations. That is why we should invest in initiatives that support the health of CBP officers and agents.

This bill creates a pilot program that authorizes CBP to adopt dogs from local animal shelters and train them as therapy dogs. Multiple studies have shown that even short-term interactions with a therapy dog can significantly reduce anxiety and distress. Not only will this bill give CBP officers and agents more access to therapy dogs, it will also help dogs in need of homes across the country.

□ 1130

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN EPPS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOYCE).

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise today in strong support of my legislation, the Providing Emotional Assistance with Relief and Love Act, also known as the PEARL Act.

For years, the men and women of Customs and Border Protection have faced mental health challenges. From confronting the scourge of illicit fentanyl crossing our borders to witnessing the heartbreaking toll of human trafficking, including trafficking of unaccompanied minors, these officers deal with some of the most difficult emotional stresses that exist.

In fiscal years 2016 through 2025, 81 CBP employees died by suicide.

In 2023, CBP launched the Support Canine Program to boost morale and improve officers' mental health through therapy dogs.

These canine teams, along with their Border Patrol chaplains and peer support staff, help with the daily trauma and grief these frontline heroes face on a daily basis.

The program has been a widespread success.

The PEARL Act is named after Pearl, as has been mentioned, a yellow lab, who was the first canine to join the Support Canine Program in the Laredo Border Patrol Sector.

This bill builds on the program's success by creating a 3-year pilot program to allow dogs from local animal shelters to enter the program and be trained as therapy dogs.

Not only will this pilot program help the men and women of the CBP, it will provide those shelter dogs a new lease on life.

When we ask our CBP personnel to face difficult and often traumatic situations, we have a responsibility to ensure they have the resources and support necessary to meet the challenges of their work.

That is why I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and demonstrate that Congress will always be supportive of the mental health of the Customs and Border Patrol personnel.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, once again, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, the PEARL Act.

It is good for law enforcement. It helps dogs in need of homes, and it is a good bill.

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

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

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 9327, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. VAN EPPS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 9237, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSPORTATION WORKER IDENTIFICATION CREDENTIAL EFFICIENCY ACT

Mr. VAN EPPS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5109) to require the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration of the United States to develop guidelines to improve returning citizens' access to the Transportation Worker Identification Credential program, to assist individuals in custody of Federal, State, and local prisons in pre-applying or preparing applications for Transportation Worker Identification Credential cards, and to assist individuals requesting an appeal or waiver of preliminary determination of ineligibility, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5109

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 ''Transportation Worker Identification Credential Efficiency Act'' or the ''TWICE Act''.

SEC. 2. DEVELOPMENT OF GUIDELINES AND PROCEDURES TO IMPROVE ACCESS TO THE TRANSPORTATION WORKER IDENTIFICATION CREDENTIAL PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration shall develop the following guidelines relating to the Transportation Worker Identification Credential (TWIC) program:

(1) To improve access of returning citizens to the TWIC program.

(2) To assist individuals who are incarcerated in pre-applying or preparing applications for TWIC cards.

(3) To assist individuals requesting an appeal or waiver of preliminary determinations of ineligibility for TWIC cards.

(b) BRIEFING.—Not later than 180 days after the development of the guidelines described in subsection (a), the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration shall brief the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate on the implementation of this section.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) RETURNING CITIZENS.—The term ''returning citizens'' means individuals released from incarceration and otherwise eligible for the Transportation Worker Identification Credential program.

(2) TRANSPORTATION WORKER IDENTIFICATION CREDENTIAL.—The term ''Transportation Worker Identification Credential'' means a Transportation Worker Identification Credential issued in accordance with section 70105 of title 46, United States Code.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. VAN EPPS) and the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. MAGAZINER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VAN EPPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 5109.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5109, the TWIC Efficiency Act, which would require the administrator of the TSA to work within their existing authorities to develop a program to assist formerly incarcerated individuals with preapplying or preparing applications for TWIC credentials prior to release.

There is currently a shortage of qualified workers in industries that require a TWIC credential, and this legislation would address what is now a lengthy and burdensome process for formerly incarcerated individuals.

It is important to note that this bill does not change or seek to change any of the factors that could disqualify an applicant from receiving a TWIC credential, and the rigorous process for adjudicating someone's application remains fully intact.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to vote in support of H.R. 5109, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MAGAZINER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CARTER), the bill's sponsor and my friend.

Mr. CARTER of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, H.R. 5109, the TWIC Efficiency, or TWICE Act. I am proud to introduce this bipartisan bill with my Louisiana colleague, Congressman CLAY HIGGINS and my dear friend from Texas who will be joining us shortly.

I have long believed our criminal justice system must be about more than punishment. It has to create a pathway back into society. That is exactly what the TWICE Act does. It is a simple, commonsense fix that helps returning citizens get the Transportation Worker Identification Credential, or TWIC, card they need to work at ports, terminals, refineries, and maritime facilities.

Right now, people are training for in-demand jobs inside prisons, such as welders, electricians, pipe fitters, and truck drivers. But the moment they walk out, they hit a bureaucratic wall. TSA doesn't allow people to even begin the TWIC application process while they are still incarcerated.

Then they get out, and they are motivated to work, but they are stuck waiting in line for months, waiting for a process that could have taken place while they were preparing for release.

While they are trying to navigate this application process, it is a frustrating, unnecessary step, and it creates a further clog in the workforce chain.

Many have to appeal an initial denial due to their records, which requires even more waiting, more paperwork, even though 98 percent of the applicants who get through the appeal ultimately receive a TWIC card. That delay can cost them the job and costs the employers skilled workers that they desperately need.

The TWICE Act doesn't lower the bar. It doesn't change who qualifies or who is disqualified. It simply directs TSA to help develop guidelines so the incarcerated individual can preapply before they are released and receive help navigating appeals if necessary. If they can get the paperwork done while they are still inside, they can start working when they come home.

These are the type of good-paying careers that will help keep them out of prison, out of a penal system, and on the road to being productive citizens again.

I want to briefly tell you a story about Joel from New Orleans. After being incarcerated, Joel wanted to work in Louisiana's offshore energy industry, where many of the jobs require TWIC credentials. He applied for a TWIC card, paid the $125 fee, and—like most people in prison—was automatically denied on the first try simply because he had a record, even though his conviction wasn't disqualifying.

He then entered the 60-day appeal process, which required a variety of forms, letters, and recommendations, and resolving discrepancies in his background check. Unfortunately, Joel ran out of time trying to navigate the bureaucracy and paperwork. Without employment, he couldn't afford to reapply. He never got the TWIC card and had to find employment elsewhere. Never mind there was a job waiting for Joel. Never mind Joel did not have a disqualifying conviction. Never mind that Joel had a job ready, and he was prepared for the job. Because of this bureaucratic quagmire, Joel could not move forward.

□ 1140

American industries are begging for workers like Joel. Nationally, there is a gap of 2 million people between job openings and available workers in these sectors. Ports, shipyards, and barge companies need qualified people. Thousands of Louisianians are released every year and want to fill these jobs. This bill connects them to the employers that need them, as well.

American Trucking Associations, The American Waterways Operators, American Association of Port Authorities, National Ocean Industries Association, Transportation Institute, World Trade Center of New Orleans, and so many others support this bill because they recognize the value that the bill stands for and the resources it brings to our workforce, and what it does to combat recidivism and give people an opportunity to have a true second chance to be productive citizens while filling a void in our workforce.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from Greater New Orleans, Inc., the National Ocean Industries Association, and Refined Technologies in support of the TWICE Act as a commonsense approach to alleviating systemic labor shortages in the maritime, transportation, and energy sectors.

SEPTEMBER 14, 2026.

Re Support for H.R. 5109, the Transportation Worker Identification Credential Efficiency (TWICE) Act.

Hon. ANDREW GARBARINO,
Chairman, House Committee on Homeland Security, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. BENNIE THOMPSON,
Ranking Member, House Committee on Homeland Security, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GARBARINO AND RANKING MEMBER THOMPSON, The National Ocean Industries Association (NOIA), Refined Technologies, Inc. (RTI), and Greater New Orleans, Inc. (GNO, Inc.) write to express our strong, shared support for H.R. 5109, the TWICE Act. The TWICE Act is scheduled for consideration under suspension on the House Floor during the week of September 14, and we urge passage. The bill offers a practical, commonsense approach to alleviating systemic labor shortages in the maritime, transportation, and energy sectors. The bill works to improve the labor participation rate through efficient access to well-paying employment pathways while preserving national security.

The TWICE Act does not change who is eligible for a TWIC card, it simply advances more efficiency in the redress process. Approximately 62 percent of applicants do not respond to redress notifications largely due to lack of guidance and resources. Those who do respond often wait months for TSA's review. Ultimately, only 0.1 percent of those requesting redress are ultimately denied due to TSA standards. As a result, the 3,270 TWIC-regulated facilities nationwide experience unnecessary delays and challenges in hiring. Americans who are otherwise qualified are left without a job, and industries facing workforce constraints miss out on a larger talent pool. By facilitating a more efficient process with clearer guidelines, TSA can process applications in an accelerated manner, and their administrative burden in reviewing applications will be mitigated.

Our support is affirmed by unanimous support from the House Homeland Security Committee, which reported the TWICE Act favorably by a 30–0 vote. The TWICE Act has received approximately 40 endorsements to date. Endorsers, varying from national trade associations to regional chambers of commerce, span sectors and geographies. Endorsements have been received by the American Trucking Association, American Waterways Operators, American Association of Port Authorities, World Trade Center of New Orleans, Transportation Institute, Center for Employment Opportunities (CEO), Right on Crime, and Jobs for the Future.

The TWICE Act's simple improvement in preserving national security, advancing efficiency, and providing industry increased access to workers will strengthen the American workforce and supply chain. In closing, we reiterate our appreciation for the House's consideration of this bipartisan legislation with benefits across states and sectors.

Sincerely,

Michael Hect, President & CEO, GNO, Inc., Erik Milito, President, NOIA, Cody Nath, President & CEO, RTI.

Official TWICE ACT Endorsements:

American Association of Port Authorities, American Trucking Association, American Waterways Operators, Bayaud Enterprises, Bridgeways, Center for Employment Opportunities (CEO), Central Ohio River Business Association (CORBA), Church World Service, Commercial Drivers License of California, Community Kitchen Pittsburgh, Conservation Corps of Long Beach, Cooper Consolidated, First 72+, IMTT, JOB1 Business & Career Solutions, Jobs for the Future, Justice & Accountability Center of Louisiana.

JustLeadershipUSA, JustUS Coordinating Council, Michigan Collaborative to End Mass Incarceration, National Skills Coalition (NSC), New Orleans Chamber of Commerce, New York Association of Training & Employment Professionals, Prison Fellowship, REDF, Reentry Working Group, Repowered, Right on Crime, Riverview Boat Store—St. Louis barge company, The Cooper Group, The Fortune Society, The Los Angeles Regional Reentry Partnership, Trade Institute of Pittsburgh, Transportation Institute, Valeo Vocation, We Work the Waterways, World Trade Center of New Orleans.

Mr. CARTER of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, employment is one of the greatest predictors of whether someone stays out of the criminal justice system or not. This bill reduces recidivism, fills workforce shortages, and strengthens our supply chain once and for all, all in one fell swoop.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this commonsense bill, H.R. 5109.

Mr. VAN EPPS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LUTTRELL).

Mr. LUTTRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5109, the TWICE Act.

Mr. Speaker, I absolutely would like to thank and commend my good friend from Louisiana, Congressman TROY CARTER, for his leadership.

H.R. 5109 directs the TSA to use existing authorities to develop clear guidelines that help formerly incarcerated individuals prepare for their applications for a Transportation Worker Identification Credential, or TWIC, before they are released and begin the reentry process.

The TWIC program was established under the Maritime Transportation Security Act of 2002 in response to the September 11 terrorist attacks and the heightened need to strengthen security across our transportation infrastructure.

This legislation absolutely cuts red tape for formerly incarcerated Americans seeking TWIC and a second chance at work. By streamlining the process, we can help fill critical workforce shortages in our maritime and energy industries and keep Americans working and our economy moving forward.

It is absolutely important to note that this bill does not change or seek to change any of the factors that could disqualify an applicant from receiving a TWIC credential, and it keeps the rigorous vetting process fully intact.

Mr. Speaker, I highly urge all of my colleagues to vote for H.R. 5109.

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5109, the TWICE Act, a sensible bill that will help make it easier for individuals who were formerly incarcerated and seeking to work at our Nation's seaports.

This bill is good for industry. It will help to fill hiring needs. It is good for consumers by lowering costs and good for those individuals who are looking for work and looking to get back on the right track.

This bill has support on both sides of the aisle, and it has been endorsed by a broad coalition of trade associations and businesses.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CARTER) for his leadership on this vital issue, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5109, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. VAN EPPS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5109, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''A bill to require the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration to develop certain guidelines to improve access to the Transportation Worker Identification Credential program.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NORTHERN BORDER SECURITY ENHANCEMENT AND REVIEW ACT

Mr. VAN EPPS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5517) to amend the Northern Border Security Review Act to require updates to the northern border threat analysis and northern border strategy, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5517

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 ''Northern Border Security Enhancement and Review Act''.

SEC. 2. NORTHERN BORDER THREAT ANALYSIS AND STRATEGY.

(a) NORTHERN BORDER THREAT ANALYSIS.—Subsection (a) of section 3 of the Northern Border Security Review Act (Public Law 114–267) is amended, the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''180 days after the date of enactment of this Act'' and inserting ''September 2, 2026, and biennially thereafter''.

(b) NORTHERN BORDER STRATEGY UPDATES.—Section 3 of the Northern Border Security Review Act is amended by—

(1) redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(2) inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

''(c) NORTHERN BORDER STRATEGY UPDATES.—Not later than 90 days after each submission of the threat analysis required under subsection (a), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall update the Department of Homeland Security's northern border strategy. If the Secretary determines no such update is required, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a notification relating thereto.''.

(c) CLASSIFIED BRIEFINGS.—Section 3 of the Northern Border Security Review Act, as amended by subsection (b), is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e) CLASSIFIED BRIEFINGS.—Not later than 30 days after each submission of the threat analysis required under subsection (a), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide to the appropriate congressional committees a classified briefing regarding such analysis.''.

(d) IMPLEMENTATION OF CERTAIN GAO RECOMMENDATIONS.—Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security, acting through the Executive Assistant Commissioner of Air and Marine Operations (AMO) of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, shall develop performance measures to assess the effectiveness of AMO at securing the northern border between ports of entry in the air and maritime environments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. VAN EPPS) and the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. MAGAZINER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VAN EPPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 5517.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5517, the Northern Border Security Enhancement and Review Act.

This bill would amend the Northern Border Security Review Act, which was enacted in 2016 to require the Department of Homeland Security to submit a northern border threat analysis on a biennial basis. It would also require the Secretary to update the northern border strategy within 90 days of the release of the review, if necessary.

The bill also requires an assessment of the effectiveness of air and marine operations between ports of entry within 6 months of passage.

The border between Canada and the United States is the longest land border in the world. It is critical that we ensure we have the tools in place to keep it secure from terrorists, illegal immigrants, and human trafficking, among other things.

By implementing biennial reviews for northern border security, this bill will ensure that DHS and Congress have the information needed to determine whether additional resources or support may be needed.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5517, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5517, the Northern Border Security Enhancement and Review Act.

This bill simply requires DHS to conduct a recurring northern border threat analysis and to update their northern border strategy accordingly. It also requires CBP's Air and Marine Operations to create performance metrics to assess the effectiveness of securing the northern border.

This is common sense. DHS should be conducting regular threat assessments to inform their strategy and should be able to assess whether its programs are effective.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN EPPS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LANGWORTHY).

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time here.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, H.R. 5517, the Northern Border Security Enhancement and Review Act.

This legislation requires the Department of Homeland Security to regularly assess threats along our northern border, update its strategy to address those threats, and ensure that Congress has the information necessary to conduct effective oversight.

The United States shares more than 5,500 miles of border with Canada, spanning one of the most diverse and challenging terrains in the country.

All threats to our homeland continue to evolve. We must ensure our northern border receives the sustained attention necessary to keep our communities and our country secure, and the numbers demonstrate why that attention is needed. Border Patrol reported that apprehensions between ports of entry along the northern border jumped from just 916 in fiscal year 2021 to more than 23,000 in fiscal year 2024.

Mr. Speaker, I represent western New York and the southern tier, including communities along our border with Canada. In the Buffalo sector alone, the Government Accountability Office reported that Border Patrol was involved in 170 drug seizure events in fiscal year 2024, nearly double the number recorded 1 year earlier.

□ 1150

While the situation at our borders has improved, we cannot become complacent and allow our border communities to be put at risk. We need to make sure that our law enforcement personnel have the strategy that reflects the threats that they are actually facing today and are prepared for the threats that they may face tomorrow.

My bill establishes a straightforward process to regularly evaluate emerging threats, update our northern border strategy accordingly, and provide Congress with briefings on those threats. It also strengthens accountability by requiring Customs and Border Protection to measure the effectiveness of its air and maritime operations between ports of entry.

The northern border is a critical part of our homeland security, and it deserves consistent focus. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5517.

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

Mr. Speaker, I once again urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5517, the Northern Border Security Enhancement and Review Act. The Department of Homeland Security should be keeping a close eye on all threats to the American people, including any threats coming across the northern border, and it should be able to measure whether its actions are having an impact.

Mr. Speaker, I support this bill. I urge my colleagues to do the same, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN EPPS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5517, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. VAN EPPS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5517, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LINKING FAMILY MEMBERS THROUGHOUT THE NEXUS APPLICATION PROCESS

Mr. VAN EPPS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 9382) to require the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to link together applications of family members throughout the NEXUS application process, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 9382

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

SECTION 1. LINKING FAMILY MEMBERS THROUGHOUT THE NEXUS APPLICATION PROCESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall link together applications of family members throughout the NEXUS application process.

(b) OPTIONS.—The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection—

(1) shall permit an individual family member to schedule interviews during the NEXUS application process under subsection (a) for all family members who are linked together in accordance with such subsection; and

(2) may offer such families the option to conduct joint interviews.

(c) EXCEPTION.—The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection may exempt from an interview during the NEXUS application process a child under 14 years of age who is linked to the application of an eligible family member.

(d) DEFINITION.—In this section:

(1) FAMILY MEMBERS.—The term ''family members'' means parents, legal guardians, children, grandparents, grandchildren and siblings residing within a single household.

(2) NEXUS.—The term ''NEXUS'' means the program under section 404 of the Enhanced Border Security and Visa Entry Reform Act of 2002 (8 U.S.C. 1753; relating to joint United States-Canada projects for alternative inspections services).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. VAN EPPS) and the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. MAGAZINER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VAN EPPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 9382.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 9382, the NEXUS for families act. The NEXUS program is operated jointly with the Canada Border Services Agency. It allows prescreened Americans, Canadians, and certain legal residents expedited processing between our two countries at land, air, and sea ports of entry.

This bill would require CBP to link together a family's applications throughout the NEXUS approval process. It would also allow families to schedule joint interviews and for CBP to exempt applicants under 14 years of age who are linked to a family from needing to interview, provided there are no other vetting concerns.

This legislation will ease burdens for families undergoing the NEXUS approval process while maintaining necessary security standards.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 9382, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MAGAZINER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. KENNEDY), the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my bill, the NEXUS for families act.

Every day, nearly 328,000 people cross the northern border, powering local economies and cementing the deep ties that bind us with our Canadian neighbors. In western New York, seamless, smooth travel through customs and across the U.S.-Canada border can make all the difference, whether you are reporting to work, visiting family and friends, or making the kickoff at a Bills' game or puck drop at a Sabres game. NEXUS, a joint trusted traveler program between the U.S. and Canada was created in 2000 to improve this kind of travel and to allow preapproved, vetted travelers expedited processing across the northern border with their NEXUS pass.

NEXUS has over 2 million members who benefit from dedicated processing lanes at northern ports of entry to move through customs efficiently. Unfortunately, families in northern border States face unique challenges when applying for or renewing NEXUS. They still have to submit separate applications for each family member, including young children.

Parents must then schedule separate interviews for their children, requiring multiple trips to enrollment centers, often located far from their home.

Even young children have to go through the interview process, including toddlers. In practice, this means families bear the burden of bureaucratic red tape, discouraging NEXUS enrollment, and stifling travel to and from Canada.

That is why I am proud to lead the NEXUS for families act, legislation that modernizes and improves the process and ensures it actually works for families. By allowing families to apply together and conduct joint interviews, this bill makes the travel process simpler for parents, children, and spouses. By allowing CBP to waive interviews where appropriate for children under 14, this legislation removes unnecessary hurdles to enrollment, keeping travel efficient and seamless. Importantly, this bill maintains the safe, secure vetting processes that have underpinned NEXUS for over two decades.

I thank my fellow colleagues from New York, Representatives MANNION, LALOTA, and TENNEY, for their cosponsorship of this legislation, and I am pleased to have the endorsement of over 20 organizations, including the Canadian American Business Council, U.S. Travel Association, Visit Buffalo, the New York State Restaurant Association, and Destination Niagara USA.

I urge my colleagues to support this underlying legislation to improve, encourage, and simplify travel to and from Canada.

Mr. VAN EPPS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 9382, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I also urge my colleagues to support H.R. 9382, the NEXUS for families act. This is a commonsense bill endorsed by the U.S. Travel Association and a host of other business organizations. We should be supporting legislation that makes government programs like NEXUS easier for families to use.

I think it bears saying at this moment that we should also recognize that our neighbor to the north, Canada, is an ally and a friend, and that we should be encouraging free flow of people and goods across the border to the greatest extent possible while keeping America safe. This bill helps to achieve that, and I thank Mr. KENNEDY for leading on this issue. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. VAN EPPS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 9382.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CIVIL PREPAREDNESS FOR AGROTERRORISM EXERCISE ACT OF 2026

Mr. VAN EPPS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 9394) to require the Department of Homeland Security to conduct an exercise related to agroterrorism, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 9394

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 ''Civil Preparedness for Agroterrorism Exercise Act of 2026''.

SEC. 2. EXERCISE ON AGROTERRORISM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In addition to, or as part of exercise programs currently carried out by the Department of Homeland Security, to enhance domestic preparedness for and collective response to terrorism, promote the dissemination of homeland security information, and test the security posture of the United States, the Secretary of Homeland Security, acting through appropriate offices and components of the Department and in coordination with the heads of appropriate Federal departments and agencies, shall, not later than four years after the date of the enactment of this section, conduct an exercise related to the prevention, response to, recovery from, and mitigation of an act of agroterrorism.

(b) EXERCISE REQUIREMENTS.—The exercise required under subsection (a) shall—

(1) include a scenario involving—

(A) developing preparedness for agroterrorists attempting to unlawfully transport into the United States a biological agent capable of adversely affecting the operations of—

(i) the agriculture and food critical infrastructure sector; or

(ii) other related economic sectors;

(B) developing preparedness for agroterrorists deploying within the United States a biological agent capable of adversely affecting the operations of—

(i) the agriculture and food critical infrastructure sector; or

(ii) other related economic sectors; and

(C) collective action by participants to determine the most effective response in managing and mitigating the effects of widespread disruption to the agriculture and food critical infrastructure sector or other related economic sectors as a result of agroterrorism, including through—

(i) effectively deploying incident command involving the entities specified in paragraph (2);

(ii) identifying key resources necessary to respond to, and recover from, and mitigate widespread disruption of the agriculture and food critical infrastructure sector or other related economic sectors as a result of agroterrorism; and

(iii) determining an efficient and effective allocation of such key resources, and addressing capability and capacity gaps at all levels of government; and

(2) include coordination with appropriate—

(A) Federal departments and agencies;

(B) State, local, Tribal, and territorial agencies;

(C) private sector owners and operators of—

(i) food and agricultural facilities;

(ii) other components of the agriculture and food critical infrastructure sector; and

(iii) components of other related economic sectors;

(D) representatives of and practitioners from the emergency preparedness and response community; and

(E) other stakeholders in, and subject matter experts of, the defense of the agriculture and food critical infrastructure sector from agroterrorism.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the completion of the exercise required under subsection (a), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall, consistent with the protection of classified information, submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate an after-action report that contains the following:

(1) The findings of such exercise, together with associated plans and a timeline for incorporating lessons learned into future operations of the Department of Homeland Security to counter and deter agroterrorism.

(2) Recommended legislative actions for improving the security posture of the United States and the future operations of the Department to counter and deter agroterrorism.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) AGROTERRORISM.—The term ''agroterrorism'' means an act of terrorism (as such term is defined in section 2 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101)) that threatens to target or targets the agriculture and food critical infrastructure sector of the United States.

(2) AGROTERRORIST.—The term ''agroterrorist'' means any actor who commits an act of agroterrorism.

(3) BIOLOGICAL AGENT.—The term ''biological agent'' has the meaning given such term in section 178 of title 18, United States Code.

(4) CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE.—The term ''critical infrastructure'' has the meaning given such term in section 1016(e) of Public Law 107–56 (42 U.S.C. 5195c(e)).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. VAN EPPS) and the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. MAGAZINER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VAN EPPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 9394.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise in support of H.R. 9394, the Civil Preparedness for Agroterrorism Exercise Act. This bill would require the Secretary of Homeland Security to develop and conduct an exercise focusing on prevention, response, recovery, and mitigation efforts pertaining to agroterrorism.

This exercise would include State, local, Tribal, territorial, and private sector partners and would require the Department to submit findings of the exercise to Congress.

□ 1200

The threat of agroterrorism is becoming more pronounced, with the Department of Justice bringing a number of cases against Chinese nationals accused of attempting to smuggle dangerous biological materials into the United States.

The committee has held hearings related to agroterrorism, and the exercise mandated by this bill would further inform this body of the seriousness of this growing threat as well as identify where Congress can support DHS as they strengthen resilience against agroterrorism.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 9394, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be here today in support of Representative STRONG's bill, H.R. 9394, the Civil Preparedness for Agroterrorism Exercise Act of 2026.

Our Nation's agriculture and food systems are critical infrastructure, and a successful terror attack against them could have devastating consequences for our economy, our communities, and our national security.

H.R. 9394 takes an important step toward ensuring that we are prepared for this threat by requiring the Department of Homeland Security to conduct an exercise focused specifically on agroterrorism. Exercises like this are critical because they allow us to identify gaps in our capabilities before a real attack occurs, determine what resources would be needed, and ensure that all levels of government know their roles and responsibilities.

This bill also requires DHS to report back to Congress with the findings of the exercise, a timeline for implementing the lessons learned, and recommendations for additional legislative action.

Mr. Speaker, I support this bill. I urge my colleagues to do the same, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN EPPS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. STRONG).

Mr. STRONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of my bill, H.R. 9394, the Civil Preparedness for Agroterrorism Exercise Act of 2026. I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their support.

The threats facing our Nation continue to evolve, and we must ensure that our Federal, State, local, Tribal, and territorial partners are fully prepared to meet them.

As chairman of the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Emergency Management and Technology, I led two hearings earlier this Congress examining the threats of agroterrorism to America's food and agriculture sector. Those hearings made one reality clear: Our adversaries recognize the strategic value of targeting the critical infrastructure that feeds, fuels, and sustains our country.

In just the past 1½ years, multiple foreign nationals have been charged or convicted for attempting to smuggle dangerous biological agents from China into the United States.

As Dr. Wims, president of Alabama A&M University in Huntsville, testified before my committee that if deployed, these agents could devastate our economy, compromise our food supply, and threaten public health. We cannot wait for an attack to identify our vulnerabilities. This is why I introduced H.R. 9394.

My bill directs the Department of Homeland Security to conduct a nationwide agroterrorism exercise alongside key stakeholders to identify gaps, establish best practices, and strengthen our collective resilience.

Equally important, this bill guarantees strong congressional oversight. It requires DHS to submit an after-action report to Congress detailing exercise outcomes, coordination gaps, and needed legal fixes.

This gives us the data to fix policy loopholes, allocate resources effectively, and hold agencies accountable.

This is a commonsense, proactive measure to safeguard one of our Nation's most vital sectors. We should not wait until an attack occurs to determine whether we are prepared.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 9394 and help protect America's agricultural backbone.

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

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is about making sure that we are prepared to protect our Nation and our food supply from an attack. It is a good bill, a necessary bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. VAN EPPS. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 9394, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STAUBER). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. VAN EPPS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 9394.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY INTELLIGENCE AND ANALYSIS TRAINING ACT

Mr. VAN EPPS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 7436) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to implement a standardized training program for employees of the Office of Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 7436

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 ''Department of Homeland Security Intelligence and Analysis Training Act''.

SEC. 2. FORMALIZED AND STANDARDIZED TRAINING CURRICULA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 201 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 121) is amended by—

(1) redesignating subsections (f) and (g) as subsections (g) and (h), respectively; and

(2) inserting after subsection (e) the following new subsection:

''(f) OFFICE OF INTELLIGENCE AND ANALYSIS EMPLOYEE TRAINING.—

''(1) STANDARDIZED TRAINING.—The Secretary, acting through the Under Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis, shall implement a standardized entry-level basic intelligence training curricula for all employees of the Office of Intelligence and Analysis. Such training shall—

''(A) be provided to all new hires within the Office of Intelligence and Analysis and, for each such new hire, shall commence not later than 90 days after the official start date of each such new hire and before the beginning of official duties of each such new hire; and

''(B) include training on civil rights, civil liberties, privacy rights, regulations, and information practices pursuant to section 552a of title 5, United States Code (commonly referred to as the 'Privacy Act of 1974'), and other relevant laws.

''(2) ANALYST TRAINING.—In addition to the standardized entry-level basic intelligence training required under paragraph (1), all new hires appointed to an analytic position within the Office of Intelligence and Analysis shall receive training that includes education and training on the following:

''(A) The role of the Department and the Office of Intelligence and Analysis's mission to integrate intelligence into operations across the Department and disseminate such intelligence to State, local, Tribal, and territorial partners and private sector partners to identify, mitigate, and respond to threats to the homeland.

''(B) Intelligence community analytic standards, including methodologies, outreach, sourcing requirements for disseminated analytical products, writing standards, and competency directories for the intelligence community, including the standards under intelligence community Directives 203 and 204, and section 1019 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (50 U.S.C. 3364).

''(3) OPEN SOURCE INTELLIGENCE COLLECTION TRAINING.—In addition to the standardized entry-level basic intelligence training required under paragraph (1), all new hires appointed to an open source intelligence collection position within the Office of Intelligence and Analysis shall receive training that includes education and training on the following:

''(A) The basic principles and techniques of open source intelligence collection, including how, in accordance with constitutional and legal parameters and relevant Federal and departmental policies regarding privacy, civil rights, and civil liberties protections, to effectively navigate unclassified, publicly available information sources.

''(B) Data management principles, including the proper protocols regarding how, in accordance with relevant Federal law and policy regarding privacy, civil rights, and civil liberties protections, to use data, information, and knowledge appropriately, including storage and retention.

''(C) Intelligence community open source intelligence collection standards and the Department's statutory authority regarding open source intelligence collection in accordance with subsection (d)(19)(A).

''(4) SPECIALIZED AND ADVANCED TRAINING.—The Secretary, acting through the Under

Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis, shall—

''(A) develop and make available specialized and advanced training curricula, including raw intelligence release authority training, to improve the activities and operations of the Office of Intelligence and Analysis and promote professional development among employees of the Office of Intelligence and Analysis; and

''(B) on a quarterly basis, make publicly available to employees of the workforce of the Office of Intelligence and Analysis a list of available specialized training provided by—

''(i) other elements of the intelligence community; and

''(ii) the Department of Defense.

''(5) PROVISION OF TRAINING TO NON-OFFICE OF INTELLIGENCE AND ANALYSIS EMPLOYEES WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT.—The Secretary, acting through the Under Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis, may, pursuant to section 208, provide to employees, officials, and other senior executives of the intelligence components of the Department training developed pursuant to this subsection.

''(6) TRACKING TRAINING PROGRESS.—The Secretary, acting through the Under Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis, shall implement a system to track the progress of completion by employees of the Office of Intelligence and Analysis of training provided by—

''(A) the Department;

''(B) other elements of the intelligence community; and

''(C) the Department of Defense.

''(7) IMPLEMENTATION.—This subsection shall take effect on the date that is one year after the date of the enactment of this subsection and apply to employees of the Office of Intelligence and Analysis, as follows:

''(A) Any individual appointed to a position in the Office on or after the date of enactment of this subsection, any employee of the Office on such date who has been employed by the Office for two years or less, and any employee of the Office occupying a position classified below grade GS–12 of the General Schedule (or equivalent) shall complete standardized entry-level basic intelligence training under paragraph (1).

''(B) All employees of the Office, as appropriate, shall complete analyst training and open source intelligence collection training pursuant to paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively.

''(8) REPORTS.—Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this subsection and annually thereafter for five years, the Under Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the implementation of this subsection. Each such report shall include the following:

''(A) A description of the curricula developed for standardized entry-level basic intelligence training, as well as analyst training, open source intelligence collection training, and specialized or advanced training courses pursuant to paragraph (1), (2), (3), and (4), respectively, provided by the Office of Intelligence and Analysis.

''(B) Information relating to the number of individuals who completed—

''(i) specialized or advanced training courses, including release authority training, pursuant to paragraph (4); and

''(ii) other training offered by—

''(I) other elements of the intelligence community; and

''(II) the Department of Defense.

''(C) Information on the extent to which employees of other intelligence components of the Department receive training developed pursuant to this subsection.

''(9) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

''(A) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term 'appropriate congressional committees' means—

''(i) the Committee on Homeland Security and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives; and

''(ii) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

''(B) INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.—The term 'intelligence community' has the meaning given such term in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)).''.

(b) COMPTROLLER GENERAL.—Not later than 300 days after the Under Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis submits the first report required under subsection (f) of section 201 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 121), as added by subsection (a), the Comptroller General of the United States shall report to the Committee on Homeland Security and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate on the implementation of such subsection (f). Such reporting shall compare the curriculum of intelligence training provided pursuant to such subsection (f) with training provided by select elements of the intelligence community (as such term is defined in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947) and the Department of Defense, as well as with training provided by the Office of Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of Homeland Security pursuant to section 208 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 124e) as of such date of enactment. Such report shall also consider the approach taken by the Office of Intelligence and Analysis to ensure training provided pursuant to such subsection (f) is completed in accordance with such subsection, and identify ways to improve the management of such training based on practices by such select elements of the intelligence community and the Department of Defense.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. VAN EPPS) and the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. MAGAZINER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VAN EPPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 7436.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 7436, the Department of Homeland Security Intelligence and Analysis Training Act.

This bill would require the Secretary of Homeland Security to implement standardized entry-level training curricula for all new hires within 90 days of the start of their employment with specialized training for those in more sensitive positions to include training on civil rights, civil liberties, privacy rights, intelligence community collection standards, and constitutional and legal parameters.

The Intelligence and Analysis Office at DHS is an integral member of the intelligence community and plays a key role in disseminating intelligence to our State, local, and Federal partners. It is critical that their collection and analysis are consistent with the law and Constitution and that their products are timely and accurate. This bill will help ensure that continues to be the case.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 7436, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of my bill, H.R. 7436, the Department of Homeland Security Intelligence and Analysis Training Act.

I thank my colleagues from the Homeland Security Committee on both sides of the aisle for their support, particularly my friend from Texas (Mr. PFLUGER), and I appreciate their partnership.

This bill, the Department of Homeland Security Intelligence and Analysis Training Act, will require a standardized entry-level basic training curriculum for all new hires at the Office of Intelligence and Analysis.

Now, this office plays a critical role in protecting the American people from violence by collecting, analyzing, and disseminating intelligence to State, local, Tribal, territorial, and private-sector law enforcement.

We just came through the 25th anniversary of the September 11 attacks on our country, which are a stark reminder of the need to have strong intelligence sharing between agencies and high-quality analysis.

However, there have been numerous incidents across administrations of both parties of I&A employees failing to adhere to best practices in intelligence work, including, at times, by inappropriately violating the civil rights of individuals being targeted.

Importantly, my bill ensures that the standardized training program include mandatory training on civil rights, civil liberties, privacy rights, regulations, and information practices for all hires on day one.

We need intelligence professionals to not only do their jobs effectively but also do them in a manner that upholds people's rights.

While the challenges at I&A have existed across multiple administrations, we also must address the fact that the current Trump administration has shown a particular disregard for the civil rights of the American people. Starting with the so-called DOGE initiative, in which Elon Musk and a group of young, inexperienced staffers, none of whom had security clearances or any training in the handling of sensitive information, were given unprecedented access to the financial and health records of all Americans, to the increasing use of mass surveillance by the Department of Homeland Security to target peaceful protesters and fuel mass deportations.

In this context, it is important that all Federal employees understand their legal obligations to honor the civil liberties and privacy protections that all law-abiding Americans are entitled to.

This bill is a small but meaningful step in that direction and will help ensure that DHS' core intelligence workforce is properly equipped with the knowledge and the skills to effectively carry out the Department's vital mission of keeping Americans safe across administrations for years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues, once again, on both sides of the aisle for their support of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1210

Mr. VAN EPPS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PFLUGER).

Mr. PFLUGER. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Homeland Security's Office of Intelligence and Analysis serves as a vital information bridge between the intelligence community and its State and local partners. While I&A is uniquely positioned, it is also fair to say that I&A is in need of reform to fully execute its mission.

This is why the Subcommittee on Counterterrorism and Intelligence has made I&A reform its primary legislative focus this year, resulting in a series of bipartisan bills. The Department of Homeland Security Intelligence and Analysis Training Act, introduced by my colleague Congressman MAGAZINER, is an important piece of this reform agenda.

This bill contributes to the professionalization of our Nation's intelligence enterprise, making us all safer. It ensures that I&A products are consistent with those produced by the rest of the intelligence community by providing training in analytic standards, enhancing interoperability and continuity across the interagency.

It also better educates I&A personnel on their role in facilitating crucial information flows between the Department, the intelligence community, and the full spectrum of law enforcement partners.

Just as important, the bill preserves constitutional protections, privacy rights, and civil liberties of U.S. citizens related to both intelligence collection and analysis. As I&A carries out its homeland-focused mission, the training required in this bill safeguards the delicate balance between security and individual liberty that our Nation has charted since its founding.

Twenty-five years removed from a day that laid bare the gaps in our own intelligence and information-sharing mechanisms, we have every interest in continuing to train, equip, and support our intelligence professionals so that we are never caught off guard in our homeland again.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to see this bill advance both at the subcommittee and the full committee levels earlier this year, and I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this very important piece of legislation.

Mr. VAN EPPS. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 7436, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. VAN EPPS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 7436, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

I&A MISSION REORIENTATION ACT OF 2026

Mr. VAN EPPS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 7443) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to realign the mission of the Office of Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 7443

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 ''I&A Mission Reorientation Act of 2026''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS; SENSE OF CONGRESS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The Office of Intelligence and Analysis (I&A) of the Department of Homeland Security plays a critical role in supporting homeland security by providing actionable intelligence to Federal, State, local, Tribal, and territorial governments and private sector entities.

(2) The Office's foundational mission is to serve as an intelligence component that supports such governments and entities by fusing law enforcement and intelligence information.

(3) The Office's effectiveness depends on the mutual flow of information, collaboration, and trust between the Department and such governments and entities.

(4) Emerging and evolving threats require a proactive approach to intelligence collection, analysis, and dissemination.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Office of Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of Homeland Security should fully execute its statutory role in supporting State, local, Tribal, and territorial governments and private sector entities through actionable, relevant, and timely intelligence;

(2) consistent with the requirements of section 201(d)(6) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 121(d)(6)), the Department should avoid an intelligence posture that promotes a one-directional flow of information from field entities to the intelligence community (as such term is defined in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4))), and should actively foster two-way collaboration; and

(3) intelligence support to the Secretary of Homeland Security should complement the Office's broader stakeholder-facing mission.

SEC. 3. REALIGNMENT OF MISSION OF DHS OFFICE OF INTELLIGENCE AND ANALYSIS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (d) of section 201 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 121) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(24) To ensure the Office of Intelligence and Analysis's operational mission of providing timely and efficient intelligence support to State, local, Tribal, and territorial governments and private sector entities is sufficiently prioritized and resourced relevant to support provided to elements of the intelligence community by carrying out the following:

''(A) Identifying and addressing emerging threats through forward-deployed intelligence capabilities.

''(B) Facilitating two-way information sharing characterized by both the receipt of intelligence from such governments and entities, and the dissemination of actionable intelligence to such governments and entities.

''(C) Maintaining robust, proficient, and sustained engagement with fusion centers (as such term is defined in section 210A).

''(D) Ensuring intelligence support from the Office provided to departmental leadership, including the Secretary, does not hinder or deprioritize broader responsibilities of the Office to State, local, Tribal, and territorial governments and private sector entities.''.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate a report detailing the following:

(1) Steps taken to implement the mission realignment of the Office of Intelligence and Analysis of the Department in accordance with paragraph (24) of section 201(d) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by subsection (a).

(2) Progress in enhancing two-way information sharing between the Office and State, local, Tribal, and territorial governments and private sector entities, in accordance with such paragraph (24).

(3) Metrics used to evaluate the effectiveness of the Office's intelligence activitiese in support of State, local, Tribal, and territorial governments and private sector entities.

(4) Any resource or organizational changes to the Office required to sustain such realignment.

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to alter or otherwise change the watchlisting functions of the Office of Intelligence and Analysis.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. VAN EPPS) and the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. MAGAZINER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VAN EPPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 7443.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 7443, the I&A Mission Reorientation Act. This bill would amend the Office of Intelligence and Analysis statutory authorization to affirm the operational mission of providing timely intelligence support to our State, local, Tribal, and territorial partners by facilitating two-way information sharing and robust and sustained engagement with fusion centers, among other things.

The Office of Intelligence and Analysis is the key intelligence community member that works with State and local law enforcement and other partners to share intelligence in both directions.

This is critical for day-to-day operations but also as our country hosts an increasing number of national special security events, like the World Cup, which just ended, and the upcoming Olympics and Paralympics.

Unfortunately, as DHS has grown, so has the mission of I&A. This bill would ensure I&A continues to prioritize information sharing with State and local partners, as intended.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 7443, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MAGAZINER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume in support of H.R. 7443, the I&A Mission Reorientation Act of 2026.

I think everybody knows that the Department of Homeland Security was created after the horrific attacks on our country on September 11, 2001. One of the major contributing factors that allowed September 11 to occur was a lack of adequate information sharing between intelligence and law enforcement agencies.

Different agencies saw warning signs, but because they weren't communicating with each other adequately and they didn't connect the dots, nearly 3,000 lives were lost on that tragic day.

This bill seeks to ensure that the Department of Homeland Security's Office of Intelligence and Analysis, or I&A, engages in adequate two-way information sharing. I&A is the only member of the U.S. intelligence community charged with delivering intelligence to State, local, Tribal, territorial, and private-sector partners, while also gathering intelligence from them to feed back to the national intelligence community.

This bill recognizes and reaffirms that two-directional flow of information is critical to keeping our homeland safe.

For years, State and local partners have complained about information sharing with the Federal Government being a one-way street, where States and localities provide a lot more information to the Federal Government than what they get back.

We all know that in many cases it is the State, local, Tribal, and territorial partners that are on the front lines of defending against threats to Americans. It is important that we have the most effective information-sharing capabilities and processes.

This bill addresses that issue and works to ensure that I&A's information-sharing partnerships are mutually beneficial, which ultimately helps first responders on the ground produce better outcomes and more comprehensive threat assessments to better prepare and respond to emergencies.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this bill, and I thank my colleague from the committe, Mr. PFLUGER, for his leadership on this issue. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN EPPS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PFLUGER).

Mr. PFLUGER. Mr. Speaker, last week, the Nation marked the 25th anniversary of 9/11, a day that forever changed American history and, in fact, the world. The way that we think about our homeland security also changed.

Terrorists did not win that day or any other day since then. The threat of terrorism exposed on 9/11 instead unleashed the force of American patriotism, innovation, and vigilance to ensure our homeland would never again be targeted.

Preventing another 9/11 is exactly why the Department of Homeland Security was established, including its Office of Intelligence and Analysis.

Recognizing that there were gaps in information sharing that hindered cohesive threat assessments, I&A was founded with a mandate unlike any other in the intelligence community: to share intelligence with State, local, and territorial law enforcement partners.

When information is siloed, or it fails to reach the appropriate stakeholders at the right time, threats to our homeland can materialize in the blind spots that are created as a result. There is no shortage of threats today, as terror groups move and adapt to evade detection by law enforcement and intelligence communities.

Actionable intelligence in the right hands at the right time is a competitive advantage for the United States over those who seek to do us harm, contributing to the Department's no-fail mission.

At the same time in the past 25 years, I&A has experienced an all-too-familiar mission creep, favoring intelligence support to the Department concentrated here in D.C. that distracts from its field-oriented mission.

Information sharing is hindered when I&A personnel and priorities are more attuned to D.C. than they are to building trust and maintaining presence and contributing to information networks within State and local jurisdictions. An I&A that fails to prioritize the field is insufficiently postured to meet today's threats.

The I&A Mission Reorientation Act is the first step toward reversing this trend and realigning I&A with its foundational mission.

It amends I&A's statutory authorization to affirm that its operational mission is to provide intelligence to support State, local, Tribal, and territorial partners by leveraging forward-deployed intelligence capabilities, engaging with fusion centers and facilitating two-way information flows. Additionally, it requires I&A to update Congress on progress made, providing the necessary oversight to make this realignment a reality.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative MAGAZINER for supporting this and for being able to work together over the past couple of years to get to this point.

On both sides of the aisle, we have to be able to tell the truth. That is what this bill does. It asks I&A to tell the truth, which at times is hard to hear and important to be able to uncover these facts. It includes things like naming radical jihadist Islamic terrorism that attacked us on 9/11 and not being afraid to name that for what it is.

Any type of terrorism is bad. Any type of terrorism we should defeat. We should use the full force of the United States of America.

This bill is a result of months of bipartisan collaboration and discussions and months of committee and Department discussions, and it has advanced unanimously twice this year in both subcommittee and full committee markups.

Today, again, I thank Representative MAGAZINER and my Democratic colleagues on the committee and here in Congress for doing the right thing.

Mr. Speaker, I urge both sides of the aisle to pass this legislation to continue to secure the United States of America.

□ 1220

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

I support this bipartisan piece of legislation. I thank Representative PFLUGER for introducing it. I am proud to serve as the Democratic lead cosponsor on this bill. I believe it will make the American people safer.

Before I yield back, I want to say that we are on the cusp now of passing seven very good bipartisan bills that will make the American people safer.

I thank all the Members on both sides of the aisle and on the Homeland Security Committee for working together on these, and the staff members sitting behind me and behind Mr. VAN EPPS for their work on these bills, as well.

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

Mr. VAN EPPS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 7443, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. VAN EPPS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 7443, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RETIRE THROUGH OWNERSHIP ACT

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2403) to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to provide a clear definition of adequate consideration for certain closely held stock, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2403

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 ‘‘Retire through Ownership Act’’.

SEC. 2. AMENDING ADEQUATE CONSIDERATION DEFINITION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3(18) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1002(18)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) as subclauses (I) and (II), respectively;

(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively;

(3) by inserting ‘‘(A)’’ before ‘‘The term’’; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

‘‘(B)(i) For purposes of clause (ii) of subparagraph (A), a fiduciary of an employee stock ownership plan (as defined in section 407(d)(6)) may make a good faith reliance on a valuation provided by an independent valuation expert or business appraiser that has relied upon the principles and methodologies set forth in Internal Revenue Service Revenue Ruling 59–60 (as amplified and modified by the Internal Revenue Service from time to time) in determining the fair market value of an asset described in such clause.

‘‘(ii) Clause (i) shall not be interpreted to—

‘‘(I) preclude the Secretary from promulgating, in accordance with section 553 of title 5, United States Code, any regulation interpreting such clause;

‘‘(II) expand the regulatory authority of the Secretary with respect to the term ‘adequate consideration’ beyond such authority available to the Secretary on the day before the date of enactment of the Retire through Ownership Act; or

‘‘(III) modify a fiduciary’s obligations under section 404.’’.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to determinations described in section 3(18)(B) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1002(18)(B)) (as added by such subsection) that are made on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALBERG. 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 S. 2403.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of S. 2403, the Retire through Ownership Act.

An employee stock ownership plan, or ESOP, is a retirement savings plan that allows employees to build wealth by owning shares in the company they work for. ESOPs often supplement, rather than replace, other retirement savings. Employee ownership gives workers a financial stake in their company’s success, which can increase productivity and help build wealth.

Unfortunately, for more than 50 years, the Department of Labor has not issued regulations for valuing employer stock, creating uncertainty for ESOP managers seeking to value the stock purchased and held by ESOPs.

S. 2403 is a bipartisan and bicameral solution that provides clear guidelines for valuing stock purchased and held by ESOPs. It is a win-win for job creators and workers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ‘‘yes,’’ and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of S. 2403, the Retire through Ownership Act.

As my colleagues know, an employee stock ownership plan, or ESOP, is a retirement plan that is designed to invest primarily in the stock of the sponsoring employer, thus providing employees with an equity stake in the company for which they work.

According to the National Center for Employee Ownership, over 6,600 ESOPs in the United States currently cover 15 million participants. ESOPs can provide valuable retirement benefits to the employees. There are many examples of successful ESOPs in our districts, and ESOPs have bipartisan support in Congress.

ESOPs must follow specific rules for valuing and purchasing an employer’s stock to ensure that the workers are getting a fair deal. This is called adequate consideration. The term is defined in law as the fair market value of an asset as determined in good faith by the trustee or named fiduciary pursuant to the terms of the plan and in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary.

While there was a proposed rule to define ‘‘adequate consideration’’ in 1988, it was never finalized. Similarly, the Biden administration proposed an adequate consideration regulation in January 2025, but the Trump administration pulled it back, along with other agency regulations.

In the absence of regulations, the stakeholder community is looking for further guidance from Congress on the guidelines that can be used for the valuation of employer stock.

This bill, which was co-authored by my Virginia colleague, Senator TIM KAINE, permits ESOPs to rely in good faith on an independent valuation if that valuation relies on the Internal Revenue Service’s longstanding guidelines on valuing the fair market value of private businesses.

Last of all, the Education and Workforce Committee considered and unanimously approved the House counterpart of the bill. The Senate has already cleared S. 2403, so House passage today will send it to the President for his signature.

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, the Retire through Ownership Act is the Senate companion to legislation I introduced in the House.

Mr. Speaker, before being elected to Congress, I founded and operated a construction business for nearly 40 years. One of the many lessons I learned over my decades-long career as a small business owner is that true success is measured by the success of your employees.

One of the greatest honors of my life has been the opportunity to provide individuals with the dignity and respect that come with gainful employment and the means to save for a fulfilling retirement. This is why I have spent my time in Congress on the Education and Workforce Committee, promoting policies that empower workers and job creators to succeed in this country and ensuring the American Dream remains intact for the next generations of leaders.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions, I introduced the House version of the legislation and present it for you today: the Retire through Ownership Act. As we know, many employers and hardworking Americans pursue employee stock ownership plans, or ESOPs, to increase employee ownership and to promote a secure and prosperous retirement.

ESOPs build wealth for retirement and give employees an ownership stake in their employer. Unfortunately, in too many cases, these plans face unnecessary risk due to the lack of a clear regulatory framework for valuing employee stock, as has been discussed today.

□ 1230

For more than 50 years, ever since the enactment of ERISA, ESOP fiduciaries have been waiting for guidance on how to value the employer stock that their plans purchase. However, the Department of Labor has never produced definitive guidance.

Instead, DOL began a national enforcement project targeting ESOPs. Rather than tell the ESOP community how to value the stock, DOL used legal actions and settlements to guide ESOP stock purchases in a practice that stockholders call regulation by litigation.

The bipartisan Retire Through Ownership Act provides valuation guidelines to ESOPs and will bring an end to over 50 years of uncertainty. This legislation is long overdue, and it is a long overdue course correction that will help ensure more Americans can pursue ESOPs and do so with confidence so they can enjoy a secure retirement.

I have been proud to lead this bill during the 119th Congress, and I thank the ESOP Association for working tirelessly with my staff and me to advance this commonsense solution.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support the bill so we can send it to President Trump's desk for signature.

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

Mr. Speaker, as we conclude the debate on this bill, it is important to keep in mind that in an ESOP, employees' retirement savings are largely invested in an employer stock. If the company goes out of business, the employees could lose not only their jobs but also a sizable portion of their retirement savings.

It is imperative the Labor Department's Employee Benefits Security Administration, EBSA, be appropriately funded and staffed to ensure that ESOPs are complying with the law.

Unfortunately, the Trump administration is doing just the opposite and proposed cutting EBSA's budget by $10 million in fiscal year 2027. That cut has been retained in the House Republicans' Labor-HHS appropriations bill.

As we look to finalize the fiscal year 2027 appropriations process in the coming weeks, we should reject the cuts to EBSA whose responsibilities have grown dramatically over the years while the funding has not kept pace.

Meanwhile, I thank Chairman WALBERG and Mr. ALLEN of Georgia, as well as the bill's sponsors in the Senate, Virginia Senator TIM KAINE and Kansas Senator ROGER MARSHALL for promoting this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for S. 2403, the Retire Through Ownership Act, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, ESOPs provide employees with a meaningful foothold in capital ownership. Studies associate ESOPs with longer employment tenure, increased productivity, and greater wealth creation for employees. S. 2403 makes it easier for businesses to create and maintain ESOPs, helping more workers build retirement wealth through company ownership and encouraging more businesses to adopt ESOPs.

By providing greater clarity for businesses, this legislation can expand access to employee ownership and help more Americans share in the success they create. At a time when communities are looking for ways to strengthen local economies and workers are seeking greater financial security, this legislation offers a commonsense solution.

I appreciate the leadership of Representative RICK ALLEN and Senator ROGER MARSHALL and all other cosponsors on this critical issue.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support American workers and S. 2403, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 2403.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. WALBERG. 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 motion will be postponed.

ENDING PREDATOR ACCESS TO UNION POWER ACT

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 8775) to amend the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 to provide that individuals who have been convicted of sex offenses against minors may not serve in certain positions, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 8775

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 "Ending Predator Access to Union Power Act".

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON HOLDING OFFICE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 504(a) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 (29 U.S.C. 504(a)) is amended by inserting after "grievous bodily injury," the following: "a sex offense against a minor,".

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 504(a) of such Act is further amended by striking "Act any" and inserting "Act, any".

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this Act shall take effect 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 8775.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 8775, Ending Predator Access to Union Power Act.

This bill has an important and concerning background. It came about after reports that a local of the Service Employees International Union, or SEIU, hired a convicted child sex offender as a business agent.

What makes this especially concerning is that SEIU represents public school employees, bus drivers, and childcare providers, positions that provide access to large groups of children.

I am thankful that the union recognized its mistake and fired this individual, but this never should have happened in the first place. We must take steps to ensure it does not happen again.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to protect children and strengthen the integrity of unions by voting "yes" on H.R. 8775.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in favor of H.R. 8775. The Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act, or LMRDA, prohibits individuals convicted of certain crimes from holding union office or a staff position and other related union-side positions. It also applies to employers by prohibiting these individuals from serving as a labor-relations consultant to an employer and in a labor-relations role for an employer or an association of employers, as well as related positions.

Currently, the law already bars individuals convicted of serious crimes such as murder, robbery, extortion, embezzlement, rape, and assault causing grievous bodily injury, from holding union or employer-side positions and roles. This bill will add "a sex offense against a minor" to the existing list of disqualifying convictions.

As written, the bill is balanced by applying to both the unions and employers. However, Republicans may exaggerate the problem this bill addresses by highlighting a singular incident from 4 years ago regarding an individual who was immediately fired by a local union.

The reality is that this is not a widespread issue as unions are one of the most regulated entities in the country, remain subject to the LMRDA, conduct background checks for job applicants, and have codes of conduct.

Furthermore, the title of the bill suggests that it only applies to unions, which is false. In fact, during the committee's deliberations, I offered an amendment to strike the title to eliminate any misinterpretation about the bill's scope. Every Republican member of the committee present voted against the amendment.

Nonetheless, any individual in a position of trust should be held to high standards and this, indeed, does apply to employers so I will support the bill.

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON), the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to sponsor H.R. 8775, the Ending Predator Access to Union Power Act, which amends the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act to prohibit individuals convicted of sex crimes against minors from being employed by labor organizations.

Specifically, this bill bars these individuals from serving in leadership or decisionmaking roles within labor organizations, acting as an employer labor consultant, or representing employers in collective bargaining. This prohibition applies for 13 years after the conviction or end of imprisonment.

□ 1240

Critics may say the bill is unnecessary. However, with the leadership of the House Committee on Education and Workforce, there was an investigation of the local chapter of the Service Employees International Union, who sadly found they had hired a convicted child molester and longtime registrant of California's Sex Offender Registry to be a member of the leadership team.

This is particularly upsetting since we appreciate that SEIU represents public service employees who work closely with children, including public school employees, bus drivers, and childcare providers. This could create a very serious situation of allowing a child molester access to children.

Additionally, union dues should not be used to fund the salaries of those convicted of these heinous crimes. Labor management reporting already prohibits individuals convicted of many crimes, including rape and serious forms of assault, from holding office in labor unions. Therefore, it is common sense to add sexual abuse of a minor to the list.

This commonsense legislation closes the loophole by adding sex offenses against minors to the list of disqualifying crimes. The passage of the bill will ensure that union power cannot be exploited by those who have committed crimes against children.

In recognition of the successful service of Chairman TIM WALBERG, it is appropriate that I am going to present him a hat signed by all bipartisan members of the congressional delegation on the delegation that he led to our allies—Japan, Philippines, and Vietnam—last month, and also, he concluded the visit to the beautiful island of Guam where we had the opportunity to be with Congressman JIM MOYLAN.

With that in mind, I urge all colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, this bill ensures that individuals convicted of a sex offense against a minor cannot serve as a union official, staff, or in a labor relations position with employers. As I noted earlier, this restriction applies to both sides, to the union side and the employer side alike, irrespective of what the bill's title suggests.

An individual in a position of trust must be held to a high standard. This bill reflects that principle, so I support the bill.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 8775, the Ending Predator Access to Union Power Act, amends section 504 of the Labor Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 to include "a sex offense against a minor" to the existing enumerated list of convictions that bar individuals from serving as a union officer or union staff, a consultant or advisor to a union, a labor-relations consultant to an employer, and a labor-relations role for an employer or association of employers, among other positions. The bill also makes a technical amendment to include a missing comma in the statute.

The Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 (LMRDA), which is enforced by the U.S. Department of Labor's (DOL) Office of Labor-Management Standards (OLMS), imposes extensive financial reporting requirements on labor organizations, including a detailed disclosure of assets, liabilities, salaries, and expenses. The LMRDA also regulates the internal governance of labor organizations, such as elections of union officials. The LMRDA's regulations are designed to hold union leadership accountable to their members because unions receive dues and are the exclusive representative of workers.

The LMRDA also provides union members equal rights and protections within their union. Under Title I, entitled the "Bill of Rights of Union Members," union members are provided multiple rights and protections, including the right to express their views, and right to assemble, and due process. Union members also have the right to enforce their Title I rights through a private suit; however, they may be required to first exhaust internal union remedies for a certain period of time. Additionally, the LMRDA requires employers and labor-relations consultants who engage in particular activities—including to wage anti-union campaigns against workers' organizing efforts or collect information on worker organizing efforts for an employer—to file disclosures with OLMS regarding arrangements with labor-relations consultants and spending on such arrangements.

Section 504 of the LMRDA prohibits individuals convicted of certain crimes from holding union office, being employed by a union, and serving as a consultant or advisor to a union, among other related positions. Section 504 also bans individuals convicted of the same crimes from serving as a labor-relations consultant or advisor to an employer, being an officer or employee of any group or association of employers dealing with any union, or holding a position for an employer that pertains to labor-management relations. The covered offenses in the statute are "robbery, bribery, extortion, embezzlement, grand larceny, burglary, arson, violation of narcotics laws, murder, rape, assault with intent to kill, [and] assault which inflicts grievous bodily injury;" violations of the LMRDAs union disclosure and trusteeship requirements; and any felony involving abuse or misuse of a union officer or union staff role. Section 504's bar generally terminates 13 years after a disqualifying conviction or after an individual completes any period of incarceration for such conviction.

As written, H.R. 8775 presents a balanced approach to adding an additional ground for barring an individual from the enumerated positions and roles by having the added disqualifying conviction apply to both union- and employer-side positions and roles. However, the short title of the bill portrays that it is only applicable to labor unions, which is categorically false.

To rectify this issue, Ranking Member ROBERT C. "BOBBY" SCOTT (D–VA) offered an amendment to strike the bill's short title to eliminate the potential for any misinterpretations about what the legislation accomplishes. However, every Republican Member of the Committee present voted against the amendment. Committee Republicans' refusal to support Ranking Member SCOTT's amendment is deeply disturbing as the title is not factually correct and could be seen as maligning the labor movement. Committee Democrats find that regrettable, yet not surprising given Committee Republicans' regressive anti-labor legislative agenda this Congress.

Furthermore, according to the bill's sponsor, Rep. JOE WILSON (R–SC), the rationale for considering H.R. 8775 relies on a singular incident from four years ago regarding an individual who was not in union leadership and immediately fired by a union local. Contrary to Rep. WILSON's statement, the reality is that this is not a widespread issue, especially given that unions are subject to the LMRDA, and one of the largest unions in the country, the Service Employees International Union (SEIU), states that it conducts background checks of job applicants, has a robust code of ethics, and affirms it does not hire or retain sex offenders.

Committee Democrats proffered three amendments to improve H.R. 5267. The first amendment, offered by Rep. ALMA ADAMS (D–NC), included any individual, including any public official, who was a business associate of Jeffrey Epstein or Ghislaine Maxwell as a disqualifying factor for serving in certain union- and employer-side positions and roles. This amendment was withdrawn. The second amendment, offered by Ranking Member SCOTT, added executives of an employer dealing with any labor organization, political appointees at the U.S. Department of Labor, and the President of the United States to the list of positions that individuals with disqualifying convictions are barred from holding. Committee Republicans rejected this amendment. The third amendment, offered by Ranking

Member SCOTT, struck the short title. Committee Republicans rejected this amendment.

Notwithstanding the above-mentioned issue, Committee Democrats believe it remains imperative that any individual in a position of trust, including public officials, must be held to a high standard. As such, all Committee Democrats present supported H.R. 8775 when the Committee on Education and Workforce considered it on July 21, 2026.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, Federal law, as we have said, already bars individuals convicted of serious crimes, including murder, rape, robbery, and embezzlement, from holding positions of power in labor unions and certain positions in employer management for up to 13 years after conviction or release. It only makes sense that sex crimes against minors should be included as well.

H.R. 8775, Ending Predator Access to Union Power Act, closes this loophole with a simple and commonsense fix.

Unions lose credibility when individuals convicted of serious crimes are allowed to hold positions of power. That is why these protections exist in the first place and why SEIU took action when this case came to light.

I appreciate the leadership of the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) on this important legislation, and I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 8775.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 8775, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FIT FUTURE ACT

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 9723) to establish the President's Council on Sports, Fitness, and Nutrition, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 9723

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 ''Fit Future Act''.

SEC. 2. PRESIDENT'S COUNCIL ON SPORTS, FITNESS, AND NUTRITION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established the President's Council on Sports, Fitness, and Nutrition (referred to in this section as the ''Council'').

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) APPOINTMENTS.—The Council shall consist of not more than 30 members appointed by the President.

(2) MEMBERSHIP.—The members of the Council may include representatives of relevant stakeholders.

(3) TERMS.—A member of the Council—

(A) shall serve for a term of 2 years;

(B) shall be eligible for reappointment; and

(C) may continue to serve after the expiration of the term described in subparagraph (A) until the appointment of a successor.

(4) CHAIR; VICE CHAIR.—The President may designate one or more of the members of the Council to serve as the Chair or Vice Chair of the Council.

(c) FUNCTIONS OF COUNCIL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Council shall—

(A) advise the President and Secretary of Health and Human Services concerning progress made in carrying out the provisions of this section; and

(B) recommend to the President and Secretary of Health and Human Services actions to accelerate such progress.

(2) RECOMMENDATIONS.—In carrying out this section, the Council shall recommend—

(A) strategies for reestablishing and implementing the Presidential Fitness Test, with any appropriate improvements, as the main assessment tool for a Presidential Fitness Award;

(B) strategies for the development and promotion of adaptive physical fitness measures and programs to help students develop lifelong physically active habits;

(C) strategies for the promotion of Presidential challenges and school-based programs that reward excellence in physical education;

(D) bold and innovative fitness goals for American youth with the aim of fostering a new generation of healthy, active citizens;

(E) campaigns and events that elevate American sports, military readiness, and health traditions;

(F) actions and opportunities at the global, national, State, and local levels that expand participation in sports and engagement in physical fitness and that emphasize the importance of an active lifestyle and good nutrition, including partnerships with professional athletes, sports organizations, players associations, influential figures, nonprofit organizations, and community groups to inspire all Americans;

(G) strategies to address the rising costs associated with youth sports by expanding access to nonprofit recreational and athletic opportunities;

(H) opportunities to increase participation in sports and physical activities with the goal of increasing availability of and access to recreational sports and other physical activities, including for youth with barriers to access, including youth with disabilities;

(I) strategies to encourage participation in a wide range of sports and physical activities that support an active lifestyle to minimize burnout, injuries, and early specialization in a particular sport or activity; and

(J) strategies to address the growing national security threat posed by the increasing rates of childhood obesity, chronic diseases, and sedentary lifestyles, which threaten the future readiness of the United States workforce and military.

(d) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR.—The President shall designate an Executive Director of the Council who shall—

(A) manage day-to-day operations;

(B) serve as a liaison to the President and the Secretary of Health and Human Services on matters and activities pertaining to the Council; and

(C) oversee engagement with executive departments and agencies, athletic institutions, and community partners.

(2) INFORMATION TO BE FURNISHED BY DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES.—Each executive department and agency shall, to the extent permitted by law and subject to the availability of funds, furnish such information and assistance to the Council as the Council may request.

(3) COMPENSATION.—Members of the Council shall serve without compensation but may receive travel reimbursement, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in accordance with applicable provisions under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, subject to the availability of funds.

(4) FUNDING; ADMINISTRATIVE AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall provide such funding and administrative and technical support as the Council may require, subject to appropriations Acts.

(B) ADDITIONAL FUNDS.—The Council may receive funds from the National Foundation on Fitness, Sports, and Nutrition in accordance with the National Foundation on Fitness, Sports, and Nutrition Establishment Act (Public Law 111–332).

(5) SUBCOMMITTEES.—The Council may, with the approval of the President, establish subcommittees as appropriate to aid in the work of the Council.

(6) SEAL.—The Council shall modify the seal of the ''President's Council on Physical Fitness and Sports'' to reflect the name of the Council as established by subsection (a).

(7) FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.—To the extent that chapter 10 of title 5, United States Code (known as the ''Federal Advisory Committee Act''), may apply to the administration of this section, any functions of the President under such chapter, except that of reporting to the Congress, shall be performed by the Secretary of Health and Human Services in accordance with the guidelines and procedures issued by the Administrator of General Services.

(e) TERMINATION.—The Council shall terminate on a date designated by the President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FONG). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALBERG. 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 H.R. 9723.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 9723, the Fit Future Act, because a strong country starts with strong kids.

Not only is fitness important for maintaining a healthy lifestyle, but it is also critical to child development. Kids today are facing a growing crisis. Only 20 percent of children are meeting the requirements of daily activity, and one in five American children and teens have obesity. These consequences can last a lifetime.

Research shows that childhood obesity and inactivity raise the risk of serious health problems later in life, making it more important than ever to encourage healthy habits today.

H.R. 9723 codifies the Presidential Fitness Test and makes physical activity a lasting national priority—helping more kids build healthy habits and grow into healthier adults.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 9723, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 9723, the Fit Future Act.

This bill codifies the President's Council on Sports, Fitness, and Nutrition. The President's Council on Sports, Fitness, and Nutrition is a ''Federal advisory committee that aims to promote healthy eating and physical activity for all people, regardless of background or ability.''

This council has been expanded and rebranded through executive orders under previous administrations going all the way back to President Eisenhower.

Notably, under the Obama administration, the council's mission was expanded to focus on healthy eating habits and elevate the importance of healthy eating, an initiative spearheaded by First Lady Michelle Obama.

The Fit Future Act would mirror President Trump's executive order by codifying the council and requiring it to make recommendations on strategies for the promotion of Presidential challenges and school-based programs that reward excellence in physical education, proposed actions to increase participation in sports and physical fitness opportunities, and strategies for reestablishing the Presidential Fitness Test. This was phased out under the Obama administration over lack of inclusivity and effectiveness.

While the bill largely codifies an existing advisory body, the committee's adoption of Democratic amendments by the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. MCBATH) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. MANNION) on affordability, accessibility, and inclusivity will strengthen the bill by ensuring that efforts to promote youth fitness are more equitable despite students' differing abilities or disabilities or how much a family makes.

These amendments are critical to ensuring that children are not left behind or subject to old fitness tests that have the potential to stigmatize and exclude children.

Additionally, the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MANNION) requires the council to recognize and consider activities that minimize burnout, injuries, and early specialization in sports, ensuring healthy fitness habits.

While the bill is redundant—the council has existed for decades through executive orders—I plan to support the bill because of the improving amendments that ensure equitable access for all children offered by my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 9723, the Fit Future Act, statutorily establishes the President's Council on Sports, Fitness, and Nutrition (the Council), and requires the Council to make recommendations that would increase participation in recreational sports and physical fitness, including supporting active lifestyles and good nutrition. Since the Eisenhower Administration, the President's Council has existed through executive action and sought to encourage healthy lifestyles among the nation's children. H.R. 9723 would codify the Council in statute. While Committee Democrats feel the legislation is redundant, we do recognize that the Council can be an important tool and has historically served an important role in identifying strategies and partnerships to improve physical fitness for kids. Further, Committee Democrats secured important improvements to the bill during the Committee's consideration to reflect the need for increased access to recreational activities and ensure programs are accessible for all kids. Those improvements were adopted on a bipartisan basis. Committee Democrats did not oppose the legislation in Committee but remain concerned that the bill fails to provide meaningful improvements and investments in health and nutrition to comprehensively address youth health and physical fitness.

According to the U.S. Department of Health and Services' Office of Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, the President's Council on Sports, Fitness, and Nutrition is a ''federal advisory committee that aims to promote healthy eating and physical activity for all people, regardless of background or ability.'' The Council has existed in various forms spanning decades and historically it has been reestablished, expanded, or rebranded through executive order. The Council was first created under President Dwight D. Eisenhower in 1956, then referred to as the ''President's Council on Youth Fitness.'' Under the Obama Administration and spearheaded by First Lady Michelle Obama, the name of the Council was changed from the President's Council on Physical Fitness and Sports to the President's Council on Fitness, Sports, and Nutrition, for the first time expanding the mission of the Council to focus on healthy eating habits and elevate the importance of healthy eating. Additionally, the Presidential Fitness Test—a nationwide school fitness assessment for children established in the late 1950s as part of the Council's mission—was phased out under the Obama Administration in 2012 in part because it was seen as neither inclusive nor effective at encouraging exercise. The Presidential Fitness Test was replaced with the Presidential Youth Fitness Program, a school-based program that promoted health and physical activity. Most recently, on July 31, 2025, President Trump reestablished the Council through Executive Order 14327 (EO 14327), and the Council is currently operational. Additionally, the Executive Order reincorporated the Presidential Fitness Test despite previous concerns.

H.R. 9723 establishes a President's Council on Sports, Fitness, and Nutrition in a manner that largely mirrors existing EO 14327. H.R. 9723 directs the Council—consisting of up to 30 members appointed by the President—to make recommendations on strategies for the promotion of ''Presidential challenges and school-based programs that reward excellence in physical education'' and actions to increase participation in sports and physical fitness opportunities. The Council is required to make recommendations on campaigns that ''elevate American sports, military readiness, and health traditions'' and on potential opportunities that emphasize ''partnerships with professional athletes, sports organizations, players associations, including influential figures, nonprofit organizations, and community groups.'' Additionally, the Council is required to make recommendations on strategies to address the ''increasing rates of childhood obesity, chronic diseases, and sedentary lifestyles'' that jeopardize workforce and military readiness. The recommendations of the Council are not binding. The bill requires the Council to terminate ''on a date designated by the President,'' thus providing the President discretion over the duration of the Council.

H.R. 9723 is duplicative of EO 14327 and redundant as the Council already exists. Nonetheless, as discussed in detail below, Democrats offered several amendments that would make the Council more effective should this legislation ultimately pass.

There is bipartisan and scientific consensus on the benefits of sports for children. Youth participation in sports fosters healthy physical, mental, and interpersonal development. Youth sports and physical fitness are associated with improved psychological health. Research shows that participation has been shown to decrease symptoms of anxiety, depression, and stress, and to increase overall mental wellbeing, cognitive performance, and creativity. Sport participation has also been linked to reduced risk of cancer and cardiovascular disease. Youth sports are associated with reduced risk of suicide and lower rates of substance abuse and risky behaviors in adolescents. Research also suggests that participation in sports facilitates young people's development of resilience and life skills, better equipping them to handle challenges. Similarly, children who play sports develop stronger peer relationships and social competence. Notably, the positive physical effects of playing sports can extend far beyond adolescence; youth who play sports are six times more likely to be physically active as adults than those who do not play sports. By setting children up with sustainable habits of activity, youth sports can pave the way for health and wellbeing into adulthood.

As mentioned above, the Council's incorporation of nutrition into its work was first instituted under the Obama Administration. Both the Trump Administration and H.R. 9723 maintain this mission focus. Proactive efforts around nutrition education can help children establish healthy eating behaviors and empower them to make more nutritious food and beverage choices. Alongside community partners, schools are instrumental in providing education around healthy eating by offering nutritious and appealing foods and beverages, displaying consistent and accurate messaging about good nutrition, and providing different ways to learn about and practice healthy eating. Instruction and guidance around nutrition and healthy habits can help children learn about food groups and how healthy eating patterns support growth and development.

Additionally, according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), more than half of many children's daily caloric intake comes from school meals, and those meals are often the most nutritious food they consume in a day. Thus, investments in school meals programs have direct impacts, and evidence-based nutrition standards embedded in the school meals programs are a critical asset in introducing children to lifelong healthy eating habits. As such, federal nutrition programs are effective instruments for achieving greater health equity, as Black and Hispanic communities face food insecurity and diet-related chronic diseases at disproportionate rates. Based off a 2019 nutrition and meal cost study from USDA, both the National School Lunch Program and the School Breakfast Program are lifelines for many low-income children of color.

While H.R. 9723 would codify a presidential council that already exists, it unfortunately fails to make meaningful policy improvements in programs that support health and nutrition. As underscored by the testimony of Katherine Van Dyck, Senior Legal Fellow at the American Economic Liberties Project, before the Committee earlier this year, efforts to increase access to affordable recreational sports and physical activities hinge on public investment. However, the Trump Administration has taken steps to curb public investment, which would counter the increasingly consolidated private market for youth sports—a market where private equity has assumed an outsized role in recent years. President Trump's proposed budget for Fiscal Year (FY) 2026, included nearly $4 billion in cuts to national parks and recreation areas—a 35 percent decrease from FY 2024 funding. Further, the Administration again proposed deep cuts to national parks and recreation in its FY 2027 budget proposal. Schools also continue to play a huge role in children's access to athletic activities, as funding for facilities maintenance, teacher pay (as many teacher play dual roles as coaches), and school support staff are integral to a schools' ability to offer extracurriculars. For instance, there continues to be a shortage of school bus drivers, which impacts transportation to and from extracurricular activities, another barrier for families.

Committee Democrats recognize that the Council can be a tool to bolster healthy eating and access to physical education and sports and certainly has been under prior administrations. Further, Committee Democrats believe that equitable access to sports is pivotal for fostering strong youth development, and all children deserve access to recreational sports and physical activities despite differing physical abilities. Therefore, it is paramount for any Council to ensure that the barriers many children face are recognized so that any recommendations proposed acknowledge and help alleviate these barriers.

Children with disabilities face barriers to participating in recreational sports and physical activities; however, there are known strategies that can ensure disabled children have more access to sports. It is crucial to examine these strategies for children as according to the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), nearly half of adults with disabilities go without leisure time aerobic physical activity. This is relevant as the lack of access to sports and fitness can lead to lifelong habits that in turn lead to adverse health outcomes. Such strategies include the use of adaptive sports which provide for rules and equipment modifications that allow all children to participate, especially disabled children. Adaptive equipment, such as wheelchairs and modified bicycles, can be used alongside able-bodied children or special races or divisions for children with disabilities. Further, while the President's Fitness Test—as reinstated through the legislation and EO 14327—is not a defined test and, if used, can and should evolve to ensure it is effective and inclusive, this amendment ensures that other adaptive physical fitness measures that can help students develop lifelong physically active habits are also contemplated by the Council. Ensuring that the Council examines other measures of 'success' is paramount to guaranteeing that kids are not left behind despite differing abilities or forced to rely on solely arbitrary measures of success that can stigmatize, shame, and exclude many children.

Expanding affordable and equitable access to recreational sports and physical fitness also has positive health effects for children, even if those children are not star athletes. Additionally, it is crucial that casual recreational programs avoid the risks of high-intensity, year-round training programs. Research shows that children who specialize in a sport at an early age are at additional risk of burnout and overuse injuries. Early sport specialization (ESS) can lead to increased likelihood of injuries compared to their less specialized peers.

When the Committee considered H.R. 9723 on July 21, 2026, Representative JOHN MANNION (D–NY) offered an amendment to address the previously mentioned barriers for children of differing abilities and help prevent burnout and overuse injuries. The amendment requires the Council to make recommendations on the development and promotion of adaptive physical fitness measures, to ensure children with disabilities and children of all athletic backgrounds are considered, as well as on increasing the availability and accessibility of recreational sports and other physical activities that include individuals with barriers to access. The amendment also requires the Council to make recommendations on strategies to encourage kids to participate in a wide range of sports and activities to minimize burnout injuries and early specialization. This amendment was accepted on voice vote.

In addition to the aforementioned barriers, the cost and time commitment associated with youth sports can be barriers for equitable access. For many families across the country, there is often limited access to free (or affordable) sports programs, and the average cost for a child to participate in a sport has increased substantially in recent years. According to a survey conducted by Aspen Institute's Project Play Initiative, the average family in 2024 spent over $1,500 for their child to play sports. While school-based programs, philanthropic entities, and community-based sports provide options for families who are unable to afford the exorbitant costs associated with some youth sports, these options can be limited. Concerningly, high fees and costs have likely exacerbated inequities in access, leaving fewer options for aspiring youth athletes from marginalized and lower income communities. During Committee consideration, Representative LUCY MCBATH (D–GA) offered an amendment to require the Committee to develop strategies to assist families with rising costs associated with youth sports by expanding access to nonprofit recreational and athletic opportunities. This amendment was accepted on a voice vote.

Furthermore, just as it is difficult for children to concentrate in school when they are hungry, adequate nutrition and access to healthy foods are a crucial determinant of a child's ability to participate in recreational activities and sports—whether on the playground or on the field. Unfortunately, as a result of the Trump Administration's "Big, Ugly Bill", more than 4.5 million people have already been kicked off of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), a crucial source of food assistance for low-income families. Recognizing the intrinsic connection between federal nutrition programs and physical fitness, Representative JAHANA HAYES (D–CT) offered an amendment requiring the Council to make recommendations on strategies to address food insecurity as a barrier to physical fitness and nutrition; ways in which federal nutrition assistance programs can improve physical fitness; and ways to coordinate federal nutrition assistance programs with the Council's recommendations to ensure all children have access to nutrition. Unfortunately, the Majority rejected the amendment.

Efforts to improve the health and wellbeing of children require a comprehensive approach to ensure all children are provided with the opportunities to pursue a healthy lifestyle. While the bill does not provide any additional public investment and is redundant of a previous EO creating the Council, Committee Democrats are not opposed to efforts by the Council to propose strategies for increasing access to recreational sports and physical fitness activities. Therefore, Committee Democrats supported H.R. 9723, as amended, in Committee, and I urge the House of Representatives to do the same.

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I express appreciation to my friend and colleague, the ranking member, as well as Representative MANNION and Representative MCBATH for their assist in making a good bill better.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MACKENZIE), the sponsor of this legislation.

□ 1250

Mr. MACKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 9723, the Fit Future Act, which I am leading alongside my colleagues Representatives GREG MURPHY and JEFF VAN DREW.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 9723 codifies the President's Council on Sports, Fitness, and Nutrition and revives the Presidential Fitness Test with appropriate improvements.

Each year, more of America's children face the consequences of physical inactivity: rising rates of obesity, diabetes, and other chronic conditions that follow them into adulthood. These conditions can limit opportunities, worsen health, and lead to a lifetime of added costs for patients and the broader healthcare system.

That is why we give young Americans every opportunity to build healthy habits early, rather than waiting until those habits become harder to change.

Currently, the President's Council on Sports, Fitness, and Nutrition exists only by executive order without a permanent statutory foundation, meaning its future depends entirely on which administration is in office. That is why this policy belongs in statute rather than being left to executive order.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 9723 does that by making youth fitness a lasting national priority.

H.R. 9723 is not about mandates from Washington. Instead, this bill gives schools, families, and communities the tools to celebrate fitness, promote healthy eating habits, and challenge our kids to be the healthiest that they can be.

That is why I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Fit Future Act represents a commitment to the health and well-being of future generations by codifying the President's Council on Sports, Fitness, and Nutrition.

Although the bill itself is largely redundant, it was improved by the adoption of my colleagues' amendments regarding accessibility and affordability. With these amendments, the bill ensures that the President's council can improve youth sports and fitness for all children, regardless of their ZIP Code, income, or disability status.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, physical fitness is critical for physical health, but there are more studies showing how it impacts mental health as well. Kids who aren't active are nearly twice as likely to struggle with self-esteem as kids who are active every day. Research also shows that physically active students tend to have better academic outcomes.

The Presidential Fitness Test gives students a goal to work toward and encourages them to take an active role in physical fitness. These are lessons that can last a lifetime and apply to other challenges in life.

I applaud Representative MACKENZIE and Representative VAN DREW for their efforts to give our children the tools that they need to grow up healthy and strong, both physically and mentally.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support our children's futures by voting ''yes,'' and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 9723, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SCIENCE OF READING ACT OF 2026

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 7890) to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to exclude certain instructional approaches from comprehensive literacy instruction, to prioritize certain funds to promote the use of evidence-based literacy instruction and supports aligned to the science of reading, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 7890

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 ''Science of Reading Act of 2026''.

SEC. 2. PROMOTING READING INSTRUCTION ALIGNED TO THE SCIENCE OF READING.

(a) COMPREHENSIVE LITERACY INSTRUCTION.—Section 2221(b) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6641(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (K), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in subparagraph (L), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(M) does not include the use of a three-cueing model.''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) SCIENCE OF READING.—The term 'science of reading' means an interdisciplinary body of evidence-based research about reading and issues related to reading and writing that—

''(A) identifies instruction in phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, comprehension, and writing as essential components to skilled reading;

''(B) demonstrates the importance of background knowledge, oral language, the connection between reading and writing, and strong writing instruction;

''(C) explains why some students have difficulty with reading and writing; and

''(D) does not use a three-cueing model.

''(5) THREE-CUEING MODEL.—The term 'three-cueing model' means an instructional approach or model that—

''(A) uses meaning drawn from context, pictures, or syntax as the primary basis for teaching word recognition (commonly referred to as 'meaning, structure and syntax, and visual cues' or 'MSV'); or

''(B) teaches visual memory as the primary basis for word recognition.''.

(b) STATE APPLICATIONS FOR COMPREHENSIVE LITERACY STATE DEVELOPMENT GRANTS.—Section 2222(d)(2) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6642(d)(2)) is amended by inserting at the end—

''(F) A description of the extent to which the State comprehensive literacy instruction plan is aligned to the science of reading.''.

(c) COMPREHENSIVE LITERACY STATE DEVELOPMENT GRANT PRIORITY.—Section 2222(e) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6642(e)) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting '', that are aligned to the science of reading.''.

(d) COMPREHENSIVE LITERACY STATE DEVELOPMENT SUBGRANT PRIORITY.—

(1) BIRTH THROUGH KINDERGARTEN ENTRY.—Section 2223(c) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6643(c)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''grants'' and inserting ''subgrants'';

(B) by striking ''grant'' and inserting ''subgrant''; and

(C) by striking the period at the end and inserting '', that are aligned to the science of reading.''.

(2) KINDERGARTEN THROUGH GRADE 12.—Section 2224(b) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6644(b)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''grants'' and inserting ''subgrants''; and

(B) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''that are aligned to the science of reading.''.

SEC. 3. GENERAL PROVISIONS.

(a) APPLICABILITY.—This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to funds awarded under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 note et seq.) on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed to—

(1) limit or alter the rights, protections, and individualized instructional requirements under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.), section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 794), or the Americans with Disabilities Act (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.); or

(2) authorize any officer or employee of the Federal Government to mandate, direct, or control a State, local educational agency, or school's specific instructional content, academic standards and assessments, curricula, or program of instruction.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 7890.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 7890, the Science of Reading Act of 2026.

Mr. Speaker, I could stand here and rattle off test score after test score and study after study, but I will spare us the time and give you the gist: Our children's literacy rates are plummeting.

How did we get here? There are many reasons, but one is that, for generations, students were taught to read through phonics by identifying letters and the sounds they represent. In recent years, some educators have moved away from phonics and encouraged students to guess words based on context or pictures.

This approach has failed too many students. How can a child learning to read be expected to use comprehension skills they haven't developed yet? It is clear why this doesn't work.

The Science of Reading Act puts phonics-based instruction at the forefront of Federal literacy funding.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 7890, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 7890, the Science of Reading Act, which the committee unanimously reported last March.

This bipartisan bill strengthens federally funded literacy instruction. Specifically, the bill aligns Federal literacy funding with evidence-based reading instruction to ensure that competitive literacy grant programs supported under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act reflect what decades of research tell us about how students learn to read. Students learn to read through strong foundations in phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension.

This bill is a reasonable, research-based approach to ensuring that Federal literacy funding supports practices that help students learn.

Furthermore, the bill makes it clear that other methods can be used as secondary methods of literacy instruction to meet the needs of special populations, such as students with disabilities or multilingual learners.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. MANNION) and the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. HOUCHIN) for their leadership on this issue.

Right now, our Nation's students are counting on us to ensure that their schools have sustained investments to provide resources to help them learn and to ensure that their rights are protected. Unfortunately, instead of helping students to meet these challenges, the Trump administration is continuing its illegal efforts to dismantle the Department of Education through interagency agreements that would transfer core K–12 responsibilities, including administration of funding for low-income and rural schools, to the Department of Labor and other Departments.

At a time when students need greater support, these actions threaten the Federal Government's ability to ensure educational opportunities for all students.

Furthermore, last year, DOGE canceled all 5-year contracts with the regional education laboratories at the Institute of Education Sciences, which have helped States implement policies and identify best practices focused on evidence-based literacy instruction. While they were eventually reinstated, many staff members did not return, and progress made in assisting States was lost.

At a moment when supporting education and addressing learning loss is critical, this administration is abandoning States in their efforts to help students recover academically.

Despite these attacks, congressional Democrats remain committed to investing in public education; protecting the Department of Education; and ensuring that every child, regardless of background or ZIP Code, has access to high-quality education. That is why I am supporting this bill, and I hope we can build on this good work, continue to close achievement gaps, and prioritize student success.

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. HOUCHIN), the sponsor of this bill.

□ 1300

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 7890, the Science of Reading Act.

Reading is a fundamental skill for future success. Last week, the Program for International Student Assessment results were published with global scores to test students' knowledge of the core subjects of reading, math, and science.

Since 2018, reading scores for American students have steadily declined, dropping by 15 points. The National Assessment of Educational Progress' 12th grade scores have dropped to the lowest level since the assessment was first introduced in 1992.

These scores confirm the concerns I have heard from parents and educators across the country: Our children are not learning to read.

What changed? In the late 1980s and early 1990s, we changed the way that we teach reading in America. The results have been disastrous. We have moved away from phonics-based instruction to a method called three-cueing, relying on sight words, context clues, and memorization.

With the information that we know, we must do better. We know that 20 percent of the population has some form of dyslexia. Dyslexia is a reading disability characterized by significant and unexpected difficulties in reading and spelling words accurately and with automaticity, typically associated with a weakness in phonological processing.

When we instituted three-cueing, we started teaching to only the top 20 percent of students. Under that method, the bottom 20 percent—the students with dyslexia—will never learn to read, and the students in the middle will learn best to read if we teach them in a way that is based on the science of reading.

This has resulted in children dropping out of school, depression, and even criminal activity, and we have to do better. In my own State of Indiana, the numbers certainly tell a different story. After we passed the State-level science of reading legislation, our trajectory turned upward.

In the most recent National Assessment of Educational Progress reading scores, Indiana jumped 13 spots, from 19th to 6th place. Fourth graders in Indiana saw a 3-point increase in their scores.

The results from Mississippi's science of reading implementation are even more dramatic, climbing from 49th place to 9th nationally. Due to these efforts, Indiana and Mississippi have become premier models of research, deployment, and success in literacy.

The science of reading is based on the five core pillars of phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. Evidence confirms that this is the way human brains are wired to learn and acquire language.

The most successful schools are those that focus on delivering the best possible phonics-based instruction to their students. Linguistic comprehension, or decoding with phonics, is the greatest predictor of literacy proficiency for students later in life. The evidence is clear and so is the solution.

Federal education dollars should only fund approaches that are proven to be the most effective. This bill does exactly that and would ensure that Comprehensive Literacy State Development grant dollars are used productively. Our kids and taxpayers deserve nothing less.

I am grateful to Chairman WALBERG, Ranking Member SCOTT, and to my other colleagues who helped champion this bipartisan bill and set it up for a resounding 33–0 vote from the Education and Workforce Committee. I am also grateful to the educators, students, and parents, who have tirelessly shared their perspectives and experience with these issues facing our children in schools throughout my career in public service.

The passage of the Science of Reading Act is a step forward that we are taking for them. I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 7890. I look forward to my Senate colleagues sending this bill to the President's desk.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MANNION), lead sponsor on the legislation.

Mr. MANNION. Madam Speaker, for nearly three decades, I was a public school science teacher, so as passionate as I am about learning and reading, there is another Mannion who is the real literacy expert in our family, and that is my wife, Jennifer Brady Mannion.

She has spent her career helping students gain a love of reading while training other teachers on best practices in the classroom. She taught at virtually every elementary level and continues to be an interventionist and literacy expert working with children and teachers.

She will tell you what most educators across our country now know, and that is that bringing the science of reading to scale is fundamental to improving literacy outcomes for every student.

The science of reading is an instructional framework grounded in five key components, which would be phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. Together, these make up the foundation of a strong reading education. We cannot rely on outdated teaching methods that have clearly fallen short.

I am the first person to fight for teacher autonomy, but today we have the evidence, the science, that shows that research is going to drive reading instruction forward. To serve our kids best, we need to follow what works and what science says works, and that is the science of reading, which is already making a huge difference in our schools nationwide.

That is true in challenging urban districts, rural districts, and suburban districts. I taught in an urban and a suburban setting. The results are showing across the country, whether it is upstate New York, Indiana, or Mississippi. However, we know there are obstacles to literacy, and that includes poverty, achievement gaps, declining test scores, and a lack of early literacy interventions that work for students. Applying evidence-based best practices, like the science of reading, work.

For years, these issues have been met with inaction by policymakers while teachers and parents continued to sound the alarm. This bill is one step that will move us in the right direction. It ensures that Federal funding for literacy programs are being spent in an evidence-based way that will improve reading outcomes nationwide.

Importantly, this bill is also careful to preserve instructional tools needed for students with disabilities or English language learners.

When we help kids learn to read, we are giving them a foundation that will carry them through for the rest of their lives. Strong readers make strong students. Strong students make strong schools. Strong schools are integral to a stronger America. It is all about literacy that leads to achievement.

The bipartisan support of the Science of Reading Act speaks to the importance of this work and to what Congress can accomplish when we focus on getting results for kids and teachers. Literacy is what unlocks the doors and lowers the barriers.

I thank my colleagues and cosponsors Representative HOUCHIN and Representative KILEY, as well as the chair and ranking member. It has been an honor to work with everyone on this legislation. I urge my colleagues to support America's students, teachers, and schools, and vote in favor of the Science of Reading Act.

As my mother-in-law, Patricia Brady, and my wife, Jennifer Mannion, would say: Children first, and that means all children.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 7890, the Science of Reading Act, represents a bipartisan acknowledgment of evidence and data. That is, in order to strengthen education and prioritize the next generation, we must strengthen literacy instruction using reasonable evidence-based practices.

Once again, I would like to highlight the work of my colleague, the gentleman from New York, Mr. MANNION, for his leadership on the bill. His decades of teaching high school are evident in the dedication that he has for fighting for better education for students, families, and teachers alike.

H.R. 7890 is a pivotal step to improving education and literacy for all students across the country, not just for the privileged few. I support the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Madam Speaker, literacy is a gateway skill. If students can't read, they can't fully access learning in other subjects, and the consequences can extend far beyond the classroom.

According to the National Assessment of Adult Literacy, two-thirds of students who cannot proficiently read by the end of the fourth grade will end up in jail or on welfare. That is tragic.

It is time to move away from failed theories and restore evidence-based reading instruction that actually works. Our children deserve an education grounded in what the evidence tells us, not the latest educational fad.

For that reason, I am grateful to my friend and ranking member as well as the cosponsor of this legislation, Mr. MANNION, as well as Mr. KILEY and also the sponsor of this bill, Representative HOUCHIN. I would add, as well, knowing Jennifer Mannion to be a teacher of teachers and for her example of doing the very thing we are talking about here.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 7890 because we cannot continue relying on approaches that fail to give children the foundational skills that they need. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BICE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 7890, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1310

FOREIGN SERVICE MODERNIZATION ACT

Mr. LAWLER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 9086) to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1980 to modify and improve that Act, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 9086

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Foreign Service Modernization Act''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

SEC. 2. REFERENCE.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section, chapter, title, or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section, chapter, title, or other provision, respectively, of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 3901 et seq.).

SEC. 3. EFFECT OF AMENDMENTS ON CONFORMING CHANGES TO TABLES OF CONTENTS.

When an amendment in this Act to the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 3901 et seq.) adds a section or larger organizational unit to the Act, repeals or transfers a section or larger organizational unit in the Act, or amends the designation or heading of a section or larger organizational unit in the Act, that amendment also shall have the effect of amending any table of contents or similar tabular entries in the Act to alter the table to conform to the changes made by the amendment.

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. DEFINITIONS.

Section 102 (22 U.S.C. 3902) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (12) as paragraphs (4) through (13), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

''(3) 'appropriate congressional committees' means—

''(A) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

''(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.''.

SEC. 102. RETURNING POLICY EXECUTION TO DIPLOMATIC EFFORTS.

Section 104 (22 U.S.C. 3904) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) implement and execute the foreign policy of the United States through the conduct of diplomacy, the management of programs, and the advancement of United States interests consistent with policies established by the President and Secretary in accordance with this Act.''.

SEC. 103. RECRUITING FROM NONTRADITIONAL INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

Section 105 (22 U.S.C. 3905) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(f) RECRUITING FROM NONTRADITIONAL INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—

''(1) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Service should actively recruit candidates from nontraditional institutions of higher education, including community colleges, junior colleges, career and technical colleges, and other open-access or workforce-oriented institutions.

''(2) OUTREACH.—The Secretary should ensure that outreach, information sessions, and preparation resources related to the Foreign Service officer selection process and other entry programs are regularly conducted at nontraditional institutions of higher education. In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary may—

''(A) partner, where appropriate, with institutional career centers, faculty, and student organizations to expand awareness of Service careers;

''(B) leverage digital and hybrid outreach methods to reach students and alumni who may not be geographically near current recruitment hubs; and

''(C) collaborate with other Federal departments and agencies engaged in workforce outreach at nontraditional institutions of higher education.''.

TITLE II—MANAGEMENT OF SERVICE

SEC. 201. EXPEDITIONARY DIPLOMACY.

Section 207 (22 U.S.C. 3927) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) shall exercise appropriate and effective risk management practices to encourage each relevant Government executive branch employee in such foreign country to regularly and meaningfully engage in expeditionary diplomacy with the population of such country.''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(e) TIGER TEAM.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall establish a team (to be known as the 'Tiger Team') to provide to the Secretary a plan to achieve the following:

''(A) Improve the capability, and willingness, of chiefs of mission, Regional Security Officers, and Regional Medical Officers to approve expeditionary diplomacy.

''(B) Improve the capability, and willingness, of members of the Foreign Service to regularly practice expeditionary diplomacy.

''(2) COMPOSITION.—The Tiger Team shall consist of the following individuals from the Department, to be appointed by the Secretary:

''(A) A senior-level officer or employee who shall—

''(i) serve as the 'Tiger Team Leader';

''(ii) be accountable for the activities of the Tiger Team under this subsection; and

''(iii) not serve concurrently in another assignment or position at the Department during their tenure as Tiger Team Leader.

''(B) Not less than one officer or employee from each of the following offices:

''(i) The Under Secretary for Political Affairs;

''(ii) The Bureau of Diplomatic Security;

''(iii) The Bureau of Administration;

''(iv) The Bureau of Diplomatic Technology;

''(v) The Bureau of Human Resources;

''(vi) The Bureau of Medical Services; and

''(vii) The Bureau of Overseas Building Operations.

''(C) Not less than one individual who has international development experience and expertise;

''(3) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall notify Congress of the names and titles of the appointed to the Tiger Team under paragraph (2).

''(4) PLAN FOR EXPEDITIONARY DIPLOMACY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The plan required to be submitted by the Tiger Team shall include the following:

''(i) A description of the manner in which the Secretary, working through the Tiger Team, shall—

''(I) assess the current state of the Department's ability and willingness to practice expeditionary diplomacy;

''(II) review previous and current Department efforts and historical recommendation reports, external and internal, on expeditionary diplomacy;

''(III) assess the current challenges experienced by the Department, chiefs of mission, and members of the Service in practicing expeditionary diplomacy; and

''(IV) produce policy, regulations, and legislative recommendations to address such challenges.

''(ii) A timeline for implementing, carrying out, and completing this plan by the date required under subparagraph (B).

''(iii) A description of the additional funding, personnel, or other resources of the Department required to carry out the plan, including any modification of applicable statutory or administrative authorities.

''(B) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary shall implement to the plan under this paragraph not later than the date that is 12 months after the date of the enactment of this subsection.

''(5) REPORT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Tiger Team shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the activities of the Tiger Team undertaken pursuant to this subsection. The report shall include the following:

''(i) A description of the challenges related to expeditionary diplomacy identified, including challenges identified by the Comptroller General of the United States.

''(ii) A description of recommendations to address such challenges, including the resources, staffing, authorities, and legislative changes required for implementation.

''(iii) A timeline for the implementation of such recommendations.

''(iv) A designation of an office responsible for monitoring the implementation of such recommendations following the termination of the Tiger Team pursuant to paragraph (6).

''(B) IMPLEMENTATION.—For the period of 90 days after the date on which the report is submitted, the Tiger Team shall oversee and monitor the implementation of recommendations submitted in such report.

''(6) TERMINATION.—The Secretary shall terminate the Tiger Team not later than the date that is 90 days after the date on which the final report required by paragraph (5) is submitted.''.

SEC. 202. ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY.

Section 207(a)(1) (22 U.S.C. 3927(a)(1)) is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: '', Diplomatic Security special agents assigned as Regional Security Officers shall support the chief of mission in meeting security responsibilities for the United States Government by serving as the principal security and lead law enforcement representatives to chiefs of mission.''.

SEC. 203. CLARIFICATION OF THE ROLE OF DIRECTOR GENERAL OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE.

Section 208 (22 U.S.C. 3928) is amended by striking the period at the end of the first sentence and inserting the following: ''and shall be appointed to serve concurrently as the Assistant Secretary for Human Resources.''.

SEC. 204. BOARD OF EXAMINERS FOR THE SERVICE.

Section 211 (22 U.S.C. 3931) is amended in the second sentence by striking ''or training in the fields of testing'' and inserting ''academic study, background in diplomacy,''.

SEC. 205. CYBERSECURITY, TECHNOLOGY GOVERNANCE, AND OPERATIONAL COORDINATION.

Chapter 2 of title I is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 212. CYBERSECURITY, TECHNOLOGY GOVERNANCE, AND OPERATIONAL COORDINATION.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish and maintain a cybersecurity and technology governance framework to support Service operations at United States missions abroad, including unified authority, accountability, and coordination for the protection of information systems, data, and mission technology.

''(b) ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES.—The framework required under subsection (a) should—

''(1) delineate the roles and responsibilities of the Bureau of Diplomatic Technology, the Bureau of Diplomatic Security, regional bureaus, and chiefs of mission with respect to—

''(A) cybersecurity policy and standards;

''(B) operational cybersecurity implementation;

''(C) technology lifecycle management, including hardware accountability and supply chain risk;

''(D) artificial intelligence governance and risk management;

''(E) incident detection and response;

''(F) vulnerability management; and

''(G) risk mitigation and reporting;

''(2) establish clear lines of authority for cybersecurity and technology incident response and escalation, including at a post abroad;

''(3) require coordination mechanisms between the Bureau of Diplomatic Technology and the Bureau of Diplomatic Security to ensure integration of cyber, physical, personnel, and supply chain security measures; and

''(4) ensure that a chief of mission is informed of, and accountable for, the cybersecurity and technology posture at the post of such chief of mission, consistent with section 207.

''(c) SECURE HARDWARE AND SUPPLY CHAIN PROTECTIONS.—The Secretary shall ensure the implementation of policies governing—

''(1) inventory control and accountability of Government-issued hardware at a United States mission abroad;

''(2) mitigation of foreign supply chain risks at United States missions abroad;

''(3) inspection and validation of equipment before deployment at United States missions abroad; and

''(4) procedures for handling equipment that is compromised or suspected to be compromised at United States missions abroad.

''(d) INCIDENT RESPONSE PROTOCOLS.—The Secretary shall ensure the development and implementation of standardized cybersecurity and technology incident response protocols for United States missions abroad, including defined reporting timelines and inter-bureau coordination requirements.

''(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to limit the authority of a chief of mission under section 207 with respect to oversight of cybersecurity and technology posture at a United States mission abroad.''.

TITLE III—APPOINTMENTS

SEC. 301. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

Section 304 (22 U.S.C. 3944) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(c) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

''(1) detailed knowledge and requisite experience formulating and executing United States foreign policy, including a working understanding of Department operations and procedures, is vital for chiefs of mission, Assistant Secretaries of State, and other senior officials at the Department to successfully advance United States national security, and for managing the Federal workforce, in order to effectively assert and expand United States competitiveness and leadership abroad; and

''(2) the People's Republic of China and other adversaries are rapidly expanding their global diplomatic presences and it is imperative that the Department is appropriately staffed by empowered, nonpartisan foreign policy professionals and thoroughly qualified and vetted political appointees, who work together to protect United States citizens and advance United States interests across the globe.''.

SEC. 302. FOREIGN SERVICE PATHWAY FOR VETERANS PROGRAM.

Chapter 3 of title I (22 U.S.C. 3941 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 313. FOREIGN SERVICE PATHWAY FOR VETERANS PROGRAM.

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish a program, to be known as the 'Veterans and Foreign Service Pathway Program', to recruit, prepare, and support qualified individuals for service in the Service.

''(b) ELIGIBILITY.—The program required by subsection (a) shall be open to—

''(1) veterans, as such term is defined in section 2108 of title 5, United States Code;

''(2) members of the Armed Forces who are within one year of separation, retirement, or release from active duty in the Armed Forces.

''(c) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The program required by subsection (a) shall include—

''(1) targeted recruitment aligned to Service career tracks, including Diplomatic Security, security engineering, cybersecurity, medical, and other roles;

''(2) mentorship and preparatory training for the Service application and assessment process;

''(3) coordination with relevant Department offices to facilitate candidate readiness for Service entry requirements;

''(4) outreach and engagement with military installations and transition programs; and

''(5) coordination with existing fellowship and recruitment programs of the Department, including the Veterans Innovation Partnership Fellowship, to support pathways to Service employment.

''(d) STREAMLINED ACCESSION PILOT PROGRAM.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to establish a pilot program to recruit and appoint qualified individuals described in subsection (b) into designated Service positions through streamlined hiring procedures.

''(2) COVERED POSITIONS.—The Secretary shall designate positions eligible under the pilot program, which may include the following:

''(A) Diplomatic Security special agent positions.

''(B) Diplomatic courier positions capped at 10 percent annually.

''(C) Security engineering officer and security technical specialist positions.

''(D) Cybersecurity and technology-related positions.

''(E) Other Service positions identified by the Secretary as critical to mission readiness.

''(e) REQUIREMENTS.—The pilot program shall—

''(1) maintain all applicable merit-based hiring principles and qualification standards; and

''(2) provide for expedited processing, assessment, and onboarding of candidates.

''(f) COORDINATION WITH DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE TRANSITION PROGRAMS.—The Secretary, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, shall—

''(1) integrate information on Service career opportunities, including Diplomatic Security roles, into the curricula and materials of the Transition Assistance Program of the Department of Defense;

''(2) conduct regular outreach to transitioning servicemembers at military installations; and

''(3) develop and maintain military occupational specialty crosswalks aligned to Service career tracks.

''(g) SUNSET.—The pilot program shall terminate on the date that is five years after the date of enactment of this section.

''(h) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to alter or diminish existing Service hiring standards or the authority of the Secretary to determine qualifications for appointment.''.

SEC. 303. COMMITMENT IN HIRING PROCESS RELATING TO PARTICIPATION IN THE FOREIGN SERVICE FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM.

Chapter 3 of title I (22 U.S.C. 3941 et seq.), as amended by section 302, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 314. COMMITMENT IN HIRING PROCESS RELATING TO PARTICIPATION IN THE FOREIGN SERVICE FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, with consideration of Department needs, shall assess the fitness and suitability for hire of any individual who—

''(1) was selected for participation in a Foreign Service fellowship program administered or funded by the Department; and

''(2) has successfully completed all educational and programmatic requirements of such fellowship program.

''(b) ELIGIBILITY FOR APPOINTMENT.—An individual described in subsection (a) shall remain eligible for appointment as a Service officer, subject to—

''(1) successful completion of applicable security, medical, and suitability requirements; and

''(2) satisfaction of the appointment standards set forth in this Act.

''(c) PROHIBITION ON ARBITRARY WITHDRAWAL.—The Secretary shall assess the fitness and suitability for service of any individual described in subsection (a) without regard to—

''(1) changes in workforce planning, hiring targets, or staffing levels; or

''(2) administrative or policy changes occurring after the individual's selection for the fellowship program.

''(d) PRIORITIZING DEPARTMENT NEEDS.—In all cases of hiring of individuals described in subsection (a), the Secretary—

''(1) shall make final hiring decisions based on the utility of the hire to the Department's mission; and

''(2) shall weigh favorably the prior military service and other relevant experiences of such individuals with respect to fitness for service.

''(e) TIMING OF APPOINTMENT.—The Secretary shall consider for appointment all eligible individuals described in subsection (a) not later than 12 months after completion of the fellowship's educational requirements, unless the individual—

''(1) requests a deferral; or

''(2) is temporarily ineligible due to pending security, medical, or suitability determinations.

''(f) NOTIFICATION AND REPORTING.—If the Secretary delays the assessment of the fitness and suitability for hire of an eligible individual described in subsection (a) beyond the period specified in subsection (f), the Secretary shall—

''(1) provide written notice to the individual describing the reason for the delay not later than 15 days after the date on which the delay begins; and

''(2) provide written notice to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives describing the reason for the delay not later than 30 days after the date on which the delay begins.''.

TITLE IV—CLASSIFICATION OF POSITIONS AND ASSIGNMENTS

SEC. 401. PROTECTION OF EXTERNAL TRAINING, EDUCATION, AND DETAILS.

Chapter 5 of title I (22 U.S.C. 3981 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 506. PROTECTION OF EXTERNAL TRAINING, EDUCATION, AND DETAILS.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

''(1) the term 'external training or education' means training, education, or fellowship programs conducted by entities other than foreign affairs agencies, including—

''(A) other Federal departments or agencies;

''(B) the Legislative branch;

''(C) State, local, Tribal, or territorial governments;

''(D) international organizations;

''(E) accredited academic institutions; and

''(F) other entities approved by the head of the foreign affairs agency concerned; and

''(2) the term 'external detail' means a temporary assignment, fellowship, or detail to an entity described in paragraph (1).

''(b) AUTHORIZATION.—A member of the Service may, with the approval of the head of the foreign affairs agency concerned, participate in external training, education, or details when such participation is determined to be in the interest of the United States.

''(c) UNIFORM CAREER PROTECTIONS.—A member of the Service participating in an approved external training, education, or detail—

''(1) shall retain Service status, grade, and appointment;

''(2) shall continue to accrue time-in-class, time-in-service, tenure eligibility, and retirement credit as if serving in a domestic assignment or an assignment in a foreign country;

''(3) shall remain fully eligible for promotion, pay increases, tenure, and awards on the same basis as members not on such assignments;

''(4) shall not be disadvantaged in assignments, bidding, performance evaluations, or career progression solely because of such participation; and

''(5) shall not be required to resign, accept a limited appointment, or otherwise relinquish Service status as a condition of participation.

''(d) PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REQUIREMENTS.—Each foreign affairs agency shall ensure that members on approved external training or detail receive—

''(1) timely and meaningful performance evaluations;

''(2) evaluation standards and promotion precepts that recognize the nature and value of external service; and

''(3) written guidance to supervisors outside foreign affairs agencies regarding evaluation responsibilities.

''(e) REENTRY AND ASSIGNMENT RIGHTS.—Upon completion of an approved external training or detail, a member—

''(1) shall be eligible for reassignment to positions consistent with the member's grade and professional qualifications; and

''(2) shall not be required to compete for reentry into the Service or otherwise be treated as a new entrant.

''(f) LIMITATION ON WAIVERS.—The protections of this section may not be waived except by statute.

''(g) REGULATIONS.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this section, the head of each foreign affairs agency—

''(1) shall issue regulations implementing this section, which shall be consistent across agencies to the maximum extent practicable.

''(2) shall revise applicable regulations, evaluation precepts, and personnel policies to ensure full implementation of this section.

''(h) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to conflict with the requirements of section 504 or the regulations to implement such section.''.

TITLE V—PROMOTION AND RETENTION

SEC. 501. JOINT DUTY REQUIREMENT.

Section 601(c) (22 U.S.C. 4001(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(7) PROMOTIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The opening of a promotion window, on or after the date that is five years after the date of enactment of this paragraph, of any Service officer, appointed under section 302(a)(1), who has general responsibility for carrying out the functions of the Service to the Senior Foreign Service should be contingent upon such individual completing at least one joint duty assignment.

''(B) EXCEPTIONS.—The Secretary may—

''(i) identify circumstances under which the requirements under subparagraph (A) shall not apply, which may include that the individual proposed for promotion to the Senior Foreign Service—

''(I) has met all other requirements applicable to such promotion; and

''(II) was unable to complete a joint duty assignment because there was not a reasonable opportunity for such individual to be assigned to such a position; and

''(ii) exempt Foreign Service Medical Specialists who entered as a FS–01 rank and serve as a Regional Medical Officer from the requirements under subparagraph (A).

''(C) JOINT DUTY ASSIGNMENT DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term 'joint duty assignment' means a tour of duty of not less than 12 months in—

''(i) a Federal department or agency other than the Department;

''(ii) the Congress, pursuant to a fellowship or detail program approved by the Secretary;

''(iii) an international organization of which the United States is a member, pursuant to a fellowship or detail program approved by the Secretary; or

''(iv) a State or local government.''.

SEC. 502. TIMELY PUBLICATION AND CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION OF TENURE AND PROMOTION LISTS.

Section 601 (22 U.S.C. 4001) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 90 days after the conclusion of any Service tenure or promotion board whose recommendations require the advice and consent of the Senate, the Secretary—

''(1) should finalize the list of Service members recommended for tenure as well as Service officers and specialists recommended for promotion to and within the Senior Foreign Service; and

''(2) transmit such list to the President for nomination consideration to the Senate.

''(e) EXPEDIENT PROCESSING.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary should ensure that the administrative review, clearance, and transmission of tenure and promotion recommendations are conducted in an expeditious manner, and that no avoidable administrative delay prevents compliance with the deadline established under subsection (a).

''(f) LIMITED EXCEPTIONS.—The Secretary may delay publication of an individual name beyond the period specified in subsection (a) only if the delay is necessary due to an ongoing disciplinary, suitability, or security investigation; and the affected officer is provided written notice of the reason for such delay. Any delay under this subsection should be limited to the minimum period necessary and shall not affect the publication of the remaining list.

''(g) ACCOUNTABILITY.—If the Secretary fails to meet the requirements of subsection (a), the Secretary shall, not later than 30 days after the expiration of the deadline, provide a briefing to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives on the reasons for the failure to meet such requirements and corrective actions taken to prevent future delays.

''(h) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to alter the constitutional role of the Senate in providing advice and consent.''.

SEC. 503. MATTERS RELATING TO RECRUITMENT PROCESS OF PUBLIC MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE SELECTION BOARDS.

(a) PROHIBITION ON NEPOTISM.—Section 602 (22 U.S.C. 4002) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) PROHIBITION ON NEPOTISM IN RECRUITMENT PROCESS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—No employee of the Department who is involved in, or has influence over, the recruitment, evaluation, or selection of public members of selection boards established under this section may refer, recommend, or otherwise facilitate the consideration of any individual with whom such employee has a personal connection.

''(2) PERSONAL CONNECTION DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'personal connection', with respect to an employee, includes—

''(A) a family member, including a spouse, domestic partner, parent, child, sibling, or any individual related by blood, marriage, or adoption, to the employee; and

''(B) any individual with whom the employee has a close personal relationship, including a friend, former colleague, or any other relationship that could reasonably give rise to an appearance of favoritism or bias.

''(3) DISCLOSURE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Any Office of Performance Evaluation employee or other personnel described in subsection (a) who becomes aware that an applicant for service as a public member of a selection board established under this section has a personal connection to such employee shall—

''(i) promptly disclose such relationship in writing to the Director of the Office of Performance Evaluation; and

''(ii) recuse himself or herself from any further involvement in the recruitment, evaluation, or selection of that applicant.

''(B) RECORDKEEPING.—The Department shall maintain written records of all disclosures and recusals made under this paragraph.

''(4) PROHIBITION.—No applicant for service as a public member of a selection board established under this section may advance to the interview or selection stage if such applicant was referred, recommended, or otherwise introduced into the applicant pool by an employee in violation of this subsection.

''(5) ADMINISTRATIVE DISCIPLINE.—Any employee who knowingly violates the terms and conditions of this subsection shall be subject to appropriate administrative discipline, in accordance with applicable law and regulations.''.

(b) CLARIFICATION OF RECRUITMENT SOURCES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 602 (22 U.S.C. 4002), as amended by subsection (a), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) CLARIFICATION OF RECRUITMENT SOURCES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to revise and standardize all contract request memoranda used for the appointment of public members to selection boards established under this section to ensure accuracy, transparency, and accountability in the recruitment process.

''(2) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—Each contract request memorandum described in paragraph (1) shall include—

''(A) a clear description of the recruitment process through which the individual was identified and selected;

''(B) the specific recruitment source of the individual, including whether the individual was identified through formal outreach, open application, or word-of-mouth referral;

''(C) the name and position of any Department employee or other individual who referred, recommended, or otherwise facilitated the individual's entry into the recruitment process; and

''(D) any relevant documentation required under Department policies governing recruitment and selection.

''(3) ADDITIONAL MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—Each contract request memorandum described in paragraph (1) shall also include a signed written certification from the individual identified as the recruitment source stating that, to the best of that individual's knowledge, the individual selected for appointment—

''(A) is not a family member; and

''(B) does not have a close personal relationship that could reasonably give rise to an appearance of favoritism or bias.

''(4) FORMS AND PROCEDURES.—The Secretary shall establish standardized forms and procedures for the certification required under paragraph (3).

''(5) LIMITATION.—No contract for service as a public member of a selection board established under this section may be approved or executed unless the contract request memorandum complies with the requirements of this subsection.

''(6) RECORDKEEPING.—The Department—

''(A) shall retain all contract request memoranda and associated certifications required under this subsection for three years; and

''(B) shall make such records available for review by appropriate oversight entities.''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsection (e) of section 602 (22 U.S.C. 4002), as added by paragraph (1), shall apply to all contract request memoranda described in such subsection that are prepared on or after the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) INTERNAL CONTROLS FOR WORD-OF-MOUTH REFERRALS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 602 (22 U.S.C. 4002), as amended by subsections (a) and (b), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(f) INTERNAL CONTROLS FOR WORD-OF-MOUTH REFERRALS.—

''(1) POLICY.—The Director General of the Service, acting through the Office of Performance Evaluation, shall establish and implement a standardized, transparent, and consistently applied policy governing the use of 'word-of-mouth referrals' in the recruitment of public members for selection boards established under this section.

''(2) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The policy required by paragraph (1) shall—

''(A) define the term 'word-of-mouth referral' to include any informal or direct communication by Department personnel to an individual encouraging or inviting that individual to apply for service as a public member;

''(B) establish uniform procedures governing when and how such referrals may be made;

''(C) ensure that such referrals are conducted in a manner consistent with merit-based selection principles and applicable ethics requirements; and

''(D) prohibit the use of informal referrals in a manner that circumvents established recruitment or outreach processes.

''(3) DOCUMENTATION.—The Assistant Secretary shall require that all word-of-mouth referrals be documented in writing. Such documentation shall include—

''(A) the name of the Department employee making the referral;

''(B) the name of the individual referred;

''(C) the date and method of communication; and

''(D) a brief description of the nature of communication, including whether the individual was encouraged or invited to apply.

''(4) LIMITATION.—No individual may advance in the recruitment process for service as a public member for a selection board established under this section unless the documentation required under this subsection has been completed and retained.

''(5) RECORDKEEPING.—The Department shall maintain records of all word-of-mouth referrals in a centralized system to ensure transparency, accountability, and auditability for not less than three years, which shall be made available for review upon request by appropriate oversight entities.''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsection (f) of section 602 (22 U.S.C. 4002), as added by paragraph (1), shall take effect on the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 504. LEGISLATIVE BRANCH EXPERIENCE.

Section 603(b) (22 U.S.C. 4003(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (8), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (9), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(10) experience with the Legislative branch, including fellowships in a congressional office or committee, or within the Bureau of Legislative Affairs of the Department.''.

TITLE VI—CAREER DEVELOPMENT, TRAINING, AND ORIENTATION

SEC. 601. ACCESS TO INFORMATION CENTER.

Section 701 (22 U.S.C. 4021) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(h) ACCESS TO INFORMATION CENTER.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Overseas Briefing Center, in coordination with the Director of the National Foreign Affairs Training Center, shall provide the appropriate congressional committees with access to the Information Center and its materials, including digital and physical materials.

''(2) SCHEDULING OPTIONS.—Not later than two days after a request by the appropriate congressional committees for access to the Information Center and its materials under paragraph (1), the Director of the Overseas Briefing Center, in coordination with the Bureau of Legislative Affairs of the Department, shall provide to the congressional committees a list of options to schedule such access on a timely basis.''.

SEC. 602. LIST OF CRITICAL FOREIGN LANGUAGES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 701 (22 U.S.C. 4021), as amended by section 601, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(i) LIST OF CRITICAL FOREIGN LANGUAGES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, and not less frequently than once every three years thereafter, the Secretary should designate, and make available to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, a list of critical foreign languages for purposes of this Act.

''(2) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—For each critical foreign language designated pursuant to paragraph (1), the Secretary shall include information in the list describing—

''(A) minimum tested levels at which a member of the Service shall be considered to be proficient in the language; and

''(B) criteria for determining positions for which such critical foreign language capability is mission essential.

''(3) COORDINATION.—In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, coordinate with the heads of other Federal departments and agencies that maintain foreign language capabilities, in order to promote interoperability, avoid duplication, and achieve cost savings to the taxpayer.

''(4) WORKFORCE PLANNING.—The Secretary should incorporate critical foreign language capability planning into the career development, training, and assignment processes under this chapter, including through—

''(A) the use of training at the National Foreign Affairs Training Center;

''(B) the use of limited noncareer appointments and recall and reappointment authorities under sections 308 and 309 to address temporary or surge requirements; and

''(C) the development of a surge reserve of rehired officers and other appropriately cleared individuals with critical foreign language capabilities who may be activated rapidly in response to crises.

''(5) CRITICAL FOREIGN LANGUAGE DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term 'critical foreign language' means a foreign language identified by the Secretary, in consultation with the heads of other Federal departments and agencies, as appropriate—

''(A) as essential to the protection of United States national security interests, United States economic prosperity, and the protection of United States citizens abroad;

''(B) with respect to which required levels of proficiency are limited in the United States workforce relative to strategic needs and operational demand; and

''(C) as corresponding to category I, II, III, or IV languages, as specified in section 3911.2 of volume 3 of the Foreign Affairs Manual (3 FAM 3911.2) or successor guidance, encompassing difficult, hard, and super hard languages that are less commonly taught or studied in the United States.''.

(b) CRITICAL FOREIGN LANGUAGE REQUIREMENT.—Section 702 (22 U.S.C. 4022) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(c) CRITICAL FOREIGN LANGUAGE REQUIREMENT.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall ensure that policies for the instruction, testing, and use of foreign languages explicitly support the preservation of capabilities with respect to critical foreign languages identified pursuant to section 701(i).''.

SEC. 603. USE OF WORLD LANGUAGE SKILLS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 702 (22 U.S.C. 4022), as amended by section 602(b), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) USE OF WORLD LANGUAGE SKILLS.—

''(1) REQUIREMENT.—Any member of the Service who undergoes full-time, Department-funded language training for a period exceeding six months shall be required to serve no fewer than three consecutive tours in positions for which proficiency in such language is a documented requirement for the position.

''(2) TIMING OF ASSIGNMENTS.—The requirement under paragraph (1) shall commence with the first assignment immediately following the completion of the language training and shall continue without interruption, except as provided in paragraph (3).

''(3) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may waive the requirement under paragraph (1) with respect to a member of the Service only if the Secretary certifies to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate that—

''(A) the member has developed a medical condition preventing service at the required posts;

''(B) the member is assigned to a position of higher priority; or

''(C) there is no vacant position for which the member is qualified where the language skill is required.

''(4) CONSECUTIVE TOURS DEFINED.—The term 'consecutive tours' refers to sequential assignments either overseas at posts where the trained language is the primary local or official language, or domestic assignments where the primary duties involve direct use of the trained language or the trained language is helpful to the completion of domestic assignment duties.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to any member of the Service who begins language training on or after the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 604. DIPLOMATIC SECURITY FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM.

Section 703 (22 U.S.C. 4023) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(f) DIPLOMATIC SECURITY FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Assistant Secretary for Diplomatic Security, shall administer a fellowship program to recruit, retain, train, and prepare qualified individuals for service within the Bureau of Diplomatic Security.

''(2) OBJECTIVES.—The objectives of the fellowship program established under paragraph (1) shall be—

''(A) to leverage specialized skills relevant to the diplomatic security mission;

''(B) to provide structured training and mentorship for fellows; and

''(C) to support recruitment into a position within the Bureau of Diplomatic Security through the existing competitive hiring processes of the Department.''.

SEC. 605. BUREAU OF AFRICAN AFFAIRS STAFFING.

Section 703 (22 U.S.C. 4023), as amended by section 604, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g) BUREAU OF AFRICAN AFFAIRS STAFFING.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Assistant Secretaries for Human Resources and for African Affairs, shall establish a program to facilitate and expedite the hiring of qualified individuals with expertise on African countries into the Service to fill positions at missions under the authority of the Bureau of African Affairs and domestic positions under the Bureau of African Affairs.''.

SEC. 606. CONTRACTING OFFICER'S REPRESENTATIVE AND AGREEMENT OFFICER'S REPRESENTATIVE TRAINING.

Section 704 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4024) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) CONTRACTING OFFICER'S REPRESENTATIVE AND AGREEMENT OFFICER'S REPRESENTATIVE TRAINING.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Under Secretary for Foreign Assistance, is authorized to establish a program to recruit, train, and retain personnel serving as Contracting Officer's Representatives and Agreement Officer's Representatives for the Department, to ensure that the Bureau has sufficient personnel with the skills and expertise necessary to plan, implement, and manage United States foreign assistance operations and programs.

''(2) TRAINING.—Personnel recruited, trained, or retained under the program authorized by paragraph (1) shall receive training necessary to effectively oversee and administer foreign assistance instruments and disaster assistance operations, which may include training in procurement, grants and cooperative agreement oversight, logistics, financial management, monitoring and evaluation, and emergency response operations.''.

SEC. 607. TRAINING FOR FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS.

(a) ANTISEMITISM TRAINING.—Section 708(a) (22 U.S.C. 4028(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(B), by inserting before the semicolon '', including instruction on identifying and addressing antisemitism, including contemporary forms of antisemitism and Holocaust distortion and denial''; and

(2) in paragraph (2)(B), in the first sentence, by inserting '', the Office of the Special Envoy to Monitor and Combat Antisemitism, the Office of the Special Envoy for Holocaust Issues,'' after ''Training Center''.

(b) AUKUS TRAINING.—Section 708 (22 U.S.C. 4028) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(f) AUKUS TRAINING.—The Secretary, with the assistance of other relevant Federal officials, shall ensure that any member of the Service who is assigned to a position in Australia or the United Kingdom or that may be called upon to work on issues related to the enhanced trilateral security partnership between Australia, the United Kingdom, and the United States (referred to as the 'AUKUS partnership', as that term is defined in section 1321(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2024 (Public Law 118–31; 22 U.S.C. 10401(2))) have access to training and briefings needed to coordinate on the AUKUS partnership, including training on—

''(1) Australia, United Kingdom, and United States governance infrastructure and policies related to the sale, development, production, and co-production of advanced defense technology;

''(2) overview of AUKUS security pact Pillar I and Pillar II technologies, capabilities, and their strategic impetus; and

''(3) workforce challenges and needs in the host country related to the AUKUS partnership.''.

(c) INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS AND LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING.—Section 708 (22 U.S.C. 4028), as amended by subsection (b), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g) INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS AND LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Assistant Secretary for International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs (INL) and such other officials as the Secretary considers appropriate, may establish training courses on—

''(A) international narcotics control, including the mechanisms, legal authorities, and programmatic requirements applicable to assistance provided under INL's statutory authorities relating to international narcotics control and law enforcement assistance;

''(B) international law enforcement cooperation, including the use of bilateral and multilateral legal assistance frameworks;

''(C) countering transnational organized crime, money laundering, and other tools of illicit finance; and

''(D) anti-corruption efforts, including most effective methods of countering corruption and promoting the rule-of-law abroad.

''(2) REQUIRED TRAINING.—Any member of the Service who is directly responsible for the administration, oversight, or management of assistance described in paragraph (1)(A) should receive training in the areas described in paragraph (1) prior to the beginning of service in such assignment or, if receiving such training prior to the beginning of service is not practicable, not later than one year after beginning such assignment.

''(3) CONSULTATION.—In developing the curriculum required under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall consult with—

''(A) the Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs;

''(B) the Office of the Legal Adviser; and

''(C) other relevant bureaus and offices of the Department as the Secretary determines appropriate.''.

(d) FOREIGN SCAM SYNDICATES TRAINING.—Section 708 (22 U.S.C. 4028), as amended by subsections (b) and (c), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(h) FOREIGN SCAM SYNDICATES TRAINING.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may establish training for chiefs of mission, deputy chiefs of mission, and Foreign Service officers who will be assigned to a country that, as determined by the Secretary, is home to significant online scam activity targeting Americans, on appropriate training on matters related to online scam activity.

''(2) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The training required under paragraph (1)—

''(A) should address—

''(i) transnational criminal organizations conducting the scams;

''(ii) online scam centers and human trafficking inside such centers; and

''(iii) foreign government complicity and corruption; and

''(B) should identify diplomatic methods to identify, prevent, and respond to such activities.''.

(e) TRAINING FOR CHIEFS OF MISSION ON DEFENSE COOPERATION AUTHORITIES.—Section 708 (22 U.S.C. 4028), as amended by subsections (b), (c), and (d), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(i) TRAINING FOR CHIEFS OF MISSION ON DEFENSE COOPERATION AUTHORITIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a training course for chiefs of mission on the authorities, requirements, and limitations applicable to defense cooperation programs that do not fall under the authority of the chief of mission.

''(2) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The training course required under paragraph (1) shall include instruction on—

''(A) the role of the chief of mission in providing concurrence for programs conducted under the authorities described in paragraph (1), including the scope of the chief of mission's role and procedures to request information from the Department of Defense prior to providing or withholding such concurrence;

''(B) the foreign policy implications of defense cooperation programs, including risks of mission creep and adverse effects on bilateral relationships; and

''(C) the relationship between defense cooperation programs and the chief of mission's responsibility for the direction, coordination, and supervision of all United States Government Executive branch activities, operations, and employees in the country to which such chief of mission exercises authority, pursuant to section 207.

''(3) PRE-ASSIGNMENT TRAINING.—Any chief of mission assigned to a post at which a defense cooperation program described in paragraph (1) is in effect or proposed, as determined by the Secretary, should complete the training course established under paragraph (1) prior to the beginning of service at such post or, if completing such training prior to the beginning of service is not practicable, not later than 180 days after beginning such service.

''(4) CONSULTATION.—In developing the curriculum required under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall consult with—

''(A) the Office of the Legal Adviser of the Department;

''(B) the Bureau of Political-Military Affairs of the Department; and

''(C) other offices and bureaus of the Department, as appropriate.''.

(f) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 2 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 707 the following:

''Sec. 708. Training for foreign service officers.''.

SEC. 608. CRISIS MANAGEMENT AND STRATEGY LEADERSHIP TRAINING.

Chapter 7 of title I (22 U.S.C. 4021 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 709. CRISIS MANAGEMENT AND STRATEGY LEADERSHIP TRAINING.

''All principal officers and Chiefs of Mission shall be required to receive a post-specific brief by the Crisis Management and Strategy Office at the Department Operations Center prior to departing the District of Columbia on assignment.''.

SEC. 609. STRUCTURED TRAINING FRAMEWORK AND PROTECTED TRAINING PERIODS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 7 (22 U.S.C. 4021 et seq.), as amended by section 608, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 710. STRUCTURED TRAINING FRAMEWORK AND PROTECTED TRAINING PERIODS.

''(a) STRUCTURED TRAINING FRAMEWORK.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to establish and maintain a structured training framework applicable at defined career milestones for members of the Service.

''(2) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—Training under the structured training framework established under paragraph (1)—

''(A) shall be integrated into normal career progression;

''(B) shall reflect evolving foreign policy priorities, emerging threats, technological developments, national security requirements, and the President's National Security Strategy; and

''(C) shall be a mandatory and institutionalized component of Service career development.

''(b) PROTECTED TRAINING PERIODS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall ensure that protected training periods are built into the assignment and promotion cycle of members of the Service to permit completion of required training.

''(2) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—Protected training periods required by paragraph (1)—

''(A) shall be treated as a standard component of service;

''(B) shall not be contingent solely upon post-level staffing flexibility; and

''(C) shall be structured to ensure that operational demands do not routinely preclude required training.

''(3) COORDINATION.—The Department shall plan workforce and assignment cycles to accommodate protected training periods required by paragraph (1) in a manner comparable to professional military education models within the Armed Forces.

''(c) SCOPE OF TRAINING.—Training under the structured training framework established under subsection (a) and protected training periods under subsection (b) may include instruction in—

''(1) national security, diplomatic security, and counterintelligence;

''(2) cybersecurity, emerging technologies, and artificial intelligence;

''(3) economic statecraft, sanctions, export controls, and trade policy;

''(4) energy security and strategic resources;

''(5) interagency coordination and crisis response;

''(6) Fellowship opportunity outside of the Department;

''(7) leadership and management; and

''(8) such other subjects as the Secretary determines appropriate.

''(d) CAREER STAGE TRAINING.—Training under the structured training framework established under subsection (a) and protected training periods under subsection (b) may include instruction in the following:

''(1) Entry-level: cohesion and rotations.

''(2) Mid-level: leadership and interagency exposure.

''(3) Pre-senior: professional development tours.

''(4) Senior: capstone training.

''(e) EVALUATION METRICS.—The Secretary—

''(1) shall establish metrics for evaluating the completion and effectiveness of training under the structured training framework established under subsection (a) and protected training periods under subsection (b); and

''(2) shall ensure that instructors of such training certify such training for members of the Service upon satisfactory completion of such training.

''(f) STRATEGIC PLANNING TRAINING.—Establish National Foreign Affairs Training Center curriculum within one year including best practices, challenges, and simulations.

''(g) PERIODIC REVIEW AND UPDATE.—The Secretary shall periodically review and update requirements for training under the structured training framework established under subsection (a) and protected training periods under subsection (b) every four years to ensure responsiveness to changes in the global operating environment.''.

(b) PROMOTION ELIGIBILITY AND TRAINING REQUIREMENT.—Section 601(c) (22 U.S.C. 4001(c)), as amended by section 501, is further amended by adding at the following:

''(8) PROMOTION ELIGIBILITY AND TRAINING REQUIREMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A member of the Service shall not be eligible for promotion to any class above FS–03 or into the Senior Foreign Service unless—

''(i) the member has completed the applicable training requirements established under section 710; and

''(ii) the completion of such training requirements is certified by the Director General of the Service prior to consideration by a promotion board with respect to the proposed promotion.

''(B) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may waive the requirements of subparagraph (A) with respect to a member of the Service in the case of extraordinary circumstances if the Secretary approves such waiver in writing. The Secretary may not delegate the waiver authority under this subparagraph.''.

SEC. 610. LEADERSHIP TRAINING.

Chapter 7 of title I (22 U.S.C. 4021 et seq.), as amended by sections 608 and 609, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 711. LEADERSHIP TRAINING.

''(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

''(1) effective leadership, including the management of personnel and resources, is essential to the execution of United States foreign policy and the management of United States missions abroad;

''(2) Foreign Service Officers frequently assume supervisory and managerial responsibilities in complex, high-risk environments; and

''(3) mandatory leadership and management preparation enhances mission performance, accountability, workforce morale, and the responsible stewardship of public resources.

''(b) IN GENERAL.—Members of the Service shall receive appropriate and comprehensive leadership training, including personnel and resource management, prior to assuming a leadership assignment, including any Service position of a duration of not less than one month that includes supervisory, managerial, executive, or chief-of-section authority over not fewer than one United States Government employee, eligible family member employed at the mission, or locally employed staff person.

''(c) REQUIREMENT.—A member of the Service may not assume a leadership position as described in subsection (b) unless such a member has successfully completed the leadership and management training required under subsection (d) within the preceding three years.

''(d) LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT TRAINING.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Director of the National Foreign Affairs Training Center, shall establish a curriculum for tiered joint leadership and management training requirements appropriate to—

''(A) first-time supervisors;

''(B) mid-level managers;

''(C) senior leaders, including Deputy Chiefs of Mission, Chiefs of Mission, and Principal Officers; and

''(D) any other category the Secretary determines appropriate.

''(2) DURATION.—The leadership and management training required under paragraph (1) shall, at minimum, consist of at least one month of training per tier.

''(3) FREQUENCY AND CAPACITY.—The Secretary shall ensure that leadership and management training required under paragraph (1) is made available with sufficient frequency and capacity to prevent undue delay in assignments.

''(e) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may waive the leadership and management training required under subsection (d) on a temporary basis in emergent circumstances where a member of the Service must assume a supervisory, managerial, or leadership position immediately to ensure continuity of operations.

''(2) SHORT-TERM WAIVER.—A waiver issued under paragraph (1) may permit a member of the Service to serve in a position described in paragraph (1) for a period not to exceed 30 days without having completed the required training.

''(3) EXTENDED TEMPORARY SERVICE.—In cases in which a member of the Service is expected to serve in a position described in paragraph (1) for a period exceeding 30 days, the chief of mission and the Director General of the Service shall coordinate to ensure that the member is scheduled to complete the required training for the position within a reasonable amount of time, not to exceed the date that is 60 days after the date on which the member assumes such position.

''(4) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—Not later than 15 days after issuing a waiver under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall notify the appropriate congressional committees of such waiver, including the justification for the waiver and the expected duration of the assignment.

''(f) SUNSET.—This section shall take effect on the date that is 180 days after the enactment of this section.''.

SEC. 611. TRAINING RELATING TO CRITICAL MINERALS.

Chapter 7 of title I (22 U.S.C. 4021 et seq.), as amended by sections 608, 609, and 610, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 712. TRAINING RELATING TO CRITICAL MINERALS.

''(a) PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Under Secretary for Economic Affairs and the Director of the George P. Shultz National Foreign Affairs Training Center, shall establish an academic program focused on global supply chains and their relation to strategic competition with the People's Republic of China.

''(2) TRAINING REQUIREMENTS.—The academic program established under paragraph (1) shall be mandatory for—

''(A) entry-level Service officers identified as Economic Officers prior to the end of the second tour in the Department; and

''(B) Service officers identified as Economic Officers prior to deployment at a United States presence post abroad to fill a billet where the primary focus of the portfolio will be critical minerals or energy.

''(3) CONTENTS.—The academic program established under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

''(A) Instruction on international documents, treaties, and agreements relevant to global energy and critical mineral supply chains.

''(B) United States Government policies and strategies for mitigating vulnerabilities in global supply chains.

''(C) Basic geological knowledge about critical minerals.

''(D) Analysis of the effects of strategic competition, including with the People's Republic of China, on United States interests.

''(E) Regional- and country-specific instruction tailored to the resources, economy, and international trade relationships of the receiving country.

''(F) Practical guidance for officers to advance United States foreign policy objectives in diplomacy, trade negotiations, multilateral forums, and crisis scenarios related to supply chains.

''(G) Specialized training related to critical minerals as described in subsection (b).

''(b) CRITICAL MINERAL-SPECIFIC TRAINING RELATING TO CERTAIN OTHER COUNTRIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall require specialized training on critical minerals for Service officers identified as Economic Officers prior to deployment to United States presence posts in countries that—

''(A) produce, process, refine, or export significant quantities of critical minerals;

''(B) host critical mineral reserves of strategic importance to the United States; or

''(C) play a significant role in global critical mineral supply chains, including through transportation, processing, or downstream manufacturing.

''(2) CONTENTS.—The specialized training related to critical minerals required under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

''(A) An overview of United States critical minerals policy and interagency roles.

''(B) Basic geological knowledge of critical minerals and extraction processes.

''(C) Country- and region-specific analysis of critical mineral resources, governance, and market structures.

''(D) Geopolitical and national security implications of critical mineral supply chains.

''(E) Risk factors related to supply disruption, foreign ownership or control, corruption, and resource nationalism.

''(F) Tools and best practices for advancing United States commercial, economic security, and strategic objectives related to critical minerals through diplomatic engagement.''.

SEC. 612. TRAINING AT CONSULAR POSTS.

Chapter 7 of title I (22 U.S.C. 4021 et seq.), as amended by sections 608, 609, 610, and 611, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 713. TRAINING AT CONSULAR POSTS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall require that each Service officer, including temporary duty assignments and permanent change of stations, assigned to perform consular duties complete mandatory, post-specific consular training—

''(1) upon arrival at post, conducted concurrently with the performance of official duties through supervised, on-the-job, and practical instruction, and building upon the consular training received prior to departure to such post; and

''(2) before independently adjudicating visas, or otherwise performing services for United States citizens.

''(b) TRAINING REQUIREMENT.—The training required under subsection (a) shall—

''(1) be conducted at post;

''(2) have a duration of not less than four weeks, unless shortened by the Secretary based on demonstrated prior experience or exigent operational needs;

''(3) be completed under the supervision of experienced consular officers designated by the chief of mission or principal officer;

''(4) be documented as part of the officer's official training and assignment record; and

''(5) be conducted by an individual at post with an equivalent or superior rank or responsibility level as the officer.

''(c) TRAINING CONTENT.—The required training shall include instruction and supervised practice in—

''(1) country- and post-specific visa adjudication trends, risks, and fraud patterns;

''(2) applicable immigration law, regulations, and Department guidance as applied at post;

''(3) local processing procedures and workflow;

''(4) use of consular information systems;

''(5) coordination with locally employed staff and relevant host-nation entities;

''(6) national security screening considerations; and

''(7) quality assurance and error prevention measures.

''(d) LIMITATION ON INDEPENDENT ADJUDICATION.—A Service officer may not independently adjudicate visas or perform unsupervised consular functions until the officer has—

''(1) completed the training required under subsection (b); or

''(2) received a written waiver from the chief of mission or principal officer based on prior consular experience and demonstrated proficiency.

''(e) RESPONSIBILITIES.—

''(1) CHIEFS OF MISSION AND PRINCIPAL OFFICERS.—Chiefs of mission and Principal officers shall ensure compliance with the training requirements of this section at post.

''(2) CONSULAR SECTION LEADERSHIP.—Consular Section Leadership shall develop, maintain and update as necessary post-specific training plans of this section consistent with Department standards.

''(3) SECRETARY.—The Secretary shall issue Department-wide guidance to standardize minimum expectations with respect to training under this section and provide for post-level flexibility.

''(f) PERFORMANCE AND WORKLOAD CONSIDERATIONS.—The time spent by a Service officer in required post-specific consular training—

''(1) shall be considered official duty time; and

''(2) shall not be treated as a negative factor in performance evaluations.

''(g) OVERSIGHT.—The Secretary—

''(1) shall periodically review compliance with the requirements of this section; and

''(2) may take corrective action in cases in which training requirements are not being adequately implemented.''.

SEC. 613. STRENGTHENING DIPLOMATIC SECURITY TRAINING STANDARDS.

Chapter 7 of title I (22 U.S.C. 4021 et seq.), as amended by sections 608, 609, 610, 611, and 612, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 714. STRENGTHENING DIPLOMATIC SECURITY TRAINING STANDARDS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State, acting through the Director of the National Foreign Affairs Training Center, shall establish and maintain Department-wide standards for diplomatic security training to ensure such training is mission-relevant, integrated across threat vectors, and responsive to evolving risk environments.

''(b) REQUIRED ELEMENTS.—The training standards established pursuant to subsection (a) shall—

''(1) integrate physical security, counterintelligence, cybersecurity, technical security and countersurveillance, legal and use of force requirements, and fraud-related threats into a unified training framework;

''(2) incorporate post-specific risk factors, including high-risk, high-threat environments;

''(3) ensure consistency in training quality and requirements across bureaus, posts, and personnel categories; and

''(4) be reviewed and updated not less frequently than once every three years.

''(c) COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall ensure that the Bureau of Diplomatic Security, the Bureau of Diplomatic Technology, the National Foreign Affairs Training Center, and other relevant bureaus of the Department coordinate in the establishment and implementation of training standards under this section.''.

SEC. 614. MANDATORY CRISIS LEADERSHIP AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT TRAINING PROGRAM FOR SENIOR PERSONNEL.

Chapter 7 of title I (22 U.S.C. 4021 et seq.), as amended by sections 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, and 613, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 715 MANDATORY CRISIS LEADERSHIP AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT TRAINING PROGRAM FOR SENIOR PERSONNEL.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish and implement a mandatory crisis leadership and emergency management training program for members of the Service assigned to senior leadership positions at United States diplomatic and consular posts.

''(b) COVERED POSITIONS.—The training program required by subsection (a) applies to—

''(1) chiefs of mission;

''(2) deputy chiefs of mission;

''(3) principal officers; and

''(4) such other senior positions as the Secretary may designate.

''(c) CONDITION OF ASSIGNMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), an individual may not be assigned to a position described in subsection (b) unless the individual has successfully completed the training required under this section.

''(2) WAIVER.—The Secretary may waive the requirement under paragraph (1) on a case-by-case basis in exigent circumstances, except that an individual granted such a waiver shall complete the required training as soon as practicable after assignment.''.

SEC. 615. CYBERSECURITY, TECHNOLOGY, AND ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE TRAINING.

Chapter 7 of title I (22 U.S.C. 4021 et seq.), as amended by sections 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, and 614, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 716. CYBERSECURITY, TECHNOLOGY, AND ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE TRAINING.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall require each member of the Service, including a career member, a career candidate, a noncareer appointee, a chief of mission, and a deputy chief of mission, to complete, on an annual basis, training on cybersecurity, technology use, and artificial intelligence governance.

''(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The training required under subsection (a) shall include, at a minimum—

''(1) cybersecurity hygiene and threat awareness;

''(2) phishing, social engineering, and insider threat risks;

''(3) safeguarding classified information and sensitive but unclassified information;

''(4) secure handling, storage, and transportation of Government-issued hardware and electronic devices, including while assigned to a post abroad;

''(5) requirements for the use of Department-approved software, cloud systems, and collaboration platforms;

''(6) risks associated with the use of personal devices, removable media, and foreign telecommunications networks;

''(7) reporting requirements for a suspected cyber incident or technology compromise;

''(8) responsible use, security implications, and data protection requirements relating to artificial intelligence systems and automated tools;

''(9) semiconductor supply chain security, technology dependency risks, and foreign sourcing vulnerabilities relevant to diplomatic operations and national security; and

''(10) responsibilities of personnel under Department cybersecurity, technology management, and artificial intelligence governance policies.

''(c) ROLE-SPECIFIC AND ADVANCED TRAINING.—The Secretary shall establish enhanced cybersecurity and technology training requirements for—

''(1) a chief of mission and a deputy chief of mission, including training on post-level technology risk management and artificial intelligence oversight;

''(2) senior bureau leadership, including governance responsibilities and technology risk accountability;

''(3) personnel with system administrator or other privileged network access;

''(4) personnel assigned to a high-risk or high-threat post;

''(5) personnel serving in information technology, cybersecurity, artificial intelligence, data management, or security-related career tracks; and

''(6) personnel responsible for the procurement, management, or oversight of an information technology system or an artificial intelligence tool.

''(d) PRE-ASSIGNMENT AND DEVICE SECURITY ABROAD.—The Secretary shall ensure that a member of the Service assigned to a post abroad receives pre-assignment training on—

''(1) secure device usage in a foreign environment;

''(2) counterintelligence risks associated with foreign infrastructure;

''(3) secure communications practices; and

''(4) protection of Government hardware from compromise, tampering, or unauthorized access.

''(e) INTEGRATION INTO CAREER DEVELOPMENT.—The requirements under this section shall be incorporated into pre-assignment training, leadership training, tradecraft instruction, and professional development programs under this chapter.

''(f) COMPLIANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY.—The Secretary shall ensure that completion of required training under this section is tracked and recorded and may consider such completion as part of performance evaluations and eligibility for leadership assignments.''.

SEC. 616. VETERANS INNOVATION PARTNERSHIP FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM; PLACEMENT AND CONVERSION SUPPORT.

Chapter 7 of title I (22 U.S.C. 4021 et seq.), as amended by sections 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, and 615, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 717. VETERANS INNOVATION PARTNERSHIP FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM; PLACEMENT AND CONVERSION SUPPORT.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish policies and procedures to improve placement and hiring outcomes for participants in the Veterans Innovation Partnership Fellowship, including structured pathways to employment within the Department.

''(b) ELEMENTS.—The policies and procedures required under subsection (a) should include—

''(1) designation of a bureau or office responsible for coordinating post-fellowship placement efforts;

''(2) procedures to match a fellow with employment opportunities in the Service, as appropriate;

''(3) guidance to bureaus on the use of existing hiring authorities to facilitate the conversion of a fellow into a permanent or term position;

''(4) mentorship and career counseling for a fellow during and after the fellowship period;

''(5) tracking and evaluation of conversion rates and employment outcomes; and

''(6) procedures to facilitate placement of a fellow into a position under the Veterans and Foreign Service Pathway Program, where applicable.''.

SEC. 617. REVIEWS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE CAREER TRACKS.

Chapter 7 of title I (22 U.S.C. 4021 et seq.), as amended by sections 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, and 616, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 718. REVIEWS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE CAREER TRACKS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall convene an independent commission to review the structure, relevance, and effectiveness of the Service's career tracks.

''(b) COMPOSITION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The commission shall be composed of individuals who are to be selected from—

''(A) the Department, including personnel other than those assigned to the Bureau of Human Resources;

''(B) other relevant Federal departments and agencies as the Secretary determines appropriate;

''(C) former Service officers;

''(D) academia; and

''(E) the private sector.

''(2) CONGRESSIONAL SELECTION.—The chair and ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate shall each select one individual to be a member of the commission.

''(3) BALANCED PERSPECTIVE REQUIREMENT.—Individuals shall be selected to be members of the commission to ensure a balanced perspective on diplomatic priorities, Department personnel needs, and evolving global challenges.

''(c) SCOPE OF REVIEW.—The commission shall—

''(1) assess the alignment of existing career tracks with current and anticipated United States diplomatic priorities, national security objectives, and global trends;

''(2) evaluate recommendations to add, consolidate, eliminate, modify, or otherwise affect, career tracks of the Service; and

''(3) consider any other matters related to career track structure, qualifications, standards, assignment processes, promotion precepts, track-specific training, or workforce planning that the commission determined relevant to the effectiveness of the Service.

''(d) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date on which the commission is convened, the commission shall submit to the Secretary, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a report containing—

''(1) the findings and assessments under subsection (c);

''(2) any recommendations for regulatory, or administrative action to improve the Service; and

''(3) a description of the composition of the membership of the commission as required by subsection (b).

''(e) INAPPLICABILITY OF OTHER LAW.—The provisions of chapter 10 of title 5, United States Code, and chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, shall not apply to either the composition or the operation of the Commission.

''(f) SUNSET.—The commission shall terminate on the date that is 30 days after the date on which the report required by subsection (d) has been submitted in accordance with such subsection.''.

SEC. 618. INTEGRATION OF FOREIGN SERVICE RECRUITMENT INTO MILITARY TRANSITION PROGRAMS.

Chapter 7 of title I (22 U.S.C. 4021 et seq.), as amended by sections 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, and 617, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 719. INTEGRATION OF FOREIGN SERVICE RECRUITMENT INTO MILITARY TRANSITION PROGRAMS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, shall establish a formal recruitment program within military transition programs to support entry into the Service of veterans.

''(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The program required by subsection (a) shall—

''(1) provide information, guidance, and preparatory resources to facilitate participation in the Veterans and Foreign Service Pathway Program established under section 313; and

''(2) support the development of a sustained pipeline of candidates aligned with workforce needs of the Department.

''(c) IMPLEMENTATION.—In carrying out the program required by subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

''(1) integrate Service career information, including Diplomatic Security roles, into Transition Assistance Program curriculum and materials;

''(2) conduct targeted outreach at military installations and transition centers;

''(3) identify and refer qualified candidates to the program required by subsection (a) and any pilot hiring authority established under section 313; and

''(4) provide pre-application guidance and onboarding support to prospective candidates.

''(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to create a separate or noncompetitive hiring process for members of the Armed Forces or veterans.''.

TITLE VII—OTHER MATTERS

SEC. 701. INTERNSHIPS FOR PART-TIME STUDENTS.

Section 1202(c) (22 U.S.C. 4141a(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''Students enrolled full-time in institutions of higher education'' and inserting ''Students enrolled, whether full-time or at least half-time, in institutions of higher education,''; and

(2) by adding at end the following:

''(4) The Secretary shall, to the extent practicable, ensure that recruitment efforts include outreach to potential applicants enrolled at community colleges, vocational or technical institutions, and other nontraditional institutions of higher education.''.

SEC. 702. DIPLOMATIC RESERVE CORPS PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than nine months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall establish a Diplomatic Reserve Corps Pilot Program (in this section referred to as the ''Pilot Program'') in the Department of State to assess the feasibility and effectiveness of maintaining a reserve cadre of trained personnel available for temporary active service in support of foreign affairs contingencies.

(b) PURPOSE.—The Pilot Program shall—

(1) provide a surge workforce to support diplomatic operations during crises, evacuations, armed conflicts, natural disasters, and other contingencies affecting United States interests abroad;

(2) assess recruitment, training, readiness, deployment, and retention requirements for a permanent Diplomatic Reserve Corps; and

(3) identify authorities, resources, and organizational structures necessary to sustain such a corps.

(c) MEMBERSHIP.—The Secretary of State may appoint to the Pilot Program retired members of the Foreign Service.

(d) INITIAL STRENGTH.—The Secretary of State shall recruit and maintain not fewer than 250 members in the Pilot Program during the first year of the Pilot Program and may increase membership by up to 250 additional members annually for the following three fiscal years.

(e) RESERVE CORPS STRUCTURE.—Of the members of the Pilot Program appointed by the Secretary of State pursuant to subsection (c)—

(1) not more than 30 percent shall be appointed at ranks equivalent to salary class 1 and salary class 2 of the Foreign Service schedule; and

(2) those not appointed at ranks equivalent to salary class 1 and salary class 2 of the Foreign Service schedule shall be appointed at ranks equivalent to salary class 3 and salary class 4 of the Foreign Service schedule.

(f) TRAINING.—Members of the Pilot Program shall complete such orientation, security, medical, and readiness training as the Secretary of State determines appropriate, including training conducted through the National Foreign Affairs Training Center, the Foreign Affairs Security Training Center, and other Department of State facilities.

(g) ACTIVATION.—The Secretary of State may activate members of the Pilot Program for temporary service in support of diplomatic operations, crisis response, evacuation efforts, disaster response, consular surge requirements, or other foreign affairs contingencies.

(h) EVALUATION.—The Secretary of State shall establish readiness standards and conduct annual evaluations of the training status and availability for deployment of each member of the Pilot Program.

(i) INITIAL PLAN TO CONGRESS.—Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a report detailing the Secretary's plans and timeline to establish, structure, and implement the Pilot Program.

(j) FINAL REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than three years after the establishment of the Pilot Program, the Secretary of State shall submit to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a report evaluating the Pilot Program and providing recommendations regarding establishment of a permanent Diplomatic Reserve Corps.

(2) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall additionally include an assessment on expanding eligible appointment to the Diplomatic Reserve Corps to—

(A) retired Civil Service employees of the Department of State;

(B) retired employees of other Federal agencies possessing relevant skills and experience; and

(C) qualified individuals from outside the Federal Government possessing critical language, regional, technical, medical, security, consular, management, or diplomatic expertise.

(k) TERMINATION.—The Pilot Program shall terminate on the date that is three after the date of the enactment of this Act, unless reauthorized by Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAWLER) and the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. AMO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LAWLER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on this measure.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, H.R. 9086, the Foreign Service Modernization Act.

This bill is a strong example of what Congress can accomplish when Republicans and Democrats are willing to sit down together, listen to one another, and focus on solving problems, and now we have a final product that delivers for American Foreign Service officers and their families.

The modern U.S. Foreign Service, which governs how our diplomats operate overseas, has not undergone a comprehensive overhaul in 46 years.

Madam Speaker, think about how much the world has changed since 1980. The Berlin Wall fell and the Soviet Union dissolved. 9/11 transformed our national security priorities, and our allies stood alongside us as we confronted the threat of global terrorism. In 1980, no one had a cell phone, and the internet didn't exist.

The geopolitical landscape has shifted significantly since the Foreign Service Act was originally signed into law. Yet the basic framework governing our Foreign Service has not been adapted to meet any of these changes.

My bill gives diplomats the tools, authorities, and flexibility they need to succeed in the 21st century and beyond.

It provides for new expeditionary diplomacy authorities to enhance on-the-ground presence where it is needed most. It ensures diplomats with language skills are matched at posts where they can have the greatest impact. It requires a review of the five career tracks Foreign Service officers can take and updates training requirements so our diplomats are prepared for the challenges they will actually face in the field. It also creates a pilot program for a diplomatic reserve corps modeled after the reserves of armed services to expand response time and capacity when diplomatic resources are urgently needed.

These are targeted and commonsense reforms, and, yes, they are bipartisan reforms. This is what happens when you sit in a room with your colleagues, Mr. Speaker, when you listen to their thoughts and concerns, instead of heeding to the folks who just want to scream and yell. The result is a Foreign Service that will be better equipped for the 21st century and better prepared to serve and advance American interests around the globe.

I am proud to be one of the most active and bipartisan Members of Congress, and I am just as proud to lead this comprehensive bill that showcases how far dialogue can get you, Madam Speaker.

I thank Chairman MAST for his leadership and his willingness to have me lead in this effort as we modernize America's Foreign Service.

Madam Speaker, I urge all Members to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 9086, the Foreign Service Modernization Act, as amended.

As vice ranking member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I was proud to work alongside my colleagues on both sides of the aisle on this important legislation, which will help equip our diplomats at the State Department with the skills and knowledge they need to advance U.S. interests and values around the world.

In the midst of the world's most challenging crises, our Nation's diplomats get up every morning and risk their lives on behalf of the American people. They are often the unsung heroes in our national security workforce.

The core of their mission is preventing the worst-case scenario from unfolding. It is a mission that comes with little recognition or medals. Whether in a war zone, humanitarian crisis, or emergency evacuation, American citizens rely on the expertise and determination of these public servants to ensure they remain safe, represented, and, if needed, supported in navigating challenges abroad and returning home safely.

That is why I am pleased that this legislation was the result of bipartisan work and serious engagement with stakeholders, including the American Foreign Service Association, The American Academy of Diplomacy, retired diplomats, and other experts. Our objective was to ensure that our Foreign Service officers have the tools to navigate the complex national security and economic matters they face today and those they need to confront future challenges.

I am particularly proud that this bill includes provisions to improve training on key issues such as critical minerals, AI, and other emerging technologies. I am also proud to have helped secure provisions in this bill that will improve training on identifying and preventing anti-Semitism and providing training for implementing AUKUS.

Our diplomatic service is only as strong as the individuals we recruit, train, and, importantly, retain. I am pleased that the bill continues to demonstrate bipartisan support for key fellowships of the State Department, including Pickering, Rangel, Payne, and the Veterans Innovation Partnership Fellowship.

This provision will ensure that we maintain a time-tested and effective pipeline to bring the next generation of diplomats into the State Department.

The past 2 years have not been easy for Foreign Service members. Last July, the Trump administration arbitrarily fired over 1,300 experts in the department, including individuals from the Bureaus of Counterterrorism; Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor; and Consular Affairs.

The administration foolishly eliminated a number of key bureaus and offices, including the Energy Bureau and its experts, who tracked Russia, China, and Iran's use of oil as a weapon.

Secretary Rubio claimed that this reduction in force was in support of both merit-based hiring and that his department reorganization helped eliminate redundant functions that were no longer necessary. The unfolding events of the past 2 years have proven them wrong at every turn. Now, more than ever, we need these experts at the State Department in Washington and at our posts around the world. Without them, American national security remains at risk.

While I am grateful that the House Foreign Affairs Committee worked on this bipartisan legislation, key provisions were not included that I believe would have made the bill much stronger. This includes an important provision that would have provided Congress with oversight over the reduction in force orders from July 2025.

Many of my Republican colleagues have spent the last 2 years supporting RIFs, so I remain shocked that they would reject efforts to showcase that the data that supposedly justified the RIFs they rubberstamped. That is why our side of the aisle on the Foreign Affairs Committee has been adamant that we need to hold the administration to account, including by demanding hearings on its stewardship of the State Department and our Foreign Service, which have been too few this Congress.

The American people are entitled to answers, and we will continue asking questions. We have a lot of work to do to ensure our diplomats and State Department have the tools, resources, and training they need to be mission ready. This bill takes very important steps towards that goal.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1320

Mr. LAWLER. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAST), the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. MAST. Madam Speaker, I am rising today in strong support of H.R. 9086, the Foreign Service Modernization Act.

This legislation is long overdue, to say the least. It hasn't been done in several decades. I would say, actually, even closer to 50 years. That is more than several decades. For the first time in nearly 50 years, Congress is undertaking comprehensive reform of the Foreign Service to ensure that the State Department is equipped to advance America's interests in an increasingly complex and changing world—again, something that has been said on both sides of the aisle.

The Foreign Service is on the front lines of American diplomacy. Those are our officers in our embassies around the globe, on every continent, doing work on behalf of the American people. That is what they should be doing. The men and women who serve our country overseas deserve a system that rewards merit above all, demands accountability, develops strong leaders, and gives our diplomats the tools and the training that they need to carry out their mission abroad effectively.

This bill does exactly that. It modernizes the Foreign Service. It strengthens leadership and management, reinforces accountability and performance, and restores a very clear focus on mission.

Importantly, it also recognizes the tremendous value that our veterans bring to public service by ensuring that those who have already served our country are given the most specific and streamlined opportunities to get into Foreign Service that has ever existed.

If our servicemembers served overseas in a combat zone, that is Foreign Service that should be carried over into a world of diplomacy. If they were serving in Germany or Latin America, not necessarily in a combat zone, that is Foreign Service that should give them a better track into diplomacy. That is something that we worked on very specifically in this bill.

Our diplomats are engaging every day in competition and strengthening our alliances and our partnerships abroad—where China is trying to make theirs stronger abroad.

We are countering the influence of our adversaries. We are protecting Americans overseas. We are advancing American interests around the world. That is what our Foreign Service officers do each and every day.

They need a Foreign Service that is professional, effective, accountable, and firmly focused on serving the United States of America and its people—not working on some of the crazy stuff that they were doing in the past, literally, like trying to make our maps queer, which was a real thing; trying to do transgender job fairs in Bangladesh for $800,000; or trying to do transgender operas, plays, and musicals on basically every continent. Those are the things that we do not need Foreign Service officers doing, and those are what I am proud to say will be removed from the Foreign Service.

Madam Speaker, I am proud of the bipartisan work that has gone into this legislation and the shared commitment to strengthening American diplomacy for the challenges ahead, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the passage of this bill.

Mr. AMO. Madam Speaker, I do not have any speakers and am prepared to close as long as there are no speakers on the other side.

Mr. LAWLER. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Guam (Mr. MOYLAN).

Mr. MOYLAN. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 9086, the Foreign Service Modernization Act.

With Guam's location in the Pacific, engaging with our allies is essential to ensuring not only Guam's security but the Nation's, as well.

This bill ensures that our diplomats are fully qualified and equipped with the ability to effectively liaise and coordinate with our allies across the Indo-Pacific.

Further, this bill requires the Department to establish a program to recruit qualified veterans and separating military personnel into the Foreign Service. As a veteran myself, I fully support and recognize the importance of recruiting our veterans to serve in the ranks of the Foreign Service. Veterans come with unique skills and backgrounds that are vital to supporting U.S. interests.

Madam Speaker, I thank my colleagues for their strong bipartisan work on H.R. 9086.

Mr. AMO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Madam Speaker, I again thank the thousands of Foreign Service officers at the State Department and around the world for their tireless and patriotic work.

To those who were arbitrarily fired in July 2025, know that I and the other Democratic Members are committed to see you are made whole and to ensure that the Halls of Congress are filled with stories of your commendable public service, professional excellence, and inspiring contributions to your country.

Though this bill could have been much improved, including language that would have granted us greater oversight over last year's RIFs, this bill is an important step toward providing our diplomats with the tools they need to succeed.

Madam Speaker, I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their work crafting this bipartisan legislation. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAWLER. Madam Speaker, again, I thank Chairman MAST for his leadership and vision in getting this done after 46 years.

At each of our posts abroad, our diplomats are the face, voice, and representatives of our foreign policy.

Amidst the current and rapidly evolving global landscape, we must ensure that the Foreign Service is mission-focused and equipped to meet the monumental task. If we expect our diplomats to effectively meet the challenges of a changing world, we have to give them the tools to do it.

Madam Speaker, I am proud of the work that was done over these past 6-plus months to put this bipartisan legislation together, and I thank colleagues across both sides of the aisle for working to modernize our Foreign Service.

Madam Speaker, I urge everyone to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAWLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 9086, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Speaker, I seek recognition for a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has been made aware of a valid basis for the gentleman's point of personal privilege.

The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Speaker, roughly 3 weeks ago, the Speaker of the House said: ''Let me tell you how stupid THOMAS MASSIE's comment is.'' An article said that JOHNSON said that ''Republicans are here to work'' and will remain in Washington throughout September, according to the House calendar. He goes on to say: ''That is a nonsensical statement by someone who is not participating as a full Member of the Congress, and it is really sad that he doesn't.''

Well, I am here today to let you know that I am a full participating Member of the House of Representatives. In fact, when other people want to go home, I am here to work.

I am here to get justice for the Epstein victims, the survivors. I am here to get the price of food and fuel down for our constituents. We have solutions. We just refuse to pass them.

What happened a couple of weeks ago is that I introduced the Epstein Files Transparency Act II discharge petition. I predicted that the House would take days off the calendar in order to avoid a vote on this again.

□ 1330

If you remember a year ago, we had the Epstein recess, I call it. My colleague, RO KHANNA, and I had been very successful in collecting names. We were just two signatures short of 218 on a discharge petition, and the leadership of this body recessed this body for weeks to avoid swearing in one Member who would have been the 218th vote. I was here. I was ready to work, to be a fully participating Member of Congress.

Well, the Speaker saw otherwise. The leadership here saw otherwise, and they kept Congress shut down for weeks.

We came back. I got that 218th signature, and the bill that RO KHANNA and I coauthored became law. Every Member, except for one Member of this House, voted for our legislation that they had criticized for months. If it was so bad, why did they all vote for it?

That bill went to the Senate. It passed by unanimous consent. If you ask the Senators, can you pass one of our House bills, what will they say? Well, we will see if we get it on the docket. That is going to take at least 3 days. We have got to get a 60-vote threshold to overcome the filibuster, and so it is going to be a while.

How long did it take them to pass the Epstein Files Transparency Act? They passed it before it got there. It left this House, and on the walk between the House and the Senate, they made a unanimous consent to pass that bill as soon as it got there. Nobody objected.

The President himself signed that bill. He had earlier said it would be a hostile act to even support that bill.

What came of it: 3 million files released.

Now, we have yet to see justice here in the United States, but we watched a British ambassador to the United States lose his job. He was sacked. We saw a prince of England lose his title. We saw the former Prime Minister of Norway arrested and convicted—maybe not convicted yet, but arrested. We saw the Minister of Culture in France receive the same fate.

CEOs and presidents of universities resigned—over a hoax? Somebody should have told them it was a hoax, because that is what we were told, that it was a hoax. Folks, it wasn't a hoax.

There are still 3 million of those files that are being withheld at the Department of Justice. The ones that have been released have been overly redacted, in contravention of that law.

What would a fully participating Member of Congress do if he got a law enacted against the will of the President, against the will of the Speaker, against all odds, and then the chief law enforcement officer of the country will not follow the law? What would a fully participating Member of Congress do?

Well, I think he would do what I did. I wrote, along with RO KHANNA and TERESA LEGER FERNANDEZ—by the way, when did it become a dirty word to work across the aisle? When did that become forbidden? I thought that was supposed to be a good thing, to form coalitions.

Oh, MASSIE, you know, he can't get anything done. He can't get people to agree with him. Madam Speaker, 427–1 was the vote on the Epstein files. Come on. I think that is a pretty big coalition.

It was more than just getting the files released. My colleague, RO KHANNA, and I held the biggest press conference that has occurred in Washington, D.C., in at least a decade, for as long as I have been here. Is that something a not fully participating Member of Congress would do? I don't think so.

Why did we do it: to give a voice to the survivors. We gave them a venue to speak to you, the people in power—the people who were hiding the files at the DOJ, at the FBI, at the U.S. Attorney's Office. For the first time ever, we gave them a voice. We gave them a platform.

They were brave. They stepped up. They told their very tragic and sad stories. They compelled the rest of this body to do the right thing, after resisting for so long.

That gets us to where we are now on the Epstein files. RO KHANNA, TERESA LEGER FERNANDEZ, and I wrote another bill. What it does is simple. It says, Mr. Attorney General, if you refuse to prosecute the co-conspirators of Jeffrey Epstein, the rapists, the pedophiles, the ones who financed it, and the ones who covered it up—if you refuse to do it at Epstein island, in New York, Florida, or New Mexico, this bill is going to give the files to the State attorneys general in the various States so that they can prosecute these crimes.

I have talked to the attorney general of New Mexico. Guess what. There are crimes that occurred at Zorro Ranch for which there is no statute of limitations. We can still bring these pedophiles to justice. He is ready to do it, but the Attorney General of this country will not cooperate with the attorney general of that State.

So the Epstein Files Transparency Act II, would make that happen, would allow for that to happen.

It does something else that is important. The survivors need closure. This Attorney General will not share those files with the survivors, the files that were generated on their behalf.

We call them survivors because some are no longer alive. I am talking about the victims who are still alive, who survived the trauma and the shame, and were subjected to horrible things by these men. These brave women, we are giving them standing in court to get their own damn files, that they can't get now. For some of them, it was so traumatic they can't even remember what they told the FBI at the time. That is important.

We also give standing to Members of this body. Who would not want to make the legislative branch just a little more capable of getting its laws carried out in the way that they were meant to be carried out? It gives Members of Congress standing to go in front of a judge and test the executive branch's flawed legal reasoning for withholding 3 million files.

Why do we want to do that? Because their reasoning is such a joke, that in front of any judge for more than a minute, their arguments could not be sustained.

Let me give you an example. The Epstein Files Transparency Act, the first version that this fully participating Member of Congress ushered through this body and through the Senate and got the White House to sign against their will, the first bill says that the DOJ has to give us and the public, internal memos, documents, and emails concerning decisions of whether to prosecute or not prosecute and whether to investigate or not investigate.

That is at the heart of this issue. Why did our government fail us? Who was it at DOJ or FBI that decided to create two tiers of justice? We want to see those internal discussions.

What does the Attorney General argue now? Oh, I am sorry. We are going to exercise our deliberative process privilege. Well, here's the problem: that is a FOIA term of art, Freedom of Information Act term of art. It does not apply to a law that was passed by both Chambers and signed by the President. Even if it did, the law itself pierces through the previous law.

That is what any judge in this country, if they looked at it on the facts, would agree to. New laws override the old laws. I am not an attorney, but as a fully participating Member of Congress, I do serve on the Judiciary Committee. I know the simple concept that a new law overrides the old law. The judges know that, too. That is why this next bill is so important.

That gets me to why—we are going to take these—at first, it was: we are just going to cancel two weeks off the calendar. We know why that happened. We know why that happened. It is to keep the Epstein Files Transparency Act from getting the 218 votes on the discharge petition, ripening over 7 days, and passing before the election, thereby making the Senate be accountable in the weeks leading up to the election.

Oh, my gosh. We can't have that. We can't have Senators called to task while they are stumping and spreading their campaign promises. Oh, no, we can't put them on the spot like that and ask them if they are going to vote for transparency and justice for the survivors. That is why they cut two weeks off the calendar.

Isn't it ironic that I was called not a fully participating Member of Congress? I am the one who most wants to be here those two weeks.

□ 1340

They got canceled. I said they would probably cancel them. We were told, oh, nope. That is a ludicrous idea.

Let me tell you how stupid THOMAS MASSIE's comment is. Those were the words of the Speaker. Forty-eight hours later, what did he do? He did exactly what I predicted. He cut 2 weeks off of this calendar.

Why did he just cut another day off the calendar?

He had some more choice words for me because I predicted this, as well.

On Tuesday, as a fully participating Member of Congress, I introduced eight Articles of Impeachment against Peter Brian Hegseth.

Over there, they are leading a little fantasy. They call it the Department of War. You can't rename things without Congress. Hell, you can't even rename a post office without us. You think you can rename the Department of Defense to Department of War. Give me a break, but enjoy your little fantasy. It is the Department of Defense.

Let me tell you about the eight Articles of Impeachment.

By the way, Speaker JOHNSON says I am not a fully participating Member of Congress. Well, it took a long time to write eight Articles of Impeachment. It didn't take much time to conceive them.

If you are looking over at the executive branch and trying to give an award for the person who has racked up the most illegal and unconstitutional acts, there is one clear winner: It is Peter Brian Hegseth, Secretary of Defense, who has done that.

It was easy to conceive of these Articles of Impeachment, but it wasn't easy to write them. They are watertight. They are watertight.

In the 24 hours that has transpired since I was right here at this podium for an hour and 20 minutes reading the Articles of Impeachment, what has happened? Have they attacked the language of these articles? Have they said there is no legal basis for this? You can't possibly think these are valid Articles of Impeachment? No. Nobody has attacked the substance and nobody has come to the rescue of the Secretary of Defense.

I don't even see the online brigade of paid media grifters who typically rally for MAGA and the President while they are collecting their checks. I just don't see it happening, and that is interesting.

What is the form of a privilege when you introduce Articles of Impeachment as a privileged resolution? What happens? Well, the Speaker has 48 hours to schedule a vote. Forty-eight hours would be tomorrow would be that vote. What happened? We just found out not more than 1 hour ago that the leadership of this body, which is Republican—I am having a hard time figuring this out, too.

We are the majority. We may only be the majority for 6 more weeks. Why would we be canceling days when the country is burning? The inflation is rampant. There are things we could do here. Why would we cancel our own majority?

I can't figure that out, but I did figure out why we canceled tomorrow, and that is what I am explaining to you, as a fully participating Member of Congress.

Tomorrow would be the vote on impeaching Secretary of Defense Peter Brian Hegseth, and it looks like that vote is not going to happen. It would be a real easy vote. It would probably be a vote to table to insulate the Members of this body from any accountability. That would avoid the Members from having to debate any of the eight Articles of Impeachment. It would let them go home to their townhalls and say, well, we didn't vote on the substance of the bill. I didn't really agree with MASSIE's thing or disagree with it. I just thought we should table it and it should go to a committee first. Maybe we will refer it to a committee or blue ribbon commission or a panel of experts because we are just mere Congressmen. We are not equipped to stand here on the floor and debate without reading our speeches that were written by our staff.

Would a not fully participating Member of Congress come down here and speak extemporaneously for 1 hour? I think if somebody does that it is an indicator that they are participating. Maybe when you hear their speeches, they are sincere.

I think it was against the rules at one time to read our speeches in this body. Why is that? Because it was considered insincere. If you didn't have the conviction of heart to come down here or the presence of mind—we have a few Senators who may not have the presence of mind, and we have some who don't have the conviction of heart. If you just always came down here and read your speeches—some of them are written by AI now. The staff better watch out. It was a good gig while they had it, writing the speech for their robot boss to come down here and—beep, beep, beep—here is my speech. Well, now, they have a robot to replace them to feed their robot a speech.

This is not a robot speech. I am not a robot Congressman. I never have been. I am, contrary to what the Speaker said, a fully participating Member of Congress. Let me talk about some of the things that I have done since I have been in Congress.

In 2014, working with Jared Polis—again, wait. That is a dirty word: across the aisle. You shouldn't be working across the aisle, Congressman MASSIE. Don't do that. We have to have a bunch of fake bills that go down party lines that we can use against the other party in this next election. We don't want anything—whatever you do, don't cosponsor some Democrat's bill. You are just giving credence to the other side, to the other viewpoint.

I ignored that, and I worked with Earl Blumenauer and Jared Polis, and we got the hemp bill in the farm bill. I am not afraid to tell you I did a little R&D to come up with that hemp bill. I ripped off and duplicated it. That is what R&D stands for.

I ripped off and duplicated that bill from Ron Paul. It became a law, and it created an entire industry with just a little thing in the farm bill, just a little pilot program that grew into an industry that helped my State, Kentucky, create an industry that is at least a billion dollars in Kentucky.

Now, they are trying to destroy it, but that is for another day.

What am I doing now right now? That was in 2014. Have you heard about this beef product, ground beef product that is going to come from a foreign country at 75 percent of market price? How do you get something at 75 percent of market price? Well, I can tell you what, it ain't grade A prime if it is 75 percent of market price. Somebody else didn't want to buy it, so they are talking about bringing 300,000 metric tons—they tell you in tons so you don't realize that that is 600 million pounds. That is 2 billion quarter pounders, Madam Speaker.

That is how much they are going to bring here to this country. Is that going to help farmers? No, it's not going to help farmers. It was never intended to help farmers. It is not even going to help consumers. Because what it is going to do is run more farmers out of business in this country, and when we run out of the 300,000 metric boatloads or whatever it is of ground beef product, we won't have our own farmers here. They won't survive through these manipulations of the market.

The solution has been here all along since 2015. As a fully participating Member of Congress, I introduced the PRIME Act. Back in 2015, what else happened? This body got rid of country of origin labeling for beef and pork. How did that help American farmers? You can't even go to the grocery store and know if it is American or where in the world it came from and where they have different laws that govern food safety. Oh, but it says USDA. That must be USA. No, that is not USA beef.

What was my solution? It is called the PRIME Act. I say it is my solution, but I have to give credit to CHELLIE PINGREE across the aisle. Oh, man. There is that dirty word again: across the aisle, working with Democrats, on a bill that could help farmers and consumers.

What does the PRIME Act do? It says if you are a small farmer and a small processor and you are not crossing State lines and you are raising your healthy beef right there in your own county and you want to sell it to a neighbor in your own county, your own State, you can use a local processor, and as long as the State or county health inspector is watching that process, you don't need the Federal Government there. You don't need a million dollars of regulation at a company that has 10 employees.

They cut up more meat at the steakhouse down the street in a day than most of these processors cut up in a week. They don't have a USDA inspector. They don't need a USDA inspector. They just need local inspection like for restaurants. So that is the bill that CHELLIE PINGREE and I came up with, as fully participating Members of Congress in 2015, in response to the repeal of the country of origin labeling, which I voted against the repeal.

By the way, your cell phone is labeled, your suit is labeled, your shoes are labeled, and your car is labeled. Everything is labeled with country of origin except for beef and pork. Why is that?

Because there is some greedy corporations that convinced the World Trade Organization and this body to get rid of those labels so they could sell you foreign food and make you think it was USDA because it has a USDA label on it.

Where is the PRIME Act right now? Well, Massie, that was a great idea, but you didn't do anything with it. Oh, no. You all voted for it. It is in the farm bill. It is in the House farm bill. I worked hard across the aisle and with the chairman of that committee. He did town halls across the country and found out that this is what people want. This would solve two problems.

□ 1350

It would lower the price of food in the supermarket. It would make our farmers more successful, and the quality of what you eat would go up.

That is what I have done as a fully participating Member of Congress.

You know what else I remember doing as a fully participating Member of Congress? I stood at this microphone on the night the big, budget-busting bill passed—some people called it beautiful—and I said: If it happens after midnight, it ain't beautiful.

I said from this podium: We are not rearranging deck chairs on the Titanic for this country. We are putting coal in the boiler and setting a course for the iceberg.

I said if you—look, I like to cut taxes. Two of my bills were in the big bill: no tax on tips and reducing tax for senior citizens on Social Security.

Why not? Massie, why would you not vote for that? Because I refused to lie to my constituents. I refused to lie to them. I am not going to tell them that you can cut taxes and increase spending and the debt will go down. That is a lie. No grade-schooler who has done the least bit of math would believe it, but some of my colleagues stood here and told that lie. I wasn't willing to tell it, and I wasn't willing to vote for it.

I said it would cause massive inflation. On that night over a year ago, when I gave my speech, I said: The bond market is also going to react poorly to this. Interest rates will go up because they see we are not serious about dealing with the debt. They see that one day we are going to default.

I called a spade a spade, and I voted against the big, beautiful bill. I am proud that I did because it is a terrible bill, and it is what has caused this inflation, part of what has caused this inflation.

Let me tell you something else I have done here over the years. I have worked with my colleague from California ZOE LOFGREN on privacy. Do you know you are being spied on by your own country without a warrant in contravention of the U.S. Constitution? ZOE LOFGREN and I got an amendment passed many years ago into the appropriations bill to ban that. Well, the Senate threw it in the trash, but we can't control what the Senate does. That is one thing that I got done.

I have been here as a fully participating Member of Congress, the sole voice for inventors on the Judiciary Committee. I have introduced propatent legislation, pro-small business legislation.

There is this misunderstanding. People think, oh, Apple, Google, Microsoft, they just use those inventions to keep the little guys from getting into their markets. No. Apple, Google, Microsoft, they are slow-moving. They have got employees there—I mean, they have got some good ones, but a lot of them are just punching the clock. They have accumulated some weight.

The fast, nimble companies, the people in their garages, little girls at science fairs, invent things that even Google or Apple couldn't think of. Then when they patent them, Google and Apple do everything they can to steal the idea, to invalidate the patent. I have worked for the small inventors to make it a level playing field so that the little guys can compete, so that their patents won't get stolen by the big guys. I have been doing that for as long as I have been in Congress.

I got a bipartisan bill passed here recently, just this spring, to improve the reporting of the NICS database. This is the background check that they do on whether you could—before you can buy the gun or not.

Well, guess what. The error rate there is astounding. There are 100,000 false denials of the Second Amendment rights of people every year, the DOJ has admitted, and they only prosecute about 12 of them every year. Why is that? Because most of them are false denials.

But here is one thing I discovered. If your name is similar to somebody else's name, they are going to deny you, and then you have got to appeal. If you don't win that first appeal, you have got to go hire a lawyer. Justice, if it is delayed, it ain't justice.

So what I did, I dug deeper. My friend, John Lott, who is a researcher and an analyst, actually worked at the DOJ and got a look at this data. It turns out if you are a minority, if you are Black, you are three times as likely to share a name with somebody else who has the same name and who has been in prison for a year or more. Because we share names within our groups, within our ethnicities, if you are Hispanic, you are twice as likely to get falsely denied the purchase of a firearm because you share names with other people who are Hispanic who have been to jail.

I don't think—whether you are Hispanic, Black, White, or Asian—anybody should be falsely denied. Banks do background checks. We should let the banks do these. If the banks had an error rate like this that was racially prejudiced, they would be sued out of existence; but the government gets away with it.

So I got a bill passed here unanimously to report by race and ethnicity. I don't want to collect more data on Americans, but that stuff is already collected. It is on the form. Just give us the data. I think what will happen is when we see what is really happening when the data becomes public, there will be an outcry to improve that database so that it is not racially biased and so that it doesn't deprive anybody of the right to carry a firearm or to keep a firearm.

One thing I have done here, as a fully participating Member of Congress, is draw attention to the foreign aid. Where is your money going? Before there was DOGE—all right. Let's talk about DOGE a little bit.

I sat here in this Chamber when we were addressed at the State of the Union about all of this waste, and everybody stood up and clapped—oh, the waste, the waste, let's get rid of the waste. These were the chairmen of the committees that created the waste. There was so much cognitive dissonance at the State of the Union. I said to myself, they are clapping because they have to clap, but there is no way they are going to cut that waste.

When candidates campaign against foreign aid because we want to put America first, I know they are not going to cut foreign aid up here. You have got foreign lobbyists up here, for heaven's sake. But I have drawn attention to that.

I have drawn attention to a war in the Middle East where 75,000 people have been killed—50,000 civilians, girls, and boys that just want to live their lives. I think it is a genocide. I call it a genocide, but I have also called attention to it.

I have worked across the aisle on War Powers Resolutions to stop these unconstitutional wars that have never been declared, never even been authorized. I have worked across the aisle with RO KHANNA on those bills, and we have got some of them passed, in fact.

I wish to spend a little bit more time on the thing that caused tomorrow to be canceled, which is the impeachment of Peter Brian Hegseth.

There are eight articles in there. Article I—by the way, the easiest way to understand this is the first three articles are impeaching Peter Hegseth for carrying out illegal orders. By the way, if you are in the military and you are given an illegal order, you do not have to carry it out. But Peter Hegseth carried out illegal orders and encouraged others, tried to get them to do the same thing, but all—the first three articles have to do with the War Powers Resolution of 1973.

The first one, they didn't even have the required predicates to act without authorization from Congress. There was no attack on Americans. In fact, now, what they are using as a predicate is attacks on shipping vessels that aren't even ours. The War Powers Resolution doesn't allow you to start a war when somebody else's ship with a different flag gets attacked. But the White House is still sending us letters saying, oh, we are starting a new attack.

So Article I, Pete Hegseth is waging war in Iran without legal authorization because they didn't have a predicate to start it without the Congress.

Article II, we passed a concurrent resolution in this body. We passed one in the House, and we passed one in the Senate. The War Powers Resolution of 1973 says if you do that and send it to the White House, they have got to stop the war.

□ 1400

They didn't stop the war. They haven't even paused the war for that. They don't even acknowledge that. They say, oh, we don't believe in that law.

What have we gotten to? We don't believe in that law. We don't think that law is constitutional, so we don't have to follow it.

Well, then ask us to repeal it if you don't think it is constitutional, then override the veto, and blah, blah, blah. Go through the legislative process if you don't like that law. Quit—quit—just ignoring the law.

The next thing they did is—the War Powers Resolution of 1973 only allows Peter Brian Hegseth to do anything. If they had reached the legal threshold, the predicates required to act alone, they have 60 days to stop. Sixty days came, and they declared a cease-fire. Then, they started again and said: Oh, this is a new war. We are not still fighting the same war.

So, see, they can't even decide: Is it a war? Is it not a war? Is this a new war? Is it the same war?

They are continuing under this ridiculous legal authority, which doesn't exist. Those are the first three articles.

By the way, some people say article IV, as well as articles I through III, but article IV isn't carrying out an illegal order. Article IV is something that Peter Hegseth did himself.

He came to Congress and asked us to turn off—because it was turned on by law, he asked us to turn off the targeting minimization procedures that keep us from blowing up civilians, minimizing it. There will be some casualties.

Congress said, no, we like this law. We are not going to repeal it.

So, Hegseth just shut down the Department over there at the Department of Defense, and the outcome was predictable. They bombed schoolchildren on the first day of the war.

You would think, if the first day of the war—I could understand in the heat of war, in the fog of war. On the first day of a war that you have been planning for a year, you bomb a school? I am not saying they did it on purpose. I am saying Peter Hegseth himself personally is culpable for that because he doesn't care about rules of engagement. He has deprecated the rules of engagement. He has degraded the ability to discriminate between civilian targets and valid military targets.

He needs to be impeached for that. He has committed extrajudicial killings. What do I mean by that? He has killed over 200 people in fishing boats. This is, they are saying, to interdict drugs. That is a law enforcement role. That is not a role for the military.

There is a reason we separate these two things, law enforcement and military. It is because you are presumed innocent until proven guilty, unless you are at war, and if you are holding a gun and you are shooting at me, you are guilty in war, okay? You are going to get shot back.

When you are in civilian mode and don't have a gun and don't have a drone and don't have a rocket, you are presumed to be innocent. You don't send in soldiers to assassinate people in boats. You certainly don't circle back and kill the people who are floating in the water because if it were a war, there are accepted norms of warfare from Geneva and elsewhere.

What Secretary Hegseth did by ignoring those rules of engagement that have been acceptable for a century—what did he do? He endangered our own soldiers because what if one of our own soldiers ends up shipwrecked, or sailors? What if one of our own soldiers ends up wounded or captured as a prisoner?

He has just encouraged every one of our adversaries to shoot our wounded, to shoot our captured, to shoot our shipwrecked, because that is what he is doing. That is why he needs to be impeached for that, for those extrajudicial killings.

Article VI should concern everybody in this body. He suppressed free speech. He tried to use the military to go after Senator MARK KELLY for saying something in his Senator capacity. You can't do that. There is the First Amendment right, and just because you served your country at one time and now do not serve, it doesn't mean you have diminished your own First Amendment rights in the process of saying I am willing to die for this country.

Now that you are done, you don't have the First Amendment anymore. That is what Peter Hegseth believes. He says we wouldn't even take this to court. We are going to deal with this in the military.

He doesn't just abrogate the powers of Congress. He abrogated the powers of the judicial branch by—and he brought every tool he had to bear. As the Secretary of Defense, he brought it against MARK KELLY to try to change the words that he said.

That should bother all of us.

Roughly 20 percent of Members of Congress have served in the military.

Do those 20 percent deserve less rights here at this microphone to say something than I do? I don't think so. We have several million veterans. Should they have diminished freedom of speech? No.

If we accept what Peter Hegseth did without challenging it, without impeaching him, then he has stolen unto himself aspects of our freedom of speech and put it under the military. Give me a break.

He kidnapped the leader of a sovereign country. Now, what was the predicate for this? This one is kind of ridiculous. He was just arresting a guy for some drug charges who happens to be the head of another country. Then what do we find out, based on quotes from the White House? Immediately after, as soon as this arrest—it was a kidnapping—was effectuated, our Commander in Chief stood up and said their oil is now ours, and our oil companies are going to come in here and make big money on it.

That is not right, but at least he is being honest. He is saying why we took out the leader of another country.

Again, that is an act of war if there ever was. They put boots on the ground. They brought in all the branches of the military. They did regime change. I mean, there are like four things that qualify as an act of war, and they did not have authorization from Congress to do that.

Finally, there was an unlawful and awful war in Yemen that was never authorized by this body, and it didn't meet the predicates of the 1973 War Powers Resolution, which is an attack on our soil or our soldiers or one of our bases overseas. That hadn't happened.

It didn't even reach the fairytale predicate. Some people say, well, if there is an imminent threat, if the President thinks that we are going to be immediately attacked, then he can attack before they attack.

That is not a valid operational war theory, but it is one that is sometimes employed, so they were using that threshold in a Signal chat that was leaked. Do you remember this? I am a little bit worried when the leaders of our country are on Signal and have added a reporter to it. I am glad they did add that reporter because here is what we learned from the leaked Signal chat: There was no imminent threat.

Let me tell you who the people on that Signal chat were who decided there was no imminent threat: The CIA Director, our former colleague here from Texas, said there was no imminent threat, that it could be done later, that they needed, really, more time to figure out what the best targets were.

Who else said there was no imminent threat? Joe Kent from national intelligence said there was no imminent threat.

The Vice President himself said there was no imminent threat.

What did Peter Hegseth say in this Signal chat among these folks? He said we can pause it whenever we want. Let's go ahead and start, and we can pause whenever we want.

What does that tell you? He also knew there was no imminent threat.

Even this lower threshold doesn't meet the threshold of the War Powers Resolution of 1973—they didn't even meet the threshold they have created for themselves, which is imminent threat, and they acknowledged it unanimously in a Signal chat.

What did they do? The Secretary of Defense is in the Signal chat saying, well, it is going to look bad politically. We are going to look weak if we don't do this, so we have to do it now.

He was worried not about what was best for America but what would look bad in the news if it got out and they didn't attack. So that was my eighth Article of Impeachment as a fully participating Member of Congress.

I haven't heard anybody—I invite them to come down here and claim some time and rebut any of the eight articles. I haven't seen it. It is because they are legally correct, and we should be having this vote. We shouldn't be canceling Congress because of the optics.

I would implore my Republican colleagues, we are in the majority. Why are we whining about the SAVE Act? I voted for the SAVE Act two or three times, as many times as you want to put it on the floor. The Senate is not going to pass it, but we won the elections.

Why are we saying the elections were stolen if we won them all? We have a conservative majority in the Supreme Court. We have a Republican in the White House. We have a Republican majority here, a Republican majority in the Senate. We are complaining that the elections were stolen, and we are calling off Congress—calling off Congress—and we are in the majority?

I would implore my Republican colleagues to take that up with our leadership. I would implore all of us to take it up with the leadership. Why are we going to be denied a debate on whether this should be an impeachment or not?

□ 1410

Why are we going to be denied a debate on whether this should be an impeachment or not? There won't even be a debate. There should be a debate.

As a fully participating Member of Congress—and I have never said any of you weren't, even though the Speaker said that I wasn't. As fully participating Members of Congress, we should stay here for every day that is on the calendar, and we should debate until it takes—in the House, we are not like the Senate, we don't go on forever. It eventually ends, maybe a couple hours later.

A good, long debate would be about 4 hours here. That is the longest debate I have ever seen in the House. Let's debate it because the world is burning. This is a global issue. This isn't just about America. The price of fuel has gone up everywhere.

By the way, China is using their own oil reserves. Now, why would they do that? Why would they help us out? Why would they want to keep the price of oil lower than it otherwise would be if they didn't use their own oil reserves? It is because they want to buy our gold.

They are tired of buying our Treasury notes. They say: No, thank you. We will take no more of your paper. We want your gold. They are the payday lender in this war.

China says: I will tell you what we will do for you. We will keep the price of oil low, and we will buy some more gold while it is low and tracking the price of oil. That is what they are doing.

However, it is a global issue. The strait isn't just shut down for American farmers who are paying more for fertilizers, for American consumers who are paying $7 a gallon for diesel. It is over $6 now. I am afraid before the election it could hit $8 a gallon.

Why would we recess when we can do something about that? What is the thing we should do? We should walk away from that mess. We should have never got in it.

Will the strait be shut down to us? Yeah, probably for a while. There are other people who didn't bomb Iran. They will let them through. They can bring our fertilizer over. Then our farmers can make the food, and it won't be so damn expensive in the grocery store. The truckers could carry the food to the supermarket, and it won't be so damn expensive in the supermarket. That is what we should do.

We should also, while we are at it, bring our troops home. Shut down those bases. Iran's missiles cannot hit the United States. They cannot reach here. What can they reach? At least a hundred of our bases or bases that we use from other countries. We have put targets for them right inside the radius of their missiles.

When people say: Congressman MASSIE, why did you have to do this this week? I know that some of you are checking your watches, and you did that when I read the Articles of Impeachment. Oh, my gosh, Congressman MASSIE wants an hour of time. I have a fundraiser to go to. I have to get back and campaign. I have things to do. I have a dinner to get to. Why are you doing this now, Congressman MASSIE?

It is because we have exhausted all other opportunities to try to stop this war, right? We have done the concurrent resolution. We have said that the clock ran out on the War Powers Resolution 1973. We have done what we can do, and we can't do any more except to take Peter Hegseth out of that job.

It is a very polite solution. I am not even suggesting to call him a name or do anything to him or put him in jail. I am saying let him go back into the private sector. Let him do what these Secretaries of Defense always do. Let him go make his millions of dollars at some military contractor coming here and lobbying us to send more money overseas to countries like Israel.

Let him go on to those greener pastures that Secretaries of Defense typically go to, and let's get somebody who is competent. Let's get somebody who can do the job. Let's get somebody who doesn't follow illegal orders. Let's get somebody who doesn't degrade our ability to discriminate between civilian and military targets. Let's get somebody who operates under the rules of engagement that everybody in the world operates under unless they are some terrorist organization.

Let's go back to being a country that when we end up with prisoners, we don't shoot them. Let's go back to being that country. Let's get somebody who will uphold the honor, that will do things that keep our soldiers safe, not things that gamble their lives so that we can steal some oil from Venezuela.

These are the reasons that I implore you to at least debate, at least debate this War Powers Resolution, right? Would it be so tough to have a debate? I don't think it would be.

Now, listen, there are some things I know I am not going to get a lot of agreement on across the aisle, but these are things I work on and I am passionate about, and that is the right to keep and bear arms.

I introduced a bill called the National Constitutional Carry Act. As a fully participating Member of Congress, as a member of the Judiciary Committee, which has jurisdiction over the Second Amendment and the other bills in the Bill of Rights, I introduced something called the National Constitutional Carry Act. Twenty-nine States already acknowledge that if you are legally allowed to have that gun in that State, then you should be allowed to carry it somewhere legally.

We have these plans, these bills, to do reciprocity. Well, how do you do reciprocity between a State that requires a permit and a State that doesn't require a permit? I say, just let every State recognize that you have a God-given right, not a congressional-given right, not a Bill of Rights-given right, not a Declaration of Independence-given right. It is a God-given right—whoever your God is—a God-given right. It is a natural right if you don't have a God. You have a right to defend yourself.

I have been passionately working on bills like this, so much so that there is a line to take over this bill when I leave.

By the way, these bills I have written—I will tell you about another one, a raw milk bill. This one I R&D'ed. I ripped it off and duplicated it from Ron Paul. I am passionate about this. Not everybody is. I get it. You want your milk cooked, I want it raw, just like a steak.

I introduced this raw milk bill in Congress, one of the first bills I introduced. The lobbyists up here are so strong, the milk lobby came at me. They said there would be kids dying in the streets from this raw milk and that there weren't enough emergency rooms in the country if raw milk were legalized.

My late wife, Rhonda, saw all these Google alerts going off about how I was such a terrible guy for this raw milk bill. She texted me. She said: OMG, I didn't realize the lactose lobby was so intolerant.

All the lobbies are really intolerant if you threaten the existence of the fat cats who pay the lobbyists the money, who are making the money. I think Republicans and Democrats are to blame. We have got a uniparty here. As a fully participating Member of Congress—maybe that is what the Speaker meant, that I wasn't a fully participating member of the uniparty. Ah, it took me this long to figure it out when he insulted me in that way.

He is right. I have never participated in the uniparty up here, the uniparty that got rid of Country of Origin Labeling. That was a bipartisan bill. The uniparty that wants to take away your right to privacy, that is always a bipartisan vote. Unfortunately, there are more Democrats and Republicans against it than there are for it on most days.

I have never been a member of the uniparty. I have never been a fully participating member of the uniparty. This much is true. I have been a member of the American party.

We don't have an American party here, do we? I have one back home. My American party is the constituents that I have served for 14 years. What do they want? They want us to take care of our own veterans. Instead of sending money overseas to oligarchs in countries, rich dictators in other countries, they want to put America first.

□ 1420

They want us to do something about healthcare.

Whatever happened to that issue?

Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago, we used to fight about that all the time.

How are we going to get affordable healthcare?

I don't know. Let's nationalize it.

No. We need to know what the price of it is.

Mr. Speaker, when is the last time you heard one of those debates here?

Mr. Speaker, do you want to know why you don't hear that debate anymore?

It is because the uniparty doesn't want that debate. That is because both parties are taking money from the lobbyists that represent the insurance companies, and the insurance companies are the ones who made out the best on the Affordable Care Act.

However, I think the Americans, the American party, wants us to work on that. They want to know why it takes one-half week's pay to fill up their pickup truck. It shouldn't take that much. One-half of it is due to this stupid war that we shouldn't be involved in.

The reality is the price of fuel would still be high anyway because we are not doing the things that are required to bring down the price of everything.

Mr. Speaker, what is the thing that is driving the price of everything?

It is inflation. This is the thing that I have fought the hardest when I have been here in Congress. I wear a debt badge. I invented a debt badge that shows the debt. They won't let me wear it here while I am giving a speech.

I guess it would be too embarrassing if America could see our debt racking up on a Congressman's lapel while he is giving a speech.

Mr. Speaker, why do I wear that debt badge? Why have I worn it ever since I invented it?

It is because I want my colleagues to look at what we are doing, what we are doing to this country. We can't lower taxes and raise spending and have it all turn out well.

What do you get, Mr. Speaker?

You get what we got. You get high prices for healthcare, high prices for college, high prices for cars, high prices for food, and high prices for housing. We get double high prices for housing because the price of housing goes up and the interest rate goes up. If you look at your mortgage payment, Mr. Speaker, if you are a young person deciding you want to start out in your own nest and buy a house, you get double whacked.

The prices of houses have gone up because the price of inflation has caused the price of two-by-fours, drywall, the nails, everything that goes into a house to go up, and the fuel to get it there. It has also gone up because if you look at your mortgage, Mr. Speaker, interest rates have gone up.

Who caused that?

I hear the President begging the Federal Reserve to lower the interest rates. They can't do it, even if they wanted to. They have pulled on that lever so much to try to give us artificially low interest rates that it doesn't work anymore. The lever is broken.

Speaking of broken levers, people feel like their levers are broken, their voting levers. We hear that the elections have been stolen. Elections aren't stolen. We are in a Republic. Mr. Speaker, I will tell you where your vote gets stolen. It gets stolen up here on the day we elect our leadership.

What am I talking about?

You work hard, Mr. Speaker, you campaign for a candidate, or maybe you are working hard at something else and you just go vote for him and your guy or your gal wins, and they promise you all these things and they fight hard. A lot of people do get up here and fight hard, but they get dejected. That is because they get here as fully participating Members of Congress. They are very enthusiastic to represent their constituents, and they find out the game is rigged.

They have a choice really early on, January 3, at noon, a lot of new people, dozens. I hear in these elections there is going to be a lot of change, so there are going to be a lot of people here on January 3 to cast their first vote.

Mr. Speaker, what is the first vote you cast for?

It is your leadership, Mr. Speaker.

I think that is kind of a misnomer, an oxymoron. Our leaders have not been doing a very good job if we are looking at the rate of inflation, the debt, and the price of fuel. We call them leadership up here, Mr. Speaker, and so you elect somebody in a secure election, and they get up here where you can't watch them, and they realize the game is rigged, and so what do they do?

They say: Well, the game is rigged. They have offered me some table scraps if I give my voting card to the Speaker or the minority leader.

Mr. Speaker, what should I do?

I think I will give my voting card to the minority leader or the Speaker. Oh, don't get me wrong. We get a few hall passes.

We have to make it look good: Oh, we will let you go on this bill. We understand you have a tough district, and that you made some promises. We have enough votes. The uniparty has enough votes on this bill. We will let you vote how you want on this bill because we want you to come back because you are a good soldier. You do what you are told. You are compliant, and we like that.

That is what a lot of people up here are faced with. However, the day I got here and realized that this game was rigged, I said: I am not playing this game. I am going to tell people what is going on up here. I am going to tell people how they sell committee seats. Yes. It is actually kind of a misnomer. I shouldn't tell you the committee seats are for sale, Mr. Speaker. They are for rent. If they were for sale, maybe I could collect enough equity and get on to Ways and Means, but I don't want to pay the rent.

Mr. Speaker, that is what they tell you when you get here: Don't get on this A committee.

Why is the Veterans' Affairs Committee a C committee?

I know why they call it a C committee up here. It is because the veterans don't have money falling out of their pockets up here in Washington, D.C., when they come to visit. They are asking for better healthcare. They are asking for the people who are in the military to be treated right. That is the way it is.

People get up here, and the game is rigged. I decided not to play the game, and for 14 years, as a fully participating Member of Congress, contrary to what the Speaker who just canceled 2½ weeks of session said—by the way, we will have been in Congress I think 8 full days since July, between July and the election.

Isn't that crazy?

Mr. Speaker, where else can you get a job that pays almost $15,000 a month and benefits and some months you don't even have to come to work?

The months where you do come to work, Mr. Speaker, there are 3 weeks, but we call a week 4 days, and 4 days, well, we wouldn't have to travel on our own time, so 4 days is actually 2 days because we needed a day to get here and a day to go home, and 3 weeks is a month if we feel like working that month.

This was supposed to be one of those 3-week months, but it just became a 1-week month. That is because as a fully participating Member of Congress, I am trying to get justice for the Epstein survivors. I am trying to stop a war, a hot war where we don't care so much anymore about which are civilians and which are military targets. It is a hot war that could go nuclear.

Yes, that is why I did it this week. That is why you had to cancel your TV appearance or your fundraiser. I don't know, maybe you had a codel you were going to go to, Mr. Speaker. Maybe there is a jet over there at the military airport, and you were going to go to Italy or South America this week, Mr. Speaker, and go on a codel because your election is all locked up. You took all the right votes that the uniparty wanted, all the right lobbyists gave you the money that you needed to get on that A committee so that you could go home and look good.

Mr. Speaker, you did all the right things, you are cruising into your reelection, and maybe you are going to go on a junket this week. I don't know.

I do know this: There are people going on trips, and it ain't to go work for their constituents.

There probably will be a few planes missed. Everybody got excited when the Speaker cut a day off of this week. I know how that works. They have all booked three plane tickets out of this hellhole, and they don't plan to work a lick until after the election, when you are going to get $5,000.

Oh, I forgot to tell you this, Mr. Speaker. You are going to get $5,000, and so as a fully participating Member of Congress, I don't hide in the tunnel and run back to my office and hope I never see a reporter. I will walk out there, and they come on you like piranhas. They want you to say something where you can screw up and they can use it to political advantage.

I don't worry about what I say because I believe what I say. Nobody wrote me a speech today. I believe what I say. So when I go out there and talk to reporters, they ask me questions that nobody else will answer.

Sir: Why don't you do the $5,000 before the election?

By the way, Mr. Speaker, isn't that interesting?

The Republicans are running against socialism in November, and what are we proposing if we win?

It is socialism. Everybody is equal. We are going to take from the people who have more and give to the people who have less. Actually, we are going to give it to everybody.

I would say that I am a fully participating Member in spite of what the Speaker said. These are just a few of the things that I have done since I have been in Congress.

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

□ 1430

BILLION DOLLAR BOONDOGGLE ACT OF 2025

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 766) to require an annual report of taxpayer-funded projects that are over budget and behind schedule.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 766

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 ''Billion Dollar Boondoggle Act of 2025''.

SEC. 2. ANNUAL REPORT.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term ''covered agency'' means—

(A) an Executive agency, as defined in section 105 of title 5, United States Code; and

(B) an independent regulatory agency, as defined in section 3502 of title 44, United States Code;

(2) the term ''covered project'' means a project funded by a covered agency—

(A) that is more than 5 years behind schedule, as measured against the original expected date for completion; or

(B) for which the amount spent on the project is not less than $1,000,000,000 more than the original cost estimate for the project;

(3) the term ''Director'' means the Director of the Office of Management and Budget; and

(4) the term ''project'' means a major acquisition, a major defense acquisition program (as defined in section 4201 of title 10, United States Code), a procurement, a construction project, a remediation or clean-up effort, or any other time-limited endeavor, that is not funded through direct spending (as defined in section 250(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900(c))).

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) SUBMISSION.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall issue guidance requiring covered agencies to, on an annual basis, submit to the Director information relating to each covered project of the covered agency, which shall include—

(A) a brief description of the covered project, including—

(i) the purpose of the covered project;

(ii) each location in which the covered project is carried out;

(iii) the contract or award number of the covered project, where applicable;

(iv) the year in which the covered project was initiated;

(v) the Federal share of the total cost of the covered project; and

(vi) each primary contractor, subcontractor, grant recipient, and subgrantee recipient of the covered project;

(B) an explanation of any change to the original scope of the covered project, including by the addition or narrowing of the initial requirements of the covered project;

(C) the original expected date for completion of the covered project;

(D) the current expected date for completion of the covered project;

(E) the original cost estimate for the covered project, as adjusted to reflect increases in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers, as published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics;

(F) the current cost estimate for the covered project, as adjusted to reflect increases in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers, as published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics;

(G) an explanation for a delay in completion or an increase in the original cost estimate for the covered project, including, where applicable, any impact of insufficient or delayed appropriations; and

(H) the amount of and rationale for any award, incentive fee, or other type of bonus, if any, awarded for the covered project.

(2) REPORT.—The Director shall submit to Congress and post on the website of the Office of Management and Budget an annual report containing the information submitted under paragraph (1) for the relevant year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SUBRAMANYAM) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COMER. 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 measure.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, Congress cannot sit on the sidelines while government projects continue to soar above the cost projections and run behind schedule.

Each year, the Government Accountability Office reports on such projects, including Federal information technology programs and National Nuclear Security Administration projects. However, there are likely additional government boondoggles flying under the radar that are falling years behind schedule or running billions of dollars over budget.

The Billion Dollar Boondoggle Act would keep policymakers and the public better informed about government-funded projects that are significantly behind schedule or over budget. We cannot fix what we do not know is broken.

This bill directs agencies to report on projects that are more than 5 years behind schedule or have expenditures that are at least $1 billion more than the original cost estimate.

The Office of Management and Budget is then required to submit an annual report to Congress summarizing these troubled Federal projects.

Congress has a duty to oversee the Federal Government for inefficiency and waste. This bill informs policymakers and allows Congress to address failing government projects before further taxpayer dollars are misused.

I thank Representatives MILLER-MEEKS and ANSARI for their work on the House companion bill, which passed the House in July. I also thank Senator JONI ERNST for her work passing this important reform through the Senate. It is time to get this bill sent to the President's desk.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 766, the Billion Dollar Boondoggle Act, as well.

Congress has a duty to ensure taxpayer dollars are spent efficiently, transparently, and with real accountability for results. Federal programs often fall behind schedule or go way over budget without Congress' knowledge.

This bill simply requires that Congress be notified anytime a project is 5 years behind schedule or a billion dollars over budget. That seems like a lot, but right now there are actually projects out there that are over $100 billion over budget and over 5 years behind schedule. This is the least we can do to make sure that we are protecting taxpayer dollars and that Congress knows about it when we are over budget and behind schedule.

The required reports to Congress will include explanations of any changes to a project's scope, cost estimate, or completion date, and this will help Congress perform critical oversight on behalf of the American people. It will also keep projects on time and on budget.

This is a bipartisan fix that increases fiscal responsibility. I thank Representatives ANSARI and MILLER-MEEKS for their work on the House companion to this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important bipartisan and bicameral government reform bill that will ensure the necessary oversight takes place. Only when Congress and the public have better visibility into these mismanaged government projects will we be able to avoid such boondoggles in the future.

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

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. Mr. Speaker, I also ask that my colleagues support S. 766, the Billion Dollar Boondoggle Act, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 766.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOMMENDING THAT THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FIND LEON D. BLACK IN CONTEMPT OF CONGRESS FOR REFUSAL TO COMPLY WITH SUBPOENAS DULY ISSUED BY THE COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution printed in House Report 119–831, regarding proceedings against Leon D. Black, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 1543

Resolved, That Leon D. Black shall be found to be in contempt of Congress for failure to comply with a congressional deposition subpoena issued to him on June 26, 2026.

Resolved, That Leon D. Black shall be found in contempt of Congress for failure to comply with a congressional subpoena for production of documents issued to him on June 26, 2026.

Resolved, That pursuant to 2 U.S.C. §§192 and 194, the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall certify the report of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, detailing the refusal of Leon D. Black to appear for a deposition before the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and produce documents to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform as directed by these subpoenas, to the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that Leon D. Black be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House shall otherwise take all appropriate action to enforce these subpoenas.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COLONEL EDWARD SHAMES POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 7365) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1225 Kempsville Road in Virginia Beach, Virginia, as the ''Colonel Edward Shames Post Office Building''.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 7365

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

SECTION 1. COLONEL EDWARD SHAMES POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1225 Kempsville Road in Virginia Beach, Virginia, shall be known and designated as the ''Colonel Edward Shames Post Office Building''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Colonel Edward Shames Post Office Building''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SUBRAMANYAM) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COMER. 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 measure.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill, which would rename a post office in Virginia Beach, Virginia, for Colonel Edward Shames.

Shames was born in Norfolk, Virginia, in 1922. Shortly after the United States entered World War II, he enlisted in the U.S. Army and volunteered for airborne training.

He was one of the brave men who parachuted into Normandy during the D-Day invasion on June 6, 1944.

He later served as an officer in Easy Company, engaging in some of the war's most brutal and consequential operations, including Operation Market Garden in the Netherlands and the Battle of the Bulge in Belgium.

Shames was awarded the Purple Heart and Bronze Star for his bravery and leadership.

Following the war, he continued his dedication to national security by serving as a specialist in Middle East affairs and remaining in the U.S. Army Reserve.

Shames retired from the Army in 1973 with the rank of colonel. He was an active member of the Virginia Beach community and an advocate for veterans and military remembrance.

Mr. Speaker, I call on my House colleagues to support this bill honoring a heroic representative of the Greatest Generation. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today also in support of H.R. 7365 to name the post office in Virginia Beach, Virginia, the Colonel Edward Shames Post Office Building. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this bill.

Colonel Shames was raised in Norfolk, Virginia, the youngest of four brothers and sisters.

At just 20 years old, Shames enlisted in the U.S. Army and later joined the 506th Parachute Infantry Regiment. On D-Day, he made his first combat jump in Normandy.

Shames continued to fight in World War II, participating in the Battle of the Bulge and traveling to Germany, where he saw the horror of Nazi concentration camps.

After serving in World War II, Shames spent decades working for the NSA before retiring to his home in Virginia Beach.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1440

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. KIGGANS).

Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, H.R. 7365, which would designate the United States Post Office located at 1225 Kempsville Road in Virginia Beach as the Colonel Edward D. Shames Post Office Building.

Colonel Shames was a proud Virginian, a decorated World War II veteran, and a member of one the most storied units in American military history: Easy Company of the 506th Parachute Infantry Regiment, 101st Airborne Division.

Colonel Shames enlisted in the Army in 1942 and volunteered to become a paratrooper. On June 6, 1944, he parachuted into Normandy as part of the D-Day invasion. During the Normandy campaign, his leadership under fire earned him a battlefield commission, and he would go on to serve as an officer in Easy Company.

He fought in Operation Market Garden, endured the brutal Battle of the Bulge at Bastogne, and participated in the Allied advance into Germany.

For his courage and sacrifice in combat, Colonel Shames was awarded the Bronze Star and the Purple Heart. The remarkable story of Easy Company would later become known around the world through Stephen Ambrose's ''Band of Brothers'' and the television series it inspired.

Colonel Shames' service to our country did not end with World War II. He continued serving in the Army Reserves and in our national security community before retiring with the rank of colonel in 1973.

He eventually made Virginia Beach his home, where he remained an active member of our community and a strong advocate for veterans and military remembrance.

When Colonel Shames passed away in 2021 at the age of 99, he was the last surviving officer of Easy Company.

Mr. Speaker, in Hampton Roads, we understand that the freedoms we enjoy today were secured by generations of Americans who answered the call to serve. Colonel Edward D. Shames was one of those Americans. By placing his name on the Kempsville Road post office, we can ensure that his story and the courage, sacrifice, and patriotism of the Greatest Generation he represented continues to be remembered by the Virginia Beach community for generations to come.

I am proud that this legislation has received bipartisan support, and I thank my colleagues for helping us bring it to the House floor today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 7365 to help us provide this lasting tribute to a distinguished Virginia veteran and American hero.

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Virginia for this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support this bill naming a post office for Colonel Edward Shames, a decorated combat veteran and devoted public servant.

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

Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, H.R. 7365, which would designate the United States Post Office located at 1225 Kempsville Road in Virginia Beach as the Colonel Edward D. Shames Post Office Building.

Colonel Shames was a proud Virginian, a decorated World War II veteran, and a member of one of the most storied units in American military history: Easy Company of the 506th Parachute Infantry Regiment, 101st Airborne Division. Colonel Shames enlisted in the Army in 1942 and volunteered to become a paratrooper.

On June 6, 1944, he parachuted into Normandy as part of the D-Day invasion. During the Normandy campaign, his leadership under fire earned him a battlefield commission, and he would go on to serve as an officer in Easy Company.

He fought in Operation Market Garden, endured the brutal Battle of the Bulge at Bastogne, and participated in the Allied advance into Germany. For his courage and sacrifice in combat, Colonel Shames was awarded the Bronze Star and Purple Heart.

The remarkable story of Easy Company would later become known around the world through Stephen Ambrose's Band of Brothers and the television series it inspired. But Colonel Shames' service to our country did not end with World War II.

He continued serving in the Army Reserve and in our national security community before retiring with the rank of colonel in 1973, He eventually made Virginia Beach his home, where he remained an active member of our community and a strong advocate for veterans and military remembrance. When Colonel Shames passed away in 2021 at the age of 99, he was the last surviving officer of Easy Company.

Mr. Speaker, in Hampton Roads, we understand that the freedoms we enjoy today were secured by generations of Americans who answered the call to serve. Colonel Edward D. Shames was one of those Americans.

By placing his name on the Kempsville Road Post Office, we can ensure that his story, and the courage, sacrifice, and patriotism of the Greatest Generation he represented, continues to be remembered by the Virginia Beach community for generations to come. I am proud that this legislation has received bipartisan support, and I thank my colleagues for helping us bring it to the House floor today.

I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 7365 and help us provide this lasting tribute to a distinguished Virginia veteran and American hero.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 7365.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TUSKEGEE AIRMEN MEMORIAL POST OFFICE

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6006) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 401 North Elm Street in Tuskegee, Alabama, as the ''Tuskegee Airmen Memorial Post Office''.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6006

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

SECTION 1. TUSKEGEE AIRMEN MEMORIAL POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 401 North Elm Street in Tuskegee, Alabama, shall be known and designated as the ''Tuskegee Airmen Memorial Post Office''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Tuskegee Airmen Memorial Post Office''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SUBRAMANYAM) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COMER. 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 measure.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill which would rename a post office in Tuskegee, Alabama, for the Tuskegee Airmen.

The Tuskegee Airmen played a vital part in American history as the first African-American military aviators in the United States Armed Forces. The program was established in 1941 and trained nearly 1,000 African-American pilots in Tuskegee, Alabama, among thousands of other support personnel.

These men bravely participated in consequential combat roles during World War II, including more than 15,000 missions and earning over 150 distinguished Flying Crosses.

These dedicated warfighters became widely recognized for their exceptional combat during World War II. The Tuskegee Airmen were awarded the Congressional Gold Medal in 2007 in remembrance of their military service, which helped pave the way for the desegregation of the military after World War II.

I call on my House colleagues to support this bill in honor of the Tuskegee Airmen and their courage, sacrifice, and achievements.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 6006, to name a post office in Tuskegee, Alabama, the Tuskegee Airmen Memorial Post Office.

I want to say a few things about the Tuskegee Airmen. They were honorably serving our country during World War II, and that included 1,000 Black pilots who trained at the segregated Tuskegee Army Airfield out of the Tuskegee Institute in Alabama starting in 1941.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. FIGURES).

Mr. FIGURES: Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on my bill, H.R. 6006, to rename the post office location in my district, in Tuskegee, Alabama, after some of the most heroic and impactful servicemembers in the storied history of our military and our country: the Tuskegee Airmen.

Beginning in 1941, thousands of men and women were trained at Tuskegee Institute's Moton Field and the Tuskegee Army Airfield to serve in America's African-American Air Force units during World War II.

During that time, almost 1,000 aviators were trained as America's first African-American military pilots. More than 10,000 military and civilian African-American men and women served as everything from flight instructors and officers, to bombardiers, navigators, radio techs, mechanics, air traffic controllers, parachute riggers, electrical and communication specialists, medical professionals, musicians, firefighting personnel, and so much more.

This history matters, and we can never forget it, particularly at a time in this administration where we recently saw efforts to remove the Tuskegee Airmen from the Air Force training materials. Fortunately, we were able to push back against that effort in a bipartisan way to rectify that.

The Tuskegee Airmen played a significant role in not just this Nation's safety and security, but in this world. This world literally would not look the way it looks today absent the contributions, sacrifices, and service of the Tuskegee Airmen. Actions from these men and women highlight the need to document this rich history and memorialize these men and women every chance we get.

We cannot forget that this is the same community, Tuskegee, where George Washington Carver conducted groundbreaking agricultural research, where Booker T. Washington did so much to influence the future of African Americans throughout the South, and where generations of Americans continue to fight for civil rights and equality.

I am honored to represent this community. Tuskegee is part of my district, the Second Congressional District of the State of Alabama. I can assure you that my constituents are proud of their history and want it to be celebrated and recognized. Renaming this post office in Tuskegee is a fantastic way to honor the Tuskegee Airmen.

A post office is one of those places where the Federal Government intersects with people in their everyday lives. Post offices are cornerstones in so many communities, particularly in rural communities like Tuskegee.

Residents of Tuskegee will walk through the doors of this location to mail a package, pay a bill, receive correspondence, or perhaps even correspond with my office. When they do, they will see the name Tuskegee Airmen Memorial Post Office, and they will be reminded of the rich history that belongs to the community they call home. They will be reminded that their home played a role in determining the future of our Nation.

The Tuskegee Airmen helped move this country forward and this world forward, and my bill is a simple, yet powerful way of honoring their contributions to our Nation. The Tuskegee Airmen earned their place in American history, and it is our responsibility to make sure that that place is never diminished or forgotten.

The legacy of the airmen goes well beyond the State of Alabama, which is why I also introduced the bipartisan Tuskegee Airmen Memorial Act, which I introduced with the entire delegation from the State of Alabama. It would authorize the establishment of a memorial here in Washington, D.C., to commemorate the service, sacrifice, and enduring legacy of the Tuskegee Airmen.

I would like to thank Tuskegee Airmen, Incorporated; all of the national chapters of Tuskegee Airmen, Incorporated; leadership at Tuskegee University; the City of Tuskegee; Macon County; my colleagues in the Alabama delegation; and especially Congressman GARY PALMER of the Oversight Committee for helping advance this legislation.

This is something that is very meaningful to us in Alabama. It truly is. Just last September, we recognized the passing of Lieutenant Colonel George Hardy, who was the last surviving Tuskegee Airman who flew combat missions in World War II.

□ 1450

It literally was the end of an era. It was the end of a very important era in this Nation's history and in this world's history. This is just another way to honor the life and legacy and sacrifice of so many who paid so much for this country and this world to be what it is.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES), the minority leader.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from the Commonwealth of Virginia for yielding and for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the underlying bill to honor the heroic, brave, and patriotic Tuskegee Airmen, part of the Greatest Generation, who stood up against fascism, authoritarianism, and the forces that were trying to bring about totalitarianism all across Europe and to the rest of the world.

We can learn and be inspired by the courage, the character, and the conviction of the Tuskegee Airmen. It is unfortunate that some in this administration are trying to erase their history, but that history is not just Black history. It is American history. We will never let it be erased. We must continue to be informed by it, encouraged by it, and inspired by it.

As I was thinking about this on the way over, I am certainly so thankful to Congressman SHOMARI FIGURES for his leadership in advancing this legislation and for continuing, in every possible way, to stand up for his constituents of every race in the great State of Alabama. As I was thinking about the Tuskegee Airmen and the Greatest Generation who rescued the world from Adolf Hitler, Nazi Germany, and fascism, I thought how ironic it is that we are on the floor today debating legislation with respect to Russia, Vladimir Putin, and their horrific invasion of Ukraine.

House Democrats, led by Speaker PELOSI and Leader HOYER and many others, have been at the forefront of standing up for the people of Ukraine, pushing back against the effort to run them over, pushing back against tyranny and propaganda and the horrors that have been inflicted on them by Vladimir Putin and this war of aggression that Russia has launched.

We will continue to, at all times, stand behind the Ukrainian people, support their courage, and their bravery in their fight, an existential one, against Vladimir Putin and Russia.

We believe it is a fight not just for their territorial integrity but it is also a battle of the forces of democracy versus the forces of autocracy, the forces of freedom versus the forces of tyranny, and the forces of truth versus the forces of propaganda.

The United States of America has always stood on the side of democracy, freedom, and truth, which is why we must always continue to stand on the side of the Ukrainian people. That is our pledge as House Democrats. We have been there with the Ukrainian people from the very beginning. This legislation that will be before us today, unfortunately, in my view, does not accomplish the objectives that some may, in good faith in this House or over in the Senate, be trying to accomplish.

All of us, I believe, certainly House Democrats, will continue to stand up for the Ukrainian people, but the manner in which this bill has been written doesn't require the President of the United States to impose sanctions on Russia.

In fact, there are so many loopholes written into the bill, I believe, that it is very unlikely that the sanctions relief contemplated in the legislation will ever see the light of day. That is particularly the case because President Trump has shown great reluctance, over the 10 years that he has been in our faces here in the United States of America, to actually side with the Ukrainian people.

He recently blamed Ukraine for the increase in diesel prices. No. Diesel prices have increased because of the President's reckless and costly war of choice in Iran.

He suggested that somehow President Zelenskyy, who has been a brave and courageous wartime leader, and the Ukrainian people have visited the horror, the terror, the war upon themselves. No. One person bears responsibility for it: Vladimir Putin.

Many of us wonder why the President has been so reluctant to aggressively confront the bully of Eastern Europe. One of the things we have learned from the Tuskegee Airmen, from the great leaders of that time, from the Greatest Generation, from FDR, and from Churchill is that you have to confront the bully, not appease the bully.

We find ourselves, once again, in 2026, just like the Tuskegee Airmen found themselves in the early to mid-1940s in the FDR-Churchill versus Chamberlain moment, you are either going to confront the bully or appease the bully. That is what Chamberlain did. When you appease the bully, it doesn't work out.

We learned that lesson, or should have, in 1939. Yet, we find ourselves at this moment in time, some, including the highest reaches of the Federal Government in the executive branch, seemingly more interested in appeasing Vladimir Putin, not confronting him.

That is why I have real concerns. I am not in a position to support this legislation, notwithstanding the fact that I am proud to represent more Ukrainian Americans than any other Member of Congress in the country.

Back home in south Brooklyn and Coney Island and in Brighton Beach, an incredible patriotic community, I say to my constituents that we will continue to stand with the Ukrainian people in Ukraine until victory is won, but this legislation does not provide a path to secure that.

Worse yet, what this legislation will do is give Donald Trump perhaps unfettered authority to unleash tariffs on the American people in ways that have already cost everyday Americans thousands of dollars in additional expense per year.

In the middle of an affordability crisis that is not a hoax, it is very real, and where far too many people in this country are working hard, playing by the rules and can't thrive, can barely survive in this failed economy, with life way too expensive in the United States of America, why in the world would this Congress or the people's House give this President unfettered authority to visit more tariffs on the world that will have an adverse economic impact on the American people?

I can't do it because I am standing up for everyday Americans who are suffering in this failed economy with a President who promised to lower costs on day one. Costs haven't gone down in America. Costs have gone up.

□ 1500

One of the reasons they have gone up is because of the Trump tariffs that have increased costs on everyday Americans, thousands of additional dollars in expense per year—on groceries, on goods, on cars, even on homeownership.

So why in the world would this Congress give this President additional authority to visit that kind of economic harm on the American people?

So, respectfully, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the bill related to Ukrainian sanctions on the floor today because substantively it will not accomplish the objective, which is to stand with the American people, stand with the Ukrainian people, stand with democracy, stand with freedom, stand with truth, and push back against tyranny. This bill, at the same time, could give the President an additional tool to visit economic harm on the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Alabama for bringing this legislation honoring the Tuskegee Airmen.

And at this moment in time, where we see renewed tyranny coming out of eastern Europe by Vladimir Putin and Russian aggression, let's summon the courage, the character, and the conviction that the Greatest Generation showed and not appease the bully but confront the bully until victory is won.

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

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close.

Mr. Speaker, I am afraid our last speaker was confused. This is a bill about a post office, not about Ukraine.

But, at any rate, I encourage my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CRAWFORD). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 6006.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GIL WHITNEY POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 8193) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 189 East Main Street in Xenia, Ohio, as the ''Gilman 'Gil' Whitney Post Office Building,'' as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 8193

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

SECTION 1. GIL WHITNEY POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 189 East Main Street in Xenia, Ohio, shall be known and designated as the ''Gil Whitney Post Office Building''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Gil Whitney Post Office Building''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SUBRAMANYAM) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COMER. 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 measure.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER), the sponsor of the bill, for the opening statement.

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 8193, my bill to designate the U.S. postal facility on East Main Street in Xenia, Ohio, as the Gil Whitney Post Office.

On April 3, 1974, a dangerous and deadly tornado formed in Southwest Ohio in the community of Xenia. The community of Xenia was directly in its path.

Understanding the severity of the situation and immediately understanding the danger to every member of the community, a local weatherman, Gil Whitney, took control of broadcasting for WHIO and told the residents of Xenia, Ohio, to seek shelter minutes before the tornado reached the town.

Gil Whitney's urgent and timely warning reached the families throughout Xenia just in time before the tornado struck. It gave of the residents opportunity to seek shelter and prepare for the tornado. Without Gil Whitney, the entire community would have been caught completely off guard.

The tornado was devastating. It proved to be one of the most dangerous storms in our region's history. Over 30 people died that day. Many more were injured. More than half of Xenia was destroyed.

The same post office that this bill renames was damaged in the tornado. However, without Gil Whitney's warning, the casualty numbers would have been exponentially and catastrophically higher in Xenia, Ohio.

To this day, many residents of Xenia remember Gil Whitney's warning and credit him with saving them and their families. He is truly a hero for the Miami Valley community.

Mr. Speaker, I thank each of my colleagues in Ohio's delegation for joining me in introducing this legislation to honor Gil Whitney, which will allow the community he rescued to continue to remember his heroism.

I also thank Gil Whitney's children—Gil Jr., John, and Jennifer—for the opportunity to honor their father in this way.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today also in support of H.R. 8193 to name the post office in Xenia, Ohio, the Gil Whitney Post Office Building.

Gil Whitney was a trusted source of news for the community of Dayton, where he served as a local broadcaster and a weatherman for more than a decade until his passing in 1982.

He was posthumously inducted into the Dayton Broadcasters Hall of Fame, in part for his efforts to warn the community ahead of the April 3, 1974, tornado. His crucial warnings saved lives.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close.

Again, I urge passage of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support this bill naming a post office for Gil Whitney for his numerous contributions to his community, and I appreciate the sponsor of the bill the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER).

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 8193, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 189 East Main Street in Xenia, Ohio, as the 'Gil Whitney Post Office Building'.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANCIS C. FLAHERTY POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 9570) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 117 West Lovett Street in Charlotte, Michigan, as the ''Francis C. Flaherty Post Office Building.''

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 9570

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

SECTION 1. FRANCIS C. FLAHERTY POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 117 West Lovett Street in Charlotte, Michigan, shall be known and designated as the ''Francis C. Flaherty Post Office Building''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Francis C. Flaherty Post Office Building''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SUBRAMANYAM) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COMER. 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 measure.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARRETT), the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, H.R. 9570, to designate the post office in my hometown of Charlotte, Michigan, after Francis Flaherty, a decorated war hero who sacrificed himself to save others during the attacks on Pearl Harbor nearly 85 years ago.

Francis Charles Flaherty was born on March 15, 1919, in Charlotte, Michigan. He grew up on East Harris Street and was a parishioner at St. Mary's Catholic Church, the same parish that my family and I attend today.

This portrait of Francis Flaherty hangs just outside of our parish hall.

After graduating from Charlotte High School, he went on to study at the University of Michigan, and after graduating was commissioned as an ensign in the Navy in December of that year.

On December 7, 1941, Flaherty, at the young age of 22, was on board the USS *Oklahoma* when the attacks on Pearl Harbor began.

During the attacks, the battleship was struck by multiple torpedoes and began to overturn. Although the order to evacuate had been given, Flaherty remained inside the ship's turrets, holding a flashlight, and allowing others to escape while he stayed behind.

□ 1510

Eventually, the USS *Oklahoma* rolled over completely. He became trapped inside the hull, going down with the ship.

Flaherty was 1 of 429 men who sank in the USS *Oklahoma*. After the ship was raised in 1943, his unidentified remains were interred in the National Memorial Cemetery in Honolulu.

For his heroic actions, he was posthumously awarded the Medal of Honor, as well as the Purple Heart.

Ensign Flaherty is the reason that the death count was not higher, for the lives that he saved. Because of his selfless sacrifices, fellow sailors lived to continue the fight.

For those of us in Charlotte, Francis Flaherty truly is the definition of a hometown hero. Through a miraculous occasion, his remains were eventually identified using DNA technology nearly 80 years after his death, and his family and our community then brought him home.

I was honored to play a part in that effort. On August 21, 2021, thousands of people from Charlotte and across Michigan came together in a solemn procession through town for a man they never had the chance to meet, concluding with the burial in Maple Hill Cemetery. We finally laid Ensign Flaherty to rest in Charlotte alongside his parents.

That same year, I led the effort to rename a portion of M–50 through Charlotte the Ensign Francis Flaherty Memorial Highway. That bill passed the Michigan Legislature unanimously, and this bill, H.R. 9570, can honor him once again.

Naming the post office in Charlotte the ''Francis C. Flaherty Post Office Building'' is another small token of our Nation's and our community's eternal gratitude for his selfless devotion to duty, exceptional bravery, and the ultimate sacrifice he made for our Nation.

I thank the entire Michigan delegation for joining this bipartisan effort to honor Ensign Flaherty and memorialize his bravery during one of the most tragic events in our Nation's history, and special thanks to Senator PETERS, who is committed to moving this bill through the Senate. Finally, I thank Ensign Flaherty's family for working with me to make this a reality.

Stories like his deserve to be told and honored, and his family has been committed to doing just that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 9570.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today also in support of H.R. 9570 to name the post office in Charlotte, Michigan, the ''Francis C. Flaherty Post Office Building.''

Francis Flaherty was an officer of the United States Naval Reserve from Charlotte, Michigan, and he was serving aboard the USS *Oklahoma* in Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, when the Japanese attacked the naval base.

He gave his own life to save others, and he was posthumously awarded the Medal of Honor for his courage and sacrifice.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this bill to honor Francis Flaherty, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. Mr. Speaker, I also urge passage of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 9570.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAFE CLOUD STORAGE ACT

Ms. LEE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 7834) to limit liability for certain entities storing child sexual abuse material for law enforcement agencies, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 7834

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 ''Safe Cloud Storage Act''.

SEC. 2. STORAGE OF CHILD PORNOGRAPHY, CHILD OBSCENITY, AND INTIMATE VISUAL DEPICTIONS OF MINORS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title II of the PROTECT Our Children Act of 2008 (34 U.S.C. 21101 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 201 the following:

''SEC. 202. MODERNIZING LAW ENFORCEMENT'S ABILITY TO STORE CHILD PORNOGRAPHY, CHILD OBSCENITY, AND INTIMATE VISUAL DEPICTIONS OF MINORS AND LIMITED LIABILITY FOR APPROVED VENDORS.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) APPROVED VENDOR.—The term 'approved vendor' means a cloud service provider that—

''(A) complies with the security requirements described in subsection (c); and

''(B) has been contractually retained by a covered agency to support the duties of such agency by—

''(i) storing digital child pornography, child obscenity, or an intimate visual depiction of a minor;

''(ii) making such child pornography, child obscenity, or intimate visual depiction of a minor available to the contracting agency, or any law enforcement or prosecutorial agency designated by the contracting agency, upon request; and

''(iii) providing maintenance, technical and analytical assistance, and forensic tool processing support upon request by the contracting agency.

''(2) CHILD PORNOGRAPHY.—The term 'child pornography' has the meaning given that term in section 2256(8) of title 18, United States Code.

''(3) CLOUD SERVICE PROVIDER.—The term 'cloud service provider' means an organization, corporation, or entity that makes available digital storage services, including remote or cloud-based storage, and analytical and forensic tool processing support.

''(4) COVERED AGENCY.—The term 'covered agency' means a Federal, State, Tribal, or local law enforcement or prosecutorial agency.

''(5) INTIMATE VISUAL DEPICTION OF A MINOR.—The term 'intimate visual depiction of a minor' means an intimate visual depiction, as defined in section 223(h) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 223(h)), including a digital forgery, of an identifiable individual who is a minor, as that term is defined in such section.

''(6) LOCAL.—The term 'local' means any political subdivision of a State.

''(7) STATE.—The term 'State' means any of the 50 States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands of the United States, Guam, American Samoa, or the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

''(b) LIMITED LIABILITY FOR APPROVED VENDORS.—

''(1) LIMITED LIABILITY FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT APPROVED VENDORS.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a civil claim or criminal charge may not be brought in any Federal or State court against an approved vendor relating to the approved vendor's performance of any contractual obligation or service described in subsection (a)(1).

''(2) INTENTIONAL, RECKLESS, OR OTHER MISCONDUCT.—A civil claim or criminal charge may be brought in any Federal or State court against an approved vendor if the approved vendor—

''(A) engaged in—

''(i) intentional misconduct; or

''(ii) negligent conduct; or

''(B) acted, or failed to act—

''(i) with actual malice;

''(ii) with reckless disregard to a substantial risk of causing injury without legal justification; or

''(iii) for a purpose unrelated to the performance of any responsibility or function described in subsection (a)(1)(B).

''(c) VENDOR CYBERSECURITY REQUIREMENTS.—With respect to any child pornography, child obscenity, or intimate visual depiction of a minor stored, maintained, or processed by an approved vendor, such approved vendor shall—

''(1) secure such child pornography, child obscenity, or intimate visual depiction of a minor in a manner that is consistent with the most recent version of the Cybersecurity Framework developed by the National Institute of Standards and Technology, or any successor thereto;

''(2) only access the child pornography, child obscenity, or intimate visual depiction of a minor upon consent of the covered agency contracting the service and for the purpose of providing maintenance, technical assistance, and forensic tool processing support in the cloud;

''(3) minimize the number of employees that may be able to obtain access to such child pornography, child obscenity, or intimate visual depiction of a minor and maintain a list of employees who have obtained such access;

''(4) employ end-to-end encryption for data storage and transfer functions, or an equivalent technological standard;

''(5) undergo an independent annual cybersecurity audit to determine whether such child pornography, child obscenity, or intimate visual depiction of a minor is secured as required by paragraphs (1), (3), and (4), including by assessing compliance with the National Institute of Standards and Technology Special Publication 800–53, Revision 5 (relating to security and privacy controls for information systems and organizations) or any successor documents or revisions; and

''(6) promptly address all issues identified by an audit described in paragraph (5).

''(d) EVIDENCE STORAGE.—Any covered agency that stores child pornography, child obscenity, or an intimate visual depiction of a minor pursuant to a contract with an approved vendor shall retain such evidence—

''(1) in compliance with the security policy of the Criminal Justice Information Services Division of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, or any other similar and appropriate division within the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

''(2) for a period consistent with the evidence retention requirements applicable to the covered agency under the relevant Federal, State, or local law, rule of criminal procedure, or prosecutorial policy; or

''(3) in the absence of such law, rule, or policy, for a period not less than the applicable statute of limitations or the duration of any sentence imposed, including the period of post-conviction review.

''(e) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR APPROVED VENDORS.—

''(1) LOCATION OF DATA.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), each approved vendor shall ensure that any child pornography, child obscenity, or intimate visual depiction of a minor stored pursuant to this section remains in the United States.

''(B) EXCEPTION.—Child pornography, child obscenity, and intimate visual depictions of a minor stored under this section may be transferred outside the United States only with the express consent of the contracting covered agency if such agency deems the transfer necessary for investigative purposes.

''(2) NOTIFICATION LETTER.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Approved vendors shall file a notification letter with the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice not later than 30 days after entering into a contract described in subsection (a)(1)(B).

''(B) CONTENTS.—The notification letter described in subparagraph (A) shall include the entity name and point of contact information of the approved vendor, the name of the contracting covered agency, the period of performance of the contract, and an acknowledgment by the approved vendor that the approved vendor will notify the Child Exploitation and Obscenity Section of the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice of any changes to the information in the letter.

''(3) BREACH OF CONTRACT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If a covered agency fails to make required payment under a contract, breaches any material term of such contract, or otherwise terminates such contract without establishing lawful transfer of the evidence, the approved vendor shall, not later than 30 days after the failure, breach, or termination, notify the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice in the case of a breach by a Federal agency, or the appropriate State attorney general in the case of a breach by a State or local agency.

''(B) MAINTENANCE OF EVIDENCE.—Upon making a notification under subparagraph (A), the approved vendor shall continue to preserve and maintain the integrity of the evidence until a prompt and lawful transfer of custody occurs to the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice or another Federal, State, or local law enforcement agency with jurisdiction.

''(f) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to—

''(1) limit bona fide use by the contracting covered agency of child pornography, child obscenity, or intimate visual depiction of a minor being stored by the approved vendor, which includes providing such child pornography, child obscenity, or intimate visual depiction of a minor to any other party as necessary for an investigation or prosecution;

''(2) limit the obligation of the contracting covered agency to comply with a constitutional or statutory obligation, court order, or request from a victim made pursuant to section 3509(m)(3) of title 18, United States Code; or

''(3) authorize or require the audit, assessment, or compliance verification of a governmental entity or any system administered by a governmental entity.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 1(b) of the PROTECT Our Children Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–401; 122 Stat. 4229) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 201 the following:

''Sec. 202. Modernizing law enforcement's ability to store child pornography, child obscenity, and intimate visual depictions of minors and limited liability for approved vendors.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. LEE) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. LEE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 7834.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. LEE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bipartisan legislation, the Safe Cloud Storage Act.

Every day, law enforcement officers across this country confront some of the most disturbing crimes imaginable. They work to identify children who are being sexually exploited, rescue victims from ongoing abuse, and find and prosecute the predators who are responsible.

I know something about that work firsthand. Before coming to Congress, I served as a Federal prosecutor, where I worked on cases involving the exploitation of children. I went on to serve my State as a judge and continued to preside and adjudicate in cases and circumstances where children were endangered.

Those experiences taught me that the best ideas for improving our laws come from the men and women who enforce them every day. They know where investigations encounter obstacles. They know which tools work, which ones do not, and what Congress must do to help them protect victims and bring offenders to justice.

The Safe Cloud Storage Act is a direct response to what the men and women of law enforcement told us they need. Crimes against children increasingly occur online, generating enormous volumes of digital evidence. Yet, many investigators are forced to store and process that evidence using thumb drives, external hard drives, and local servers. These outdated systems have limited capacity, create unnecessary costs, and can slow investigations in which every hour matters.

Law enforcement needs modern tools for modern investigations. We know that with the right cybersecurity standards and safeguards in place, secure digital storage can help investigators manage large volumes of evidence, coordinate more effectively, build stronger cases, and preserve sensitive evidence more securely.

The Safe Cloud Storage Act establishes a trusted framework for vetted, law enforcement-approved technology providers to assist with this work while meeting rigorous cybersecurity and evidence storage standards.

This legislation will give law enforcement access to the modern capabilities they need while ensuring that some of the most sensitive evidence they handle is protected with the security and seriousness it demands.

This legislation builds upon the bipartisan REPORT Act, which was signed into law in 2024. That law strengthened the requirements for reporting online child exploitation evidence and modernized protections for those working with the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children.

The Safe Cloud Storage Act is the next step in allowing trusted technology providers to work directly with law enforcement so that investigators can use secure, modern systems to pursue these cases.

Mr. Speaker, when a child is being exploited, delay is not an abstraction. It can mean another day that a child remains in danger and another opportunity for a predator to evade justice. When investigators tell us that an outdated law is standing between them and a tool that could help rescue children, Congress should listen and act. That is what this bill does.

I am grateful to the ranking member and Representatives COHEN, DEAN, and KNOTT for joining me in leading this bipartisan effort and to the members of the Judiciary Committee for advancing it unanimously.

The men and women who pursue child predators deserve laws that support their work, technology that meets the demands of modern investigations, and a Congress willing to take action.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the Safe Cloud Storage Act, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bipartisan Safe Cloud Storage Act, and I salute the gentlewoman from Florida for her leadership on this legislation.

For more than a decade, we have seen exponential growth in the volume of child sexual abuse images and videos, or CSAM, and child obscenity material that offenders distribute and share online, and our law enforcement agencies have struggled to keep up with it all.

This legislation will allow cloud service providers to work with law enforcement to maintain and store relevant evidence in a safe and secure way. When CSAM is found online, reports are made to the CyberTipline, a hotline operated by NCMEC, the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, which then routes the reports to the appropriate law enforcement agency, which may be Federal, State, local, or Tribal.

□ 1520

As the inventory of this evidence of criminal conduct continues to grow, law enforcement has faced challenges in storing, transferring, and analyzing this sensitive evidence. Outdated policies around cloud storage compound the challenge, slowing down crucial work, and creating barriers for solving crimes and bringing perpetrators to justice.

While NCMEC and the digital storage companies it contracts with are generally immune from criminal liability for possession and transmission of these materials, that liability shield does not currently extend to private companies if they contract with law enforcement.

Instead, many investigators are forced to rely on outdated physical storage tools like thumb drives, external hard drives, and on-premise servers. These tools, which were never designed to handle the immense scale of digital evidence that law enforcement is now forced to process, are costly, limited in capacity, and significantly hamper investigations.

These inefficiencies delay victim identification and allow offenders to remain at large longer and perhaps even continue to victimize children. Cloud-based tools would give investigators, forensic examiners, and prosecutors the ability to effectively identify, categorize, and tag large volumes of files in minutes compared to human review, which can take hours or days.

By modernizing legal protections for secure cloud-based storage and processing of evidence related to child sexual abuse and exploitation, the Safe Cloud Storage Act would allow law enforcement, investigators, and prosecutors access to better tools that are needed to pursue predators.

Specifically, this legislation would allow approved third-party vendors to work with law enforcement to provide secure, cloud-based storage of CSAM and child obscenity material to police without the threat of incurring civil or criminal liability, giving law enforcement the flexibility they need to manage, preserve, analyze, and share critical evidence.

These liability protections would, of course, not extend to any cases of vendor misconduct, whether intentional, malicious, reckless, or negligent. This legislation requires vendors that provide these services to law enforcement to notify DOJ within 30 days when they enter new contracts. It also requires them to adhere to stringent cybersecurity and storage rules.

I thank my colleagues, Congresswoman DEAN, Congressman COHEN, Congresswoman LEE of Florida, and Congressman KNOTT for their hard work on this bipartisan legislation. I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 7834, the Safe Cloud Storage Act.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, for all of the aforementioned reasons, I strongly support passage of the bill and urge all of my colleagues to join me in doing that.

I also would just mention that we are being supported here by the Fraternal Order of Police, the Child Rescue Coalition, the National District Attorneys Association, the National Center on Sexual Exploitation, the Association of State Criminal Investigative Agencies, and the International Justice Mission.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. LEE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I again thank my colleagues on the Judiciary Committee, specifically the chairman, the ranking member, and Representatives COHEN, DEAN, and KNOTT for their partnership in bringing forward this important legislation.

I am also very grateful to the men and women of law enforcement who come to us and share with us the things that they need to help them bring these important cases, to bring more children to safety, and to bring more predators to justice.

We also are fortunate to work with a number of very important stakeholder groups, including Raven, NCMEC, the Tim Tebow Foundation, and so many others who work with us every day to make sure that we are doing all that we can to help end this type of criminal activity.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this important bill, the Safe Cloud Storage Act, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. LEE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 7834, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL FOSSIL ACT OF 2026

Ms. LEE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 9191) to amend chapter 3 of title 36, United States Code, to designate the American mastodon as the national fossil mammal and the Tyrannosaurus rex as the national fossil dinosaur of the United States, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 9191

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 ''National Fossil Act of 2026''.

SEC. 2. NATIONAL FOSSIL MAMMAL AND DINOSAUR OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) DESIGNATION.—Chapter 3 of title 36, United States Code, is amended—

*(1) in the chapter heading, by striking ''**AND BIRD**'' and inserting ''**BIRD, AND FOSSIL**''; and*

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''§307. National fossil mammal and dinosaur

''The fossil of—

''(1) the genus Mammut americanum, commonly known as the American mastodon, is the national fossil mammal; and

''(2) the Tyrannosaurus rex is the national fossil dinosaur.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Title 36, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the table of sections for chapter 3, by adding at the end the following:

''307. National fossil mammal and dinosaur.''; and

(2) by striking the item relating to chapter 3 in the table of chapters at the beginning of such title and inserting the following:

''3. National Anthem, Motto, Floral Emblem, March, Tree, Bird, and Fossil .... 301''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. LEE) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. LEE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 9191.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. LEE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 9191 continues the tradition of Congress designating certain plants and animals with significant connection to the United States as national symbols. Most recently, Congress designated the bald eagle as the national bird in 2024.

The bill before us today would designate the American mastodon and the Tyrannosaurus rex as the national mammal fossil and the national dinosaur fossil.

The fossils that remain from these creatures have fascinated children and adults alike for generations. Among the many fossils found throughout North America, the American mastodon and Tyrannosaurus rex have become enduring symbols of American paleontological discovery.

H.R. 9191 recognizes the importance of these creatures in America's natural history by designating them as the national fossil mammal and fossil dinosaur.

I urge all Members to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in strong support of this legislation and am delighted to work on it with my colleague, Ms. LEE of Florida.

H.R. 9191, the National Fossil Act, would designate the American mastodon, an extinct relative of the modern elephant, as our national fossil mammal. It would also designate the famous and beloved Tyrannosaurus rex as our national fossil dinosaur. Both the mastodon and T. rex fossils have only ever been found in North America, and therefore this is a fitting and appropriate honor.

I love the T. Rex, and I am glad it beat out apparently its closest competitor for national fossil dinosaur, which was the modern Republican Party. I must admit, I am partial to Maryland's State dinosaur, the Astrodon johnstoni, a long-necked brachiosaurid that probably spent its days munching on plants and whose fossils were first found in the suburbs right outside the District of Columbia, either in my district, the beautiful Eighth, or the Fourth Congressional District, Congressman IVEY's district, depending on the state of dinosaur gerrymandering at the time. Recent research suggests that the T. rex descended from dinosaurs that crossed a land bridge from Asia, indicating that immigrant dinosaurs were making America great even before humans walked the Earth.

As for the choice of the mastodon, an extinct prehistoric elephant, please accept my endorsement of this bill as a gesture of true bipartisanship. It is our sincere hope that by designating the fossils of these creatures as national symbols, it will inspire all of our fellow Americans, and not just the kids, to investigate the natural world and natural history and to appreciate that through the application of the miracles of modern science, we have discovered that the Earth is more than 4 billion years old. It is so old that it has been inhabited by organisms, which in the case of dinosaurs evolved and died off many millions of years before humanity came into existence.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I express my strong support for the legislation, which will be enthusiastically greeted by millions of children across America, especially my T. rex-loving nephew Maddox. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LEE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. HOUCHIN).

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the National Fossil Act, a bipartisan bill I introduced with my colleague from Michigan, Congresswoman DEBBIE DINGELL.

This bill was brought to us by a renowned geologist from Hanover College within my district, Dr. Stan Totten. This has been a passion project of his and now mine. It pushes a simple idea. It would name the American mastodon our national fossil mammal and the Tyrannosaurus rex our national fossil dinosaur. They would stand as national symbols beside the bald eagle, the bison, the rose, and the oak.

□ 1530

Why the mastodon?

It is because the American mastodon, only found in North America, was perfectly adapted to live in the dense, cold forests of North America.

It is also important that we chose the mastodon because Thomas Jefferson himself chose it first. In our founding years, a French naturalist told the world that America was a lesser continent, and Jefferson would not have it. He sent William Clark to dig at Big Bone Lick on the Ohio River, and when the crates reached Washington, the President of the United States spread them across the floor of the White House and studied them himself.

He had argued in favor of American exceptionalism for years. On the floor of the White House, he didn't have to. The animal was the argument. A country that was home to an animal like that does not apologize to anyone. Jefferson knew it then, and we know it now.

Why the T. rex?

It is because it is the most famous dinosaur on Earth, and it is an American story. American pioneers went West and found it. American grit dug it out of the badlands. American museums put it on display, and American children have stood in front of it, awe-inspired, for more than a century.

Unlike dinosaur bones in general, the T. rex fossils are entirely unique to North America. Think about that. The most famous and fearsome of all dinosaurs is unique to our homeland.

This year marked the 250th anniversary of our great Nation. We have spent it honoring the Founders, the Framers, and the men and women who built this country from the ground up. However, America's story did not begin in 1776. The land came first. God gave us a continent and a country unlike any other, and it holds a record of miraculous life.

A national fossil is more than a symbol. It is an invitation. It tells young boys and girls in southern Indiana and across the country put down the phone, get outside, and go dig. It tells them that discovery is an American tradition, our American story, and that they are part of it.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to pass the National Fossil Act.

Ms. LEE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman for her legislative initiative here and for bringing that to the Judiciary Committee. We very much applaud the effort to recognize these victories for modern archeology, geology, and science. We are glad that we can endorse this bipartisan effort.

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

Ms. LEE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support H.R. 9191 to recognize the importance of these creatures in America's natural history by designating them as the national fossil mammal and fossil dinosaur, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. LEE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 9191, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BANKRUPTCY THRESHOLD ADJUSTMENT ACT

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 7730) to amend title 11, United States Code, to modify certain bankruptcy eligibility requirements, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 7730

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 ''Bankruptcy Threshold Adjustment Act''.

SEC. 2. DEBT LIMIT MODIFICATIONS.

(a) MODIFICATION TO THE SMALL BUSINESS BANKRUPTCY DEBT LIMIT.—Section 1182(1) of title 11, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(1) DEBTOR.—The term 'debtor'—

''(A) subject to subparagraph (B), means a person engaged in commercial or business activities (including any affiliate of such person that is also a debtor under this title and excluding a person whose primary activity is the business of owning single asset real estate) that has aggregate noncontingent liquidated secured and unsecured debts as of the date of the filing of the

petition or the date of the order for relief in an amount not more than $7,500,000 (excluding debts owed to 1 or more affiliates or insiders) not less than 50 percent of which arose from the commercial or business activities of the debtor; and

''(B) does not include—

''(i) any member of a group of affiliated debtors under this title that has aggregate noncontingent liquidated secured and unsecured debts in an amount greater than $7,500,000 (excluding debt owed to 1 or more affiliates or insiders);

''(ii) any debtor that is a corporation subject to the reporting requirements under section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78m, 78o(d)); or

''(iii) any debtor that is an affiliate of a corporation described in clause (ii).''.

(b) MODIFICATION TO THE CONSUMER BANKRUPTCY DEBT LIMIT.—Section 109 of title 11, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (e) and inserting the following:

''(e) Only an individual with regular income that owes, on the date of the filing of the petition, noncontingent, liquidated debts that aggregate less than $2,750,000 or an individual with regular income and such individual's spouse, except a stockbroker or a commodity broker, that owe, on the date of the filing of the petition, noncontingent, liquidated debts that aggregate less than $2,750,000 may be a debtor under chapter 13 of this title.''.

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this Act shall apply to any case that is commenced under title 11, United States Code, on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CLINE) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 7730.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 7730, the Bankruptcy Threshold Adjustment Act of 2026.

H.R. 7730 is an important bipartisan bill that will help small businesses and individual consumers reorganize their financial affairs in bankruptcy.

First, H.R. 7730 increases the debt limit for cases under subchapter V. In 2019, I sponsored the bill that created the subchapter V process, which allows small businesses the opportunity to efficiently reorganize their debts and exit bankruptcy as a viable small business. Between 2020 and 2024, Congress temporarily increased the subchapter V debt limit allowing debtors with up to $7.5 million in debt to be eligible for Subchapter V. In 2024, the higher limit expired and reverted to around $3 million.

All available evidence suggests that subchapter V is working as Congress intended. Subchapter V provides a quick, cheap, and effective path forward for indebted small businesses allowing businessowners to keep employees on the payroll while repaying creditors. Subchapter V has also proven to be better for creditors. Evidence shows that creditor recoveries are higher in subchapter V than they would have been under chapter 11.

H.R. 7730 permanently reinstates the higher $7.5 million limit. By reinstating the higher debt limit, H.R. 7730 will allow more small businesses to effectively reorganize their debts and exit bankruptcy as a financially viable business.

H.R. 7730 also modifies the eligibility criteria for individual debtors filing for relief under chapter 13. Between 2020 and 2024, Congress temporarily allowed individual debtors to aggregate their secured and unsecured debts for purposes of qualifying for chapter 13.

After 2024, the temporary change expired, meaning individual debtors can only qualify for chapter 13 if their unsecured or secure debts are under their respective thresholds.

H.R. 7730 reinstates the ability for debtors to qualify for chapter 13 if their aggregate debts are less than $2.75 million, regardless of how those debts are constructed.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense, bipartisan bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to support this bipartisan bill which would restore and make permanent higher debt limits for working families, individuals, and small businesses under both chapters 11 and 13 of the Bankruptcy Code.

Too often, bankruptcy is spoken of in hushed tones or considered something not really relevant to the lives of people in our economy, but it is not just a footnote in the American economy. It turns out to be a major force in it. At its core when it is used properly and not abused, it is a guardrail for the life and the dignity and the livelihoods of American people.

Even the President of the United States has filed for bankruptcy six times under chapter 11 alone. Although we don't recommend that frequent usage, it is there for all of us when we need it, and we do hope that those who are able to exercise their bankruptcy rights, like the President, will learn from the experience. Alas, he has already added $11.6 trillion to our national debt in his one-and-a-half terms in office so far.

In any event, it should be there in less extreme cases for people who need it in order to get through tough times.

All across America, small businesses and working families are shouldering debts that would have once been considered extraordinary, but now really just reflect the cost of staying afloat in today's economy. Although it remains a remedy of last resort legally, our bankruptcy system must be equipped to provide relief when economic pressures collapse the margins of household and commercial stability and solvency. A well-calibrated system does not punish misfortune or entrench failure. It provides a lawful path forward where all else fails.

H.R. 7730 reestablishes a higher debt threshold for small businesses under subchapter V and working families under title 13. For 5 years, subchapter V of the bankruptcy code, the streamlined bankruptcy process for small businesses to reorganize and restructure, offered small businesses a path back to viability by providing a simpler pathway to restructure debt, save jobs, and continue serving in the communities.

Regrettably, that path was narrowed, not because the policy failed but because in June 2024, the debt limit set by Congress, the maximum debt small businesses can have and still be eligible for subchapter V's streamlined process, lapsed and dropped by 60 percent from $7.5 million to $3 million.

Despite clear data and near unanimous agreement among the bankruptcy bar that the $7.5 million debt limit was a success for small businesses and their creditors, we went back to the old, lower debt limit, which excludes way too many of the very small businesses that subchapter V was designed to support.

Without a workable path to reorganize under subchapter V, all that remains of these businesses is used equipment and unpaid bills. This tremendous loss in value is lost not only for small business owners, but also for their employees, their creditors, and entire communities are affected.

I am heartened by the bipartisan agreement we have to permanently restore the $7.5 million debt limit in the Bankruptcy Threshold Adjustment Act of 2026. It is both sensible and long overdue.

Additionally, this bill also reinstates the higher debt limit for working families under chapter 13. Families who exceed the chapter 13 debt limit, which is $1.58 million, are legally barred from filing under that chapter, no matter how regular their income or sincere their repayment intentions.

Nor can they turn to chapter 12, which is limited to farmers or fishermen, or chapter 15, which is limited to international cases, or subchapter V, which requires you to be a small business.

Because of chapter 13's expired debt limit, we risk pushing working people into chapter 11 bankruptcy proceedings, which is not designed for people with stable income and assets they seek to keep. Chapter 11 was never meant for someone trying to save their home while paying down medical bills and putting kids through school.

I am glad we are acting to reinstate the higher debt limit of $2.75 million.

The Senate has already unanimously passed identical legislation. This is a good example of how Congress should function when we work together in a bipartisan way.

Mr. Speaker, I thank our colleagues, Representatives CORREA, NEGUSE, CLINE, and LEE, for their leadership on this legislation. I urge my colleagues to support it today and hope we can advance the bill to the President's desk. I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1540

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the bipartisan Bankruptcy Threshold Adjustment Act of 2026, legislation that I am proud to co-lead with my friend and colleague, Representative CLINE.

For small businesses facing financial difficulty, bankruptcy does not always mean going out of business. In many cases, it can provide an opportunity to reorganize debt, work with creditors, and keep the doors open.

That is why Congress created subchapter V of chapter 11 specifically for small businesses. Traditional chapter 11 bankruptcy can be complicated, lengthy, and expensive. Subchapter V provides qualifying small businesses with a more streamlined process to develop a restructuring plan, negotiate with creditors, and continue operating.

The goal is simple: When a business is still viable but struggling under debt, we should give it a reasonable opportunity to reorganize, rather than making liquidation the only practical option.

For several years, businesses with up to $7.5 million in debt could qualify for this process, but that temporary threshold expired, significantly reducing the number of small businesses that could use it.

Our legislation would permanently restore the $7.5 million threshold. That matters to the family-owned restaurant trying to recover from an unexpected downturn. It matters to the local contractor dealing with rising costs or delayed payments. It matters to farmers and other small employers working to overcome financial challenges without closing their doors or laying off employees.

This legislation does not excuse businesses from their financial obligations. It gives more small businesses access to a structured and cost-effective process to address those obligations, work with their creditors, and develop a plan for the future.

Small businesses should not be pushed to liquidation simply because the cost and complexity of a traditional chapter 11 proceeding makes restructuring unrealistic.

By permanently restoring this higher threshold, we can provide greater certainty and give more small and family-owned businesses a practical opportunity to recover, preserve jobs, and continue serving their communities.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to work on this bipartisan legislation. I thank Representative CLINE for his continued leadership on this issue. I urge my colleagues to support the Bankruptcy Threshold Adjustment Act of 2026.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, for the aforementioned reasons, I support this legislation and recommend that all of our colleagues join us in voting for it. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I also support the legislation and urge our colleagues to support the bill. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CLINE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 7730, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL FRAUD ENFORCEMENT DIVISION ACT OF 2026

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1530, I call up the bill (H.R. 9576) to establish the National Fraud Enforcement Division of the Department of Justice, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BICE). Pursuant to House Resolution 1530, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 119–41 is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 9576

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 ''National Fraud Enforcement Division Act of 2026''.

SEC. 2. NATIONAL FRAUD ENFORCEMENT DIVISION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 31 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 509B the following:

''§ 509C. National Fraud Enforcement Division

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is hereby established a National Fraud Enforcement Division within the Department of Justice under the authority of the Attorney General (referred to in this section as the 'Division').

''(b) HEAD.—The Division shall be headed by an Assistant Attorney General appointed under section 506, and designated by the President as the Assistant Attorney General for National Fraud Enforcement.

''(c) DUTIES.—The Assistant Attorney General for National Fraud Enforcement shall perform such duties as the Attorney General may prescribe.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 31 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item related to section 509B the following:

''509C. National Fraud Enforcement Division.''.

(c) PROHIBITION ON POLITICAL ACTIVITY.—Section 7323(b)(3) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting '', National Fraud Enforcement Division,'' after ''Criminal Division''.

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

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. VAN DREW) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 9576.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 9576, the National Fraud Enforcement Division Act of 2026.

For far too long, the Federal Government's approach to fighting fraud has been fractured, slow, ineffective, and buried under layers of unnecessary bureaucracy.

For years, complex fraud investigations were treated as just another item on the lengthy to-do list of the Department of Justice's overextended Criminal Division.

Because there was no single dedicated division at Main Justice waking up every single day with the sole mission of protecting the public, sophisticated syndicates operated with relative impunity, treating American taxpayers and their dollars like it was their own personal piggy bank.

Madam Speaker, that era of bureaucratic neglect should be over.

Earlier this year, the administration took decisive action by establishing the National Fraud Enforcement Division to centralize Federal efforts against multi-jurisdictional fraud. The results of this dedicated focus have been immediate and, I believe, undeniable.

In July, the National Fraud Enforcement Division announced a series of significant fraud enforcement actions across the southeastern United States of America.

The charges announced encompass 17 cases, spanning 7 States. These cases involve over $350 million in intended losses and include cases involving SNAP benefits, Small Business Administration loans, housing benefits, and tax fraud.

As impressive as those results are, administrative action can be reversed easily with the stroke of a pen.

That is why H.R. 9576 is so very vital. This legislation formally codifies the National Fraud Enforcement Division into statutory law, ensuring this powerful shield for the American taxpayer becomes a permanent fixture of our justice system.

By passing this bill, we ensure that the division will permanently be led by an Assistant Attorney General appointed by the President, whomever that is, and confirmed by the Senate, whomever they are.

To my colleagues who are concerned about institutional neutrality, the bill explicitly subjects all division employees to the strict political prohibitions of the Hatch Act.

□ 1550

This is not a partisan initiative. Rather, it is a permanent, nonpartisan commitment to fiscal accountability and the rule of law.

We must protect the integrity of our Federal programs, and we must honor our duty to the hardworking citizens of America who fund our government.

By codifying this division, we guarantee that the aggressive fight against government waste, fraud, and abuse, which we hear so much about, will continue unabated, regardless of who occupies the White House and regardless of what whatever political party they are.

I thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FINSTAD) for his leadership on this essential legislation, and I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 9576.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

We learned just before coming down to the floor that votes have been canceled for tomorrow suddenly. No public explanation has been offered by the Speaker, but they are certainly saying in the cloakrooms that the last-minute cancellation of one of three 8-hour days we were scheduled to work this week was due to Congressman MASSIE's filing of a detailed and compelling impeachment resolution against Secretary Pete Hegseth.

He introduced the resolution asserting that there were multiple high crimes and misdemeanors that have been committed by Secretary Hegseth, including violations of the War Powers Act, ignoring laws requiring the minimization of civilian casualties, engaging in extrajudicial killings, violating the speech rights of members of the armed services, and more.

At least Republican THOMAS MASSIE's suggestion is that they were unwilling to confront his impeachment resolution, and there was such division on that side of the aisle that they decided simply to call it quits after only 2 full days of work. This to be followed, of course, by 2 months of us being away from Washington. At least some explanation should be offered to us for why yet another day of work has been canceled.

In any event, as a gesture of good faith and mercy for our colleagues, a political party whose members are fleeing the Nation's Capital like residents of South Vietnam on the roof of the embassy in Saigon at the end of the Vietnam war, I will rise in tepid support of this bill simply codifying the National Fraud Enforcement Division, which the Department of Justice has already established by regulation. Of course, the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice has had a fraud section for more than 70 years now, so this is hardly some kind of great breakthrough in law enforcement or criminal justice.

It is perhaps the least offensive piece of legislative flotsam and jetsam that has washed ashore in the last 48 hours of Republican chaos and retreat here in the House of Representatives.

An initial version of the bill actually required the division to do something, to ''investigate, prosecute, and remedy fraud.'' They took that out. It seems our colleagues decided even that modest demand for action went too far, so it was dropped.

No wonder they got cold feet. This is, alas, the most pro-fraud administration in American history. Nothing comes close. When this 34-felony-count President took office—and that is felony counts of fraud—he immediately fired and demoted 20 inspectors general who had rooted out billions of dollars in waste, corruption, fraud, and abuse.

He dismantled and gutted the parts of the Federal Government most seriously engaged in investigating and prosecuting fraud: the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, which has saved American taxpayers tens of billions of dollars from fraud; the 40-lawyer Public Integrity Section of the Department of Justice, which was reduced to two lawyers; and the well-regarded Tax Division at the Department of Justice, which was completely wiped out by the administration.

They have eliminated expert FBI squads, like CR–15 that handled complex corruption investigations around the country.

Amazingly, President Trump halted all enforcement of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act upon taking office. They said that they were not going to enforce it anymore.

As The Wall Street Journal has reported, the Department of Justice is pulling back not just on prosecuting fraud, but corporate crime of all kinds. In the first 6 months after taking office, the Trump DOJ dropped over 23,000 criminal investigations, including one in Tennessee into criminal fraud at a national hospital chain and one of the largest Medicaid managed care companies; another, an investigation into a Virginia nursing home with a documented record of fraud and patient abuse; probes of criminal fraud involving several New Jersey labor unions, including one opened after a top official of the union was accused of embezzling the members' money; and an investigation into a cryptocurrency company suspected of cheating thousands of investors.

It is not just the DOJ. The SEC enforcement actions in 2025 hit a 20-year low, and corporate disgorgement plummeted by a whopping 98 percent.

Following a wave of political donations to the President's inaugural committees, the SEC closed or dismissed high-profile fraud and registration investigations into numerous crypto platforms, like Coinbase, Gemini, Binance, and Kraken.

Every administration chooses its priorities. This is the first one that has made not prosecuting white-collar fraudsters, corporate crooks, corrupt politicians, international tax cheats, and narcotraffickers a number one priority.

Let me give an example of the kind of people benefiting from the pro-corruption policies of the administration. After a lengthy investigation, the Indian billionaire Gautam Adani and other executives from the Adani Group were indicted in 2024 after a yearslong investigation for perpetrating a $265 million bribery scheme and a multibillion-dollar fraud scheme against U.S. investors, as well as obstructing investigations by the FBI, the SEC, and a Federal grand jury.

The investigation was led, in part, by the Foreign Corrupt Practices Unit that Trump, of course, dissolved upon taking office. Then, Adani started flattering the President on Twitter and promised big investments. Suddenly, DOJ dropped the entire indictment.

For those fraudsters who have already been convicted, they have nothing to fear themselves. They were convicted, I should say, by a Department of Justice that once believed in the rule of law. Why have they nothing to fear? This President has a pardon waiting for you if the price is right.

For the low, low price of just a few hundred thousand dollars—or maybe $3 million if your crime was really bad or you don't know anybody in the Trump circle so well—you can get a Presidential pardon and get all the fines and restitution payments wiped out that you still owe to the victims and the taxpayers.

President Trump's indiscriminate pardoning of not just convicted cop assaulters right here in this building from January 6, 2021, but convicted white-collar fraudsters has allowed white-collar criminals to hold on to—check this one out—over $1.7 billion that they legally owed to the employees, consumers, investors, and taxpayers that they bilked through their various fraudulent schemes.

Take another example. This guy is Trevor Milton, the disgraced former CEO of Nikola, who preyed on vulnerable retail investors, including people who had turned to trading in the market after losing income during COVID–19.

Milton repeatedly claimed that his company had built a prototype of a hydrogen-powered semitruck that fully functioned and worked, which is really incredible, he advertised. Well, that was a total lie. His product did not work. A video he put on Twitter of his truck driving down the street on a flat road, in fact, turned out to be a truck that was towed to the top of the hill, at which point the driver released the brakes and the truck rolled down the hill. That was how they got their truck to apparently work so they could advertise it and bilk money out of the investors.

After a yearslong investigation, the Department of Justice prosecuted him and convicted him before a jury of his peers. He was sentenced to 4 years in prison for his fraud, for stealing people's money. Prosecutors insisted that he pay back the defrauded investors nearly $700 million in restitution for what he had stolen from them. In many cases, his victims had lost their entire retirement savings. Before restitution could be paid or even ordered, Milton got a surprise pardon from President Trump.

□ 1600

How did that happen? It was classic ''Pardons, Inc.,'' the name of the report we have describing dozens of cases like this, the Democrats on the Judiciary Committee have.

What happens in ''Pardons, Inc.,'' the new cash-for-clemency racket? In the weeks before the 2024 election, Milton and his wife donated over $1.8 million to political committees supporting the campaign of Donald Trump, including $920,000 reported to the Trump 47 Committee in October 2024 and $750,000, three quarters of a million dollars, in September 2024 to the MAHA Alliance Super PAC affiliated with the now-Secretary of HHS, Robert F. Kennedy, Jr.

Milton also shrewdly hired two attorneys with direct ties to the President: Brad Bondi, the brother of the disgraced former Attorney General Pam Bondi, who was forced out by Trump after she brought embarrassment to the administration; and Marc Mukasey, longtime attorney for both Eric Trump and the Trump organization.

In March 2025, 2 weeks after prosecutors filed their $695.2 million restitution calculation and report, the President called Milton personally to inform him of a full and unconditional pardon and his decision, moreover, to wipe out any obligation he had to repay his victims. It was a direct transfer of money from the victims of white-collar fraud back to the criminal himself.

President Trump even invoked the $750,000 contribution to RFK, his pal in the Cabinet now, telling Milton to call Bobby and thank him, too.

Now, fresh off of his pardon, Milton is back at it. He has joined an exclusive group of post-pardoned businessmen seemingly empowered and sainted by Trump's pardon and favor. ''I walk into meetings now and I'll get high fives from the most wealthy people in the world,'' he said. ''They're like, 'Welcome to the club. You can withstand the fire. We can trust you now.' ''

His new venture, SyberJet, which he claims will transform flying, is seeking to raise a billion dollars from investors. Americans beware. Another pardoned Trump criminal on the loose today like Andrew Paul Johnson.

Do you remember him? He was the insurrectionist who stormed the Capitol who Trump pardoned without looking at any of the specifics of his case. He went back out and just 2 months later, he sexually assaulted two 12-year-olds, one boy and one girl. He then tried to bribe them into silence, saying he was going to get his payoff from Attorney General Todd Blanche's plan for the $1.776 billion political slush fund to pay off the insurrectionists. He said, I will give you guys that money.

Luckily, the children told their families, the families told the police, and Andrew Paul Johnson was just prosecuted and convicted and sentenced to jail for life, and yet the lives of those two 12-year-olds are irrevocably altered by the fact that Donald Trump let him out of prison. He let Andrew Paul Johnson walk free to go and commit another crime.

There are dozens and dozens of people like that: home invasion, domestic violence, sexual assault, threatening the life of an FBI agent, all of them just let free en masse as Donald Trump dismantled the U.S. pardon attorney's office and instead made this an operation out of his back pocket in the White House.

We are seeing unprecedented grift, corruption, and fraud go unpunished in this administration and criminals being let free. But if the majority thinks it is important to freeze in place the name of the National Fraud Enforcement Division, great. Maybe we can use that to actually go after all of the fraud and corruption that we are seeing in this administration.

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

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I enjoy the gentleman on the other side of the aisle. He is a very able speaker. He is articulate. He is eloquent, but he is losing the point here. I say this because we are here to focus on a piece of legislation.

I have the honor of being on the Judiciary Committee, and often it occurs there, too, where we get into a political diatribe, a political discussion.

Today, right now, the conversation we are having here in this formal sense on the floor of the House of the United States Government—this conversation is about a piece of legislation. It is about a piece of legislation that we want to be enacted into law. It is not a partisan initiative. It is a permanent, nonpartisan commitment that we do something better.

The people who are listening here, Madam Speaker, the people who are watching, are getting tired of it. They are getting tired of all the money that has been wasted. Then for the gentleman to try and pretend that just a couple of years ago everything was perfect, everything was taken care of and that there was no corruption, we know better.

There has been a great deal of abuse in many of these programs in the Federal Government, and it is wrong. It is wrong because people work too hard and they work too much to have to put up with that. It is wrong because it just is something that shouldn't be in modern America. It is wrong because we can do better than that. Finally, it is wrong because it is hurting the very people who depend on those programs that supposedly everybody cares about so much.

When fraudsters and crooks and corrupt individuals rape these systems, it hurts everyone and it hurts especially the most vulnerable. I take issue with that.

Madam Speaker, I would love if we could stick to this legislation and do the good work of government. It is not about Donald Trump. It is not about Pete Hegseth. It is not about TOM MASSIE. It is not about a political debate. This is government now, and we should stick to doing the work of government in trying to help our people.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. KIM).

Mrs. KIM. Madam Speaker, I am proud to stand today in strong support of the National Fraud Enforcement Division Act. In California, we have lost at least $180 billion to fraud across State programs. That is money meant for our seniors, veterans, families, and students in need, not criminals gaming the system.

Under Vice President VANCE's anti-fraud task force, we have made real progress uncovering more than $245 billion in fraud across the Nation and sending fraudsters a very clear message: Their days of stealing from Americans with impunity are over.

For too long, our Federal response to fraud has been fragmented and disorganized, with no central office leading the charge. This bill brings everything together so we have one goal, one game plan, and one team reading from the same playbook.

I have been working to better coordinate our Federal response to fraud with my No More SCAMS Act, and I am proud to support this ironclad effort to hold these criminals accountable.

Americans work hard for every dollar they earn. The least they deserve is a government that fights just as hard to protect their taxpayer dollars.

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

Madam Speaker, my friend from New Jersey invoked fraudsters, crooks, and corrupt individuals. The problem is, you can put whatever name you want over the door, but if the Department of Justice is not actually prosecuting these people, then we are not ferreting out the fraud.

Look at some of the cases that have been dropped by the Department of

Justice under the various people that have been presiding over the DOJ.

For example, let's take Eric Adams. He was the Democratic mayor of New York. Maybe my colleague would like to hear about this. Eric Adams was indicted in September 2024 for bribery and wire fraud over luxury travel and illegal foreign campaign contributions he recruited.

After President Trump took office, then-Acting Deputy Attorney General Emil Bove ordered that the case be dropped after Eric Adams aligned himself with Trump with a memo from Bove stating that the decision was made without regard to the strength of the case.

You will all recall that the administration's own appointed United States Attorney in New York quit along with five other lawyers in her office because they thought it was so outrageous that the Department of Justice would dismiss these charges for a political reason.

In fact, the grand jury had already handed down the indictment and they had to go and beg the judge to revoke the whole indictment and to quash it after it was very clear that there was probable cause that fraud had taken place.

Here is another example. Tom Homan accepted $50,000 from an undercover FBI agent posing to buy access to government contracts in the coming Trump administration. He got that in a CAVA bag, $50,000.

□ 1610

Despite knowledge of the investigation, President Trump appointed Homan to be the border czar on January 20, 2025, and soon after Trump's second term, then-Acting Deputy Attorney General Emil Bove shut down the investigation. We still don't know.

Was that a $50,000 cash bribe, or was he just holding the money?

Did he declare that money on his taxes?

We have got no idea what happened. Why isn't the Department of Justice looking into that?

There is case after case. Justin Sun, in 2023, the SEC charged Sun for fraudulently manipulating the secondary market of a cryptocurrency. After the 2024 election, Sun invested $75 million into World Liberty Financial, the President's family's own crypto company, and he became one of the largest known holders of Trump's memecoin. He attended a private reception and dinner with President Trump. Then, suddenly, what do you know, the FCC dropped all the charges and moved to a settlement, with Sun paying a mere $10 million penalty.

And on and on, case after case dropped.

We have seen what they have done with respect to the Epstein files with the Department of Justice leading the coverup, doing everything that they can to blockade the release of the materials mandated by the United States Congress in the Epstein Files Transparency Act.

So the Department of Justice is not acting to ferret out and prosecute fraud. It is covering it up. I am sorry, you might have political sympathies with the people that they are covering up for, but that is not how the rule of law works.

The rule of law should be objectively rendered. If people violate the law, they should not be freed. The charges should not be dropped. The indictments should not be quashed, or they should not be pardoned simply because they are friends with people in the right place.

America sees what is going on. That is not justice.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. HAGEMAN).

Ms. HAGEMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 9576, the National Fraud Enforcement Division Act of 2026.

But before going to my specific remarks, I would just like to note that you can tell when my friends on the other side of the aisle start to panic because you start hearing them scream at the top of their lungs: ''Trump, Epstein,'' and all the other things, as they try to deflect attention from what is an excellent bill that should be passed by this body.

Madam Speaker, waste, fraud, and abuse persist in nearly every sector across this Nation, including healthcare, public welfare programs, foreign aid, and the issuance of commercial driver's licenses.

What has come out of Minnesota over the last year and what has been exposed is absolutely criminal in nature, and that is what everybody in this room ought to be focusing on.

According to a 2024 GAO report, examining data from 2018 to 2022, it was estimated that total direct annual financial losses to the Federal Government from fraud were between $233 billion and $521 billion. I think it is substantially higher than that, and I think what is being exposed in blue cities and blue States run by Democrats demonstrates that it is probably higher by an order of magnitude.

While its existence costs American taxpayers hundreds of billions of dollars each year, fraud further deprives hardworking American citizens of vital government investment and assistance.

My colleagues across the aisle emphasize the importance of programs like Medicaid and SNAP, but allowing waste, fraud, and abuse to continue unaddressed redirects funding away from the populations they are intended to assist, while threatening the programs' fiscal stability.

The Department of Justice created the National Fraud Enforcement Division earlier this year for precisely these reasons, fulfilling a vital mission of the department, while bolstering cooperation between Federal, State, local, and Tribal law enforcement.

Its creation has yielded significant results this month alone.

On September 4, two men were sentenced to prison for their roles in a $34.8 million healthcare fraud conspiracy in which they billed Medicare for thousands of orthotic braces sent to beneficiaries who did not need them.

Last week, a man in California was sent to prison for his role in a healthcare fraud scheme in which nearly $270 million in fraudulent claims were submitted to the California Medicaid program.

Just yesterday, it was announced that 12 individuals are facing Federal fraud charges after it was found that over $10 million intended to help low-income families and pay for childcare was funneled to fraudulent daycare providers.

It is time for Congress to codify the National Fraud Enforcement Division and ensure that this vital element of the Department's mission is properly carried out long into the future.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of this bill, and I thank Representative FINSTAD and Chairman JORDAN for their leadership on this legislation.

I urge all of my colleagues, including the Democrats, to support H.R. 9576.

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, the President has pardoned dozens of people convicted of fraud. These are the people most likely to go out and start committing fraud all over again, and we are already seeing his pardonees go out and reoffend. But if you make a chronological list of the people that he pardoned, the thing that is most shocking to me is the forgiveness of the fines and the restitution that they owe to the public and that they owe to their victims, because every other prior President had essentially deferred to the U.S. pardon attorney, which would do a very careful, systematic study consisting of: What the individual seeking a pardon had done, what was their crime, how had they behaved in prison, had they shown contrition and remorse, had they begun the process of rebonding with society, were they rehabilitated, or were they still a threat.

Well, that has not been this administration's approach. You recall President Trump pardoned the January 6ers, as they call themselves, all en masse, more than 1,500 of them, without referring to any particular case—just all of them were free, which is why so many of them have gone out and reoffended again.

What we are seeing in the case of the white collar criminals here is something very interesting, because the prior Presidents have overwhelmingly said: If you want to get a pardon from the President of the United States, which used to be a very special, difficult, extraordinary thing, you have got to show that you have paid off all your criminal fines and you have paid restitution to your victims. After all, that is part of showing that you are remorseful, that you are contrite, and that you are rehabilitated. Show that you have paid back the people you damaged, that you ripped off, that you hurt, whether they were consumers, investors, family members, members of your religious congregation, whatever.

Well, under the Trump administration, it is quite the reverse. A bunch of the white collar criminals—now some of them, as we have seen, were on their way to prison, and he let them go from prison and also forgave their crimes. But a lot of them are applying after they have done their time because they don't want to pay the fines back, and President Trump is forgiving the restitution and the fines that have been ordered by a court.

If you go chronologically, I am looking at the first four that he happened to pardon who had committed white collar fraud crimes.

One of them, Governor Blagojevich, there was no restitution left to pay.

Then there is the second, Trevor Milton, convicted of securities fraud and wire fraud. Check this out. He was forgiven $695 million that his victims could have gotten back, $695 million.

Devon Archer, a name familiar to a lot of people on the other side of the aisle, committed securities fraud conspiracy and securities fraud, and he was supposed to pay $43,427,436 back to the victims, and that was forgiven by President Trump.

The next one, Jason Galanis, he was convicted of conspiracy to commit securities fraud, investment adviser fraud, conspiracy to commit securities fraud, securities fraud, and conspiracy to commit investment adviser fraud. But he did do something for the President. I remember because he came over on a video Zoom presentation to testify against Hunter Biden about something, and, of course, that led nowhere because Hunter Biden had already been convicted of his crimes and had done good time. But, anyway, this guy, Jason Galanis, he was forgiven $84,817,513.

□ 1620

We have dozens more like this. We counted up more than $1.7 billion in restitution that was supposed to go to the victims of white-collar fraud or to the government, to the taxpayers and the citizens, which President Trump forgave. If they don't do it on the back end with the pardon, they do it on the front end by dismissing the case, if you can find the right lawyers and the right brokers.

My dear friend from New Jersey wants to make it sound like I am doing something partisan. I am joining his bill. It would be very easy for me to say that I reject everything Republicans do because they are on the side of this pro-fraud President, but I am not doing that.

The bill says let's call this the National Fraud Enforcement Division, and I say fine. That makes sense to me.

Why don't Republicans cross the aisle and say that it is wrong for them to be pardoning white-collar fraudster after white-collar fraudster, or at least pardoning them from having to pay the fines and the restitution back? It is an honest question.

Do my colleagues really think that $1.7 billion should go from what was going to be the pockets of the victims back into the bank account of the perpetrators?

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, the gentleman has his numbers. He has his vision. He has his partisan ideas. That is up to him, but I am trying to point out today—and I am going to continue to say this. We are trying to codify a division. We are trying to take something that is, right now, just an executive order and make it law to help the people who are right here in the gallery, right now, listening, who are wondering how their government works, wondering why, when they are here to witness a discussion and a debate about a bill. Whether for it or against it, whether it has value or not, we are getting into a host of other people and other ideas.

By the way, we don't know that the numbers are accurate. We don't know that the names are accurate. We don't know that anything, quite frankly, that my good friend from the other side of the aisle is saying is accurate.

What we are prepared to discuss today is trying to do legislation to take care of a problem that we all have to admit we know exists, and it is a serious problem. It is almost in every major city and other areas, as well, in the United States of America.

It is costing taxpayer dollars. The victims are the people who should be receiving the help from these programs, and they are not, often because so much of the money is wasted. It is a shame, so let's do the right thing today.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded that the rules do not allow for references to persons in the gallery.

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

Madam Speaker, I am afraid that the floor leader for the majority simply won't take ''yes'' for an answer. He says that we are here to consider this bill about fraud enforcement at the Department of Justice. I agree with his bill. I am going to vote for his bill, but I don't just want a new sign on the door.

I want a completely new philosophy which says that we actually prosecute fraud. I am certain that my colleague is not interested just in the form of fraud enforcement but in the actual substance of fraud enforcement.

The gentleman does somewhat of a drive-by hit on my numbers. If my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have different numbers, let me know because I am taking the actual numbers that come from public records about how much money is being forgiven.

Madam Speaker, it may be that the majority has no interest in the fact that $1.7 billion is going from the victims of white-collar fraud back to the perpetrators because of the pardons, and we haven't even begun to tabulate how much has been taken from the victims when they don't even bring the charges because somebody gets the right lawyer or the right lobbyist involved in the situation.

I guess my question is, are we not interested in what this National Fraud Enforcement Division is actually going to do? Do we not want them to deal with the fraud that is now rampant throughout the Federal Government?

This President has made more than $2 billion in his first year in office, which is more than every other President in the history of the United States combined. It was made not just on the side, obviously, but through private and public salaries together.

Madam Speaker, $2 billion is more than every Member of the U.S. House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate make together, and the President made that on the side. We have never seen anything like it before. He brought back a $400 million jet from Qatar, in blatant violation of Article I, Section 9 of the Constitution, which says that no Federal official, including the President, can receive a present, an emolument, which means a payment, an office, or a title of any kind whatever, from a King, a Prince, or a foreign state.

Our colleagues say nothing. Where is the bipartisanship on that side that will say that the legislative branch stands for something, that we are going to stand up for the Constitution, and that we are going to stand up against fraud and crime even if the executive branch won't do it?

They are the ones who are acting like naked partisans every day and why the performance of this 119th Congress limps to a close with a whimper because they won't even speak up for the constitutional powers that have been stripped from us, like the tariff power, the taxing power, and the war power, even the power to regulate Federal buildings, like the Kennedy Center and the White House.

They won't stand up, actually, for a muscular law enforcement agenda, which should be a central commitment of the House Judiciary Committee. If the people of the United States reject this corrupt and authoritarian performance on their part, it will be a centerpiece of what the Judiciary Committee does when we get into the next Congress.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, we are going to wrap this up, but let me say that we certainly know that there was a great deal of fraud during the Biden administration. I didn't bring that up. I could give example after example of what has happened in agencies and different State programs and Federal programs. It is terrible, and it hurts people.

The purpose here today is to move forward, and the purpose here today is to support this legislation. I am glad that the gentleman from Maryland is begrudgingly supporting it but supporting it nevertheless. He is using his time in a political sense to display an entirely political argument about numbers of individuals and situations that have nothing to do with this legislation, but it is his right to use his time the way he wants to.

Madam Speaker, I urge everyone on both sides of the aisle to vote for this legislation to reduce the fraud that existed for so many years.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, our colleagues today have bragged about a lot of the investigations and prosecutions that were conducted under the Biden administration's Department of Justice.

By the way, before this Presidential administration, we didn't really think that the Attorney General was someone who reported directly to the President. That is an innovation of President Trump, who says he wants his own Roy Cohn and he wants an Attorney General who is going to report directly to him.

Madam Speaker, while they have dropped thousands of criminal investigations, thousands of them, including lots of fraud investigations, they brought prosecutions against James Comey, against Letitia James, against Senator ADAM SCHIFF and Senator MARK KELLY, and against our colleagues JASON CROW and MAGGIE GOODLANDER.

These are fraudulent investigations and fraudulent prosecutions. Simply, the President orders out for a pizza, and they snap to and deliver every time. Oh, you want us to prosecute the former Director of the FBI? You want us to prosecute a U.S. attorney? You want us to prosecute a U.S. Representative, a U.S. Senator? Fine, we will do it.

They had to fire a bunch of U.S. attorneys who refused to go along with it. That, in itself, is fraud. They have converted the Department of Justice into an instrument of fraud, not an instrument of fighting fraud.

I take the gentleman to be absolutely sincere in wanting to fight fraud, but this administration is not doing it. We have to get back on track, and we have to restore the rule of law in America.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1630

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

I am going to just share with you a few of the other people who have been pardoned in case people aren't completely convinced of the culture of corruption that we are saturated in.

President Trump said he was going to drain the swamp. He became the swamp. In fact, he gave a very swampy, insider, no-bid contract to the pool guy from Mar-a-Lago, who ended up turning the reflecting pool of the United States into an algae farm. My constituents are now calling it the strait of warm ooze, as the algae overpours the sides of the Reflecting Pool.

They tried to set up one of my constituents, Madam Speaker. Davey Hearn, a three-time Olympic canoeist, went for a bike ride, and he dipped his hand in the water to see what was going on. He was pounced on by Federal agents, held for 5 hours, and then they charged him with felony counts of destruction of Federal property, when they knew it was totally fallacious.

Then, finally, in court, they had to release the real Interior Department study showing that this was a botched installation by President Trump's contractor, by his hand-picked, no-bid, insider contractor, which has now taken full responsibility for it.

My constituent had to go out and find a lawyer, 76 years old, an Olympic canoeist, and they have no problem with that, a fraudulent prosecution. I hope that the new fraud unit with the sign on the door will prosecute that case.

I sent a letter to the U.S. attorney, Jeanine Pirro, the former FOX News commentator who is the U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia. I sent her a letter. I said: If you are still looking for vandals in the District of Columbia who are destroying Federal property worth more than a thousand dollars, I have a very good lead on who demolished the east wing of the White House without any permission from Congress or any license to do that. I have a very good lead on who has been scrawling graffiti illegally on the wall of the Kennedy Center and desecrating that institution set up by Congress, if you are looking for vandals.

This fraud goes from the biggest cases involving billions of dollars down to the level of the Reflecting Pool and the President's press team. I call it the deflecting pool. The whole executive branch of government is drowning in corruption and fraud.

I understand the impulse to say: Well, let's say we are against fraud, hey, we will put JD VANCE on it, and then there will be an antifraud unit. If you want to call it an antifraud unit, great, I am with you. I will demonstrate my bipartisanship. Will you, on the other side, demonstrate your bipartisanship by calling out the billions of dollars worth of fraud that are taking place right now in the executive branch of government?

It is going to take us years, maybe decades, to dig out from this nightmare of corruption and fraud that they have brought down on the Government of the United States. They have sent the message to all the white-collar criminals and fraudsters out there: They are just fine with what is going on. If nobody blows the whistle on the executive branch, then they won't blow the whistle on anybody else.

Well, that is not going to work for a society devoted to the rule of law, to freedom, democracy, and justice. At this point, let's put it all in the hands of the American people.

We can continue as we are going, the government being an instrument for the private self-enrichment of the guy who gets in and his family, friends, and corporations or the government being an instrument for the common good of the people. That was the vision of the Framers. That was the vision of the Founders of this country. Let's get back to it.

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

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I wish I heard that passion when there were all the issues that occurred with President Biden and his son, Hunter Biden, all the issues that occurred with the Steele dossier, all the issues that occurred with the misuse of the Attorney General and the Department of Justice. The list goes on and on.

I wish that passion that the gentleman from Maryland has right here and right now about all the issues he mentioned that don't deal with this legislation, I wish he had that in the previous 4 years. I wish he had that moral anger. I wish he was as focused then as he is now, but I didn't hear anything, including barely anything on the Epstein files.

I could go on and on, too. I could talk about all of those things, the illegal gun Hunter Biden—I am not going to go into it. I am here today to ask that Republicans and Democrats come together and do the right thing, and I urge them to support H.R. 9576.

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

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 1530, 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. The question is on passage of the bill.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Madam 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 will be postponed.

PREVENTING RIP-OFFS AND OBTAINING OVERSIGHT OF FUNDS ACT

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1530, I call up the bill (H.R. 10326) to enhance information-sharing capabilities between Federal law enforcement and State agencies to detect, investigate, and prosecute fraud in certain Federal programs, and to protect individual privacy, 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 1530, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 10326

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 ‘‘Preventing Rip-offs and Obtaining Oversight of Funds Act’’ or the ‘‘PROOF Act’’.

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION FOR INFORMATION SHARING AND ACCESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The head of a State administering a program described in subsection (b) shall, upon receipt of a written request from the Attorney General, provide such information as the Attorney General may require for purposes of investigating or prosecuting alleged fraud committed with regard to such program.

(b) PROGRAMS DESCRIBED.—The programs described in this subsection are the following:

(1) A State plan under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.) (or waiver of such plan).

(2) The supplemental nutrition assistance program established under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.).

(3) The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program established under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.).

(4) State unemployment compensation programs receiving funding under title III of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 501 et seq.).

(5) The Coronavirus Relief Fund established under section 601 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 801).

(6) The Coronavirus State and Local Fiscal Recovery Funds established under sections 602 and 603 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 802, 803).

(7) The Emergency Rental Assistance programs established under section 501 of subtitle A of title V of division N of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021 (15 U.S.C. 9058a) and section 3201 of the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 (15 U.S.C. 9058c).

(8) Elementary and secondary school emergency relief grants under—

(A) section 18003 of the CARES Act (Public Law 116–136; 20 U.S.C. 3401 note);

(B) section 313 of the Coronavirus Response and Relief Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2021 (Public Law 116–260; 20 U.S.C. 3401 note); and

(C) section 2001 of the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 (Public Law 117–2; 20 U.S.C. 3401 note).

(9) The Broadband Equity, Access, and Deployment Program established under section 60102(b)(1) of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (47 U.S.C. 1702(b)(1)).

(10) The Community Development Block Grant program administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development under title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.).

(11) Public Assistance and Hazard Mitigation grant programs administered by the Federal Emergency Management Agency under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.).

(12) The State Small Business Credit Initiative program established under the Small Business Jobs Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5701 et seq.).

(13) Any other program pursuant to which funds are made available to States identified by the Attorney General as vulnerable to fraud.

(c) SCOPE OF INFORMATION.—The requirement under subsection (a) applies to the following:

(1) Identity verification records.

(2) Benefit disbursement logs.

(3) Provider billing statements.

(4) Demographic information directly related to an active fraud investigation.

(5) Any other information, as determined appropriate by the Attorney General for purposes of the investigation or prosecution of alleged fraud.

SEC. 3. INFORMATION PROTECTION AND PRIVACY SAFEGUARDS.

(a) COMPLIANCE WITH PRIVACY LAWS.—The Attorney General shall handle all information obtained under section 2 in accordance with section 552a of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the ‘‘Privacy Act of 1974’’), and, where applicable, the regulations promulgated under section 264(c) of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (42 U.S.C. 1320d–2 note).

(b) SECURITY PROTOCOL.—The Attorney General shall establish information security protocols to ensure that information transferred from a State agency—

(1) is encrypted using industry-standard protocols;

(2) may only be accessed by authorized personnel; and

(3) is destroyed and permanently removed from any database upon the conclusion of the relevant legal proceedings or investigation.

(c) LIMITATION ON USE.—A Federal agency may only use information obtained under this Act for law enforcement purposes related to fraud, and may not disclose such information for any unrelated administrative or commercial purpose.

SEC. 4. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Attorney General shall submit a report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives detailing—

(1) the number of requests issued to State agencies pursuant to this Act;

(2) the programs with respect to which such requests were made; and

(3) the number of fraud investigations initiated and convictions secured using the information obtained.

SEC. 5. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect on the date that is 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 6. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this Act, and the application of the provisions of such to any person or circumstance, shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 7. DEFINITION.

In this Act, the term ‘‘State’’ means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and any other territory or possession of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees.

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. VAN DREW) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 10326.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 10326, the Preventing Rip-offs and Obtaining Oversight of Funds Act, otherwise known as the PROOF Act.

For years and years, the American taxpayer has been treated like an open ATM machine by sophisticated criminal syndicates, international fraudsters, and identity thieves. Billions of dollars intended for our most vulnerable citizens, for our children, for the hungry, and for the unemployed have, instead, been stolen by criminals.

The tragedy isn’t just that the money was stolen. The tragedy is that Federal law enforcement didn’t have sufficient tools to stop it. Sophisticated fraud rings intentionally scatter their operations across State lines because they know individual State databases do not talk to each other, and they also know they can hide behind local bureaucratic red tape.

We saw this exact crisis play out in Minnesota, where the Department of Justice and the United States Department of Agriculture uncovered massive, multimillion dollar retail SNAP fraud rings. The State administration actively resisted handing over the necessary applicant and disbursement data, calling the Federal request unprecedented.

When Federal oversight agencies demanded daycare attendance logs to stop corrupt providers from billing for kids who actually didn’t attend the center, they were denied the request.

Let me say that again: billing for children who weren't even there—to find that out and to stop it. It is the American taxpayers' money.

Voluntary State compliance has failed. We cannot allow State-level bureaucratic foot-dragging to act as a shield for criminals who are robbing the American taxpayer, and we certainly can't allow partisan political grandstanding, like we saw in Minnesota and California, derail these vital investigations and prosecutions. Wrong is wrong, and right is right. What was going on there was very, very wrong.

The PROOF Act provides the solution. It gives the Federal Government the statutory legal teeth it needs by mandating that when an Attorney General issues a written request tied to a fraud investigation, State agencies must share the data. We are all in this together. Crucially, this legislation builds directly off the powerful antifraud foundation already laid by the administration.

□ 1640

Earlier this year, the administration established a National Fraud Enforcement Division and launched a National Fraud Detection Center to centralize and aggressively target high-impact fraud schemes.

This bill ensures that Congress enables the administration—any administration—to have a whole-of-government crackdown on government waste go directly into law.

Madam Speaker, I would tell my colleagues who may be concerned about privacy to read the bill. It is clear. The legislation establishes ironclad, statutory legal guide rails. It explicitly mandates compliance with the Privacy Act and HIPAA. It makes clear that this data can only be used for fraud investigations, and it includes a mandatory data destruction clause requiring the DOJ to permanently purge and delete these records when an investigation or legal proceeding concludes.

Madam Speaker, if you are a law-abiding American citizen, then your privacy is protected. However, if you are a fraudster, if you are a crook, if you are a criminal, or if you are a rip-off artist ripping off the public, then your hiding spot is gone.

The PROOF Act is a commonsense, vital shield for taxpayer dollars. It ensures that public funds actually go as they should, to infrastructure, to communities, and to families that truly need them.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I was delighted to help the majority on the last bill because I thought it made some sense.

However, I rise in vehement opposition to H.R. 10326, the so-called PROOF Act, which is a dangerous bill and has nothing to do with fighting fraud and everything to do with orchestrating a huge privacy data power grab from the American people.

The goal of the bill is to get Congress to permit Trump's Department of Justice to do what DOGE was unable to do, even though it tried, because the courts blocked them from doing it. They were trying to amass all of our private and personal data into a master government database of every American who has ever applied for or accepted a benefit from or otherwise used any Federal program without any proof or any probable cause or any reasonable suspicion of a crime.

The gentleman says that the requests from DOJ are not being honored by the States. They are being honored when they can demonstrate that there is a connection to actual fraud. However, when the States are resisting and going to court to stop—and this is not just blue States but red States too—our requests from the administration to turn over all data, all data about Americans who are not suspected of any fraud, courts across the country are ruling for the States and for the people against that outrageous privacy data power grab.

We are being asked to vote today on a bill that overthrows the longstanding privacy safeguards governing these programs and all the general privacy laws enacted by Congress to protect our personal data from unwarranted government surveillance and collection. This is a sweeping change being rushed to the floor at the last minute in the waning days of the least productive Congress for one century, at least, in total violation of regular order.

We have had no Judiciary Committee hearings on this bill and no Judiciary subcommittee hearings on this bill. We have not marked it up in committee, nor have we had an opportunity to amend or improve it.

I know my friends are not going to get any votes over on this side of the aisle, at least I hope not, but I sure hope that other Members on that side of the aisle read the fine print on this thing. That is because the majority's constituents are not going to like it one bit.

This legislation is totally unnecessary. The Department of Justice already has the tools it needs to investigate and prosecute fraud. That is what the other side has been bragging about for the last hour about the fraud investigations, most of them coming from the Biden administration originally, but in any event, they are bragging about the fraud investigations that they have done.

Using grand jury subpoenas, Republicans were able to get everything they need not just from the State agencies but from banks, from businesses, and from people.

Madam Speaker, follow the Constitution. The Framers were pretty wise people.

Earlier this year, the DOJ announced arrests and convictions in a variety of cases against fraudsters who tried to steal $340 million from various government programs. Although the administration claimed credit for bringing several cases, it actually began under the last administration. It is clear either way, wherever you want the credit to go, Madam Speaker, that the government had the capacity to investigate and prosecute fraud.

Our friends have not referred to a single case, not one single criminal case, where they tried to get evidence but couldn't get evidence. They have not shown one. They just said: Well, we have demanded all of the data.

Of course, Madam Speaker, you shouldn't get all the data. That is not consistent with the Privacy Act or any of the Federal statutes we have protecting the private information of every American citizen.

Under the statutes governing programs explicitly covered by this bill, States are already required to share information with the Federal Government to prevent, investigate, and root out fraud. We have gone through a very careful, painstaking legislative process writing those into specific bills.

Madam Speaker, what is the point of this bill?

It is not about fraud at all. It seeks to wipe out the privacy protections that Congress has enacted in these programs and to force States to turn over to Attorney General Todd Blanche massive amounts of personal data without the government having to show an iota of evidence that anyone is even suspected of fraud or anything else, no probable cause, no reasonable suspicion, no legal standard, just give us the information, which is exactly what Elon Musk wanted to do and why he was driven out of town by a bipartisan coalition.

This is not the first time the administration has tried to collect and assemble all of our data into one master Big Brother database.

Madam Speaker, you remember DOGE, and you remember Elon Musk. They stormed into the Social Security Administration in February of last year demanding access to the complete personal records of tens of millions of Americans. Judges all over America blocked DOGE's unlawful effort to vacuum up our most personal financial data.

One court called it a mass fishing expedition. Another judge blocked DOGE from obtaining student records, work records, and financial records from the Department of Education, the Office of Personnel Management, and the Treasury Department.

After DOGE's failure to create Elon Musk's desired central registry of private information on every American, the Trump administration has now shifted its tactics from DOGE to DOJ—you might say it has shifted from DOGE to DOJ, Madam Speaker, depending on how you want to pronounce it—demanding data in violation of numerous Federal laws, not even to mention State laws, often alongside threats to withhold Federal funding. Many States objected to these baseless demands in recognizing that fighting fraud was being used as a pretext for mopping up our private information.

They have been challenging the administration's data demands in court, and now that the States are, again, systematically beating Donald Trumped in court all over America, including with some Trump appointed judges, the administration is coming to Congress to insist that we force the States to give the Attorney General unfettered access to troves of Americans' most sensitive data for whatever purposes they see fit.

I want to clear up a misconception since it seems to be a common one among our colleagues. In addition to cooperating with law enforcement agencies like DOJ, the States already share program data and other information with the Federal Government for the purposes of prosecuting and preventing fraud in federally funded programs. That goes on all the time.

For some programs, regulations require States to share unemployment insurance data with the Department of Labor's Inspector General. In other programs, Congress has acted. For example, Federal law requires the States to report information for all SNAP applicants to local, State, and Federal law enforcement officials for the purpose of investigating fraud and maintaining the integrity of the program. It is already right there where it is necessary.

The difference is, of course, that in those cases, Congress has also required the States to maintain these essential privacy safeguards to balance the need for data sharing.

□ 1650

The States can only make our most sensitive information—our Social Security numbers, photographs, addresses, sources of income, and other private data—available to a law enforcement agency in extraordinary circumstances, when the government can show that their target is a flight risk or violating probation or subject to immediate arrest, or there is probable cause or reasonable suspicion that a crime is being committed.

The Trump administration is now demanding that State administrators provide the most intimate details of everyone's lives—home addresses, recent locations, Social Security numbers, and household incomes—to the Department of Justice on demand without any demonstrated need and without any showing of probable cause or reasonable suspicion or what have you.

Twenty-one State attorneys general are fighting this demand for blanket access to this data with respect to every person who has ever enrolled in the SNAP program. As the State attorneys general have made clear, this demand violates multiple Federal laws, creates massive privacy and security risks, and will almost certainly be used by this administration to profile, harass, and surveil the citizens who lawfully apply for and receive these benefits but are not within the political favor of this White House.

The point is that States already share information necessary to investigate and prosecute criminal fraud. States are already required to share the data with the Federal Government for legitimate antifraud purposes. Relevant prosecutions are taking place every day, which is why the Department of Justice is able to brag about all the successes they have been having based on prosecutions and investigations done in the Biden administration.

What DOGE demanded, and Trump's DOJ is now demanding, is access to all of our data, including the data of tens of millions of Americans who are not and have never been suspected of fraud.

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

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Speaker, I want to answer a few of those thoughts that were put out.

I know the gentleman from Maryland is proposing a conspiracy theory here that somebody is trying to get everybody's sensitive information, the Social Security numbers of good Americans across the country. Nothing could be further from the truth.

He also says that constituents won't like this. Do you know what I know constituents don't like? They don't like getting ripped off. I know constituents are tired of working so hard and seeing their tax dollars completely wasted and going down the drain.

I think constituents are tired of being taken advantage of by fraudsters, crooks, and people who are actually hurting the very people who are supposed to get the money to make it better, to try to help them, whether it is TANF, Medicaid, COVID funding, all of these different areas.

We found some, and the States wouldn't cooperate in certain cases. I would maintain that more of it was political than anything else, and it was wrong. Do you know what constituents don't like? They don't like when State governments and the Federal Government stupidly can't talk to each other to try to stop fraud and corruption. That is what they don't like.

This PROOF Act doesn't build a surveillance state. That is nonsense. It builds a shield for the taxpayer. They are not tracking law-abiding citizens. That is complete nonsense, too.

We are tracking organized criminal rings, identity thieves, scammers, people who have stolen billions of dollars meant for our most vulnerable Americans.

The claim that this creates a sweeping Federal surveillance database is completely and totally false. Data sharing would be highly targeted. It requires an explicit—explicit—written request from the U.S. Attorney General for the purpose of investigating and prosecuting crime.

The legislation explicitly mandates full compliance—yes, read it. It is in there. It mandates full compliance with the Privacy Act of 1974 and with HIPAA regulations. The Federal Government cannot and will not simply hoard this data, as was suggested. The bill requires strict encryption, tightly restricted access, and permanent destruction of shared records once an investigation concludes.

This is just a flimsy excuse. The gentleman on the other side of the aisle, my friend, what he is saying is an excuse for inaction and more of the same corruption, more of the same hurt and waste of money.

Yes, we should know if a fraudster is charging for children to get care when these children don't exist and aren't there. We should know if a fraudster is claiming to provide medical care to a patient and that patient doesn't exist or the care was never provided. Dammit, they do have a right to know that.

If we really want to make change and not just keep talking about change, then we have to have action. That is what this bill represents.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to sponsor this bill. Defending the status quo under the guise of privacy ignores the reality of the rampant fraud that exists. If we can really dig into this, it will be shocking to see. We have touched only the tip of the iceberg. It is irresponsible and wrong to block commonsense accountability measures while billions—not millions, billions—in taxpayer funds disappear into the pockets of criminals.

The ranking member from the other side says to read the bill. I agree, read the bill. The text already includes robust protections, proving that their objection is purely political. Again, this is more about politics and less about reality, and more about politics, less about government.

True compassion means ensuring that the limited Federal benefits that are so stretched—and it is going to be tough over the next couple of years. We want to make sure that money actually reaches the people who need it. Every dollar stolen by a fraudster is a dollar taken away from some senior, child, or family.

Antifraud measures protect the integrity of these vital programs, and the PROOF Act is simply a good antifraud measure.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. KILEY).

Mr. KILEY of California. Mr. Speaker, if there is one thing that ought to be bipartisan, that ought to be nonpartisan, it is rooting out fraud.

When public dollars are taken away from their intended purpose and instead go into the pockets of criminals or organized criminal syndicates, criminal organizations, then everyone loses. Only the criminals win.

Unfortunately, my State, California, has seen more fraud than any other State. Just to take one example, during the COVID years, our nonpartisan

State auditor found that there was massive fraud in the unemployment department, amounting, by best estimates, to about $32 billion—$32 billion—in fraud.

Here is the thing. When fraudsters steal our unemployment funds, that means those funds aren't there for folks who have fallen on hard times. When fraudsters steal our SNAP benefits, that means those benefits aren't there for Californians who are hungry. When fraudsters steal our Medi-Cal benefits, those funds don't go to Californians who need healthcare.

When fraudsters steal our homelessness funds, those funds don't go to Californians who need shelter.

When fraudsters steal our financial aid funds, those funds don't go to Californians who need an education and need to be able to afford the cost of living.

When fraudsters steal our hospice funds, then they are not there to provide for comfort and dignity at the end of life.

When fraudsters steal our VA benefits, then they are not going to those who have served our country so valiantly.

When fraudsters steal SBA funds, then they are not going to the small businesses that are at the heart of our communities.

When fraudsters steal our workers' comp funds, then they are not going to workers injured on the job.

When fraudsters steal our childcare funds, then those funds are not going to families that need care for their kids, working families who need the help.

Mr. Speaker, this is not in any way, shape, or form a partisan issue. We need to have folks at all levels of government coordinating and working together to protect public tax dollars. If we can do this—and that is the very least that the public ought to expect of us—then we will save taxpayers' money. We will make a dent in the national debt. We will ensure program integrity so that the folks who need these benefits are actually receiving them.

□ 1700

I think part of the problem is that we have this sense on both sides where the issue has gotten politicized. You have folks on different sides, depending on one State or the other or the Federal Government, that are controlled by different parties, who accuse one or the other of fraud of various kinds instead of working together to actually get to the root of the problem.

In particular, what we are talking about with this bill, where we have Federal programs that are administered by the States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOLDMAN of Texas). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from California.

Mr. KILEY of California. Of course, information sharing, specifically as it relates to ongoing fraud investigations, is needed.

I mean, can you imagine? How lucky for the fraudsters if their misdeeds can go undetected because there is an artificial wall of separation between the State and Federal authorities in jointly administered programs. It makes no sense.

I do agree to some extent with my colleague from Maryland's process concerns. If he has ideas for improving the bill, I would hope that they see light in the Senate, and it will come back to us here in the House. As this legislation now stands, I think it is a good measure. I think it will help us to have greater coordination to protect public tax dollars and protect the integrity of public programs. I will be supporting it today.

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

I thank our Independent colleague from California for saying that we are registering legitimate concerns here, because we certainly are. Remember, there has been no subcommittee hearing, no committee hearing, and no markup. This just appeared on the House floor on the last day of session before the election. I don't know where it came from. Maybe the stork brought it.

The floor leader assures us that this is narrowly tailored. Look, we can root out criminal fraud while protecting the data and privacy rights of hundreds of millions of Americans. That is what we have been doing.

Our colleagues are talking about what took place in Minnesota, which was atrocious. It was also discovered, investigated, and prosecuted by State and Federal teams. So that is work—there are dozens of investigations, prosecutions, and indictments that have taken place there.

They say: Oh, well, something bad happened, and we responded to it. Therefore, now let's get back to that Elon Musk idea of mopping up everybody's privacy data information in the country.

The gentleman assures us that it is narrowly tailored. Well, I hate to bring some facts into it, but why don't we actually look at the legislation itself, because it goes through a whole series of programs that it applies to. The gentleman might say, okay, well, that is a finite number of programs, like the SNAP program, the Community Development Block Grant Program, or the highway funds program.

Then, it says ''any other program pursuant to which funds are made available to States identified by the Attorney General as vulnerable to fraud.'' All the AG has to say is, vulnerable to fraud, and now we want all of your information.

You say: Oh, well, no, it is just specific information, right? Maybe it is just Social Security numbers, address, and so on. No, look in section 2, clause 5 on the top of page 5 of the bill.'' Any other information, as determined appropriate by the Attorney General for purposes of the investigation or prosecution of alleged fraud.''

It is up to the Attorney General to tell us what is appropriate. Now, what is narrowly tailored about that? The narrowly tailored approach is the one that we have. It is built into each statute. We have the Privacy Act.

You want to demolish and override all of that simply to say whatever the Attorney General considers to be appropriate, as either a program to target or information that the Attorney General wants, is now going to be the standard. Now we are right back to Elon Musk land.

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

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

Just a few points here as we go back to the gentleman's conspiracy theory. There is going to be specific need for this and a specific reason for doing it. HIPAA still would exist. The Privacy Act will still be there. Nothing is going to change. It isn't going to be hundreds of millions of—it is nothing like that.

What the gentleman is arguing, whether he realizes it or not, is the same old-same old, you know, just to do the same old thing. It is good enough just to go along, what we have now. There is nothing to see there. There is nothing to worry about. There are no problems.

Nobody believes that. I know I can't reference the people here watching and listening today, so I won't, but I will reference the American public. They know better. They know that a lot of it is wrong. They know that there is a lot of waste and that there is criminality involved.

To say there is no need and we are just going to do things the same old way that we have always done them and not make any change, is wrong. We can't do that anymore. We are hurting too many people. We are hurting the taxpayer, and we are hurting the people who should be receiving those benefits. It isn't good enough.

If there is nothing to see there and there is nothing to worry about, what are we so concerned about? What are we so concerned about?

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

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

I think the gentleman just said something very important there, when he said we would still have the Privacy Act. One can only assume his unfamiliarity with the litigation going on across the country to vindicate Privacy Act rights against an attempt to mop up all of this information.

That is why the executive branch has come to Congress to say: Will you pass this law so the Privacy Act won't apply anymore?

This is an attempt to overturn the Privacy Act.

I just want to know, for the purposes of legislative history and the record, is the gentleman actually stipulating that nothing in this legislation is intended to override the Privacy Act?

I am happy to yield to the gentleman to respond or if he wants to take a moment to look at that.

Let me just try to explain why the constitutional values that we are raising here apply to everybody across the board in America. There are some people perhaps who don't have much of an interest in people who get SNAP benefits. Those are millions of our fellow citizens. You say, well, no big deal. I don't care about their privacy rights.

Imagine a future administration, and let's say there are allegations that there is a pay-to-play system for getting a gun license or a concealed carry permit. There have been scandals around that. Say there are allegations about that in a particular State or a group of States. In fact, you don't even need allegations because the Attorney General can just dream it up and say: I think that there is a risk or a hazard of that happening. But say there are allegations.

Under a different administration, this legislation that we are about to vote on would allow the Department of Justice to go to police departments and gun licensing agencies around America and demand that they turn over all of the privacy data for all individuals who have applied for a firearm license, if in the unilateral discretion of the Attorney General he or she thinks that is relevant to combating fraud.

You don't have to show they have done anything wrong. You can already get that information. That is what I am trying to explain to you. That is what the whole process is designed around today. The reason why the administration is losing in court is because they just want all of the information, even if it doesn't relate to any particular facts suggesting that there is criminal wrongdoing taking place.

Do we really want to say, or do our colleagues want to say, that we are going to empower the Attorney General to go to State police forces or licensing authorities around America and get all of the information about people who have applied for a gun license, even if they didn't get it, or everybody who has received a gun license, their Social Security number, their home address, any other information the Attorney General considers relevant, their criminal record, their civil record in court, whatever the Attorney General says is relevant to the possible vulnerability of fraud?

This is why we have a legislative process. This is why we have hearings, so we can talk about these things. Why do our colleagues want to skip over the entire legislative process and just throw this very hastily and, I think, incompetently written legislation on the floor? That is my question.

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

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

Let me just answer a couple of those things. First of all, that is why we are doing this. We are going to be voting on it in a little while, and it will be up to the Members of Congress to decide what they want to do, number one.

Secondly—I am just going to read to you right from the bill—the gentleman is not accurate in what he is saying.

□ 1710

''Section 3, Information Protection and Privacy Safeguards.'' It is there for everybody to read. ''A, Compliance With Privacy Laws. The Attorney General shall handle all information obtained under section 2 in accordance with section 552a of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the ''Privacy Act of 1974''), and, where applicable, the regulations promulgated under section 264(c) of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996,'' otherwise known as HIPAA.

It says it right there, Mr. Speaker. It says it right there that we must comply with that, that this legislation complies with that.

Again, we don't need to do the same old-same old. No, what we have done for years is not good enough. No, what has been going on is wrong. No, we need to do better. We need to be more accountable to the taxpayer.

Nobody is gathering everybody's Social Security numbers in the country, but when somebody claims, when a vendor claims, that they have given something or provided care or done something and they haven't done it but the American tax dollar goes toward it, that is wrong.

Finally, I would say, why do we have an interest in this? It is the right thing to do for the taxpayer. It is the right thing to do for people who are recipients of these programs, but we also have a responsibility as Members of Congress. These are Federal funds, very often, most often, that flow through the States and the States administer. We do have a responsibility to make sure that those funds are being spent properly.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I was hoping that the gentleman would say that because he is referring to one section of the Privacy Act, about the handling of data, but our concern is about the acquisition of the data in the first place. The attorney general has the authority under the bill that the gentleman is representing to share that information with every other Federal department and agency.

There is nothing in there about that unless I am missing something. I saw the part about the handling of the data, but is he not allowed to share it with other Federal departments and agencies? That is my reading of the bill. I would stand to be corrected. I would hope to be corrected.

In any event, the gentleman has not denied—I wish he would—that this is overriding all of the other provisions of the Privacy Act, and it is also overriding all of the privacy provisions that we have inscribed into the specific statutes that are being affected here.

For example, the SNAP Act and the USDA's implementing regulations have privacy provisions. The Privacy Act of 1974 itself and all of the other provisions, the Computer Matching and Privacy Protection Act of 1988, the Paperwork Reduction Act, and so on, all of these other laws have privacy protections that you are wiping out by giving the attorney general all of this authority.

If you are not doing that, please clarify it for the legislative history record that we are making right now. If you are saying that the Privacy Act in its entirety is preserved by this bill, please clarify because that is something that we need to know.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I will comply—I don't always—but I will comply with the gentleman from Maryland. I am reading right from the bill: ''Limitation on Use. A Federal agency may only use information obtained under this act for law enforcement purposes related to fraud, and may not disclose such information for any unrelated administrative or commercial purpose.''

I am going to read it again.

''A Federal agency may only use information obtained under this act for law enforcement purposes related to fraud, and may not disclose such information for any unrelated administrative or commercial purpose.''

I am complying with the gentleman's request.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, again, I am afraid we are talking at cross-purposes here because what we are talking about is the vast acquisition of information from the States that cannot be obtained now, which is why they are consistently losing in court. They can't receive it under the Privacy Act or under the provisions of each of the Federal statutes governing those State programs.

They want to wipe out those privacy protections and say it is up to the Attorney General. Then the Attorney General can share with other Federal agencies and departments if, in his sole view, that it is relevant to what he says is related to fraud and he can share it with all of these other Federal departments and agencies and so on.

I still don't have an answer as to whether or not this is meant to supersede and override the privacy protections that exist in all of those other

Federal laws. I just want to get clarity on that point.

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

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Speaker, I have given that clarity. I could go on all night, to be honest with you, I just disagree with you. I believe you are incorrect, but nevertheless, we have to move along.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I will return for a moment to the example that I gave about this legislation being written in such an overly broad and sloppy way. Remember, we have not had a hearing or markup on it, so we haven't had the opportunity to improve it. It has been written in such a sloppy and broad way that an Attorney General could literally say, we believe that there is pay-to-play going on for people getting gun licenses or getting a concealed carry permit in a particular State, and there has been scandals about that. Therefore, we want to get all of the information about everybody who has sought and received or been rejected in getting such a gun license or such a permit.

We want their addresses. We want their names. We want their Social Security numbers. We want to know every time they have applied for that benefit or any other benefit. We want any information you have about their finances.

The gentleman seems to be saying that is fine with him, that any Federal agency that can get the approval of the Attorney General to do it or the Department of Justice itself can go on a fishing expedition against anybody who has sought any Federal benefit or program.

We are going to be creating a mass Orwellian database of information about people and that, of course, is what Elon Musk and the President wanted to do, and the courts shut them down.

Now, we are doing it through the backdoor by saying if you have ever sought any kind of program benefit, such as a school loan, a VA loan, a housing loan, you could have tried to get a gun permit, you could have applied to get some kind of benefit from your State, some kind of tax benefit from your State or what have you, then all of a sudden, the attorney general now has fishing expedition rights to mop up all of that information.

The courts are not allowing it under the Privacy Act. The courts are not allowing it under the specific privacy protections inscribed into the very statutes. That is why they are coming forward with this mass omnibus database that they want to put together at this point.

I think the American people reject it just like the courts have rejected it and just like our Constitution rejects that approach. We don't have a problem today going after the fraud by using that old-fashioned American principle of evidence.

If somebody is actually ripping off the system or we have reason to believe, reasonable suspicion to believe, then you can launch your investigation. If there is probable cause, bring an indictment. That is what has been working in Minnesota. That is happening right now.

They just want to exploit the opportunity of that scandal to say, now, let's go and get everybody's data information in the country, and I think that is totally antithetical to the basic founding values of our Constitution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman uses some examples. For one example, gun licenses and permits don't get Federal funds. It is not an issue where Federal funds are flowing to the States at all, so some of what he is saying there is not accurate. Again, in the interest of time, we could go back and forth, but the claim that this creates a sweeping, Federal surveillance database just isn't true.

I don't know how many ways I can say it. I am reading from the bill. I think it has been clarified over and over again. I think the gentleman is just attempting to frighten people, and it is just not accurate.

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

□ 1720

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

Mr. Speaker, the police departments receive money for background checks for NCIC and have gotten traditionally tons of Federal money through various grant programs. Any grant program under the legislation that the gentleman is carrying opens up that State, county, or municipality to investigation by the Federal Government.

If I am wrong about that, please correct me.

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

Mr. VAN DREW. I will make this brief. The gentleman is wrong, and I am correct.

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

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

Well, what the gentleman offers by way of brevity, he lacks in terms of accuracy.

There are lots of Federal programs, lots of Federal moneys that go to State and local governments. That is the whole point of the legislation that the gentleman is representing—to use that as a lever to get all of this information from the States and localities about the people of the United States.

Let's stand up on a bipartisan basis for constitutional values and reject this legislation. In fact, I would urge our colleagues just to withdraw the legislation and say save it for another day where we can have an actual hearing about it and a markup, and we can analyze it and engage in the legislative process.

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

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we have demonstrated that this is legislation that is a solution in search of a problem.

We are working on the fraud problem, which in the last bill they were bragging about all of the great successes that they have had. Now, we can, in fact, contest some of that because most of those cases came from the prior administration. But, regardless, they were bragging about the successes that they have had prosecuting fraud cases. They certainly haven't prosecuted any of the friends of the President, but that is a separate problem that we have talked about exhaustively today.

But, in any event, there is no problem being solved by their legislation, other than the fact that they haven't really done anything in this Congress and so they want to say that they are doing something.

The fraud prosecutions are taking place today. This legislation is really a vehicle for creating a mass privacy database of information about Americans who have dared to go and seek a benefit from their own tax dollars going to the Federal Government, whether it is the SNAP program, or it is a background check on guns, or it is applying for a VA loan, or what have you.

I don't think applying for participation in a Federal program or a Federal benefit should be justification for surrendering the rights that you have under the Privacy Act and under the Constitution.

We are talking about law-abiding, innocent Americans, millions of them. Let us go after the criminals, the kind of people that Donald Trump has been pardoning—dozens and dozens of convicted white collar fraudsters. Let's go after them.

Let's not engage in an information grab against tens of millions of other Americans who have done nothing other than try to survive in this economy, which is teetering. That is what we should have been spending our time on today rather than on this nonsense, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me say the claims that this creates a sweeping Federal surveillance database just aren't true. They are false.

The data sharing is highly targeted. It requires an explicit written request for a U.S. Attorney General. We must abide by the Privacy Act. None of that has changed.

When it comes to the gun situation, gun licensing, a NICS check, it is not a program that is administered by giving benefits to people. It doesn't relate to that at all, and the gentleman is inaccurate in what he is saying.

I know he is putting forward a conspiracy theory, but the bottom line is he speaks about what constituents would like and not like.

You know what they don't like? They don't like the same old-same old. They don't want to hear from us: Yeah, everything we are doing is good. It is all perfect. Nothing to see there. Don't look into it. It has all been fine. It has all been okay.

Mr. Speaker, it hasn't been okay. There is a lot of wrong that has been done with these programs—a lot of people who haven't been helped that should be helped, a lot of taxpayers that paid for nothing and got hurt in this, and it should come to an end.

To say no, we are just going to do the same stuff, nothing to see there, no big deal; that is wrong. The American public is tired of it. They are sick of it. They are sick to death of it, and they can't afford it.

That is why this is a good bill.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge everyone, regardless of whatever political party they are, to vote for this piece of legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 1530, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

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. The question is on passage of the bill.

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

Mr. RASKIN. 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 will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE ISSUED BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY RELATING TO THE ''CALIFORNIA STATE NONROAD ENGINE POLLUTION CONTROL STANDARDS; COMMERCIAL HARBOR CRAFT REGULATIONS; NOTICE OF DECISION''

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1530, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 213) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule issued by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to the ''California State Nonroad Engine Pollution Control Standards; Commercial Harbor Craft Regulations; Notice of Decision'', and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1530, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 213

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves the rule issued by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to the ''California State Nonroad Engine Pollution Control Standards; Commercial Harbor Craft Regulations; Notice of Decision'' (90 Fed. Reg. 1998 (January 10, 2025)), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the legislation and to include extraneous material on H.J. Res. 213.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 213.

H.J. Res. 213, led by Representative JAMES GALLAGHER from California, would overturn a waiver allowing California to regulate emissions from tugboats, ferries, and other commercial harbor craft.

This CRA action would not impact the State's previous regulations on these vessels.

These newest California regulations at issue are impractical and costly for most of the commercial boat industry to meet.

It would expand California's EV and zero-emissions mandates to ferries and would impose the most stringent emissions standard for diesel engines to tugboats and other harbor craft. These hardworking vessels are essential with keeping goods and people moving.

The State's newest rules would significantly impact tugboats and harbor pilots, which are essential for guiding tankers and container ships safely to ports and back out to sea.

They would impose billions of dollars in compliance costs to these boat operators, which will be passed down to consumers, and could bring the petroleum delivery supply chain for the entire West Coast to a halt. That would raise gas prices throughout the country.

□ 1730

These regulations also pose safety risks for boat operators and the general public.

The State rules would require the use of engine technology that may be appropriate for trucks, including the use of diesel particulate filters, but it would require significant reengineering for use on boats. They have not been certified as safe for maritime use.

The use of diesel particulate filters poses fire risks on land, which is a problem in itself, but it would be disastrous when used on a boat.

The risk is so significant that the Coast Guard wrote to California highlighting this concern. Multiple maritime labor unions also oppose California's regulations and urged EPA to reject the waiver due to these safety concerns.

Finally, EPA's decision to approve a waiver for these rules has impacts far beyond California, and it is appropriate for Congress to use the Congressional Review Act to disapprove the waiver and block these regulations.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.J. Res. 213 to overturn these unsafe and overburdensome regulations, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 213.

Republican leadership is sending us home 2 weeks early for a 2-month recess before we return after the election, and instead of using the little time we have left to address the worsening affordability crisis that the Trump administration is causing, we are wasting the last week of session on another round of useless Congressional Review Act resolutions, or CRAs.

Mr. Speaker, Trump is destroying our economy while House Republicans sit on the sidelines. Let's take stock of where we are almost 2 years into this disastrous administration.

We have skyrocketing diesel prices, above $6 a gallon, the highest price ever, and getting higher every day. Trump's reckless war of choice in Iran is costing the average household more than $3,800 from higher grocery bills and transportation costs.

Gasoline prices are 33 percent higher compared to this time last year.

Thanks to President Trump's disastrous tariffs, inflation has reached a 3-year high.

With President Trump's latest trade war with Canada, costs to consumers are only going to rise further.

Rather than face any of these problems, the Republican majority is going back to the CRA well and then getting out of town.

This week's CRAs seek to nullify commonsense standards that will help save money on fuel costs and health bills. The commercial harbor craft standards simply require harbor craft vessels, such as excursion vessels, tugboats, workboats, and ferries operating within California waters, to upgrade to a cleaner diesel engine or zero-emission power, depending on vessel class.

The at-berth standards require large vessels like container ships, tankers, cruise ships, and auto carriers docked at California ports to either connect to shore power or use an approved emission-control strategy. Both are designed to help decrease the use of diesel fuel.

Mr. Speaker, these provisions have been on the books for years, driving investments in cleaner engines and technologies to upgrade port infrastructure and saving families billions in avoided healthcare costs.

Repealing these programs would throw that all away so that Republicans' corporate polluter friends like Big Oil can take advantage of hard-working American families. Meanwhile, these California maritime programs are making people's lives better and producing real benefits.

The transportation sector is a major source of dangerous pollution. The commercial harbor craft standards will save up to $5 billion in healthcare costs. The at-berth standards are delivering more than $2 billion in public health benefits to the American people and are reducing California residents' cancer risks by 55 percent.

If House Republicans were really concerned about costs and affordability for Americans, they would acknowledge the costs of pollution. They would recognize that repealing these standards is to shift those costs from the responsibility of those who are generating the pollution to American workers, families, businesses, and taxpayers at a time when healthcare costs are also skyrocketing.

The Republicans should do something about these costs instead of doubling down on these reckless CRAs.

Mr. Speaker, to top it off once again, House Republicans are ignoring the law and abusing the CRA process to retroactively target legally authorized Clean Air Act waivers. Both the Government Accountability Office and the Senate Parliamentarian have ruled that California waivers are orders, and so they are ineligible to be repealed with a CRA.

Last week, a judge granted a preliminary injunction blocking the EPA from reclassifying Clean Air Act waivers as rules and basically stopping the agency from sending them to Congress for nullification. Obviously, the Republicans don't care. They do whatever they please, like the President, so here we are wasting floor time on something that actually won't even make a difference. I can question whether these would even be sent to the Senate, to be perfectly honest.

Mr. Speaker, these resolutions, as I said, are a waste of time this week. Once again, they show that the Republicans have no interest in providing much-needed relief to American families.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose H.J. Res. 213, like I opposed H.J. Res. 210 last night, and urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GALLAGHER), representing California's First District.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 213, which overturns a Biden-era EPA waiver that gave California sweeping authority to impose burdensome and unrealistic zero-emission requirements on commercial harbor craft.

This House did a big part of the job last night when we repealed this waiver as it applies to oceangoing vessels at berth, but we need to finish the job by repealing this requirement on our commercial harbor craft.

Our maritime industry helps to move goods throughout the State and across the country. It is very interesting to hear Democrats today argue against something that would cut the cost of goods and the cost of living for the American consumer, and not in any small way.

Industry has estimated that this requirement would cost $2.5 billion. Who is going to pay that? The American consumer.

By this one act today, we are actually doing a whole lot more on the affordability front. We are doing a whole lot more to cut the cost of living, which has gotten way too high, especially in California.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle like to make a lot about protecting democracy and about affordability, but California is the example for the world, for this Nation, that they have done anything but.

Let's start by how this regulation was imposed: by an unelected bureaucracy and not by the legislature. It was not by the elected representatives of the State, but by bureaucrats, to the tune of $2.5 billion, costs that the consumer is supposed to pick up.

Our goods are brought by ships, our commercial fishing industry, our ferries, our tugboats, and our workboats. All of them will have this cost imposed, and it will have to be imposed then on the consumer.

Why should we allow an unelected bureaucracy to then dictate—our ports are international. Our boats move in international waters. It affects all the goods in America. Why should one unelected bureaucracy in California be able to determine that added cost for the world and for our Nation?

That is not democracy. In fact, that is actually the opposite of democracy, and it certainly is not helping our affordability.

Mr. Speaker, let's talk about where this all really comes from. The Clean Air Act, section 209, generally preempts States from regulating emissions for motor vehicles and other mobile sources unless EPA grants the State a waiver of preemption.

When that is done, a determination must be made that the State standards are at least as stringent as Federal standards and that they are needed by the State ''to meet compelling and extraordinary conditions.''

There was a bipartisan time in California when we did that to deal with the smog problem in Los Angeles, and that was a bipartisan effort. We imposed those more stringent standards to get to that point.

Nowadays, we have a one-party rule system and an unelected bureaucracy that imposes costs to get minimal benefit. California is the fifth largest economy in the world and represents less than 1 percent of the world's carbon emissions. Yet, we have the strictest standards and the most costs. It has become a theme in California: We pay more to get a whole lot less.

That stops here by taking this much-needed action to repeal this undemocratic rule that has been imposed and to actually start getting results on affordability.

It starts in California, where we are paying now almost $6 a gallon for gas because of these types of regulations, and where we are paying over $7 a gallon for diesel.

□ 1740

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

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I will just end with this: Reports even note that these rules would actually increase the cost of fuel, again taking us in the wrong direction when it comes to cost of living.

One study estimated that if you were to have to get rid of articulated tug barges because of this rule, we would actually increase carbon emissions, so we are going the wrong way on climate policy.

Again, why do we allow this to continue when we have a chance to actually lower people's cost of living and have a better policy for our Nation? There was a time when, in a bipartisan manner, we would do that, but now one-party rule and unelected bureaucracies have been allowed to get out of control and impose those costs on all of us throughout the Nation. It is wrong, and it needs to stop by passing this joint resolution today.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), the ranking member of the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, as chair of the California congressional delegation, I rise to strongly oppose this resolution and note that every Democratic House Member from California opposes it.

This is the 119th Congress' last day of business before we head home for 7 weeks. What are House Republicans doing? They are not reining in costs, not reining in ICE, not reining in the Iran war. No, they are focused on reining in California.

This is absurd. We are wasting precious time where we could be legislating for the American people. Instead, we are apparently legislating to benefit the oil and gas companies.

Why would we want to use diesel, that is selling in some parts of the State now at $8.99 a gallon, instead of cheaper, clean, electricity? It doesn't make any sense.

A Federal court even ruled just this Saturday that Trump's EPA violated the law in labeling these California waivers as rules, so they are not even subject to the CRA process that is being used here, and it is likely that they will not withstand legal scrutiny.

California is actually the fourth largest economy in the world. We are a donor State. We send more than $800 billion to the Federal Government, more than we take in, and we subsidize many of the States who are here represented on the floor today. I haven't been thanked by them very often.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that when people pick a fight with California, we have learned that you don't win. I urge a ''no'' vote on this ridiculous resolution.

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

I will comment on whether or not the EPA has the authority to declare these as rulemaking. The waivers were part of a bunch of last-minute midnight regulations pushed out at the end of the Biden administration.

The fact that they pushed out regulations setting standards for which technology doesn't exist to comply is indicative of the fact that these were last minute. Fortunately, the EPA rightly recognized that these are not waivers at all. They are new rules subject to review by Congress. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. RIVAS).

Ms. RIVAS. Mr. Speaker, California has a proud history of environmental protections that have delivered more than $2.3 billion in public health benefits and slashed port communities' cancer risk by 55 percent.

California's protections ensure polluters are held accountable for the environmental and public health harms that they are causing to environmental justice communities. We should be learning from California on how to protect our communities from polluters, but instead we have this resolution today, H.J. Res. 213, that is an illegal attack on California's work to set vital health protections at a time when Republicans have gutted Americans' healthcare and have done nothing to lower their cost of living.

I hear from my constituents across the San Fernando Valley about how Trump's and Republicans' policies are making life more expensive for them, including the cost of gas. This week, the cost of gas in the Los Angeles area was over $6 per gallon. This resolution will also do nothing to bring down skyrocketing fuel costs.

Americans have spent more than $105 billion on gasoline and diesel fuel since the start of Trump's reckless war of choice with Iran, while Trump's Big Oil buddies are raking in record profits.

Instead of working on a solution that would make life more affordable, Republicans are choosing to send Congress home early and give their polluting donors another gift.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this harmful Republican proposal, and I urge my Republican colleagues to work with us on solutions that will make life more affordable for our constituents instead of, yet again, making Americans sicker and poorer.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers, so I am prepared to close. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I want to close by explaining why this resolution should be defeated. The reality is that Big Oil has raked in record profits over the course of President Trump's disastrous war in Iran. Some of the world's biggest oil giants have nearly doubled or even quadrupled their earnings in the second quarter of 2026 compared to last year.

This is all while Americans have spent more than $105 billion more on gasoline and diesel fuel since the start of President Trump's war of choice in Iran.

The problem isn't getting any better, Mr. Speaker. Gas prices are 35 percent higher compared to this time last year, and diesel prices have soared to over $6 a gallon, hitting a new record. This will have devastating and cascading consequences on American households as high fuel costs ripple throughout the economy and raise prices on goods.

What is worse is that inflation has already hit a nearly 3-year high. Hardworking American families cannot continue to shoulder the burden of President Trump's and Republicans' affordability crisis.

Despite this, what have my Republican colleagues decided to do about it? Nothing. Absolutely nothing. Instead of providing relief to the American people, we are debating a resolution that attacks vital public health protections for the State of California that slash health-harming pollution and help save on expensive fuel costs.

Forget that Americans can barely afford to put food on their table or their healthcare. Republicans are more concerned with picking fights with blue States and cozying up to corporate polluters.

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

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

I want to point out that this Congressional Review Act does not impact California's longstanding regulatory program, just the most recent amendments that cannot be implemented affordably or with existing technology.

The air emissions from tugboats and the tugboat industry are very low. What we think would happen is, a recent report found that California's commercial harbor craft regulation would cause refinery tank operations to switch from ocean vessels to trucks. A switch of this nature would cause over 10,000 more trucks on the road, which would emit significantly more air pollution than ocean vessels.

I would also like to address something else. I keep hearing from my Democratic friends about Republican policies and how it has impacted things. In the 18 months after Democrats took control of both the House and the Senate when they were in the majority during 2021 and 2022, just 18 months into that Congress, inflation hit 9.1 percent. By the end of the 4 years they had the majority, inflation was over 21 percent. Wages only went up 16 percent.

□ 1750

Gas went over $5 a gallon. In regard to California, in October of 2022, gas was $5.45 a gallon. In September 2023, it was $5.48 per gallon.

My Democratic colleagues were not engaging with the world's leading sponsor of terrorism to try to prevent them from getting a nuclear bomb that terrorists could use on our country.

Once the Republicans took the majority in 2022, we immediately began working on reducing the cost of living for people. We brought inflation down to now, it is about 3.4 percent. We have got a lot more work to do, but we are committed to doing it.

What we are talking about here in regard to this current CRA is that we are trying to, once again, reduce the number of regulations that are imposing an enormous burden on American households. In fact, in the 4 years of the Biden administration, it was a record. The previous record was over $800 billion in regulatory costs imposed by the Obama administration. That is novice compared to what the Biden administration imposed of $1.6 billion.

We are working to try to address this, to bring down the cost of living, make sure our Nation is safe and secure, and to try to build on an economy that will benefit everyone.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this congressional review amendment resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 1530, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. PALLONE. 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 will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

Concurring in the Senate amendments on H.R. 5334;

Passage of H.R. 9576;

Passage of H.R. 10326;

Passage of H.J. Res. 213; and

Motions to suspend the rules and pass:

H.R. 9340;

S. 2403; and

H.R. 9497.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 2- or 5-minute votes.

SUPPORTING EARLY-CHILDHOOD EDUCATORS' DEDUCTIONS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to concur in the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 5334) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow early childhood educators to take the educator expense deduction, and for other purposes, offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to concur.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 262, nays 159, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 308]

YEAS—262

Aderholt
Alford
Allen
Amodei (NV)
Arrington
Auchincloss
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Barr
Barrett
Baumgartner
Bean (FL)
Begich
Bell
Bentz
Bergman
Bice
Biggs (SC)
Bilirakis
Bishop
Boebert
Bost
Brecheen
Bresnahan
Brownley
Buchanan
Burchett
Burlison
Calvert
Cammack
Carbajal
Carey
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Case
Castor (FL)
Ciscomani
Clarke (NY)
Cline
Cloud
Clyburn
Clyde
Cohen
Cole
Collins
Comer
Costa
Crane
Crank
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Davis (NC)
De La Cruz
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Donalds
Downing
Edwards
Elfreth
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Evans (CO)
Ezell
Fallon
Fedorchak
Feenstra
Figures
Fine
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flood
Fong
Foster
Foxx
Frankel, Lois
Franklin, Scott
Fry
Fulcher
Fuller
Garbarino
Gill (TX)
Gillen
Gimenez
Golden (ME)
Goldman (NY)
Goldman (TX)
Gonzalez, V.
Gooden
Gosar
Gottheimer
Graves
Gray
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hageman
Hamadeh (AZ)
Haridopolos
Harrigan
Harris (NC)
Harshbarger
Hern (OK)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Hinson
Houchin
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunt
Hurd (CO)
Issa
Jack
Jackson (IL)
Jackson (TX)
James
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kaptur
Kean
Keating
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy (UT)
Kiggans (VA)
Kiley (CA)
Kim
Knott
Krishnamoorthi
Kustoff
LaHood
LaLota
Landsman
Langworthy
Latta
Lawler
Lee (FL)
Lee (NV)
Letlow
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luttrell
Mace
Mackenzie
Magaziner
Malliotakis
Maloy
Mann
Mannion
Mast
McCaul
McClain
McCormick
McDowell
McGuire
Menendez
Messmer
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Min
Moolenaar
Moore (AL)
Moore (NC)
Moore (UT)
Moore (WV)
Moran
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy
Nehls
Newhouse
Nunn (IA)
Obernolte
Ogles
Onder
Owens
Palmer
Panetta
Patronis
Pelosi
Perez
Perry
Pfluger
Pingree
Quigley
Raskin
Reschenthaler
Riley (NY)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rouzer
Rulli
Rutherford
Scalise
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Shreve
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Soto
Spartz
Stansbury
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stevens
Strong
Stutzman
Suozzi
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Timmons
Titus
Tokuda
Tonko
Turner (OH)
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Van Epps
Van Orden
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Vindman
Wagner
Walberg
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westerman
Wied
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Yakym
Zinke

NAYS—159

Adams
Aguilar
Amo
Ansari
Balint
Barragán
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Blair
Bonamici
Brown
Budzinski
Bynum
Carson
Carter (LA)
Casar
Casten
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Cleaver
Conaway
Correa
Courtney
Craig
Crockett
Crow
Davids (KS)
Davidson
Davis (IL)
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Dexter
Doggett
Escobar
Espaillat
Evans (PA)
Fields
Fletcher
Foushee
Friedman
Frost
Garcia (CA)
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gomez
Goodlander
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Harris (MD)
Hayes
Himes
Horsford
Hoyle (OR)
Huffman
Ivey
Jacobs
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kamlager-Dove
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy (NY)
Khanna
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latimer
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Levin
Liccardo
Lieu
Lofgren
Lynch
Massie
Matsui
McBath
McBride
McClain Delaney
McClellan
McClintock
McCollum
McDonald Rivet
McGarvey
McGovern
McIver
Meeks
Mejia
Menefee
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Morrison
Moskowitz
Mullin
Nadler
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Norman
Ocasio-Cortez
Olszewski
Omar
Pallone
Pappas
Peters
Pettersen
Pocan
Pou
Pressley
Ramirez
Randall
Rivas
Ross
Roy
Ruiz
Ryan
Salinas
Sánchez
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Self
Sewell
Sherman
Simon
Sorensen
Stanton
Strickland
Subramanyam
Sykes
Takano
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tlaib
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Tran
Underwood
Velázquez
Wahab
Walkinshaw
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Whitesides
Williams (GA)

NOT VOTING—12

Biggs (AZ)
Boyle (PA)
Dunn (FL)
Gallagher
Garamendi
Luna
Mills
Salazar
Smith (WA)
Tiffany
Wilson (FL)
Womack

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCDOWELL)(during the vote). The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings or other audible conversation is in violation of the rules of the House.

□ 1828

Mr. EVANS of Pennsylvania, Mses. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and ROSS changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. COHEN and VARGAS changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to concur was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL FRAUD ENFORCEMENT DIVISION ACT OF 2026

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on passage of the bill (H.R. 9576) to establish the National Fraud Enforcement Division of the Department of Justice, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 352, nays 72, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 309]

YEAS—352

Aderholt
Aguilar
Alford
Allen
Amo
Amodei (NV)
Arrington
Auchincloss
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Balint
Barr
Barragán
Barrett
Baumgartner
Bean (FL)
Beatty
Begich
Bell
Bentz
Bera
Bergman

Bice
Biggs (SC)
Bilirakis
Bishop
Boebert
Bost
Boyle (PA)
Brecheen
Bresnahan
Brown
Brownley
Buchanan
Budzinski
Burchett
Burlison
Calvert
Cammack
Carbajal
Carey
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Case
Castor (FL)
Ciscomani
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cohen
Cole
Collins
Comer
Conaway
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crane
Crank
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crockett
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davidson
Davis (NC)
De La Cruz
Dean (PA)
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donalds
Downing
Edwards
Elfreth
Ellzey
Emmer
Espaillat
Estes
Evans (CO)
Ezell
Fallon
Fedorchak
Feenstra
Fields
Figures
Fine
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flood
Fong
Foster
Foxx
Frankel, Lois
Franklin, Scott
Fry
Fulcher
Fuller
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Gill (TX)
Gillen
Gimenez
Golden (ME)
Goldman (TX)
Gooden
Goodlander
Gosar
Gottheimer
Graves
Gray
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hageman
Hamadeh (AZ)
Harder (CA)
Haridopolos
Harrigan
Harris (MD)
Harris (NC)
Harshbarger
Hayes
Hern (OK)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Himes
Hinson
Horsford
Houchin
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunt
Hurd (CO)
Issa
Jack
Jackson (TX)
James
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kaptur
Kean
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy (NY)
Kennedy (UT)
Kiggans (VA)
Kiley (CA)
Kim
Knott
Krishnamoorthi
Kustoff
LaHood
LaLota
Landsman
Langworthy
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latimer
Latta
Lawler
Lee (FL)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Letlow
Levin
Liccardo
Lieu
Lofgren
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luna
Luttrell
Lynch
Mace
Mackenzie
Magaziner
Malliotakis
Maloy
Mann
Mannion
Massie
Mast
Matsui
McBath
McBride
McCaul
McClain
McClain Delaney
McClellan
McClintock
McCollum
McCormick
McDonald Rivet
McDowell
McGarvey
McGuire
Meeks
Mejia
Meng
Messmer
Meuser
Mfume
Miller (IL)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Min
Moolenaar
Moore (AL)
Moore (NC)
Moore (UT)
Moore (WI)
Moore (WV)
Moran
Morelle
Morrison
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Murphy
Nadler
Neal
Neguse
Nehls
Newhouse
Norcross
Norman
Nunn (IA)
Obernolte
Ogles
Olszewski
Onder
Owens
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Patronis
Pelosi
Perez
Perry
Pfluger
Pingree
Pou
Quigley
Randall
Raskin
Reschenthaler
Riley (NY)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rouzer
Roy
Ruiz
Rulli
Rutherford
Scalise
Scanlon
Schmidt
Scholten
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Self
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shreve
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Sorensen
Soto
Spartz
Stansbury
Stanton
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stevens
Strickland
Strong
Stutzman
Suozzi
Sykes
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Timmons
Titus
Torres (CA)
Trahan
Tran
Turner (OH)
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Van Epps
Van Orden
Vasquez
Veasey
Vindman
Wagner
Walberg
Walkinshaw
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westerman
Whitesides
Wied
Williams (TX)
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Yakym
Zinke

NAYS—72

Adams
Ansari
Beyer
Blair
Bonamici
Bynum
Carson
Carter (LA)
Casar
Casten
Castro (TX)
Chu
Clyburn
Craig
Davis (IL)
DeGette
Dexter
Escobar
Evans (PA)
Fletcher
Foushee
Friedman
Frost
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Hoyle (OR)
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jacobs
Jayapal
Kamlager-Dove
Khanna
Lee (PA)
McGovern
McIver
Menefee
Menendez
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Peters
Pettersen
Pocan
Pressley
Ramirez
Rivas
Ross
Ryan
Salinas
Sánchez
Schakowsky
Schneider
Simon
Subramanyam
Takano
Thanedar
Thompson (MS)
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (NY)
Underwood
Vargas
Velázquez
Wahab
Watson Coleman
Williams (GA)

NOT VOTING—9

Biggs (AZ)
Dunn (FL)
Garamendi
Gonzalez, V.
Mills
Salazar
Smith (WA)
Tiffany
Womack

□ 1837

Messrs. JACKSON of Illinois and KHANNA changed their votes from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PREVENTING RIP-OFFS AND OBTAINING OVERSIGHT OF FUNDS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on passage of the bill (H.R. 10326) to enhance information-sharing capabilities between Federal law enforcement and State agencies to detect, investigate, and prosecute fraud in certain Federal programs, and to protect individual privacy, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 217, nays 207, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 310]

YEAS—217

Aderholt
Alford
Allen
Amodei (NV)
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Barr
Barrett
Baumgartner
Bean (FL)
Begich
Bentz
Bergman
Bice
Biggs (SC)
Bilirakis
Boebert
Bost
Brecheen
Bresnahan
Burchett
Burlison
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Ciscomani
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Collins
Comer
Crane
Crank
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Davidson
Davis (NC)
De La Cruz
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Downing
Edwards
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Evans (CO)
Ezell
Fallon
Fedorchak
Feenstra
Fine
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flood
Fong
Foxx
Franklin, Scott
Fry
Fulcher
Fuller
Gallagher
Garbarino
Gill (TX)
Gimenez
Golden (ME)
Goldman (TX)
Gonzalez, V.
Gooden
Gosar
Graves
Gray
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hageman
Hamadeh (AZ)
Haridopolos
Harrigan
Harris (MD)
Harris (NC)
Harshbarger
Hern (OK)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Hinson
Houchin
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunt
Hurd (CO)
Issa
Jack
Jackson (TX)
James
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kean
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy (UT)
Kiggans (VA)
Kiley (CA)
Kim
Knott
Kustoff
LaHood
LaLota
Langworthy
Latta
Lawler
Lee (FL)
Letlow
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luna
Luttrell
Mace
Mackenzie
Malliotakis
Maloy
Mann
Mast
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McCormick
McDowell
McGuire
Messmer
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Moore (AL)
Moore (NC)
Moore (UT)
Moore (WV)
Moran
Murphy
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Nunn (IA)
Obernolte
Ogles
Onder
Owens
Palmer
Patronis
Perez
Perry
Pfluger
Reschenthaler
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rouzer
Roy
Rulli
Rutherford
Scalise
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Self
Sessions
Shreve
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Strong
Stutzman
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Timmons
Turner (OH)
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Van Epps
Van Orden
Wagner
Walberg
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westerman
Wied
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Yakym
Zinke

NAYS—207

Adams
Aguilar
Amo
Ansari
Auchincloss
Balint
Barragán
Beatty
Bell
Bera
Beyer
Bishop
Blair
Bonamici
Boyle (PA)
Brown
Brownley
Budzinski
Bynum
Carbajal
Carson
Carter (LA)
Casar
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conaway
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crockett
Crow
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Dexter
Dingell
Doggett
Elfreth
Escobar
Espaillat
Evans (PA)
Fields
Figures
Fletcher
Foster
Foushee
Frankel, Lois
Friedman
Frost
Garcia (CA)
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gillen
Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Goodlander
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jacobs
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy (NY)
Khanna
Krishnamoorthi
Landsman
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latimer
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Levin
Liccardo
Lieu
Lofgren
Lynch

Magaziner
Mannion
Massie
Matsui
McBath
McBride
McClain Delaney
McClellan
McCollum
McDonald Rivet
McGarvey
McGovern
McIver
Meeks
Mejia
Menefee
Menendez
Meng
Mfume
Min
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Morrison
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Nadler
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Ocasio-Cortez
Olszewski
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pelosi
Peters
Pettersen
Pingree
Pocan
Pou
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Randall
Raskin
Riley (NY)
Rivas
Ross
Ruiz
Ryan
Salinas
Sánchez
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Sewell
Sherman
Simon
Sorensen
Soto
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Subramanyam
Suozzi
Sykes
Takano
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Tran
Underwood
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Velázquez
Vindman
Wahab
Walkinshaw
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Whitesides
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

Biggs (AZ)
Buchanan
Dunn (FL)
Garamendi
Mills
Salazar
Smith (WA)
Tiffany
Womack

□ 1843

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE ISSUED BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY RELATING TO THE ‘‘CALIFORNIA STATE NONROAD ENGINE POLLUTION CONTROL STANDARDS; COMMERCIAL HARBOR CRAFT REGULATIONS; NOTICE OF DECISION’’

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on passage of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 213) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule issued by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to the ‘‘California State Nonroad Engine Pollution Control Standards; Commercial Harbor Craft Regulations; Notice of Decision’’, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 214, nays 208, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 311]

YEAS—214

Aderholt
Alford
Allen
Amodei (NV)
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Barr
Barrett
Baumgartner
Bean (FL)
Begich
Bentz
Bergman
Bice
Biggs (SC)
Bilirakis
Boebert
Bost
Brecheen
Bresnahan
Burchett
Burlison
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Ciscomani
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Collins
Comer
Crane
Crank
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Davidson
Davis (NC)
De La Cruz
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Downing
Edwards
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Evans (CO)
Ezell
Fallon
Fedorchak
Feenstra
Fine
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fleischmann
Flood
Fong
Foxx
Franklin, Scott
Fry
Fulcher
Fuller
Gallagher
Garbarino
Gill (TX)
Gimenez
Goldman (TX)
Gonzalez, V.
Gooden
Gosar
Graves
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hageman
Hamadeh (AZ)
Haridopolos
Harrigan
Harris (MD)
Harris (NC)
Harshbarger
Hern (OK)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Hinson
Houchin
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunt
Hurd (CO)
Issa
Jack
Jackson (TX)
James
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kean
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy (UT)
Kiggans (VA)
Kiley (CA)
Kim
Knott
Kustoff
LaHood
LaLota
Langworthy
Latta
Lawler
Lee (FL)
Letlow
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luna
Luttrell
Mace
Mackenzie
Malliotakis
Maloy
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McCormick
McDowell
McGuire
Messmer
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Moore (AL)
Moore (NC)
Moore (UT)
Moore (WV)
Moran
Murphy
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Nunn (IA)
Obernolte
Ogles
Onder
Owens
Palmer
Patronis
Perry
Pfluger
Reschenthaler
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rouzer
Roy
Rulli
Rutherford
Scalise
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Self
Sessions
Shreve
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Strong
Stutzman
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Timmons
Turner (OH)
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Van Epps
Van Orden
Wagner
Walberg
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westerman
Wied
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Yakym
Zinke

NAYS—208

Adams
Aguilar
Amo
Ansari
Auchincloss
Balint
Barragán
Beatty
Bell
Bera
Beyer
Bishop
Blair
Bonamici
Boyle (PA)
Brown
Brownley
Budzinski
Bynum
Carbajal
Carson
Carter (LA)
Casar
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conaway
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crockett
Crow
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Dexter
Dingell
Doggett
Elfreth
Escobar
Espaillat
Evans (PA)
Fields
Figures
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Foster
Foushee
Frankel, Lois
Friedman
Frost
Garcia (CA)
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gillen
Golden (ME)
Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Goodlander
Gottheimer
Gray
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy (NY)
Khanna
Krishnamoorthi
Landsman
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latimer
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Levin
Liccardo
Lieu
Lofgren
Lynch
Magaziner
Mannion
Matsui
McBath
McBride
McClain Delaney
McClellan
McCollum
McDonald Rivet
McGarvey
McGovern
McIver
Meeks
Mejia
Menefee
Menendez
Meng
Mfume
Min
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Morrison
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Nadler
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Ocasio-Cortez
Olszewski
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pelosi
Perez
Peters
Pettersen
Pingree
Pocan
Pou
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Randall
Raskin
Riley (NY)
Rivas
Ross
Ruiz
Ryan
Salinas
Sánchez
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Sewell
Sherman
Simon
Sorensen
Soto
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Subramanyam
Suozzi
Sykes
Takano
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Tran
Underwood
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Velázquez
Vindman
Wahab
Walkinshaw
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Whitesides
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—11

Biggs (AZ)
Buchanan
Dunn (FL)
Garamendi
Jacobs
Lee (NV)
Mills
Salazar
Smith (WA)
Tiffany
Womack

□ 1849

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Ms. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, my vote was not recorded today. Had it been recorded, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 311.

RATEPAYER PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 9340) to amend the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 to establish a Federal standard relating to the recovery of the full, incremental costs of upgrades that serve large-load customers, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 417, nays 3, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 312]

YEAS—417

Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Alford
Allen
Amo

Amodei (NV)
Ansari
Arrington
Auchincloss
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Balint
Barr
Barragán
Barrett
Baumgartner
Bean (FL)
Beatty
Begich
Bell
Bentz
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bice
Biggs (SC)
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blair
Boebert
Bonamici
Bost
Brecheen
Bresnahan
Brown
Brownley
Budzinski
Burchett
Burlison
Bynum
Calvert
Cammack
Carbajal
Carey
Carson
Carter (GA)
Carter (LA)
Carter (TX)
Casar
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Ciscomani
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Cline
Cloud
Clyburn
Clyde
Cohen
Cole
Collins
Comer
Conaway
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crane
Crank
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crockett
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davidson
Davis (IL)
Davis (NC)
De La Cruz
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Dexter
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donalds
Downing
Edwards
Elfreth
Ellzey
Emmer
Escobar
Espaillat
Estes
Evans (CO)
Evans (PA)
Ezell
Fallon
Fedorchak
Feenstra
Fields
Figures
Fine
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flood
Fong
Foster
Foushee
Foxx
Frankel, Lois
Franklin, Scott
Friedman
Frost
Fry
Fulcher
Fuller
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gill (TX)
Gillen
Gimenez
Golden (ME)
Goldman (NY)
Goldman (TX)
Gomez
Gonzalez, V.
Gooden
Goodlander
Gosar
Gottheimer
Graves
Gray
Green, Al (TX)
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hageman
Hamadeh (AZ)
Harder (CA)
Haridopolos
Harrigan
Harris (MD)
Harris (NC)
Harshbarger
Hayes
Hern (OK)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Himes
Hinson
Horsford
Houchin
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hunt
Hurd (CO)
Issa
Ivey
Jack
Jackson (IL)
Jackson (TX)
Jacobs
James
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Kean
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy (NY)
Kennedy (UT)
Khanna
Kiggans (VA)
Kiley (CA)
Kim
Knott
Krishnamoorthi
Kustoff
LaHood
LaLota
Landsman
Langworthy
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latimer
Latta
Lawler
Lee (FL)
Lee (NV)
Letlow
Levin
Liccardo
Lieu
Lofgren
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luna
Luttrell
Lynch
Mace
Mackenzie
Magaziner
Malliotakis
Maloy
Mann
Mannion
Massie
Mast
Matsui
McBath
McBride
McCaul
McClain
McClain Delaney
McClellan
McClintock
McCollum
McCormick
McDonald Rivet
McDowell
McGarvey
McGovern
McGuire
McIver
Meeks
Mejia
Menefee
Menendez
Meng
Messmer
Meuser
Mfume
Miller (IL)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Min
Moolenaar
Moore (AL)
Moore (NC)
Moore (UT)
Moore (WI)
Moore (WV)
Moran
Morelle
Morrison
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Murphy
Nadler
Neal
Neguse
Nehls
Newhouse
Norcross
Norman
Nunn (IA)
Obernolte
Ocasio-Cortez
Ogles
Olszewski
Omar
Onder
Owens
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Patronis
Pelosi
Perez
Perry
Pettersen
Pfluger
Pingree
Pocan
Pou
Pressley
Quigley
Randall
Raskin
Reschenthaler
Riley (NY)
Rivas
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Ross
Rouzer
Roy
Ruiz
Rulli
Rutherford
Ryan
Salinas
Sánchez
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schmidt
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Self
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shreve
Simon
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Sorensen
Soto
Spartz
Stansbury
Stanton
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stevens
Strickland
Strong
Stutzman
Subramanyam
Suozzi
Sykes
Takano
Taylor
Tenney
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Timmons
Titus
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Tran
Turner (OH)
Underwood
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Van Epps
Van Orden
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Velázquez
Vindman
Wagner
Wahab
Walberg
Walkinshaw
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westerman
Whitesides
Wied
Williams (GA)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Yakym
Zinke

NAYS—3

Lee (PA)
Ramirez
Tlaib

NOT VOTING—12

Biggs (AZ)
Boyle (PA)
Buchanan
Dunn (FL)
Garamendi
Leger Fernandez
Mills
Peters
Salazar
Smith (WA)
Tiffany
Womack

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1853

Mr. COHEN changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2026

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 9497) to provide for improvements to the rivers and harbors of the United States, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 415, nays 9, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 313]

YEAS—415

Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Alford
Allen
Amo
Amodei (NV)
Ansari
Arrington
Auchincloss
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Balint
Barr
Barragán
Barrett
Baumgartner
Bean (FL)
Beatty
Begich
Bell
Bentz
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bice
Biggs (SC)
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blair
Boebert
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle (PA)
Bresnahan
Brown
Brownley
Budzinski
Burchett
Burlison
Bynum
Calvert
Cammack
Carbajal
Carey
Carson
Carter (GA)
Carter (LA)
Carter (TX)
Casar
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Ciscomani
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Cline
Cloud
Clyburn
Clyde
Cohen
Cole
Collins
Comer
Conaway
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crane
Crank
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crockett
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davidson
Davis (IL)
Davis (NC)
De La Cruz
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Dexter
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donalds
Edwards
Elfreth
Ellzey
Emmer
Escobar
Espaillat
Estes
Evans (CO)
Evans (PA)
Ezell
Fallon
Feenstra
Fields
Figures
Fine
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flood
Fong
Foster
Foushee
Foxx
Frankel, Lois
Franklin, Scott
Friedman
Frost
Fry
Fulcher
Fuller
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gill (TX)
Gillen
Gimenez
Golden (ME)
Goldman (NY)
Goldman (TX)
Gomez
Gonzalez, V.
Gooden
Goodlander
Gosar
Gottheimer
Graves
Gray
Green, Al (TX)
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hamadeh (AZ)
Harder (CA)
Haridopolos
Harrigan
Harris (NC)
Harshbarger
Hayes
Hern (OK)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Himes
Hinson
Horsford
Houchin
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hunt
Hurd (CO)
Issa
Ivey
Jack
Jackson (IL)
Jackson (TX)
Jacobs
James
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (TX)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Kean
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy (NY)
Kennedy (UT)
Khanna
Kiggans (VA)
Kiley (CA)
Kim
Knott
Krishnamoorthi
Kustoff
LaHood
LaLota
Landsman
Langworthy
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latimer
Latta
Lawler
Lee (FL)
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Letlow
Levin
Liccardo
Lieu
Lofgren
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luna
Luttrell
Lynch
Mace
Mackenzie
Magaziner
Malliotakis
Maloy
Mann
Mannion
Massie
Mast
Matsui
McBath
McBride
McCaul
McClain
McClain Delaney
McClellan
McClintock
McCollum
McCormick
McDonald Rivet
McDowell
McGarvey
McGovern
McGuire
McIver
Meeks
Mejia
Menefee
Menendez
Meng
Messmer
Meuser
Mfume
Miller (IL)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Min
Moolenaar
Moore (NC)
Moore (UT)
Moore (WI)
Moore (WV)
Moran
Morelle
Morrison
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Murphy
Nadler
Neal
Neguse
Nehls

Newhouse
Norcross
Norman
Nunn (IA)
Obernolte
Ocasio-Cortez
Ogles
Olszewski
Omar
Onder
Owens
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Patronis
Pelosi
Perez
Perry
Peters
Pettersen
Pfluger
Pingree
Pocan
Pou
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Randall
Raskin
Reschenthaler
Riley (NY)
Rivas
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Ross
Rouzer
Ruiz
Rulli
Rutherford
Ryan
Salinas
Sánchez
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schmidt
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shreve
Simon
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Sorensen
Soto
Spartz
Stansbury
Stanton
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stevens
Strickland
Strong
Stutzman
Subramanyam
Suozzi
Sykes
Takano
Taylor
Tenney
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Timmons
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Tran
Turner (OH)
Underwood
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Van Epps
Van Orden
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Velázquez
Vindman
Wagner
Wahab
Walberg
Walkinshaw
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westerman
Whitesides
Wied
Williams (GA)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Yakym
Zinke

NAYS—9

Brecheen
Downing
Fedorchak
Hageman
Harris (MD)
Johnson (SD)
Moore (AL)
Roy
Self

NOT VOTING—9

Biggs (AZ)
Buchanan
Dunn (FL)
Garamendi
Mills
Salazar
Smith (WA)
Tiffany
Womack

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1858

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RETIRE THROUGH OWNERSHIP ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2403) to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to provide a clear definition of adequate consideration for certain closely held stock, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 401, nays 14, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 314]

YEAS—401

Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Alford
Allen
Amo
Amodei (NV)
Ansari
Arrington
Auchincloss
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Balint
Barr
Barragán
Barrett
Baumgartner
Bean (FL)
Beatty
Begich
Bell
Bentz
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bice
Biggs (SC)
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blair
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle (PA)
Bresnahan
Brown
Brownley
Budzinski
Burchett
Burlison
Bynum
Calvert
Cammack
Carbajal
Carey
Carson
Carter (GA)
Carter (LA)
Carter (TX)
Case
Casten
Castro (TX)
Chu
Ciscomani
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Cline
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins
Comer
Conaway
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crank
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crockett
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Davis (NC)
De La Cruz
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Dexter
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donalds
Downing
Edwards
Elfreth
Ellzey
Emmer
Escobar
Espaillat
Estes
Evans (CO)
Evans (PA)
Ezell
Fallon
Fedorchak
Feenstra
Fields
Figures
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flood
Fong
Foster
Foushee
Foxx
Frankel, Lois
Franklin, Scott
Friedman
Frost
Fry
Fuller
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gillen
Gimenez
Golden (ME)
Goldman (NY)
Goldman (TX)
Gomez
Gonzalez, V.
Gooden
Goodlander
Gosar
Gottheimer
Graves
Gray
Green, Al (TX)
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hageman
Hamadeh (AZ)
Harder (CA)
Haridopolos
Harris (NC)
Harshbarger
Hayes
Hern (OK)
Hill (AR)
Himes
Hinson
Horsford
Houchin
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hunt
Hurd (CO)
Issa
Ivey
Jack
Jackson (IL)
Jackson (TX)
Jacobs
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Kean
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy (NY)
Kennedy (UT)
Khanna
Kiggans (VA)
Kiley (CA)
Kim
Knott
Krishnamoorthi
Kustoff
LaHood
LaLota
Landsman
Langworthy
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latimer
Latta
Lawler
Lee (FL)
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Letlow
Levin
Liccardo
Lieu
Lofgren
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luna
Luttrell
Lynch
Mace
Mackenzie
Magaziner
Malliotakis
Maloy
Mann
Mannion
Massie
Mast
Matsui
McBath
McBride
McCaul
McClain
McClain Delaney
McClellan
McClintock
McCollum
McDonald Rivet
McDowell
McGarvey
McGovern
McGuire
McIver
Meeks
Mejia
Menefee
Menendez
Meng
Messmer
Meuser
Mfume
Miller (OH)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Min
Moolenaar
Moore (AL)
Moore (NC)
Moore (UT)
Moore (WI)
Moore (WV)
Moran
Morelle
Morrison
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Murphy
Nadler
Neal
Neguse
Nehls
Newhouse
Norcross
Nunn (IA)
Obernolte
Ocasio-Cortez
Ogles
Olszewski
Omar
Onder
Owens
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Patronis
Pelosi
Perez
Perry
Peters
Pettersen
Pfluger
Pingree
Pocan
Pou
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Randall
Raskin
Reschenthaler
Riley (NY)
Rivas
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Ross
Rouzer
Ruiz
Rulli
Rutherford
Ryan
Salinas
Sánchez
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schmidt
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shreve
Simon
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Sorensen
Soto
Spartz
Stansbury
Stanton
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stevens
Strickland
Strong
Stutzman
Subramanyam
Suozzi
Sykes
Takano
Taylor
Tenney
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Timmons
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Tran
Turner (OH)
Underwood
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Van Epps
Van Orden
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Vindman
Wagner
Wahab
Walberg
Walkinshaw
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Westerman
Whitesides
Wied
Williams (GA)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Yakym
Zinke

NAYS—14

Brecheen
Cloud
Clyde
Crane
Davidson
Fine
Fulcher
Harris (MD)
Higgins (LA)
McCormick
Miller (IL)
Norman
Roy
Self

NOT VOTING—18

Biggs (AZ)
Boebert
Buchanan
Casar
Castor (FL)
Dunn (FL)
Gallagher
Garamendi
Gill (TX)
Harrigan
James
Mills
Salazar
Smith (WA)
Tiffany
Velázquez
Webster (FL)
Womack

□ 1905

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent and unable to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 308, YEA on Roll Call No. 309, YEA on Roll Call No. 310, YEA on Roll Call No. 311, YEA on Roll Call No. 312, YEA on Roll Call No. 313, and YEA on Roll Call No. 314.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Ferrari, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 3657. An act to amend the Federal Power Act to require the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to annually submit to Congress a report on the status of ongoing hydropower relicensing applications.

H.R. 7250. An act to reauthorize the Fort Peck Reservation Rural Water System Act of 2000.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 114–255, the Chair, on behalf of the Democratic

Leader, reappoints the following individuals to serve as members of the Health Information Technology Advisory Committee: Zeynep Sumer King of New York. Derek De Young of Wisconsin.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 16, 2026.

I hereby designate the period from Wednesday, September 16, 2026, through Sunday, November 8, 2026, as a ''district work period'' under clause 13 of Rule I.

MIKE JOHNSON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. LIEU. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1544

Resolved, That the following named Member be, and is hereby, elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES: Mr. Blair.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 10076.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, I hereby remove my name as cosponsor of H.R. 10076.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's request is granted.

HONORING RAY GAESSER OF CORNING, IOWA

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

Mr. NUNN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, today, the people of Iowa remember a great farmer, a great friend, and a great American, Ray Gaesser.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ray Gaesser of Corning, Iowa, who died in a farm accident on September 5.

Ray started farming at only 15 years old. After his father passed away, he had to step up and become the farm lead for the home. In 1977, he and his wife, Elaine, started with a few hundred acres outside Corning and built it to what it is today, now over 5,000.

He led the Iowa Soybean Association. Then he led the American Soybean Association, and he carried the priorities of Iowa's farmers with him on trade missions around the world.

We had the privilege to call him a friend. He was the first on our call list whenever it came to agriculture and the farm bill. He answered, and he made sure that Iowa's agriculture was always first.

This week, I am introducing a resolution in Ray's honor for all he did for Iowa's agriculture and to recognize National Farm Safety Week, which begins this Monday.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring him and join Kelly and me as we pray for Elaine, Chris, Jennifer, and everyone who knew and loved Ray. Iowa has lost a champion, and we will all dearly miss him.

From Randy, myself, the entire Iowa delegation, and from all of Iowa, may he rest in peace.

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE THREATENS OUR SAFETY AND SECURITY

(Ms. DEXTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. DEXTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today at a moment of a grave importance for our collective humanity.

As we face competing challenges, from the climate crisis to the ever-looming threat of nuclear war, the American people expect their leaders to prioritize their safety and know when to take action.

That time is now.

While the threat posed by artificial intelligence has been growing for years, suddenly there is a growing consciousness that AI agents are already out of human control.

How is this Republican-led Congress preparing to step up and take action to protect the safety and securing of the American people?

They aren't.

This is the moment for Congress to show up for the American people, to plan for the worst and then hope for the best. We must stay here in Washington and do our jobs. I challenge our Republican leadership to prioritize the survival of this country over going on vacation.

□ 1910

RECOGNIZING CONSTITUTION DAY

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Constitution Day, which is celebrated tomorrow.

On September 17, 1787, our Founding Fathers gathered in Philadelphia to sign the United States Constitution, one of the greatest documents in history.

For 239 years, this document has served as a beacon of freedom worldwide. Our Constitution guarantees our freedoms, from the right to free speech to the right to practice our faith. It defines the checks and balances that have kept our Nation strong for over two centuries, and it guarantees that all men are created equal.

Most importantly, the Constitution guarantees that we the people are at the forefront of our government. It provided us with the opportunity to debate, disagree, and, most importantly, unite as Americans.

As our country continues to celebrate 250 years, let us remember the significance of our Constitution and its impact on history.

Mr. Speaker, this Constitution Day, let us celebrate the principles that make our Nation great.

CELEBRATING HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

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

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Hispanic Heritage Month and the vibrant Hispanic community in western New York.

For 16 years, the Hispanic Heritage Council of Western New York has worked to foster understanding and appreciation for our Hispanic community, honoring the generations who came before while celebrating the people who continue to shape our future.

Under the leadership of my dear friend Cas Rodriguez, president of the council, they have championed the preservation and celebration of Hispanic culture.

That work is building toward something truly special: the first Hispanic Heritage Cultural Institute in upstate New York. This institute will be a place where history is preserved, culture is celebrated, and young people can learn from the stories and achievements of those who came before us.

I thank the Hispanic Heritage Council and everyone working to bring this vision to life for strengthening the fabric of western New York.

Happy Hispanic Heritage Month.

THANKING WASHINGTON'S FIREFIGHTERS, NATIONAL GUARD, AND FIRST RESPONDERS

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to thank the local, State, and Federal firefighters, first responders, and National Guard members for their tireless effort throughout this wildfire season.

My district in central Washington has seen over 368,000 acres burned this year alone. These fires have destroyed homes, businesses, and livelihoods, but without the work of the brave men and women in the field, the damage would have been much worse.

The swift and decisive responses by our local fire departments and first responders have ensured that thousands of Washingtonians have stayed safe from these dangerous wildfires.

Last week, 550 Washington National Guard members returned home after spending 7 weeks responding to wildfires throughout our State. They have more than earned their rest.

Mr. Speaker, I thank all those who have helped protect our communities this wildfire season. Their efforts have made a lasting impact on those of us who call central and eastern Washington home.

REMEMBERING ED BAROCAS

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

Ms. MEJIA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember Ed Barocas of Fairfield, New Jersey, a tireless champion for civil rights and civil liberties in New Jersey.

For nearly 20 years, Ed served as the legal director of the ACLU of New Jersey, where he fought for free speech, religious freedom, reproductive freedom, due process, and equal protection.

He was an early supporter of marriage equality in New Jersey and played a leading role in consequential civil liberties battles, including challenging post–9/11 secret detention and surveillance practices and fighting for government transparency.

Ed's legacy was not only in the courtroom. He was a mentor to generations of lawyers, a professor at Rutgers Law School, and a fierce believer in the power of the law to protect people and expand freedom.

Like so many organizers, I also benefited from Ed's wisdom, camaraderie, and mentorship.

He lived with muscular dystrophy—thrived, in fact—mostly because he never let those barriers diminish his commitment to justice.

Mr. Speaker, we mourn his passing and celebrate his life devoted to making New Jersey and our country more free and more just. May his memory always be a blessing.

STANDING IN SOLIDARITY WITH NEPAL

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

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as the co-chair of the Congressional Nepal Caucus in solidarity with the families of missing Americans and the people of Nepal in the wake of the devastating floods that recently swept through the north.

The scale of the loss and destruction is truly overwhelming, and my heart goes out to everyone during this tragedy.

I appreciate the administration's commitment to supporting the recovery efforts during this critical time.

I will be sending a letter to Secretary Rubio offering our full cooperation to assist the administration to aid in rescue and recovery efforts.

I extend my deepest sympathies and express my sincere gratitude for the tireless rescue workers helping those in need.

CALLING FOR REAL PROTECTIONS FROM DATA CENTERS

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

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, the so-called Ratepayer Protection Act won't do a darn thing to protect us from AI data centers. It will only serve utility CEOs and encourage more data centers.

People across the country, no matter the political party, have been coming together, loud and clear, in saying that data centers are not welcome in our communities.

AI data centers are polluting our air and water and raising energy costs by as much as 267 percent.

We just saw a report that PFAS forever chemical manufacturers are increasing production to meet the demand for use in data centers.

The House's response is to require utility regulators to only consider new rules to prevent utility rate hikes? Say what?

Now is not the time for half-measures. Over 200 environmental justice groups said no to this bill. They actually call it the ratepayer deception act.

Congress has to face Big Tech bros threatening our way of life head-on.

Mr. Speaker, Congress needs to pass a national moratorium on data centers and pass my No AI Data Centers on Federal Lands Act before Trump turns Yellowstone over to OpenAI and Oracle.

REMEMBERING BRUCE BURKART

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart to remember Bruce Burkart of Bucks County, Pennsylvania, a devoted husband, father, grandfather, veteran, and beloved member of our Bucks County community.

Born in Doylestown in 1931, Bruce dedicated his life to serving his country and community. After graduating from North Wales High School, Bruce answered the call to serve our Nation, enlisting in the U.S. Army during the Korean war, serving from 1951 through 1954.

Mr. Speaker, upon his return, Bruce served the people of New Britain borough as its first building inspector, tax collector, judge of elections, and borough historian.

He repaired and maintained the local library, helped restore the local World War I Memorial, and delivered meals through the Bucks County Meals on Wheels program.

Mr. Speaker, even after his beloved wife, Nancy, passed away, Bruce continued delivering meals 4 days a week in her honor.

Bruce lived a life defined by generosity, humor, and an unwavering commitment to his neighbors. His family will carry his memory forward with great pride.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the U.S. House of Representatives, we extend our deepest condolences to Bruce Burkart's entire family and all who loved him.

□ 1920

HONORING GARRETT EDWARDS

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

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor my constituent Garrett Edwards.

Like many, Garrett struggled with mental health during the pandemic. Despite being restricted from owning a firearm, he legally purchased a lethal airgun and tragically took his own life.

This should have never happened. Currently, some modern airguns are as deadly as traditional firearms yet aren't regulated as guns. This allows anyone to bypass background checks and effectively buy a firearm no matter what.

That is why I am introducing Garrett's Law, which would designate lethal, high-powered airguns as firearms and extend gun safety protections to them.

Garrett should still be here today. His family should have never had to endure this unthinkable tragedy. We should treat all lethal guns like guns.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill and close this deadly loophole.

HONORING DR. WOLDE-AB ISAAC

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the career and service of Dr. Wolde-Ab Isaac and his 50-year career of defending education and eliminating barriers for students.

Dr. Isaac grew up in Eritrea and was the first in his family to attend college. He majored in chemistry at Ethiopia's Haile Selassie University and then moved to the United States to pursue a master's of science and Ph.D. at the University of Michigan in medicinal chemistry.

Before serving as the chancellor of the Riverside Community College District in 2017, Dr. Isaac served as president of the University of Asmara in Eritrea, where he defended academic freedom and the right to an education under an authoritarian regime.

As Riverside Community College District chancellor, Dr. Isaac has prioritized workforce development partnerships through college vocational certificates to meet the demands of the Inland Empire and lowered barriers by automatically admitting every high school student into a college in the Riverside Community College District system.

Chancellor Isaac's career exemplifies the transformative power of education as a social and economic equalizer.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Dr. Isaac on his work over the past 50 years defending education for all students, and I wish him a restful retirement.

HONORING RON YOUNG

(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, today, I stand to honor Ron Young, an incredible constituent in Maryland's Sixth Congressional District.

Ron is a former mayor of Frederick, as well as a longtime Maryland State senator. Ron's commitment to family, community, and public service, as well as his visionary leadership in elected office, is being celebrated this month at the unveiling of a statue in his honor to be located at Carroll Creek inside Frederick city. It is a well-deserved tribute.

Ron was born and raised in Frederick County, and his family roots run deep. Frederick has been forever changed by Ron and his pioneering vision of a more diverse, inclusive, and vibrant city that encompasses new community spaces to uplift music, arts, and culinary pursuits.

His much-celebrated Carroll Creek Linear Park transformed downtown Frederick and even solved its flooding problems. Funny enough, that successful project was initially unpopular, but Ron had an iconic response: ''I never did anything important in my life that I didn't catch hell for . . . and I'd do it all again.'' That is classic Ron.

He took that same determination to Annapolis while serving in the State senate, and there he had a long, illustrious career. He passed that legacy to his family members as both sons went into elected office, as well as his wife, Karen Lewis Young, who now serves with distinction and determination in the State senate. It is a family that cares deeply about service.

In closing, my husband, John, and I consider Ron, Karen, and the Young family as friends, and we look forward to joining them at the statue unveiling.

Mr. Speaker, Ron's fingerprints are all over downtown Frederick. For many years to come, families will walk along Carroll Creek and enjoy the community Frederick has. God bless Ron, and we look forward to seeing him soon.

DETERIORATING CONDITIONS AT ELOY DETENTION CENTER

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

Mrs. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to sound the alarm about the deteriorating conditions at the Eloy Detention Center.

My office has received multiple reports from family members of people in detention, and their lawyers, that detainees are being denied access to proper drinking water. Instead, they are being given one cup of ice chips per day.

In fact, I just met with Sonya, the wife of Yari, who was diagnosed with leukemia and is currently being held in Eloy. Her wife told her that the detainees are only being given ice chips for water, which they have to wait until they melt. Two housing units are also without air-conditioning.

This is an outrage. At least 57 people have died in ICE custody this year, 4 of them in Arizona. This number is likely higher. How many more human beings need to die before we do something?

This is a moral failure. I am calling on DHS to immediately address these conditions and ensure that all detainees have access to safe drinking water, edible food, and humane living conditions.

REDUCING VOTING DAYS

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

Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today, we are sent home after canceling 2 weeks and 1 day of voting, a fitting end to the bleak record of the 119th Congress, which has canceled nearly 25 percent of voting days.

Perhaps my Republican colleagues do not feel the need to vote because they have surrendered their constitutional powers—for example, our duty to impose taxes as they support Donald Trump's inane and chaotic tariffs and our power to declare war as they buckle to the President's reckless war with Iran.

On immigration, the majority has handed over $120 billion to ICE, enabling masked agents to terrorize our communities and kill immigrants and American citizens.

On the cost of living, the majority has done nothing to save American families billions of dollars more, whether it is at the gas pump or with healthcare. They have left many families unable to afford basic necessities, even food.

On healthcare specifically, the majority has slashed affordable coverage for care of our seniors and families, care for those fighting this disease of addiction.

On AI, they have done nothing.

Now, with fewer than 50 days until the midterm election, Mr. Speaker, as this Congress and this Republican majority comes to an end, you will be remembered for a failure to govern and for capitulation to the rot and rubble of this administration.

HONORING REVEREND WAYNE HINES, SR.

(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, Reverend Wayne Hines, Sr., would say: ''So listen to me, and listen to me good.''

I ask the House to listen and to listen good as we remember a man whose life spoke louder than words. Reverend Hines was a faithful pastor, public servant, and beloved voice in eastern North Carolina. He served as an Edgecombe County commissioner and pastor of Bunn Chapel Missionary Baptist Church and Bethlehem Missionary Baptist Church, dedicating his life to serving God and his community.

Through ''Joy of the Morning'' on Soul 92, he carried powerful messages of faith, hope, and encouragement into homes throughout our region.

Mr. Speaker, I am praying with his wife, Lady Carolyn, his family, and our community, and celebrating the remarkable life he lived.

□ 1930

HONORING HARRIET JANE FRIIS

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

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life of Harriet Jane Friis, who recently passed away at the age of 94.

Harriet was an Orange County native and a resident of the city of Orange. Harriet worked as a librarian at the Long Beach Public Library and had a passion for history. Harriet was active in the community as a member of the Orange County Historical Society and at the Trinity Episcopal Church's senior group, yet her most popular contribution was her citrus punch, which garnered praise and support from all who tried it.

Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in remembering Ms. Friis and appreciate her contributions to our communities. We will remember Harriet.

GIVING OUR FARMERS STABILITY THEY NEED TO FEED AMERICA

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

Mr. MRVAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to share what feedback I received from the northwest Indiana farmers on the Agricultural Advisory Council I met with this week.

Our farmers are getting crushed. The conflict in Iran has pushed diesel above

$6 a gallon. Tariffs are driving up fertilizer costs and closing agricultural markets. Immigration policies have disrupted the legal workforce farmers depend on, and the rush to build data centers is putting upward pressure on electricity costs.

Meanwhile, Congress has failed to pass a farm bill or a fiscal year 2027 Agriculture Appropriations Act, leaving farmers without certainty.

Their message to me was simple: Help us. They need tariff relief, lower fuel costs, expanded markets, and action from Congress. They know how to endure tough times, but they told me this is as difficult as it has ever been.

These are real costs threatening real workers, families, and farms. Farming is a national security issue. We must listen. We must act, and we must give our farmers the stability they need to keep farming America.

OPPOSITION TO PRESIDENT'S NUMEROUS ABUSES OF POWER

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

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the President's numerous abuses of power.

Just 5 days into his second term, the President fired inspectors general across 17 Federal agencies. These officials are tasked with conducting independent oversight to fight waste, fraud, and abuse, and have been respected in a bipartisan way for years.

The President also routinely threatened the press, referring to them as ''the enemy of the people'' and suggesting that broadcasting licenses for news networks be stripped. He has attacked Federal judges individually. He has attacked registered voters. Just yesterday, he attacked the U.S. Supreme Court and his own nominees for standing up and defending the integrity of individual Americans' right to cast a vote.

The institutions he has attacked are enshrined in law and in the culture and the spirit of the United States, respectively to promote transparency, accountability in government, trust in these institutions, and in a democracy. To undermine them in the way he has is to undermine American democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in condemning these grave abuses of power.

CIDER MILL CELEBRATES 100 YEARS IN BUSINESS

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

Mr. RILEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, in upstate New York, we love our neighbors. We root for the underdog, and we cherish our traditions.

Anyone from Broome County will tell you that one of our best traditions is a visit to the Cider Mill in Endicott to celebrate the start of fall.

Generations of kids from our public schools have gone there for field trips to see upstate apples pressed into fresh cider, and eat warm doughnuts pulled straight out of the fryer.

When I was growing up, I would stop at the Cider Mill on my walk home from school and use some of my paper route money for the best deal in town: a fresh doughnut and a pint of cider for a couple of bucks.

When I brought my wife home to meet my parents for the first time, our first stop was not at my parent's house. It was at the Cider Mill. I think Monica loved it so much that she later said ''yes'' when I asked her to marry me.

This year, the Cider Mill celebrates its 100th year in business. For over a century, folks have walked through the doors of that big red barn on Nanticoke Avenue and found not just crates of fresh apples but community. It is the type of place that brings people together, something we really need these days when so many forces are trying to pull us apart.

Mr. Speaker, to all my friends at the Cider Mill and my neighbors who continue to support it, here is to 100 years of tradition and to many more ahead.

REFLECTING ON THE STATE OF OUR UNION

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to submit extraneous material into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this podium on this mid-day week evening as the House is set to adjourn. I was not expecting the House to be adjourning this evening for the remainder of the election cycle, 48-some days until the American people participate in one of the most incredible and fascinating processes, which is to vote and to engage in our elections, but as we will return after such midterm election, the Congress will be in a lame-duck period.

As you and I both know, Mr. Speaker, we do not use such Chamber activity to engage in electoral politics, so I make this address not for political purposes but to reflect in a matter of ways on the state of our Union, the state of our economy, the direction that this country is going in, and what it means for the American people.

One thing is clear that not one person controls the full wheel of the American democracy. It is a participatory process of engagement, one in which Americans can self-select. They can self-select to run for office. They can self-select to serve their country. To the brave men and women in uniform here in our own borders and across the world, we respect, honor, and salute their service. Those who are carrying a tremendous weight of intelligence and information and those who seek the disruption of our very Nation are recognized. They are seen and valued and heard by so many of us in this Chamber.

We also know that people show up for America in so many ways. In Michigan, in Rochester Hills, we just concluded the Art & Apples Festival. My parents helped start the Art & Apples Festival, and it is a great family event that goes the weekend after Labor Day. The bees are already starting to get weird in Michigan at this time of the year because they know that summer is ending, so they tend to bother you a little bit more.

You always have the emergency EpiPens or allergy medications at the ready for bee stings at the Rochester Hills Art & Apples Festival. It is largely volunteer run, and it is participated in by members of the community.

That is just another way in which we build our brilliant societies, in ZIP Codes, in towns, in villages, in cities across America, across Michigan in all seasons. Although, certainly in the upper North, we do appreciate our good weather days, and we hold on to them for as long as we can.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I did advise to the public, the members of the press corps—I don't see any of them up there. That is okay. They don't need to be up here. They have other deadlines and things to write, but I did advise I was giving this address. It is not the first address that I have given to this tune from this Chamber.

In fact, before political activity consumed much of the last year for me, although I voted at every turn and never missed vote—I actually might have missed one. I was talking to someone in the Speaker's lobby, and it was one of those 2 minutes. I know they like to play the gotcha.

□ 1940

I have always taken the vote very seriously. Before such political activity, I always found it very important to deliver these addresses, not assuming that it would be met with a huge audience or fanfare. Sometimes I told people to tune in, friends and family. You can see the Chamber is fairly empty.

Mr. Speaker, because this is the United States of America, this is the U.S. House of Representatives, as the incredible former majority leader and statesman from Maryland, Congressman STENY HOYER, would remind and tell all of the new Members of Congress as he led them through an orientation upon their election to Congress that, as we all know, you can't be appointed to this body. You have got to be elected.

If a Member resigns midterm, passes away midterm, leaves a vacancy, it is constitutionally required, meaning for the whole country—the States can't usurp this—that a vote has to be taken.

So what is the beauty and the state of this Chamber and its responsibility to the American people in such a moment?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am very well aware of the generosity of the time that such a Member of Congress as I get allocated, the 60 minutes, to make such remarks, to etch them in the historical document of the House RECORD. I firmly and readily believe in the power, the beauty, and the magnificence of the House RECORD. I very much thank the typist who is making notes in real time about such remarks so that they can go into the House RECORD.

Some in the American public might wonder why we have the recorder. You have got the remarks on digital and audio, and all of that. Decades ago now, they opened this whole place up to the cameras and C–SPAN, which is actually a wonderful thing to have the ability to tune in—not to doomscroll, not to engage in rage as you face the intersection of American Government, but to see really what happens here—not by way of the media outlet, not by way of some orchestration. You know, these internet maestros, the really talented people, I know that they will maybe take an interest. They did in one of my hour addresses during a campaign I just completed—not a big deal. It was just a few clips of a clip. Yet, that is someone's perception. It is someone's orientation of what gets said.

Now, the typist here, she is recording for the RECORD, and I firmly believe, Mr. Speaker, that no matter what America faces, what challenges, what great opportunities we seize, we will always have the House RECORD, not some incredible article—there are so many articles, journalistic articles, internet articles, tweets, posts, engagements, likes, clicks, data ballooning by the millisecond, more than any data that has ever been created in the history of the world up until the internet age proliferated—proliferated through the economic might and ability of the United States of America, might I just say.

Earlier this month—well, just 5 days ago now, Mr. Speaker, we recognized the 25-year anniversary of 9/11. Now, I remember that time very clearly.

I was 18 years old. I had actually just temporarily moved to the Nation's Capital. I had received admittance into a college called American University—Go Eagles—and I took the opportunity to get my degrees at American University. My mother and my brother dropped me off to my Washington, D.C., dorm room 3 such weeks before the terrorist attack that took the precious lives, stolen in instances of American people going to work, serving this country, those in the Pentagon, those whose lives were forever changed and impacted, the heroes of our fire departments and our police departments, and those who put up their hand to volunteer in such a dark moment.

Now, that was just 5 days ago that we recognized the quarter century mark of 9/11.

My first term in Congress, 9/11 actually turned 18 years old. It had grown up. It was an adult. Now, it is further distant from us. In reflecting on the years that we have now spent in this 21st century, as a millennial, of course, I am mightily aware of how people celebrated and recognized the arrival of the 21st century. Everything was 21st century. Everything was focused on this not only new century, but new millennium. I mean, oh, my goodness gracious, the United States of America also just turned 250 years old, and we have been cruising through this new millennium.

What do we make of it? Can we take a moment, Mr. Speaker, to reflect after this unbelievable tragedy that befell us, that impacted us, that shook us to our core—so unimaginable. I remember being woken up by my landline ringing from my college roommate's mother calling in, shrieking, and I am turning on the TV just in time to see the second plane crash, attack, blow up the second tower.

So what has happened since? What is our story? You know, we didn't cower per se. No, we didn't at all. In fact, we were the ones who propagated the age of the gig economy, the mass proliferation of ones and zeroes through fiber optics, less than a decade later, these handheld, flat screen, computer-type phones that had cameras, texting, the internet, and music, and all of a sudden, a new economy of scale.

Now, interestingly, a company that started at the tail end of last century called Google—started by some Michiganders, as a matter of fact, in a college dorm room or college garage, or something along those lines—Google's first outpost out of the innovative area of California was to Michigan, actually to Birmingham, Michigan.

I remember being a young girl, graduating from Birmingham's Seaholm High School—go Maples—still a fantastic school, still a school that has so many engaged and talented students, students who I recently visited because they were putting together a documentary recognizing 75 years of Seaholm High School's existence. I challenged them on a claim that I make often that I am the first Seaholm graduate to Congress. As far as my records and their records show, that is true.

The Congresswoman from North Carolina, Kathy Manning, was also a graduate of Seaholm High School, but she came to Congress a term after me. I said: Kathy, I really needed that benchmark more than you because I don't think a lot of people in North Carolina know about Seaholm High School on Lincoln Street in Birmingham, Michigan.

But I remember being such a teenager and seeing the Google sign in Birmingham, Michigan.

□ 1950

It was kind of cool, to say the least. We were Motor City. We were continuing to, as we do now, lead the world on manufacturing, innovation, putting the world on wheels, and continuing to innovate around safety standards, technology standards, and emission standards. There is incredible benchmark-setting that goes on to this day, but why did Google come to Michigan?

It is not just because we are good, hardworking people. It is because of that auto industry. They came to Michigan because of the auto industry and the advertising dollars attached to it.

Let us centralize and remember why there is so much fascination, adoration, and adulation for the proud, incredible State that I represent, my nearly 800,000 constituents, here in the United States Congress. This is Michigan's 11th District. Oakland County, 26 communities, they are all phenomenal. I love and adore working with all of them, by the way. I love coming here to the Nation's Capital to make sure that Michigan is heard.

Mr. Speaker, that is not the intent of such an address. There are many such moments to make love letters, overtures, and fanfares to Michigan. This address is about centering us on why the American people and the people of Michigan, the heartbeat of making things and growing things, are feeling twisted, frustrated, and maybe somewhat confused.

Not everyone is angry. There is some unhappiness in this country. We do seek the pursuit of happiness—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness here in the United States of America.

It is more so, Mr. Speaker, the confusion around why, in Heaven's name, do we have nearly 65 percent of Americans in this country living paycheck to paycheck.

Why is it that from the recent high school graduate to even, let's say, the high school student working a job, to the single parent, to the hardworking middle-class family, they are living paycheck to paycheck? We must ask that, Mr. Speaker.

It is not just to own a political point or a political talking point but around policy propositions. You see, Mr. Speaker, in the last handful of years in this quarter century mark of which America finds themselves in, I feel more compelled than ever to fight for my country, to fight for our freedoms, our way of life, the ability to start a small business without drowning in debt, the ability to live your life.

When I look around, I am not seeing anyone's bills going down. I am not seeing housing prices going down. I am not seeing healthcare bills going down. I am not seeing energy costs going down.

Over and over, I am rigorously engaged, as an extroverted individual, with the people in my communities and in Michigan. It is hard to even say this in a way that will actually land, but this is the truth: that the people who I talk to, particularly retirees on that fixed income, with their incredibly well-earned Social Security check, that earned benefit—Heaven knows why the trust has been robbed, why the trust is on shaky ground, what the next session of Congress will inherit to secure the earned benefits for the American people, the hardworking American people, even some who are doing hard labor, inspecting our trains—AFGE Union and SMART are some who come to mind—the incredible manufacturing workers of the machinists, the UAW, my friends at the bricklayers union, Mr. Speaker—I believe you know them well—physical labor.

You wait until 65 for your Social Security check, and you fight in your labor contract for your pension, if you are lucky to get one.

I remember helping to lead the passage of the Butch Lewis Emergency Pension Plan Relief Act from this very floor. What was that bill? Securing the multiemployer pensions of millions of Americans. People to this day come up to me with tears in their eyes with gratitude that their pension was saved.

What is the deal here? What is the deal? The future Speaker of the Chamber, a history-making, wise, steady, leaderly individual, HAKEEM JEFFRIES, led the Congress today on these very steps, saying that we are fighting for an affordable America.

We have to say this, but we also have to do something. That is what Speaker—future Speaker JEFFRIES knows. Pardon the slip, but what we say gets willed sometimes into existence.

I am proud and eager and energized to call out for action right now, to call out for action as I maybe peel into some statistics. I did print out the numbers.

Who is paying for Social Security? Why is it that we have a cap at a certain salary? What is that saying to the middle class and the hardworking person? You are paying for it.

What is it saying when we know that we have to do another infrastructure bill? I can't believe it, Mr. Speaker. The last one we did in this very Chamber was over 5 years ago, just about.

I mean, you can't make it up because last time I checked, the pipes in Detroit, the water pipes in the Great Lakes State in the Nation, are 100 years old. It is a multibillion-dollar problem to replace those pipes. I live in Oakland County, Michigan. Boil-water advisories because of pipes bursting happen regularly.

The retiree, the hardworking family, the individual clocking in 40 or 50 hours to whatever job, those who are raising the young people of America through our great public schools, who deserve and need full funding for special education, why, Mr. Speaker, must I turn to those individuals and say to them they have to pay more? Why is it that I have to say that to them?

I am aware of the reality that this Nation is in debt. It is terrifying—$40 trillion. In the last year, the debt has grown faster than the economy. You have people being misled around growth sectors, people freaked out about new tech and outside billionaires coming in.

I am talking, of course, about data centers. There is work to build them. There is no work to maintain them. There is a little bit of an incentive, and people—look, I am not pointing fingers, but take 10 steps back and ask yourself why the taxpayer has to get taxed again for the pipes, the roads, and to make sure the air stays clean. Why is it, Mr. Speaker, that in Genesee County, Michigan, some people—too many people, residents—are paying electricity bills that are higher than a mortgage?

□ 2000

Now, we all know that this outrageous tax bill that was the only thing that the Republican Conference sought to get done this 119th session in the Congress. Not much else has happened. I do remember the showerheads bill, you know. We are not doing too many bills.

I have written 60 bills this term. They are great. They are bipartisan. I would love to see some of them get voted on and passed and signed into law. The current President has signed some of my bills into law in his prior term, the only other one I shared while he was in such a role. It is not clear how much bills are looking to be signed over executive orders written.

The partisan tax bill that went forward, the one we argued about, debated about, I hope the American people tuned in to what was taking place on the House floor. I hope they tuned in when Democratic Leader HAKEEM JEFFRIES gave the longest floor speech in the history of this body. I was sitting in this very cold Chamber right by him, paying witness to history taking place.

Why is it, among all the outrageous provisions in this tax bill—oh, my gosh, we are going to cut healthcare, we have slashed Medicaid. Take a phone call to the Medicaid recipients of America. Talk to those families and their sobering experiences.

Cuts to food benefits lead to the sobering conversations that I have with Michiganians whose eyes well up in tears because they worked all their life and never thought that they would have to be nervous about what was going into their grocery cart: embarrassment, shame, food banks being pushed to a brink.

The post-World War II industrial world order and the narrative surrounding every great secondary school student reading Steinbeck's ''Grapes of Wrath,'' well, the 1930s are certainly a bygone era. Plastic has been invented, right?

However, from that, bread lines, dust bowls, farmers being pushed to the brink, being unheard, not even making pennies on a dollar. Mr. Speaker, it is why I wrote the No Tariffs on Groceries Act, but there is nothing more palpable. It is not hyperbole. It is not hysteria. It is just my lived experience as a Congresswoman in Michigan's 11th District that I have witnessed my constituents cry because they cannot afford food.

Why is that happening? Why are SNAP benefits being cut? Why are clean energy tax credits out the window? My goodness gracious, it is a deep frustration of the utility companies who, on occasion, when they are working with organizations such as the League of Conservation Voters, and we remember this on such a bill called the Inflation Reduction Act that was signed by President Biden that made some incredible transformations, one of which being the largest investment ever to address climate change.

See, those utility companies were with the environmentalists. I was fascinated by the Inflation Reduction Act, Mr. Speaker, because as a Michiganian, I have never seen the auto companies and the environmentalists say they wanted the exact same thing in a bill, and they got it.

However, the utility companies this time around, with the GOP tax bill, abandoned their ratepayers. They didn't tell the administration that they couldn't go forward. Remember how I just mentioned that we have to upgrade and replace our pipes, our water pipes?

Well, of course, every sitting Member of Congress knows about our outdated, overextended, fragile electric grid and the needed investments for that, but what has been said to the hardworking taxpayer yet again? You will pay. You will pay in your annual taxes, and you will pay with an increased utility bill.

I call outrage. I frankly call, Mr. Speaker, unfairness. Economic unfairness off the backs of hardworking people who continue to work, who continue to meet the charge of America, who continue to do remarkable things in their communities, and yet they are being suffocated because it is not just 65 percent living paycheck to paycheck.

Let's talk about what that really means. It means that we have got $1.3 trillion of credit card debt, Mr. Speaker, $1.3 trillion of credit card debt.

Now, there are few such individuals who I worked at the Treasury Department with. One is a former mayor in Connecticut, Luke Bronin. Another is a mayor of Scranton, Pennsylvania, Paige Cognetti. We all worked in the Treasury Department during President Obama's first term. Actually, Democrats and Republicans worked alongside one another during what we called—with a capital G and a capital R—a Great Recession, of which our

State of Michigan was the absolute nadir of.

Do you know what I don't want to live through again, Mr. Speaker? Another that. I don't want to live through another Great Recession. Some of the contributing factors, as you know, were that Wall Street was unregulated. All those folks made out like bandits as a result of not being prosecuted. That is such a reality many decades on now.

Another reality, Mr. Speaker, from that time period was that we had to stabilize our economy. We had to spend taxpayer dollars. We did. There were no bread lines. There were homes lost, iPhones kept, an economy shaken, and an American people who were left holding the bag.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to go back to another Great Recession. I want some real honesty from the creditors and the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, should this President still be maintaining such an agency, to answer and address why we are in such a debt position.

The consumer debt matched with the Nation's debt, the fiscal debt, is $40.1 trillion. Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is very clear that I am a prominent Democrat—I will give myself that accolade—talking about the debt. Publicly held debt is $32 trillion. Intragovernmental debt is $7.69 trillion. The debt service cost, over a trillion. The alarm bells are ringing.

Mr. Speaker, there are only so many of us in this Chamber, and there is only so much willingness to concentrate and address probing and pressing challenges that aren't explosive crises.

I remember acting in such a bipartisan way upon the arrival of COVID. I am not sure if our current Secretary of Health and Human Services would join in such a note of gratitude to the President for making his first action in the COVID–19 crisis to invest in the research to create the vaccine. That vaccine was produced in Michigan. The first vaccines rolled out of a community in Michigan to begin saving lives.

□ 2010

It was bipartisan action. It was legislation from this Chamber. The CARES Act was written, literally, I believe, on napkins. We could ask Secretary Rubio about that. I know he was involved with writing the personal payment protection program. Of course, the incredible Italian-American Speaker, the woman from Baltimore, the Congresswoman from San Francisco—who also, alongside Mr. HOYER, concludes a remarkable tenure of service in this very Chamber—NANCY PELOSI, led those bills in a Democratic majority that were signed by the President.

Of course, I remember cowering. We had to be socially distant. It was a nerve-wracking time for Members of Congress. We had another bill, the Families First Act. We were ready to go on it. I was the first one here in the Chamber for the CARES Act, driving through the night to exercise from the will of our democratic institution here in the Congress, the floor of the House of Representatives, Mr. Speaker.

The Families First Act, we were waiting for the President to tweet. This is before he started his own social media platform. It is unclear who uses that one, but this was on the Twitter platform. We were waiting for him to do a tweet in order to move forward with lifesaving legislation. It actually got us paid family leave. It passed bipartisan in the House.

Remarkable things happened in a moment of crisis and also some tragic and Shakespearean things happened as well. This is not an address to reflect on the period of time from 2020 to 2022 when we wrestled and we fought each other. I know that we are analyzing and experiencing as a society, as a people, as a world, the consequences of such a virus, a pandemic, hitting all of us and impacting our lives and changing the world forever.

We keep moving forward, and that is certainly what I do here tonight, Mr. Speaker. It is propelling us on an agenda to move forward, to get in front of what our taxpayers are dealing with. That is because, Mr. Speaker, when you are working a job and you are seeing all that tax coming out from the Federal Government, and you are not seeing your bills go down, who is fighting for you?

Who is saying that we need taxpayer fairness?

That is because it certainly is not the people who took $75 billion of your taxpayer money and put it into some crazy slush fund.

This needs to be said, Mr. Speaker, the Immigration and Customs Enforcement department, we had a disaster of a Secretary prancing around as a social media star, not at all focused on the security of this country. It is the most sensitive thing we deal with, the border, immigration. One-half of it is stuck in the last century. It is driving everybody crazy.

Do you know what my district experienced, Mr. Speaker, in March of this year?

A Hezbollah terrorist attack on Temple Israel.

Why was ICE not there?

They weren't. It was State and local law enforcement and the security of that temple, and by the darn grace of all things holy, the 104 lives in that very temple, all children, were saved and spared. The last time I darn checked, ICE was not available, and they had your money while your food bills are going up, Mr. Speaker. They had your money when your healthcare is through the roof, Mr. Speaker. You owe it to the people of Michigan, the people of Michigan's 11th Congressional District, to explain why you took our taxpayer money to allow for a naturalized citizen to come and do that. It really boils my blood, Mr. Speaker.

That is because the town just over from there in Beverly Hills, shortly after that terrorist attack in the United States of America, in my district, Temple Israel is located in West Bloomfield, Michigan. It is comprised of incredible individuals from our community. We were delighted to see them reopen after destruction, after being blown out, the commitment and the will of the people. It would have been great to give assistance to the places of worship that get attacked in a country such as ours.

Let me clarify this, Mr. Speaker. A couple of months after that attack, ICE did make an arrest in Michigan. They did. They arrested a lady who cleans up the homes. She cleans up the homes. She was on the street in Beverly Hills, Michigan. It is in Oakland County. Her paperwork was in her car, but she was intercepted.

It is not said with any such gratitude that our taxpayer dollars, $75 billion of it, instead of being redirected to State and local law enforcement, of which Congressman CHRIS PAPPAS has led a bill that I have joined him on to redirect that funding, to re-center it to the places of real community safety are going forward.

Mr. Speaker, I don't seek to propel division or frustration or hatred. I don't believe in any hatred of Americans. No American is my enemy. The United States is reckoning with some very real and profound forces at this time.

Let us look forward, Mr. Speaker, as I pause to ask you how much time I have remaining in my 1-hour address.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Michigan has 19 minutes remaining.

Ms. STEVENS. Only 19 minutes remaining. How interesting, Mr. Speaker, 19 is my father, Jim Stevens', favorite number. So how nice that I pause to ask about the time for how much of this address I have remaining.

Let us look forward, Mr. Speaker, because we know that that is only where we are going.

Let us ask ourselves, for those who tuned in or are making it thus far in such an address, what will this country look like in the year 2050?

Can we have the same energy, fanfare, and excitement around the midcentury mark as we did at its beginning?

I am so very hopeful, Mr. Speaker, but I have a direction for us. I have a proposal for us. It is that American freedom, American entrepreneurship that I mentioned. My amazing father alongside my amazing mother were small business owners for a time together and then separately. Different enterprises—many countries really don't have small business owners. We should really understand what happens in those countries. Entrepreneurship doesn't exist. It all goes toward the State.

I am a Democratic labor capitalist. Mr. Speaker, I believe in the 21st century labor movement to continue to move people into the middle class to keep them in the middle class so that we can eradicate poverty in the United States of America, troubling and unearthing in this moment, Mr. Speaker, is the reality that the middle class is putting the grocery bill on a credit card.

Congresswoman HILLARY SCHOLTEN from Grand Rapids has the Lowering Costs Caucus that she leads, adopting measures, saying that we are not going to saddle the burden of paying for everything through the middle class.

Mr. Speaker, that is what has been occurring under this full Republican-led government.

Mr. Speaker, you will just pay more.

Mr. Speaker, aren't you paying more?

It is interesting to see the gas prices in Michigan nearing $5. We have got a lot of land in Michigan; a lot of people rely on their automobile to get to their job. We see the repairman charging a gas fee. It is a frustrating matter, and we were being so misled during an unbelievable electoral season several years ago now, being promised in the State of Michigan that China was going to be taken on, that jobs from Shanghai were going to come back to Sterling Heights.

Yet, all that has happened is a trade war with Canada that continues to balloon costs for those seeking affordable prescription drugs, given the administration wants to continue the previous administration's effort to lower cost.

In Michigan we have a little trick. We cross the bridge. We just had this new Gordie Howe International Bridge, finally. It only took two decades. Canada paid for the whole thing.

□ 2020

They paused its opening. I worked on that bridge creation with the great Congresswoman DEBBIE DINGELL and the former ambassador to Canada, former Governor of Michigan, Jim Blanchard, when I was in the Obama administration.

The little trick in Michigan: crossing the bridges—we have two now right there in Detroit—to go get lower-cost drugs. We did lower the insulin cost for seniors. We do it for everyone who is on insulin, just a lifeline-type of medicine. Now, when you go and try to cross the bridge to get cheaper drugs, you are met with a tariff. We are being entrapped. It feels like we are being suffocated.

Maybe it would help if we had a few who were not in the 0.01 percent wealth class running things like the Department of the Treasury or the Department of Commerce. Maybe if we had a Secretary of Health and Human Services who upheld science over conspiracy theory—I love science. Oh, my gosh. We could do a whole other hour address on just that, Mr. Speaker, but I will save that for the next time. This is a series of remarks around the economic challenges that we face and the economic opportunities.

We can't wait another term to do nothing. We can't wait another term to just see one big crazy life-altering bill come through that I really can't pinpoint lowered anyone's bill. It just didn't. I find it offensive. I know it is offensive to the many people who we know will go to the polls, who maybe don't spend their lives in the political industry or affairs but who are being deeply impacted. The hardworking men and women of our building trades union, who would love another infrastructure bill. That one should include recycling in it, by the way, because recycling, which sounds sometimes like a throwback, is a critical part of our supply chain and is a community affair. We salute those who choose to sort. It does help on the back end.

There is incredible research and development, standards that could be set, money that could be made, businesses that could be spurred, costs that could be lowered. Mr. Speaker, I have this fantastic bill called Unearth America's Future Act. It is taking the most beautiful parts of the CHIPS and Science Act, which we did to lessen our Nation's dependence on critical parts, components, the microchip that goes into all high-end manufactured goods, most notably, Mr. Speaker, our automobile.

The Unearth America's Future Act is a bill that creates loan guarantees, tax credits, and moneys for an R&D center of excellence with an emphasis on synthesizing, processing, and refining for the critical minerals that become our critical materials, 95 percent of which come from China.

Even our great allies in Japan are up in arms about why they have to be subject to the cost manipulations of the Chinese Communist Party as a democratic ally of ours, as a trade partner of ours, as a nation that abides by the rules-based order. That cannot be assumed.

Hope is absolutely an action. I am always hopeful, but we have to be actionable. We have to not only set goals but lead around them.

The goal, Mr. Speaker, has to be the success of the American enterprise, the success of American democracy in this very moment and into the mid-century mark and beyond, for freedom, for those with an idea, those seeking to create wealth for themselves—a lowercase w—the putting food on the table, being able to retire with dignity, being able to take an idea and propel it into an enterprise.

Mr. Speaker, this is such a fantastic and incredible moment for this country. The bills that get moved to the floor of the House—those of us who take the time to share, to engage, to participate in the discourse, the hard-nosed, dedicated work—Mr. Speaker, you are going to have to indulge me because there is a bit of philosophical work that I believe should be revived. Habermas, writing in the mid-20th century, into the late 20th century—Mr. Habermas talked about the concept of discourse as action, discourse as movements for democracy.

We have to take pride, as I know all duly elected Members of Congress in this Chamber do, that we are a democracy. We have to feel compelled to recognize and go back to the words of this very Chamber's great legislator Henry Clay, a good Kentuckian. I had no idea as a child I would ever run for such an office, but I always thought he was such a neat guy when I was in history classes as a kid, the great compromiser. Can you believe it? This very Chamber, from a time that no one is certainly alive from anymore. We know that. Debating, adding States to the Union, States that would have human beings as slaves to move parts of their economy forward. Clay, during a time period leading up to a Civil War, sought to keep this country together.

He had some words. He had this great quote that I just adore, and I had it on the wall of my cubicle in the Department of the Treasury when I was working on the auto rescue when I was an appointee in the Obama Administration, just saying, as some 20-something-year-old, I want to do something for Michigan, that we can't let this industry go bankrupt, as a former Michigander who ran for President once famously said.

Mr. Clay said that government—government of which we, in this Chamber, are a part—government is a trust, and the officers of the government are the trustees. Both the trust and the trustees are created for the benefit of the people.

What did Mr. Clay mean with those remarks? That those in the government, those elected to office, don't own political power. No, that is for the people.

There is such an unbelievable industry in American politics. I don't even know what to call it. Punditry doesn't seem to quite fit it. Consultants, politicos, campaign people, talkers, tweeters, influencers, volunteers, parties that get created. Well, we have two major, big parties here in the country, still. It is a whole industry. There is even cable news still going on about it. They are very much a part of this political-industrial complex. I say that with love, okay? I am not trying to attack anybody.

□ 2030

It is all about assumption. It is all about assumption.

Then there is some—and they are good people. I do like to name names of some good political scientists. I haven't spent enough time with them.

Frances Lee from Princeton, she writes some very good books, and Jeremi Suri, who talks about—Lee talks about the Congress, and Suri talks about the Presidency and some of its challenges.

Certainly, all our branches are in need of modernity and reform. I would always like to see, Mr. Speaker, Michigan get more attention.

We have to remember—and maybe it is a call upon those who profit off of the commentary and the exchange, the gossip, and the drama. American politics is quite dramatic, very much more dramatic than our neighbors, our Canadian neighbors from the north.

It would do us some good to really look at, outside of assumption, what takes place when people vote. That is the whole shebang. Yet, we spend years leading up to votes, years of speculation, and there are still people just living their lives and going to the polls who are counted as part of a vote. I think that is what we have to remember. In this country power lies in the vote and those who engage in democracy.

For all, in these remaining weeks of a rigorous midterm election, where we know, Mr. Speaker, many more assumptions will be made—I do hail from a State that receives a fair amount of electoral participation. I am such a proud Michigander. I started getting involved in the American democratic experiment and process at a very young age. I am still very proud to be a part of that. I don't say it wistfully, but my name is not on the ballot for November.

I also know that anybody can get involved in any such way that we can move ideas and exchange ideas and support one another. As Truman once said: America is not built on fear; America is built on courage, imagination.

Let us bring some imagination to restoring the strength of American democracy: open, free market, democratic, equal-opportunity capitalism so that all can succeed. Let us watch that go forward.

America is not built on fear. America is built on courage, imagination, and the willingness to do the job at hand.

We will break for elections. We will return, hopefully, for a rigorous lameduck, and I will see you then.

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

HYDE AMENDMENT'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam 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 (Mrs. FEDORCHAK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, 50 years ago, on September 30, 1976, Congress first enacted an amendment offered by the late great Congressman Henry Hyde of Illinois to prohibit Federal Medicaid funding from being used to subsidize the killing of unborn children by abortion.

During a debate in the House, right here, 50 years ago, Henry said: "An innocent, defenseless human life, in a caring and humane society deserves better than to be flushed down a toilet or burned in an incinerator. The promise of America," Henry Hyde said, "is that life is not just for the privileged, the planned, or the perfect."

Mr. Speaker, according to Dr. Michael New of the Charlotte Lozier Institute, approximately 2.7 million people are alive today and each year another 60,000 evade the irreversible consequence of death by abortion and they survive because of Henry Hyde's amendment.

Thanks to Henry Hyde, 2.7 million people, who would otherwise have been aborted, have experienced the joys, challenges, and opportunities to thrive.

Madam Speaker, beginning in 1981, I had the honor of serving alongside Henry Hyde right here in the U.S. House of Representatives. He was brilliant, compassionate, tenacious, incredibly articulate, self-effacing, a man of great wisdom and humor, a one-of-a-kind lawmaker who to this day remains the great defender of unborn children and their mothers.

He was so good at debate that you always wanted Henry Hyde to be your closer.

Henry believed sound moral principles and courage should inform and guide the decisions we make in government. He addressed a 1990 class of incoming freshmen Members of Congress with these words: "This may sound odd, even ironic. You are here in the flush of victory. And yet it is precisely now that I ask you to contemplate the possibility of defeat—perhaps even the necessity of defeat . . . If you don't know the principle, or the policy, for which you are willing to lose your office, then you are going to do damage here."

Madam Speaker, obviously, nobody wants to lose an election. However, we do great damage when we sacrifice our core convictions on the altar of political expediency. It is truly sad that far too many politicians who know better have abandoned unborn children and their mothers to the abortionists for political gain or upward advancement.

The Hyde amendment is under relentless assault. Yet, polling data consistently reflects what the 2026 Marist Poll found: a significant majority of Americans do not support taxpayer funding for abortion.

As pro-life Americans work to replace abortion violence, the culture of death, with compassion and empathy for women and children, the Hyde amendment continues to stand as one of the most important human rights policies of the past 50 years.

However—and we know this so well—the billion-dollar abortion industry, like Planned Parenthood, which itself has killed over 10 million babies in their clinics, continues to cleverly market the cheap sophistry of choice while going to extraordinary lengths to downplay the suffering and the pain experienced by the battered baby victims in the womb as well as the coercion or pressure exerted on the mother to end the life of her unborn child.

I would remind my colleagues that the abortion pill, mifepristone, kills the baby by starving the child to death, while other methods of abortion dismember and decapitate the baby.

We now know—and there has been a coverup on this for many years—that mifepristone is extremely dangerous to women. The Ethics in Public Policy Center conducted the largest known study ever on the abortion pill. They looked at 865,000 women who took mifepristone from 2017 to 2023 and found that 10.93 percent, almost 1 of every 11 women, experienced significant adverse events like sepsis, infection, hemorrhaging, and other serious adverse events. That has all been covered up for decades, and it has to get out into the light of day.

Let's not forget that if you look at the container that carries this, it says it has less than 0.5 percent adverse events. That is a big lie, big lie. Let me say it again: It is big lie.

Mr. Speaker, future generations of Americans, I believe, will look back and wonder how such a seemingly smart and enlightened society could have permitted and perpetrated the violent deaths of more than 66 million children by abortion, often with government authorization, enabling, and in many of our States, with public funding.

History will note, however, that the struggle of Henry Hyde and millions of pro-life Americans who joined him in his quest to protect and defend the rights of the weakest and most vulnerable—they will know that we are with him and so many others who have stood tall.

Henry Hyde has always encouraged all of us in the pro-life movement, despite setbacks and the often harsh criticism that we all get, to preserve and never give up.

□ 2040

He famously said—and I will close on this—"When the time comes as it surely will, when we face that awesome moment, the final judgment, I have often thought, as Fulton Sheen wrote, that it is a terrible moment of loneliness. You have no advocates, you are there alone standing before God, and a terror will rip through your soul like nothing you can imagine. But I really think that those in the pro-life movement will not be alone. I think there will be a chorus of voices that have never been heard in this world but are heard beautifully and clearly in the next world, and they will plead for everyone who has been in this movement. They will say to God, 'Spare him because he loved us.' And God will look at you and say, not 'Did you succeed,' but 'Did you try?'"

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

MCDOWELL) who is joining us today as part of this Special Order.

Mr. MCDOWELL. Madam Speaker, on the heels of my wife, Rachel, and I welcoming our third daughter into this world, it is only fitting to celebrate life through the 50th anniversary of the Hyde amendment.

Life is just as precious today as it was in 1976. Unfortunately, some have lost sight of protecting the unborn.

I will say this: I will never lose sight.

The idea that this amendment is even needed in the first place is hard to fathom, but my colleagues on the other side have shown they will use any chance they get to steer American tax dollars to fund abortions.

This wasn't always their position, Madam Speaker. While they have always been opposed to protecting life, many at least agreed not to have the tax dollars of my constituents fund it. It is only in recent years where the curtain fell and they stopped pretending.

On this 50th anniversary, let us be reminded that there is no greater cause than the protection of life and giving a voice to the voiceless. Now, and going forward, this body must not simply protect the Hyde amendment. We must strengthen it and never back down.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend for his very fine comments and his leadership.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN), the chair of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee and longstanding advocate and defender of the unborn.

HONORING LIFE AND LEGACY OF ROBERT ''BOB'' MELVILLE LEE

Mr. BABIN. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend Representative CHRIS SMITH for always standing up for life.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate the Pro-Life Caucus for allowing me some time to give an off-topic speech, momentarily just departing from the very important topic of preserving and strengthening the Hyde amendment, of which we are celebrating the 50th anniversary of.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of the life and legacy of my friend, Robert ''Bob'' Melville Lee, who went to be with our Lord on August 17, 2026. While his many professional achievements are astounding, it is the titles of husband, father, grandfather, and friend that he was most beloved for. A close friend described him as an incredibly honest, forthright, and above all, loyal individual.

Bob was born on August 7, 1945, in Columbus, Ohio. He moved to California shortly after. He was proud to call San Francisco home for most of his life. Bob's love of sports and the drive to excel began at a very young age as he collected quotes from athletes and coaches for his father who was a journalist for The Associated Press.

He recounted often the time that his mother found him snagged by his own jacket on a playground fence before returning to dinner. He attended Lowell High School and was an exceptional athlete, excelling in football and baseball, and receiving honors for both.

Bob went on to play collegiate football at both San Francisco City College and the University of the Pacific in Stockton. His hard work and determination opened the door to an extensive career in the National Football League. Over the next 14 years, he competed for the Minnesota Vikings, the Atlanta Falcons, and the Los Angeles Rams.

He received most valuable player, MVP honors, and the team award all in the same year, becoming the first person to receive these distinctions in a single season. He also received Rookie of the Year. Bob advanced to the Super Bowl three times and enjoyed sharing the experience with those around him, including his perspective on one of America's favorite sports.

While Bob's athletic ability spoke for itself, his character preceded him. He spent the off-season as a substitute teacher for the San Francisco Unified School District and San Francisco City College. An avid learner, he earned his master's degree from the University of the Pacific while in the NFL.

After retiring from the NFL, Bob's love of hard work, architecture, and craftsmanship led him to launch a successful real estate business. He designed and built his home on Lone Mountain, which he shared with his wife, Janice Lee. He filled his time sketching floor plans on graph paper while watching Sunday football and competing with coaches to call plays before they happened.

Bob returned to the University of the Pacific as the athletic director for a brief time, advocating for athletes, the importance of academics, the university's football program, and women's sports.

He was the only person in the country who served as an athletic director and radio play-by-play announcer for the university's football games.

He volunteered at several organizations in the city, serving as Little League coach for his children's team, proudly including his daughter on the boys' baseball teams, leading his local neighborhood associations, and spending time on the board of the San Francisco Prep Hall of Fame and NorCal Chapter of the National Football Foundation.

During his time on the board, he was recognized with the Distinguished American Award as an individual who set the standard for excellence and a life of service to his community. The title coach followed Bob wherever he went, bringing patience and focus to the task at hand. Whether it was playing catch with his two sons or teaching his daughter how to drive his well-loved 1958 Impala, he took it seriously.

Bob never stayed still for long, working outdoors on his property at Sebastopol, researching future real estate projects, playing golf, or enjoying a plate of spaghetti carbonara or a cup of hot chocolate with his wife in one of his favorite city eateries. He was an animated storyteller, keeping the attention of those closest to him as he worked his way to an important lesson, moral, or occasional punch line. Family and friends fondly recount receiving hard copies of newspapers with his favorite sections circled.

It is often said that people's only legacy is their children, and Bob's is one that I can attest to. His daughter, Jenna, married my son, Leif, and my family has been a direct recipient of the love, the hard work, and the character that he instilled in his children.

Bob believed in people, supported friends and strangers, and was charitable with his time and thoughtful counsel. His generous heart, passionate spirit for the city and the sports that he loved, and genuine desire to make the world a better place will be deeply missed by his family, his friends, and those in the Bay Area community.

Good-bye, Bob.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from North Dakota (Mrs. FEDORCHAK) and thank her for her leadership. She is a new Member but a rising star and has a tremendous background in government.

Mrs. FEDORCHAK. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman SMITH for the kind words and appreciate the chance.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a mom of three and as a voice for every unborn child whose life has value, dignity, and purpose.

For almost 50 years, the Hyde amendment has reflected a simple principle: Taxpayer dollars should not be used to pay for abortions. This anniversary is about much more than a policy or a line in an appropriations bill.

It is about life.

Since 1976, the Hyde amendment is estimated to have saved more than 2.7 million lives. My State of North Dakota has under a million people. That is nearly three times the number of people in North Dakota.

This involves millions of sons and daughters, brothers and sisters, friends and neighbors. These are people who were given a chance to live, to grow, to love, to work, and to make a difference in our country. These are people who become parents and built families themselves.

□ 2050

Becoming a mother changed the way I saw the miracle of bringing a child into this world.

Every life is precious, and every child has value.

Truly, every mother deserves encouragement and real support. We should make sure every young woman facing an unexpected pregnancy has the support she needs to see not just the challenge before her, but the precious and priceless gift of life.

The pro-life cause is not simply a political position. It is a conviction rooted in the belief that every human life has dignity, purpose, and value, because every life is made in the image of God.

Abortion is often presented as a measure of women's rights. I reject that. Protecting women and protecting unborn children are not opposing causes.

We can be a country that honors mothers and protects children.

Americans believe in life. We believe in family. We believe in community. That means we must support mothers facing difficult circumstances. That means strengthening families, promoting adoption, improving maternal healthcare, and caring for the vulnerable children.

For half a century, the Hyde Amendment has protected both life and the conscience of millions of Americans.

As we mark this 50th anniversary, let us recommit ourselves to that enduring principle.

Every life matters. Every life has dignity, and every life deserves a chance.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mrs. FEDORCHAK for that very moving statement, for her leadership, and for reminding all of us that we love them both—the mother and the baby. That was so well stated.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my good friend and colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Tax.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. SMITH for the time.

We celebrate dates all the time or we refer back to dates, things that happen in our history. Last Friday, I was actually near Bedford, Pennsylvania, the site of the crash of Flight 93, and the talk was about the number of innocent lives that were lost that day.

How could anybody plan an attack on the United States of America by using people who were flying to a destination in an airplane? They were totally innocent people who were maybe going to their job, maybe going back home, maybe going to celebrate something else, but the loss of life that day.

We talk about the loss of life that day. What happened in New York? What happened in our Pentagon? What happened in the open fields of Pennsylvania? The reference is always to the loss of life, and we stop, and we pray. People get up and speak about it, and they talk about how horrific this was. How could anybody plan something that dastardly? How could anybody think that by taking the lives of innocent people, you would be making a statement to the rest of the world that was important.

My wife and I have been blessed with four children. She is one of nine. I am one of five. I am always fascinated by people who talk about healthcare because we have got to do something about saving lives in this country. We are the wealthiest country in the world. Why can't we spend more money on healthcare? Why can't we extend life for people? Why can't we find cures? Why can't we do things like this?

Every day, I hear things about life, the loss of life, how horrible it is, and how the greatest Nation in the world, how can we not look at what we could do to stop that loss of life?

Yet, you have this other reversal then when it comes to, well, you don't understand. I am very thankful to my mother because she gave life to me, but I am in a political position where I can protest the birth and the life of a new child.

Isn't that unusual that somehow when we celebrate, we celebrate—you know what, the really great thing in the Dobbs decision is that in 2022, all of a sudden, we don't have to worry about that anymore. No, no, no. We have to worry even more because all the Dobbs decision did was to return that decision to the States, whatever the individual States decide.

Again, I am going to go back to this. I am a Hyundai automobile dealer. This last week, we celebrated the fact that we had created a fund by the Hyundai dealers and Hyundai Motor of America. We have raised over $300 million, and that money is all to go to the fight against pediatric cancer. We celebrate the fact that isn't this great, an automobile company and automobile dealers would think so much of life that they would try to build up a fund where we could fight this horrible disease that parents face, a cancer child who loses his or her life. We can say we are making such great progress. We actually raised $300 million to help save the lives of these children. These children represent 25 percent of our population, but 100 percent of our future.

Yet, the debate goes on. Who has the right to life? Well, it depends on who you talk to, and it depends on the situation they are in. Now, if they are running for a political office and they think that somehow there is a political gain to looking at legislation that would allow the elimination, through abortion, of our future generation, oh, we would rail about what we have to do in protecting women's rights and how horrible it is.

Then we will turn around, and we will go out and buy birthday cards, and we will celebrate birthdays.

For those of us who have big families, the biggest birthday we celebrate is for our children. Then we have all of these wonderful events, and we just celebrate them.

The same people are looking to give people this idea that they will know if it is not your time, if it is not your day, if it doesn't fit your financial situation, and here is what you should be able to do: eliminate that life. Take that life away, because you know what, it isn't worth it. It isn't worth it.

Yet, again, there will be some headline about a horrible loss of life of some innocent person, and I hear about it all the time. How can we have this outrageous activity taking place where people think that they need to go into a grade school and shoot children, and we just abhor that. We abhor that.

Yet, we want to have legislation that allows the elimination of the next generation. Somehow, in my mind, I am trying to figure out what the heck happened.

Listen, the Dobbs decision was a great decision, but all it did was take the abortion law out of the hands of the Federal Government and return it to the States and say, you know what, this is truly a Pontius Pilate moment. They washed their hands of it and said, you know what, not my decision. You all make the decision. We are walking away from it.

I have watched CHRIS SMITH since I got here in 2011. The one constant that I know when I talk to CHRIS SMITH is that it is going to be a life issue, an issue that involves the unborn and their right to life.

Yet, in this House—and keep in mind, this is called the people's House where all of us represent three-quarters of a million people—isn't it wonderful that there are three-quarters of a million people that we can actually represent, and somewhere their parents made a decision to go ahead and make sure that the birth that they were expecting actually took place.

We really relish in the idea of how great America is, how we come here and we make these wonderful decisions, and we just abhor all the violence, and we abhor all of these horrible things that happen. Yet, we have a blind eye and a deaf ear to the unborn.

□ 2100

How? How can we change this? Well, I have to tell you.

So the Hyde amendment was one way of trying to get things, and the Dobbs decision, of course, another. Ultimately, we can pass no piece of legislation that will help determine this issue because the real issue doesn't take place at the ballot box. The real issue takes place in the hearts and minds of the American people.

If you are willing to sit back and watch this happen and say, well, that issue, I can actually understand that because that is actually up to the mother to decide whether that child should be born.

By the same token, I have a piece of legislation that I want to pass that will go after people who do these ungodly things and destroy life. I am trying to figure out, in the people's House, in the United States of America, the greatest defender of life, liberty, and freedom the world has ever known, is this a serious debate? Is this something we are trying to figure out, this whole issue?

We are trying to think: Well, but, see, Kelly, you are not looking at it the way I look at it. I am going to tell you how I look at it.

It may not be your time. It may not be something you can afford. It may not be an interruption of something you had planned in your life that this new life is interrupting. Well, the answer is: Look, if it is not your time, if it is not something you really want, if it is something you don't think that much about, why don't you do this. There is something called the adoption option.

There are thousands and thousands of people in the United States of America today who would love to have a little girl or a little boy come into their lives. Again, these are life issues, but we get them confused all the time because it depends on whose life you are messing with.

I am saying to you that there is something wrong. We are wired wrong, and I would tell you that I am so thankful to my parents. I watched what they went through, and I never really thought about it until my wife and I had children. Then, I looked at that boy, and I said, you know what? In our society, we celebrate life, and we grieve death.

How did we get these two things mixed up that we could actually reverse it and say that somehow allowing the abortion of a new little girl or a new little boy makes our lives easier? It ends their life, but it makes our lives easier. That is absolutely the most upside-down thinking. I don't know who wired you folks, but you ought to get to somebody as soon as you can to get it unwired.

I always, at the end of these times that we get a chance to talk—please, when you find time that your head is settled down, call your mother and thank her for giving birth to you so that you could enter into a debate about the right to life, and ask her opinion or what her guidance would be.

My mother would have said: Well, son, I don't even know why you are calling me. We couldn't wait to have you. We couldn't wait to celebrate your birth. We couldn't wait to see you get married. We couldn't wait to see you and your wife have children and have our grandchildren.

I am trying to get this balance in America where we actually think this is a serious debate.

I will tell my friends that it is in your heart. It is in your mind. If you want it to change, then you have to change it. Please do not allow an unelected official to make a decision on whether that child should have the right to be born.

This is the most bizarre—I can't call it an argument because it doesn't hold any logic. It doesn't hold any light, but I thank my friend, CHRIS SMITH, and the people who I have the honor to serve with, that at the end of the day, there is one thing we will never walk away from, and that is the right for every single person—every life to be lived.

If they are fortunate enough and blessed enough to be born in the United States of America and be able to forge legislation that actually determines just how great life can be—I thank Mr. SMITH. The gentleman is a guardian angel of life, and I appreciate it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I thank MIKE KELLY so very much for his passion and deep commitment to preserving the most vulnerable among us, and that would be the unborn.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MANN), former Lieutenant Governor of Kansas. I thank the gentleman for his leadership, as well.

Mr. MANN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for hosting this and for being a champion for life here in our body.

I appreciate the comments earlier about Congressman Hyde, who the gentleman knew. Congressman Hyde was an amazing person. I associate myself with all the previous comments here tonight, as well.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 50th anniversary of the Hyde amendment, one of the most consequential pro-life protections ever enacted by Congress.

In 1976, Congressman Henry Hyde offered a simple principle: American taxpayers should not be forced to pay for abortions with their hard-earned tax dollars. For half a century, that principle has endured.

The Hyde amendment restricts Federal funding for abortions through programs like Medicaid and has been renewed annually since its adoption. Its impact has been enormous.

According to analysis by the Charlotte Lozier Institute, the Hyde amendment has saved approximately 2.6 million lives since it was first enacted. That means that millions of Americans are alive today because Congress drew a line in the sand to say that Federal taxpayer dollars should not be used to end a life.

Hyde has accomplished more than that. For 50 years, it has established a commonsense understanding that regardless of where Americans stand on abortion, no American should be forced by their government to financially support it. Hyde has historically received support from Members of both parties because this principle is not and should not be controversial.

Unfortunately, in recent years, that consensus has begun to break down. Because the Hyde amendment is attached to annual appropriations bills, its protections are not permanent. Congress must renew them year after year, leaving one of our Nation's most important protections for unborn life vulnerable to political attacks.

Madam Speaker, Hyde should not be used as the finish line for the pro-life movement. It is the floor. It is a bare-minimum compromise.

America was founded on the self-evident truth that every person is created equal and endowed by our creator with an inherent right to life. That right is the foundation of every other right that we enjoy.

As a father, I believe every child is fearfully and wonderfully made by God. Every life has value. Every child has purpose, and no child is a mistake.

Our responsibility does not end with protecting unborn children. We must continue supporting mothers and families, strengthening adoption and foster care, and standing with pregnancy centers and community organizations that work alongside women in difficult circumstances.

Madam Speaker, 50 years after Henry Hyde first offered his amendment, Congress should build on that legacy. We should make the Hyde protections permanent law so that unborn children are protected and American taxpayers are never forced to fund abortion. For half a century, Hyde has saved lives. We must ensure that that never changes.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time. I thank Congressman SMITH for being a champion of life.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD), a member of the Ways and Means Committee and a true leader who assumed office in 2015.

Mr. LAHOOD. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. SMITH for yielding. I appreciate it.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the upcoming beatification of Archbishop Fulton J. Sheen. On Thursday, September 24, in St. Louis, Missouri, a Mass will be held to honor the beatification of Fulton J. Sheen. This is the step before canonization. He will be the first American bishop to reach the status of beatification. Archbishop Sheen was a tireless servant of the Catholic Church and one of the most influential religious communicators of the 20th century.

Born in 1895 in El Paso, Illinois, which is in Woodford County, a rural farming community, he was raised in Peoria, Illinois. He graduated from Spalding Institute in Peoria in 1913, studied at St. Viator College in Illinois, and attended Saint Paul Seminary. He was ordained a priest in the Diocese of Peoria in 1919.

After studying in Washington, D.C., and Europe, Sheen became deeply concerned about the rise of communism and totalitarianism. In 1926, he began teaching at the Catholic University of America in Washington, D.C., where he remained until 1950.

□ 2110

Sheen's influence extended far beyond the classroom. During the Great Depression and the rise of totalitarian regimes abroad, he used the pulpit, the lecture hall, and radio to reach Americans across the country. His radio program, "The Catholic Hour," brought his message into millions of American homes.

After World War II, Sheen devoted himself to Catholic missionary work around the world. In 1950, he became national director of the Society for Propagation of the Faith, where he helped raise more than $100 million for missions during his tenure.

Then he came to television. In 1952, ''Life is Worth Living'' debuted on DuMont Television Network. Sheen quickly became one of the most recognizable religious figures in America. His combination of scholarship, humor, storytelling, and common sense attracted tens of millions of viewers.

In 1953, Bishop Fulton J. Sheen received an Emmy Award for the most outstanding personality on television. Imagine that, receiving an Emmy Award.

Long before podcasts, social media, and streaming, Sheen understood how technology could be used to reach people wherever they were, including in their own homes.

He asked fundamental questions about why are we here on Earth, who we are as people, and how we ought to live.

Sheen participated in the Second Vatican Council from 1962 to 1965 and later served as the Bishop of Rochester, New York. After retiring in 1969, he continued traveling, preaching, speaking, and giving retreats to laypeople and priests.

Even as his health declined, he remained intellectually curious, spiritually devoted, and engaged with the world around him. Archbishop Sheen died on December 9, 1979, in New York City.

In 2002, his cause for canonization formally opened in the Diocese of Peoria. In 2014, Pope Francis approved a miracle attributed to Sheen's intercession involving the healing of a stillborn child in Washington, Illinois, outside of Peoria. That child today is 15 years of age. His name is James Fulton Engstrom, and he will be at the mass for the beatification next Thursday, September 24.

Now, after decades of prayer and discernment, his cause is reaching a historic milestone.

As I mentioned, next Thursday, September 24, Fulton Sheen will be beatified and declared blessed of the Catholic Church.

For the people of central Illinois, this is an especially meaningful moment. Fulton Sheen was one of our own, a product of central Illinois. All of his formative years were spent there, and he carried with him the faith and values he first learned in the Peoria area.

Today, his legacy continues in central Illinois through the Archbishop Fulton J. Sheen Museum, which welcomes visitors from across the United States and around the world. The museum is now expanding with the Sheen Experience, an immersive destination that will introduce a new generation to his life, ministry, and message.

Over his career, he consistently and beautifully offered a message centered on faith, human dignity, personal responsibility, and purpose. He spent his life encouraging people not to simply watch the world around them, but to participate, serve others, stand for human dignity, seek truth, and live with purpose.

As we recognize his upcoming beatification, I am proud to honor the life and legacy of Archbishop Fulton J. Sheen, a great Catholic leader, a pioneering communicator, and a proud son of our Peoria diocese.

May his example continue to inspire generations to come.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank Darin for those very powerful remarks.

Just coincidentally, in 1976, when the Hyde amendment passed, James Oberstar flew to the Boston Right to Life national conference. I was working press for the National Right to Life Committee then, and he brought the great news. That is when there was more of a bipartisan sense of defending life, and Jim Oberstar was a great Congressman from Minnesota. Guess who the keynote speaker was at the National Right to Life Conference in Boston? It was Fulton Sheen. I thank Mr. LAHOOD for those very great remarks.

I yield now to CHIP ROY. He is the sponsor of the FACE Act Repeal Act, the No Taxpayer Funding for the United Nations Population Fund Act, and the Protecting Life on College Campus Act. He has been very, very powerfully promoting the culture of life. I thank him for his leadership and yield to him.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend, Mr. SMITH. He has devoted so much of his time and his career before Congress and since in defense of life. I am not sure what greater cause we can have than to stand up for life as Members of this great deliberative body, the people's House here in the United States House of Representatives.

As we all know, and as the gentleman referred to, in the Declaration, it affirms that all people are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights. Obviously, the pursuit of happiness is one of those, but so are life and liberty. These things are at the core of who we are as people, as Americans.

Last Friday, we were commemorating the courage of those who stood strong in the face of terrorism, those who ran into the buildings, but we are also mourning still 25 years later the loss of life. We did that collectively as a country because we understand that life matters.

What strikes me is the phone calls that were made during that time, the phone calls that were made from those airplanes as they were being flown into buildings, as they were being flown into the field in Pennsylvania. What were they saying? They weren't talking about getting abortions. They weren't talking about killing people.

They were calling loved ones to say: I love you. They were calling loved ones to say: I will see you soon on the other side. I will be looking down on you from above. They were celebrating life, knowing that they were about to lose life, knowing that they were going to go into eternity for those with strong faith, and they knew that that phone call was something that their loved one needed to hear because it was about life.

Here we are, and we are having to have political battles in defense of innocent life. Now, 50-odd years removed from Roe, obviously we celebrated the decision by the Court in Dobbs, but abortion continues. Babies continue to lose their lives. They are babies. They are babies that continue to be assaulted in the false name of some sort of freedom.

Fifty years ago, Congressman Hyde, Judiciary Committee Chairman Hyde eventually, one of the more eloquent statesmen that this body has ever known, led on this issue, and we have had now for 50 years, as we are celebrating today, the Hyde amendment, which was a commonsense, bipartisan understanding that taxpayers shouldn't be forced to fund something abhorrent to their faith and abhorrent to the values that any sense of humanity and decency would suggest you shouldn't have to fund.

That is all it stands for, and it was bipartisan. It was not that long ago. For 50 years, it reflects that shared value that we shouldn't force people to subsidize something so abhorrent to their belief system.

I rise today, thanking Henry Hyde, thanking my colleague, thanking those who have stood for life, but I also want to offer an admonition. I am proud that in the One Big Beautiful Bill Act, we had a provision in there that stopped funding from going to Planned Parenthood for a year. That is a good thing because funds are fungible, and we all know that money was flowing to Planned Parenthood for the purpose of ultimately exterminating life. We stopped that for a year. I am proud of this body, I am proud of my colleagues for doing that and fighting to get that accomplishment in that piece of legislation, one of many great pieces of legislation in that bill.

However, I would note, it expired, so now we are 2 months beyond the termination of that provision and its effects.

□ 2120

I would note also that we continue to fund a regime that allows mifepristone to be circulating around our Nation so that pills can be taken by women in their dorm rooms and women in their apartments and endanger their lives while terminating life via pills.

That is not victory.

I am proud of what we have done, but that is not victory. It is not victorious when tonight a woman's life is in danger and a baby's life is going to be terminated through a pill circulating through the mail of the United States Postal Service or through various forms of transit, all still being allowed by our own Federal Government. That must stop.

While we stand here commemorating it, those tax dollars continue to flow, and that contradiction is something that Congress needs to confront.

Annual appropriations riders should not override this great accomplishment of 50 years. The American taxpayer should not be forced to subsidize the abortion industry directly or indirectly.

I will close with this, coming back to what we said 1 week ago in celebrating the courage, for example, of the people who stood up on United Flight 93 and confronted terror, with Todd Beamer's famous words: ''Let's roll.''

Before that what did he do?

He asked a woman that he called to recite the Lord's Prayer. Life matters.

Who are we, as a people, if we cannot stand up in defense of the most innocent form of life there is: a child in the womb of its mother?

That should be our calling, and we should be able to unite as human beings in defense of the defenseless.

Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for hosting this hour.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for his comments and his leadership on so many bills, including the FACE Act. I was here when that passed. I led the opposition to it, and we lost. Now wonderful people who are accused of physically obstructing an abortion clinic lose, not only can they get up to 2 years in prison for what was the staple of the civil rights movement, and that was nonviolent civil disobedience. They can have their entire bank account and 401(k)s taken away from them and given to Planned Parenthood. It is too much, but the gentleman led the effort on that.

My friend mentioned Todd Beamer. He is from just the next town over from my district, from Cranbury. I got to know his wife and many of the widows. They have such strength and such courage. They saved many lives that day, as my friend knows, to make sure that that airliner did not end up here or wherever their final terrorist designation may have been.

It is great that the gentleman brought that in. That was so very, very important, and I thank my friend for his leadership.

Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

VETERANS BENEFITS

(Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, Mr. TAKANO of California was recognized for 19 minutes.)

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TAKANO. Madam 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 in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. Fedorchak). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to highlight for the American people just how badly the Republican majority has failed veterans in this Congress.

First, before I get into that, I want to talk about something especially important. September is Suicide Prevention Month. We lose far too many veterans to suicide. Suicide Prevention Month is a perfect time to bring attention to this critical issue and to show support for veterans who need it.

It is important to remind veterans that the Veterans Crisis Line is always reachable at 988 and you need to press 1. Responders are standing by to offer help and support.

Unfortunately, my Republican colleagues declined to hold a single suicide prevention hearing in the month of September last year, and, sadly, no hearings were planned for this year.

I will take this opportunity to say to any veterans watching: You are not alone and support is available.

We all have a role to play in preventing veteran suicide by reaching out, checking in, and letting veterans know that they have support.

Now, one of the most important things that Congress should do for veterans is to ensure that they have the resources and programs that they need. House Democrats have been demonstrating our commitment by leading the charge to do what is right for veterans without consideration for politics or party.

For example, last night, the discharge petition Representative RAUL RUIZ and I introduced on the Major Richard Star Act received the 218th signature to force a vote in the House.

This bill, sponsored by my honorable Republican colleague, Representative GUS BILIRAKIS, has for years sat without action as veterans service organizations came to Congress repeatedly to demand relief for combat-injured veterans.

My Republican colleagues offered excuses that it was too expensive, that helping wounded veterans would require cuts to other benefits, and my Democratic colleagues and I refused to accept that.

Now, together with veterans service organizations and veteran partners and a few courageous Republicans who put veterans before partisanship, we can finally have a vote on this priority legislation.

I thank every person in this room, in the galleries, people watching at home who use their voice to advocate to end the wounded veteran tax. This victory belongs to them, but our work is not over until the Major Richard Star Act is signed into law. We have come too far, built too much momentum, and brought together too powerful a coalition to stop now. We must force the majority to act.

Madam Speaker, the House has spoken, and these veterans have waited far too long for the benefits they deserve. Do not make them wait another 2 months for a vote on this bill.

I ask this question to the Speaker: Is it more important for Congress to leave town than for us to stay here and take care of these 59,000 combat veterans?

Instead of sending everyone home this evening, we should vote on this bill so it can be sent to the Senate and passed during this work period. Combat-injured veterans fulfilled their duty to this country.

Will Congress fulfill our duty to them?

Right now, veterans are struggling to access their care and benefits, including mental health care. Too many veterans are facing the affordability crisis, which is leading to spikes in homelessness and home foreclosures. Republicans have failed to advance a single bill to move the needle on those issues and others over the last 2 years. Instead, they have focused their attention on cobbling together politically divisive mega bills that would expand care and benefits for some veterans only at the cost of cutting benefits to others.

Meanwhile, the administration's big donors continue to line their pockets with taxpayer money while they bilk the government for billions of dollars in lucrative VA contracts.

Now, my Republican colleagues wasted months pushing their deeply flawed taking benefits away from America's veterans act, which they claim was the ''only viable path for the Major Richard Star Act''. However, in reality, H.R. 9237 never had a path to passage. They brought it to Congress, to the House floor twice, but it was resoundingly rejected by the VSO and the veteran community because it includes the largest cut to veteran benefits in history. Now the House is recessing with nothing for veterans.

For my Republican colleagues to try and rip veterans' benefits away now, while we are in an active conflict with Iran, is a slap in the face to every servicemember in harm's way. They should have to look in the eyes of our sailors who were on the USS *Lincoln*, our soldiers and our airmen and marines in the Middle East and tell them: Thank you for your service, but we are cutting your benefits.

Nothing illustrates this point more than the majority's inaction on any new presumptions of service connection for veterans who desperately need help.

The presumptions include blast overpressure, the Nevada Test and Training Range, missileer cancer, Atsugi Air Base, Fort George, Fort McClellan, Guam, Panama, infertility, fast boats, Red Hill, toxic base housing, cultural support teams, and the list goes on and on and on.

All these veterans and their families are looking to us for relief. Yet all has been left by the wayside by this majority. Republicans haven't seen fit to address even one of the issues I just mentioned.

Why? I can only speculate.

□ 2130

History has shown that when push comes to shove on veterans benefits, my Republican colleagues' first question is always about cost and never about need.

We see what they are doing right now, trying to actually cut benefits. What makes it even worse is that the $60 billion in benefits that my Republican colleagues want to cut in H.R. 9237 would not just fund increases in benefits for some veterans. Most of those cuts would go to lining the pockets of government contractors and privatizing the VA.

Their bill even includes a $500 million slush fund for VA IT contractors at a time when the agency is preparing to spend $17 billion more on its Electronic Health Record Modernization program with Oracle. Billions of dollars are going to private industry on the backs of veterans serving our country.

Oracle isn't the only company getting rich or richer while the rest of America struggles with rising healthcare costs, expensive groceries, and sky-high gas prices. VA is also giving American taxpayers the opportunity to line the pockets of healthcare conglomerates, like UnitedHealthcare and private equity giants, with the VA's new community care contracts, amounting to $1 trillion. That is trillion with a t.

I would say I am surprised, but I am not. It is no secret that this administration and sycophants in Congress like to pat themselves on the back, professing to put America first, all the while picking America's pockets. We should all be watching what they are doing instead of what they are saying and just follow the money.

For instance, in 2022, after Oracle purchased Cerner for $28.3 billion, Oracle's CEO Mike Sicilia testified that they would actually eat the cost for the deployment of VA's electronic health records system in the case of cost overruns.

However, we know that this is no longer the case. After Larry Ellison, Oracle's executive chairman and the eighth richest man in the world, made more than $45 million in donations to Donald Trump, Oracle is getting a $17.5 billion contract augmentation, a shocking amount that was initially hidden from both Congress and the public.

Look at this contract that shows the augmentation of Oracle's contract by $17.5 billion. As you can see, VA has redacted, meaning blacked out, this number when it was quietly posted on SAM.gov on August 11, 2026.

In fact, VA never even notified Congress of this $17 billion increase. To this day, VA still has not provided the committee or the public with an unredacted copy of this justification.

The fact that Secretary Collins chose to hide the amount that the American taxpayer will be shouldering in order to shore up Oracle's bottom line should be concerning to all of us.

Everyone can certainly draw their own conclusions here, but it is extremely clear to me that we are in desperate need of more facts. We need more information about how VA landed on this $17 billion number and just what led Oracle to be awarded this massive sum, despite no proven success.

This is exactly what I am attempting to do.

On September 2, the Veterans' Affairs Committee voted unanimously to adopt Congresswoman MAXINE DEXTER's motion to subpoena Oracle Chairman Larry Ellison and Oracle Health CEO Mike Sicilia.

While I was glad to see that the subpoena was finally issued Monday night by Chairman BOST, I would like to reiterate that compliance with the subpoena must occur in a public hearing this Congress.

Congress has a duty to examine the sequence of events that led us to this point, especially while the administration and congressional Republicans contemplate tens of billions of dollars in cuts to benefits that veterans earned for their service.

Chairman BOST scheduled Mr. Sicilia and Mr. Ellison's appearances before the Veterans' Affairs Committee for November 19 and December 10, respectively. I can't help but cynically wonder if the chairman is delaying enforcement of the subpoena to run out the clock on this Congress, hoping the Speaker adjourns the House for early holiday recess.

Subpoenas effectively die and lack enforcement power when the 119th Congress ends, but I can assure Oracle and the public that my Democratic colleagues and I will not back down from our demands for transparency and accountability.

As VA continues to push more and more care out to the private sector and outsources even more of its IT services to Oracle and other Trump donors, it is clear, at least to me, that veterans are the ones who will suffer because of this corruption.

I want to go on to another issue. House Republicans' posture this week—our last week of session before an unexpected recess—is honestly symbolic of their posture with veterans in this Congress. At every turn, the majority has ensured that veterans were at the end of their priority list, from benefits-cutting legislation to canceled oversight hearings.

Just months into the 119th Congress, Chairman VAN ORDEN and Chairman BOST urged President Trump and Secretary Collins to end the most important foreclosure relief program for veterans. With no warning, no foresight, and no planning for what comes next, Secretary Collins pulled the plug on the Veterans Affairs Servicing Purchase program, known as VASP.

The VA informed the committee that the decision sent over 15,000 veterans and their families into foreclosure and tens of thousands more at risk of losing their homes. Our own estimates now put that figure in excess of 17,000 foreclosures.

Let's review how we got here. The unprecedented crisis of COVID–19 required action from the VA to prevent the loss of hundreds of thousands of homes. President Biden, with the support of Congress, used existing authorities to pause foreclosures that were occurring during the pandemic.

Then, by the authorities granted by the National Disaster Declaration, the VA was able to implement a partial claims program, saving tens of thousands of veterans from losing their homes. That is what this chart shows, the plummeting number of foreclosures.

Chairman BOST and Republicans repeatedly called for the termination of the U.S. National Emergency for COVID–19, which happened on April 11, 2023. This resulted in VA losing authorities to continue foreclosure mitigation.

Action was still critically needed, or veterans would have lost their homes. President Biden instituted a second foreclosure moratorium to give VA time to offer a solution.

That is what you see here.

President Biden and then-Secretary McDonough launched the Veterans Affairs Servicing Purchase program, otherwise known as VASP, on May 31, 2024. From 2023 to 2024—that is what you see here under 3. This is when they implemented the VASP program. Look at what happens to foreclosures when they implement and address the issue, following through on the pandemic.

Most lenders worked with the Biden administration to ensure that very few veteran foreclosures occurred. This new program used explicit existing authorities by Congress to offer veteran homeowners a last resort before losing their home.

However, last year, Secretary Collins, President Trump, and Elon Musk's DOGE abruptly ended the VASP program, giving veterans no notice that a critical lifeline for borrowers was being ripped away. The decision was for and celebrated by Chairman BOST and subcommittee Chairman VAN ORDEN.

It is now 18 months since VASP was terminated, and still, veterans are unable to use the new replacement program. According to VA's own data from June, this has led to over 15,000 veteran foreclosures. Based on this current trend, we estimate that figure to have grown to over 17,000.

Let me say that again: 17,000 veterans and their families have lost their homes because Secretary Collins, Chairman BOST, and, most of all, Chairman VAN ORDEN decided to call for an end to the VASP program, unnecessarily.

Industry estimates are even more dire. Mortgage industry representatives told me today that they believe VA is underestimating the numbers. They think at least 22,000 veterans have lost their homes, and the actual number may be approaching 30,000. That is astronomical.

□ 2140

That is astronomical. Tens of thousands more veterans and their families are at risk if Secretary Collins does not reverse course.

While my Republican colleagues created an unnecessary veteran housing crisis, they have simultaneously turned a blind eye to the plight of the most vulnerable veterans.

At the beginning of this Congress, both Chairman BOST and Economic Subcommittee Chairman VAN ORDEN announced ending veteran homelessness as one of their top priorities. Yet, there has not been a single piece of legislation related to veteran homelessness brought to the House floor, nor a subcommittee hearing on the topic. In fact, the policies that Chairman BOST and Congressman VAN ORDEN advocated actually produced more housing insecurity among veterans by ending VA home loan foreclosure protections.

I have asked repeatedly how VA has helped these families who are facing foreclosure, but the Trump VA has refused to provide that information. I have gleaned what I can from available VA data, which shows a massive increase in the number of veterans using VA homelessness prevention services.

Nearly 10,000 more veterans and their families were served this year through the VA Supportive Services for Veteran Families program of 2022. The VA has refused to tell me how many of these families became at risk of homelessness due to their home foreclosure.

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

Mr. TAKANO. I wish I could tell you more, but I think I have told you quite a bit.

But my Democratic colleagues and I will not quit asking the hard questions and pushing VA to use its resources to help vulnerable families.

There are still an estimated 32,000 veterans experiencing homelessness on any given night. One veteran sleeping on the streets is too many—32,000 should be treated by both sides of the aisle as an emergency.

I remain committed to leading the fight to end veteran homelessness and creating a housing ecosystem that serves the needs of everyone, instead of prioritizing profits and the bottom line of billionaires. I will continue to push back on needless policies that create housing insecurity for veteran families. If Chairman BOST and Congressman VAN ORDEN were truly committed to ending veteran homelessness, they would be fighting next to me, but sadly they are sitting on the sidelines while veterans sleep on the streets.

Madam Speaker, I've spent this past half hour walking through what this Majority has done—and hasn't done—for our veterans over the past two years. And I want to be clear about something: my Republican colleagues do not lack for words on this floor. They will tell you, and they will tell veterans, that they care. That veterans come first. That this Congress honors their service.

But talk is cheap, and veterans know the difference between a press statement and real action.

So, let's test it. Last night, the discharge petition for the Major Richard Star Act hit 218 signatures. A majority of this House, Democrats and Republicans together, said enough waiting. That petition is no longer a message. It's a mandate. Combat-injured veterans have earned the right to keep both their retirement pay and their disability compensation, and the House has now spoken.

The only person standing between 59,000 veterans and that vote is the Speaker. But the Speaker has cancelled session until November 9th. Don't make these veterans wait another two months, for a vote on this bill. There is no procedural excuse left, no committee to wait on, no more signatures to chase. Mr. Speaker, schedule the vote. Not next month. Not when it's convenient. This week. Every day this vote sits on a calendar instead of the floor is another day combat-injured veterans go without benefits this House just told the world they deserve.

To the veterans watching tonight: last night you won something. Not because Washington finally decided to do right by you—but because of you and the organizations who fight for you refused to let this go quietly. That's how every real gain for veterans in this country has happened—not from a Congress that moved first, but from veterans who MADE it move.

You've watched this body take 18 months to fix what VASP's termination broke, while families lost their homes. You've watched a VA Secretary spend more energy attacking the VFW than answering for a contract increase he tried to hide. You've waited on hold, waited on a claim, waited in a clinic that still isn't staffed. Tonight is proof that waiting isn't the only option. Democrats will keep pushing this House to prove, with votes and measurable actions, not just words—that this time is different.

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

AMERICANS ARE ASKING QUESTIONS

(Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, Mr. ROY of Texas was recognized for 19 minutes.)

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, yet again, I am sitting here in an empty Chamber late at night. People have gone home to campaign. I understand that it is campaign season.

But while some are preparing for elections, American families are preparing for another trip to the grocery store, are filling up their cars, are paying their mortgages and their rent, and are looking at their utility bills.

A lot of Americans are asking a simple question: Why are things so expensive? Why is life so hard to afford? Inflation, lower than it was 2 years ago, is still built on the back of the massive inflation after COVID.

Today, the Federal Reserve raised rates another .25 percent, raising rates for the first time since 2023. Gasoline prices and diesel prices continue to go up and rise as the war in Iran rages on. Americans have difficulty affording their homes.

All of these things are true. Now, why is that the case? Let me pause for a second and say that until a little over 18 months ago, 19 months ago, President Trump comes in, and this Republican Congress got to work. I am deeply proud of the work that we have done to take on the biggest challenges that our Nation faces.

I also want to say that I am deeply proud of the United States House Freedom Caucus, conservatives who stood up in defense of the things Americans sent us here to do. But for conservatives and but for the Freedom Caucus, we would not have reduced spending on welfare, Medicaid, and the various programs ripe with fraud that are racking up mountains of debt and causing the American people to have to spend much more in inflation.

But for the Freedom Caucus, we would not have saved $1.7 trillion. But for conservatives and the Freedom Caucus, we would not have repealed $500 billion in inflation-causing subsidies put on by green new scam companies trying to make money off of the back of taxpayers.

But for the Freedom Caucus, we would not have eliminated a tax on guns that infringe on our Second Amendment right. But for the House Freedom Caucus, we would not have made the tax cuts permanent all the way through. But for the House Freedom Caucus, we would not have passed the Laken Riley Act, with the SUE Act in it, giving power to States to sue the Federal Government if they fail to secure the border. But for the House Freedom Caucus, we would not have gotten a 5-year ban on a central bank digital currency, to protect you from surveillance.

But for the House Freedom Caucus, we would not have held off on just an automatic renewal of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, carrying out surveillance on the American people.

I can go on and on and on. But the people that are in here trying to fight every single day for the hardworking American feeling screwed by their government and screwed by corporate America, those men and women, those patriots in the House Freedom Caucus and conservatives, are going to bat for you.

I can tell you, a lot of people in this town are not. A lot of people in this town want the easy road. A lot of lobbyists and a lot of people who are more interested in their election certificate or climbing the ladder of being a committee chairman or in some leadership post, they don't dare care about what that means for you. That is true on both sides of the aisle, and we need to recognize that.

Even as we speak, there are candidates who are in an R plus 20 or R plus 15 district who are already jockeying for committee positions. Even as we speak, there are current Members of this body spending money to try to raise money for their colleagues in large amounts to try to buy a committee chair, to try to buy a seat in leadership.

I think we ought to be here right now. I think we ought to be finishing the job, because I am proud of the job that we have done because of those of us who have stayed through the night until 2 a.m.—regardless of what phone call we get from the White House or when we get it—to demand that we deliver for the people of the United States.

Some folks in the White House have a moniker for some of us: ''the 2 a.m. caucus.'' I am a proud member. You think you need to call me at 2 a.m. to get my vote? Yes, you do, because this is Article I, this is Congress, and we are the first branch of government. This is the people's House. We ought to be here, and we ought to be delivering for the people of the United States. When we do, we are at our best. When we do, we deliver results for the American people.

But when we try to politicize or self-serve or climb the ladder of committee chairmanships and leadership, then we walk away from what our core responsibility and our job actually is.

Going back to the American people who are still struggling to afford life, I don't care what billionaire I piss off when I tell them that the American people are suffering right now because they can't afford a home or because they can't afford their food or they can't afford a car because we want to have another safety device in the car or another regulation in the car or a surveillance apparatus, like a kill switch, in the car. Then we wonder why the car can't be afforded.

Maybe it is another protection device in the housing. Maybe we need to import a whole lot of cheap labor that are going to be increasing the demand on the housing so American citizens can't afford a house.

Both the supply and demand of housing is causing the increase of prices. When you import half the world demanding housing, you wonder why housing is going up. When you regulate the hell out of homebuilding, you wonder why the price of housing is going up.

When you import half the world, you wonder why the entirety of the culture of this country changes in a nanosecond and you suddenly have mosques on every corner in Dallas/Fort Worth and you have people spreading sharia law and you have people that are standing in values that are directly opposed to what we believe in our Judeo-Christian society. When we say, ''In God We Trust,'' we mean it. When we have Moses looking down on our Chamber, we mean it because we know what this country was founded upon.

Yet, when we are importing half the world with people who do not share our values, you wonder why there are imams in Texas today that are literally plotting jihad against Western civilization. Then you wonder why the American people are mad, because the chamber of commerce and big business said they valued cheap labor more than protecting the people of the United States, more than protecting our culture, our heritage, and who we are as people. That is what the American people are mad about.

You want to know why they are mad about data centers? I will tell you why they are mad about data centers. It is not electricity or water necessarily. That is part of it. It is not necessarily noise pollution or light pollution. If they are out in a farming community, that is part of it. You know what it is? They are sitting in their town, and they are being told: You must do this because of China; you must do this because it is really important.

To do what? Some esoteric defense against the arms race against China, so I can have a concrete box outside of my small town in west Texas that is filled with computers that are being operated by people on H–1B visas from India, that are chock-full of all sorts of searches for child pornography and hooking kids on porn or betting on college sports, while we turn college sports upside down and make it basically professional.

Then we have TikTok targeting our kids. Then even the most important and the smartest people in the world tell our people: You are not going to have a job in 10 years because robots and AI are going to take your jobs away.

Why do you think the American people are in revolt to data centers popping up at every corner in America? All because the powers that be in this town and in tech oligarch rooms across the country say: You got to do it because of China.

How about the people of this body meet the people where they are.

□ 2150

People who want to be able to afford food and housing and cars. People who want to have their communities. They want to be able to maintain the culture of their country. They want their kids and their grandkids to have a job. They want to have the dignity of work. They want to pass that down because they know that is what made this country great.

They don't give a rip about the earnings per share announcements that are coming out of Wall Street. They want their country back. That is what they want.

If we want to go out and earn votes between now and November, let's talk to them about taking their country back for them. Let's make sure that we stand up in defense of what they want.

I can promise you that as secure as the border is, because of the great work of the Trump administration, we have not codified a darn thing in this Chamber. I had to threaten votes sitting in that aisle right over there. I had to threaten votes in July. Remember the 2 a.m. caucus that everybody gets mad about? That is too damn bad. I am happy to do it because someone has to do it.

They were going to just gloss over a bill that we have to codify the President's policies of securing the border, stopping the abuse of asylum, stopping the abuse of parole, stopping catch and release, stopping the abuse of unaccompanied children, all of these things that led directly to the deaths of Americans like Laken Riley, like Jocelyn Nungaray, and countless others. We said we were going to do something about it and we didn't.

I want every Republican to hear me. We didn't. Some of us stood up there and said we were going to threaten bills. We were going to get this done, and we finally move the bill through the Judiciary Committee because we threatened to stop the floor.

By the way, that is the only thing that works around here. You have to go up to leadership and say, you are not getting whatever nonsense you want unless we get the things that the American people said they wanted.

That is the truth. We still haven't codified on the floor. We should, and when we come back here to lameduck, we should. We should pass the legislation the American people wanted us to pass. We should protect the people that we said we were going to protect. We should stop the flow of the 1 million people coming in here on green cards every year from all over the world when we still have a glut in this country with housing that is unaffordable and Americans who can't find jobs. We have a massive assault on our culture with 50-something million foreign-born people in the United States, a massive percentage.

We haven't addressed birthright citizenship after the United States Supreme Court made up out of whole cloth nonsense that the 14th Amendment says that if you are born here, literally of a mother pregnant who comes here across the Rio Grande River or flies into Miami and has a baby, you are a citizen.

Under no circumstances did the 14th Amendment when it was ratified in 1868 mean that that is the law. It is a fiction, and we shouldn't let the United States Supreme Court make up a fiction and then follow it and dismantle our country in the process.

The fact of the matter is that decision enables one of the most pervasive illegal immigration magnets that is destroying our country. We should not entertain importing one more person until we secure our border for good. We can't leave it to the next Democratic President to do it. You saw what happened in the last one.

They destroyed our country, flooding people in who were dangerous and killing Americans. If we aren't serious about securing the border, then what are we doing? We will never have a secure border if we don't pass the bills we said we would pass.

If we aren't serious about cutting spending, with a national debt of $40 trillion, we will never solve the inflation crisis that pervades us today. If we are not serious about codifying President Trump's border policies, we can't expect our border to be secure rather than descending into chaos as soon as the Democrats take power.

If we are not serious about passing the SAVE America Act, which we passed three times in this body and the Senate refused to pass, how can you stand up and say that you believe that only American citizens should vote in American elections and we should have voter ID federally? If we are not serious about the rise of Sharia law and the massive expansion of mosques and Islamic centers across the United States, how will we maintain a Judeo-Christian nation that built the Western world, that has stood for a beacon of hope for the entirety of the world, built on those principles, those principles of western civilization that are under direct assault right now by people who want to Islamify this country?

If we are not serious about those things, we will lose the country. Now is the time not for fist bumping about some bills that we passed or whatever we did over a year ago in the big, beautiful bill. Go out and campaign to the American people about where we want to take this country, build on what we have done, and tell them where we want to go.

I want to live in a free country. I want to live in a country that respects our Judeo-Christian principles. I want to live in a country where you don't have to worry about walking down the street. I want my daughter, my wife, my son to be safe walking on our streets. I want a country where I know that we can afford the American Dream and afford a house, food, automobiles, and not one that is so regulated that you can't.

I do not want a world in which people are addicted to these godforsaken devices and where our children are addicted to porn and gambling. I don't want a world in which your life depends on the digital transmission of the world.

I want a world where you look somebody in the eye, where you have a relationship, where you have a community, where you go to church, where you raise the flag, where you celebrate God and Jesus Christ our Lord and Savior, and you are able to do so because people fought, bled, and died for this country.

Start speaking about things that rise above the political rhetoric each year of one party versus the other. Rise up for something that is worth fighting for. That is why those boys sat in those foxholes in Bastogne in the freezing cold in 1944 getting shelled and shot at, why they walked into a wall of bullets at Normandy. Those men took the field on both sides of the war in Gettysburg and fought it out, hand to hand, brother against brother, for something bigger, for something better, for something that you could pass down to your children and something that was more than whatever is contained in one of these godforsaken devices.

We have the obligation to stand up for something more important as this whole debate of AI, this whole debate of data centers. It is about putting God first. It is about putting family first. It is about putting communities first. It is about restoring what is right and good about this thing that God gave to us to have dominion over.

We can choose how to live. We can choose to live the lives that we know will be fulfilling for our families and our communities and our kids and grandkids.

It is a great honor to serve in the people's House. The people's House has to reflect the people. When people question me because they say, Chip, you are a free market guy. You are a free enterprise guy. Why are you talking about AI in the negative? I am not a doomer. I am a cancer survivor. I want AI to solve cancer for everybody alive. I want all of the great things we can have to come out of technology in advancements, but what I don't want are a handful of people in board rooms and Big Tech companies in collusion with government to tell me how I have to live.

I don't want those people to tell me I have to have some sort of data center or have to have some sort of way of living that isn't consistent with what I think God gave to us to have dominion and control over.

Madam Speaker, winding down here with about a minute to go in the empty Chamber that is the House of Representatives, we have this great blessing of being Americans and we have the opportunity to do something with it. I am calling on this body as they go out and campaign, when they come back in November, when they come back in January, stand up for something bigger. Stand up in defense of who we are as a people. Stand up for this country. Stand up for our grandparents and our great-grandparents who fought and bled and died to give it to us. Stand up for your children. Don't just turn a blind eye to what is happening. Make this place affordable and livable and enjoyable.

That is what the pursuit of happiness meant. Those unalienable rights that Jefferson wrote about: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That is the calling of the people in this Chamber.

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

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 13 of rule I, the House stands adjourned until 10:30 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon (at 9 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 17, 2026, at 10:30 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

EC–4729. A letter from the Executive Vice President, Commodity Credit Corporation, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Supplemental Disaster Assistance Programs, Marketing Assistance Loans, and Sugar Provisions [Docket ID: FSA-2026-0067] (RIN: 0560-AI84) received August 14, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

EC–4730. A letter from the Attorney, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Unsafe or Unsound Practices, Matters Requiring Attention [Docket ID: OCC-2026-0174] (RIN: 1557-AF35) received September 1, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC–4731. A letter from the Administrator, Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defining and Delimiting the Exemptions for Executive, Administrative, Professional, Outside Sales, and Computer Employees; Implementation of Federal Court Judgments [Docket No.: WHD-2026-0100] (RIN: 1235-AA57) received September 1, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

EC–4732. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Labor for Occupational Safety and Health, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Open Fires in Marine Terminals [Docket No.: OSHA-2025-0007] (RIN: 1218-AD51) received August 25, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

EC–4733. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Labor for Occupational Safety and Health, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — House Falls in Marine Terminals [Docket No.: OSHA-2025-0008] (RIN: 1218-AD52) received August 25, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

EC–4734. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report titled ''The Rural Maternal and Obstetrics Management Strategies Program September 2026'', pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 254c-1b(d); July 1, 1944, ch. 373, title III, Sec. 330A-2 (as added by Public Law 117-103, div. P, title I, Sec. 142); (136 Stat. 799); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC–4735. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Medicaid Program; Prohibition on Federal Medicaid and Children's Health Insurance Program Funding for Sex-Rejecting Procedures Furnished to Children [CMS-2451-F] (RIN: 0938-AV73) received August 13, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC–4736. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's direct final rule — NRC Modernization: Rulemaking Procedure, Federal Advisory Committee Act Alignment, Access, and Security [NRC-2025-1139] (RIN: 3150-AL46) received August 12, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec.

251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC–4737. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the situation in and in relation to Burma declared by Executive Order 14014 of February 10, 2021, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC–4738. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the widespread humanitarian crisis in Afghanistan and the potential for a deepening economic collapse in Afghanistan that was declared in Executive Order 14064 of February 11, 2022, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC–4739. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the threat of foreign interference in or undermining public confidence in United States elections that was declared in Executive Order 13848 of September 12, 2018, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC–4740. A letter from the Deputy Assistant General Counsel, Department of the Treasury, transmitting six notifications of a vacancy, designation of acting officer, nomination, action on nomination, and discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, Sec. 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

EC–4741. A letter from the Sergeant at Arms, Sergeant at Arms, transmitting the semiannual report from January 1 — June 30, 2026; to the Committee on House Administration.

EC–4742. A letter from the Division Chief, Regulatory Affairs, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's direct final rule — Revisions to Regulations Regarding Locating, Recording, and Maintaining Mining Claims or Sites--Fees [Docket No.: BLM-2025-0203; A2407-014-004-065516; #O2412-014-004-047181.1] (RIN: 1004-AF47) received September 3, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC–4743. A letter from the Division Chief, Regulatory Affairs, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's direct final rule — Revisions to Regulations Regarding Locating, Recording, and Maintaining Mining Claims or Sites--Failure To Comply [Docket No.: BLM-2025-0204; A2407-014-004-065516; #O2412-014-004-047181.1] (RIN: 1004-AF48) received September 3, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC–4744. A letter from the Division Chief, Regulatory Affairs, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's direct final rule — Revision to Regulations Regarding Approval of Operations; Valid Period of Approved Application for Permit to Drill [Docket No.: BLM-2025-0136; A2407-014-004-065516; #O2412-014-004-047181.1] (RIN: 1004-AF39) received September 3, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC–4745. A letter from the Supervisory Attorney Advisor, Executive Office for Immigration Review, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Inflation Adjustment for EOIR OBBBA Fees; Fiscal Year 2027 [Docket No.: EOIR-26-AB42; Dir. Order No.: 09-2026] (RIN: 1125-AB42) received September 1, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–4746. A letter from the Branch Chief, Border Security Regulations Branch, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulatory Changes Required by the Energy Security and Lightering Independence Act of 2022 [CBP Dec. 26-08] (RIN: 1651-AB62) received August 7, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–4747. A letter from the Branch Chief, Border Security Regulations Branch, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — 9-11 Response and Biometric Entry-Exit Fee for H-1B and L-1 Visas [Docket No.: USCBP-2024-0009] (RIN: 1651-AB48) received August 24, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–4748. A letter from the Chief Regulatory Officer, USCIS, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's major interim final rule — Mandatory Electronic Filing (e-Filing) [CIS No.: 2853-26; DHS Docket No.: USCIS-2026-0232] (RIN: 1615-AD19) received August 11, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–4749. A letter from the Attorney-Adviser, Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Retiring Form FRA F 6180.107 and Form FRA F 6180.150 [Docket No.: FRA-2025-0124] (RIN: 2130-AD59) received September 3, 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–4750. A letter from the Section Chief, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's notice of proposed rulemaking — Pro Rata Share of Subpart F Income, Tested Income, or Tested Loss [REG-115646-25] (RIN: 1545-BR77) received September 1, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EC–4751. A letter from the Acting Director for Legislative Affairs, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency's State and Local Cybersecurity Grant Program Fiscal Year 2023 Annual Report, pursuant to 6 U.S.C. 665g(q)(2); Public Law 107-296, title XXII, Sec. 2218 (as added by Public Law 117-58, Sec. 70612(a)); (135 Stat. 1284); to the Committee on Homeland Security.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALBERG: Committee on Education and Workforce. H.R. 5505. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to ensure campus access at public institutions of higher education for religious groups; with an amendment (Rept. 119–833). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GOTTHEIMER (for himself and Mr. LAWLER):

H.R. 10405. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to ensure that pediatric cancer experts are represented in State comprehensive cancer control coalitions, to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish a pediatric cancer advisory committee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. SUOZZI):

H.R. 10406. A bill to impose sanctions and other policy consequences in response to the death of political prisoners in Hong Kong, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Financial Services, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MOYLAN:

H.R. 10407. A bill to amend the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 to increase funding for certain States and territories during certain fiscal years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Mr. MOYLAN:

H.R. 10408. A bill to provide for periodic consultation between designated officials of Guam and the Federal Government; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. UNDERWOOD (for herself and Mr. LEVIN):

H.R. 10409. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to update the Lethal Means Safety and Suicide Prevention training course of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. UNDERWOOD (for herself, Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia, and Ms. BONAMICI):

H.R. 10410. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish a national graduate nurse education program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HURD of Colorado (for himself and Mr. EVANS of Colorado):

H.R. 10411. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to consider certain acreage not planted due to a lack of irrigation water to be eligible for prevented planting payments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska (for himself, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. WALBERG):

H.R. 10412. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to eliminate the State opt-in requirement for the qualified elementary and secondary education scholarship credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska (for himself, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. WALBERG):

H.R. 10413. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the qualified elementary and secondary education scholarships credit limit for married taxpayers filing a joint return; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. ADAMS (for herself and Mr. RUIZ):

H.R. 10414. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to increase access to community health workers under the Medicare and Medicaid programs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BARRAGÁN (for herself, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COSTA, Ms. CROCKETT, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. ROSS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. STANSBURY, Ms. TLAIB, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 10415. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make grants to certain institutions of higher education to provide free meals to low-income students, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Ms. BARRAGÁN (for herself, Mr. NORCROSS, and Ms. SCANLON):

H.R. 10416. A bill to require a process for the exclusion of certain articles used in home constructions from certain duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 10417. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to disclose each instance in which the Secretary uses artificial intelligence to interact with a covered individual, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 10418. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish, build, and operate a technology platform to modernize the disability claims process in accordance with the plan submitted by the Secretary under the Honoring our PACT Act of 2022 for the modernization of information technology systems of the Veterans Benefits Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BERGMAN (for himself, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. GOLDEN of Maine, Ms. KING-HINDS, and Mr. MURPHY):

H.R. 10419. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a pilot program to improve access to and awareness of community-based dental services for veterans residing in rural areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS of Arizona:

H.R. 10420. A bill to increase the water supply available to the Colorado River Basin, expedite the construction of water, energy, and infrastructure in the Basin, provide Federal financial assistance for water augmentation projects, advance water augmentation for satisfaction of the Mexican Water Treaty, and authorize the development of additional Federal water infrastructure; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BONAMICI (for herself, Mrs. GRIJALVA, Ms. OMAR, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. BYNUM, Ms. SALINAS, Ms. BUDZINSKI, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. SÁNCHEZ):

H.R. 10421. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to increase support for elementary and secondary education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, Oversight and Government Reform, Science, Space, and Technology, Armed Services, and Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BURCHETT (for himself and Mr. FULLER):

H.R. 10422. A bill to prohibit the export of diesel fuel from the United States during certain periods, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BURCHETT (for himself and Mr. FULLER):

H.R. 10423. A bill to provide for a temporary prohibition on the export of diesel fuel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CARTER of Louisiana (for himself, Mrs. MCIVER, Mr. MENEFEE, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. NORTON, Ms. CROCKETT, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H.R. 10424. A bill to establish a National Science Foundation grant program to provide opportunities for and strengthen research capacity at institutions of higher education to stimulate sustainable improvement in existing research and development at such institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. CASTEN (for himself, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, and Mr. NEGUSE):

H.R. 10425. A bill to restore and strengthen the obligation of the Environmental Protection Agency to protect human health and the environment, to halt unlawful deregulatory actions, to require enforcement of the Clean Air Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, Agriculture, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CLEAVER (for himself, Mrs. WAGNER, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. CHU, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. LAWLER, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MACKENZIE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. SIMON, Mr. THANEDAR, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 10426. A bill to improve the processing of samples of sexual assault evidence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COURTNEY (for himself, Ms. BROWN, Ms. STANSBURY, and Mrs. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 10427. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to expand the Magnet Schools Assistance Program; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas (for herself and Mr. EVANS of Colorado):

H.R. 10428. A bill to modernize the application process for survivors insurance benefits under section 202 of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SORENSEN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. CASTEN):

H.R. 10429. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 901 Lake Street in Oak Park, Illinois, as the "Detective Allan Reddins Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. DONALDS:

H.R. 10430. A bill to establish the United States Space Academy as a service academy of the United States, to require that the Academy be located in the State of Florida, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. ESTES:

H.R. 10431. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify certain provisions relating to the taxation of international entities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVANS of Colorado:

H.R. 10432. A bill to provide for a land exchange between the city of Greeley, Colorado, and the Forest Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. FOUSHEE (for herself and Mr. MOYLAN):

H.R. 10433. A bill to prohibit certain online platforms from materially contributing to fraudulent content, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas:

H.R. 10434. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a dedicated trust fund for investments in oil and gas communities; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas:

H.R. 10435. A bill to extend Federal recognition to the Lipan Apache Tribe of Texas; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. GRIJALVA (for herself, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 10436. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to direct the Secretary of Education to award institutions of higher education grants for teaching English learners; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Mrs. GRIJALVA (for herself, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 10437. A bill to improve the English language and literacy skills of English language learners and their families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Mrs. GRIJALVA (for herself, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 10438. A bill to establish high-quality dual language immersion programs in low-income communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Mr. GROTHMAN (for himself and Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois):

H.R. 10439. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to extend the consumer credit protections provided to members of the Armed Forces and their dependents under title 10, United States Code, to all consumers; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HARRIGAN (for himself, Mr. BARRETT, and Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina):

H.R. 10440. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a refundable tax credit for health care providers in rural areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERNÁNDEZ (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Ms. POU):

H.R. 10441. A bill to extend the period of performance for certain disaster recovery projects in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HILL of Arkansas (for himself, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. WESTERMAN, and Mr. WOMACK):

H.R. 10442. A bill to require the Ronald A. Robinson Post Office in Little Rock, Arkansas, to replace certain exterior signage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. HOYER (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SUBRAMANYAM, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Mr. EZELL, Mr. WALKINSHAW, and Mr. VAN ORDEN):

H.R. 10443. A bill to amend title 41, United States Code, to build upon and strengthen the Committee for Purchase From People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled to ensure it continues as an essential procurement and employment program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. HOYLE of Oregon (for herself, Mr. SUBRAMANYAM, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. DELUZIO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. ANSARI, Ms. DEXTER, Ms. SALINAS, Mr. FROST, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Ms. TLAIB):

H.R. 10444. A bill to establish certain protections for physicians and other licensed health professionals, place certain requirements on medical practices and management services organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. IVEY:

H.R. 10445. A bill to amend chapter 4 of title 5, United States Code, to provide 10 year terms of service for Inspectors General, to provide that Inspectors General may only be removed for cause, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LATIMER (for himself and Mr. CISNEROS):

H.R. 10446. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to enhance the deduction for expenditures to remove architectural and transportation barriers to certain individuals and to extend and enhance the work opportunity credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MACE:

H.R. 10447. A bill to combat birth tourism and safeguard the integrity of United States citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MCDONALD RIVET (for herself, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Mr. DELUZIO, Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, Mrs. GRIJALVA, Mr. LANDSMAN, Mr. MANNION, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. MCCLAIN DELANEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. ROSS, Mr. STANTON, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. TRAN, Mr. VASQUEZ, Mr. VINDMAN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. SALINAS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. HOULAHAN, and Ms. KAPTUR):

H.R. 10448. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt qualified data center property from bonus depreciation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MILLER of Illinois (for herself, Mrs. BIGGS of South Carolina, Mr. FINE, Mr. NORMAN, and Mr. PALMER):

H.R. 10449. A bill to establish a prohibition for certain disclosures of personally identifiable information under the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS:

H.R. 10450. A bill to amend chapter 131 of title 5, United States Code, to prohibit certain political officials from owning or trading stocks or trading on prediction markets; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, the Judiciary, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MORELLE:

H.R. 10451. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish an emergency grant aid program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Mr. NORCROSS:

H.R. 10452. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to include in the calculation of cost of attendance an allowance for costs for prior learning assessments; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself and Mr. GUTHRIE):

H.R. 10453. A bill to amend the Secure and Trusted Communications Networks Act of 2019 to expand the coverage of such Act and to streamline the processes under such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. PINGREE (for herself and Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE):

H.R. 10454. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to take appropriate actions to advance textile circularity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. POCAN (for himself, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. MCGARVEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Ms. TLAIB, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. LIEU, Ms. SIMON, Ms. CHU, and Mr. FIELDS):

H.R. 10455. A bill to establish State-Federal partnerships to provide students the opportunity to attain higher education at in-State public institutions of higher education without debt, to provide Federal Pell Grant eligibility to DREAMer students, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Mr. RASKIN (for himself, Mrs. BICE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. BOEBERT, Mr. BARR, and Mrs. MCBATH):

H.R. 10456. A bill to provide for the replacement of the plaque at Lincoln Memorial commemorating the ''I Have a Dream'' speech of Martin Luther King, Jr; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. RYAN (for himself, Mr. LIEU, Mr. DELUZIO, Mr. VINDMAN, Ms. GOODLANDER, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. CROW, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. TRAN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. PANETTA, and Mr. CARBAJAL):

H.R. 10457. A bill to ensure the transparency and integrity of casualty accounting and benefits and awards for military and civilian personnel during military operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SALINAS (for herself, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. DEXTER, Ms. BYNUM, and Ms. HOYLE of Oregon):

H.R. 10458. A bill to transfer certain Federal land into trust for the benefit of the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself and Mr. CASAR):

H.R. 10459. A bill to amend titles 41 and 10, United States Code, to include new requirements for Federal contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 10460. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to establish a skills-based immigration points system, to focus family-sponsored immigration on spouses and minor children, to eliminate the Diversity Visa Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 10461. A bill to improve the ability of United States citizens and businesses to travel to and invest within Somaliland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SOTO (for himself and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 10462. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish the Firefighter PFAS Injury Compensation Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. SPARTZ:

H.R. 10463. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for concurrent receipt of veterans' disability compensation and retired pay for disability retirees with combat-related disabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. STEVENS:

H.R. 10464. A bill to amend the Robert Levinson Hostage Recovery and Hostage-taking Accountability Act with respect to compensation for United States nationals unlawfully or wrongfully detained; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 10465. A bill to clarify the requirements for authorizing the use, occupancy, and development of public lands for hyperscale data centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 10466. A bill to direct the Secretary of Energy to provide funding to electric and natural gas utility service providers to eliminate the arrears of residential customers of such service providers, support implementation of and participation in percentage of income payment programs and other energy affordability measures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 10467. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to require the Environmental Protection Agency to impose and collect a charge on the total annual electricity consumption by certain facilities from the owners or operators of such facilities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 10468. A bill to provide financial and technical assistance to State utility commissions to improve the oversight and regulation of energy utilities and ensure the provision of safe and reliable energy utility services at just and reasonable rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 10469. A bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to provide financial assistance, through States and Indian Tribes, to establish and maintain energy hubs to increase awareness and access to energy and energy efficiency programs and opportunities to improve energy affordability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. VAN EPPS:

H.R. 10470. A bill to direct the Attorney General to develop an evidence-based lethality assessment tool for use by law enforcement with respect to domestic violence and to develop a public awareness campaign with respect to resources for victims of domestic violence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself and Mr. DAVIDSON):

H.R. 10471. A bill to create a safe harbor for insurers engaging in the business of insurance in connection with a cannabis-related legitimate business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. VINDMAN:

H.R. 10472. A bill to ensure that the Office of Investigations within the Office of the Inspector General of the United States Postal Service is adequately staffed to improve accountability and oversight, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. WALKINSHAW (for himself, Mr. BACON, Mr. LANDSMAN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. ROSS, Mr. LATIMER, Mr. COSTA, Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. MCBRIDE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. KEATING, Ms. OMAR, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. KEAN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. RANDALL, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CARSON, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Ms. MCCLELLAN, Mr. RASKIN, and Ms. HOYLE of Oregon):

H.R. 10473. A bill to authorize amounts for the purpose of investigating, documenting, verifying, and preventing the Russian Federation's ongoing and systemic unlawful transfer, deportation, indoctrination, and militarization of Ukrainian children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WALKINSHAW (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mrs. RAMIREZ):

H.R. 10474. A bill to require a force structure assessment of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. WILSON OF FLORIDA:

H.R. 10475. A bill to protect the independence of the Smithsonian Institution, the National Museum of African American History and Culture, and other Federally supported cultural institutions, to preserve accurate and inclusive American history, to reaffirm the mission fiduciary authority of the NMAAHC Council, and to ensure that no executive action may limit their ability to research, present, and educate the public through exhibits and programming, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. WILSON OF FLORIDA (for herself, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mrs. GRIJALVA, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MFUME, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. THANEDAR, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WATERS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. MENEFEE, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. CROCKETT, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mrs. MCIVER, Mrs. BEATTY, and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H.R. 10476. A bill to require coverage of annual glaucoma screenings for certain individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MEEKS (for himself, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. BEYER):

H.J. Res. 217. A joint resolution disapproving the proposed civilian nuclear cooperation agreement between the United States and Saudi Arabia submitted to the Congress on September 14, 2026; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. DINGELL (for herself and Mr. BACON):

H. Con. Res. 118. Concurrent resolution designating September 2026, as ''Gynecologic Cancers Awareness Month''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COMER:

H. Res. 1543. A resolution recommending that the House of Representatives find Leon D. Black in contempt of Congress for refusal to comply with subpoenas duly issued by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. LIEU:

H. Res. 1544. A resolution electing a Member to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. BARRAGÁN (for herself, Mr. COSTA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. FROST, Mrs. GRIJALVA, Mr. VASQUEZ, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. GARCIA of California, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. CUELLAR, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. RUIZ, and Ms. SALINAS):

H. Res. 1545. A resolution recognizing the importance of Latino community leadership and engagement in outdoor recreation and conservation activities that protect United States natural resources, and expressing support for the designation of September 12 through September 20, 2026, as ''Latino Conservation Week''; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BISHOP (for himself, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. CARSON, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. FROST, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Ms. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MENEFEE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. THANEDAR, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. VEASEY, and Ms. WATERS):

H. Res. 1546. A resolution expressing support for the recognition of Nigerian Heritage Month and celebrating the heritage, culture, and contributions of Nigerians and Nigerian Americans in the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mrs. FOUSHEE):

H. Res. 1547. A resolution recognizing the importance of diapers to infant health and family well-being, and expressing support for the designation of the week of September 14-20, 2026, as ''National Diaper Need Awareness Week''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. HINSON (for herself, Ms. ADAMS, and Ms. STANSBURY):

H. Res. 1548. A resolution supporting the designation of September 19, 2026, as ''National Stillbirth Prevention and Awareness Day'', recognizing tens of thousands of families in the United States that have endured a stillbirth, and seizing the opportunity to keep other families from experiencing the same tragedy; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LYNCH (for himself, Mr. MOOLENAAR, and Mrs. KIM):

H. Res. 1549. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the People's Republic of China has engaged in the arbitrary or wrongful detention of American academics and has otherwise harmed the prospects for scientific collaboration and people-to-people exchanges between the United States and the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. MCBATH (for herself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. MRVAN, and Mr. MACKENZIE):

H. Res. 1550. A resolution expressing support for designation of the week of September 13 through 19, 2026, as ''National Adult Education and Family Literacy Week''; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Mrs. MCBATH (for herself and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania):

H. Res. 1551. A resolution honoring the life and legacy of the late Constance Benjamin Clery; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Mr. NEWHOUSE (for himself, Mr. MOORE of North Carolina, Mr. HUNT, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. LAWLER, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. HURD of Colorado, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BARR, Mr. BACON, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. MANN, Mr. ROSE, Mr. NUNN of Iowa, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mrs. KIM, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. CAREY, Mr. VAN EPPS, Mr. MILLS, Mr. FULLER, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. MCGUIRE, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. RULLI, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. CISCOMANI, Mr. MESSMER, Mr. MACKENZIE, Mrs. HINSON, Mr. STAUBER, Ms. LETLOW, Mrs. BICE, Mr. DUNN of Florida, Mr. MAST, Mr. BRESNAHAN, Ms. DE LA CRUZ, Mr. ALFORD, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. GUEST, Mr. MCDOWELL, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. FEENSTRA):

H. Res. 1552. A resolution supporting the designation of the week of September 20 through September 26, 2026, as ''Gold Star Families Remembrance Week''; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NUNN OF IOWA (for himself, Mrs. HINSON, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, and Mr. FEENSTRA):

H. Res. 1553. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the week of September 21, 2026, as the ''Ray Gaesser Memorial Farm Safety Week'' to recognize thelife and legacy of Ray Gaesser, who passed away in a tragic farming accident, and promote farm safety in the honor of Ray Gaesser; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. PRESSLEY:

H. Res. 1554. A resolution recognizing the duty of the Federal Government to create a Federal job guarantee; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Mr. TONKO (for himself, Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mr. MOULTON, and Mr. BACON):

H. Res. 1555. A resolution supporting the designation of September 20, 2026, as ''Pharmacy Workforce Suicide Awareness Day'' to raise awareness of, and promote a national discussion about, pharmacy workforce suicide and to reduce the stigma of mental health conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. VINDMAN:

H. Res. 1556. A resolution to honor and recognize Mr. Ahmad Shah Massoud, the former military leader of Afghanistan's Northern Alliance who was tragically assassinated by Al-Qaeda and the Taliban 25 years ago on September 9, 2001; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WHITESIDES (for himself, Mr. FONG, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. OBERNOLTE, and Ms. CHU):

H. Res. 1557. A resolution commemorating the 50th anniversary of the rollout of Space Shuttle Enterprise from the Rockwell International plant in Palmdale, California; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

ML-136. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Resolution No. 292, to memorialize the United States Department of Commerce and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to take such actions as are necessary to properly inspect and ensure the safety of imported seafood; which was referred to the Committee on Natural Resources.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. GOTTHEIMER:

H.R. 10405.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 10406.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. MOYLAN:

H.R. 10407.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. MOYLAN:

H.R. 10408.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

section 8 of article I of the Constitution and clause 2 of section 3 of article IV of the Constitution.

By Ms. UNDERWOOD:

H.R. 10409.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. UNDERWOOD:

H.R. 10410.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. HURD of Colorado:

H.R. 10411.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska:

H.R. 10412.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska:

H.R. 10413.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. ADAMS:

H.R. 10414.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution

By Ms. BARRAGÁN:

H.R. 10415.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. BARRAGÁN:

H.R. 10416.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 10417.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. BARRETT

H.R. 10418.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. BERGMAN:

H.R. 10419.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BIGGS of Arizona:

H.R. 10420.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, which provides Congress the power to provide for the general welfare, and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which provides Congress the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution its enumerated powers.

By Ms. BONAMICI:

H.R. 10421.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section I Article 8

By Mr. BURCHETT:

H.R. 10422.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. BURCHETT:

H.R. 10423.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. CARTER of Louisiana:

H.R. 10424.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is introduced pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under the General Welfare Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 1).

By Mr. CASTEN:

H.R. 10425.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3 of the Constitution

By Mr. CLEAVER:

H.R. 10426.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. COURTNEY:

H.R. 10427.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas:

H.R. 10428.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 10429.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution, which provides Congress the power ''To establish Post Offices and post Roads.''

By Mr. DONALDS:
H.R. 10430.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Art 1, Sec 8
By Mr. ESTES:
H.R. 10431.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1 Section 8 Clause 1
The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;
By Mr. EVANS of Colorado:
H.R. 10432.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18
By Mrs. FOUSHEE:
H.R. 10433.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I
By Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas:
H.R. 10434.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas:
H.R. 10435.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Mrs. GRIJALVA:
H.R. 10436.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, §1 and §8
By Mrs. GRIJALVA:
H.R. 10437.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, §1 and §8
By Mrs. GRIJALVA:
H.R. 10438.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, §1 and §8
By Mr. GROTHMAN:
H.R. 10439.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution
By Mr. HARRIGAN:
H.R. 10440.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. HERNÁNDEZ:
H.R. 10441.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution.
By Mr. HILL of Arkansas:
H.R. 10442.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.
By Mr. HOYER:
H.R. 10443.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.
By Ms. HOYLE of Oregon:
H.R. 10444.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution
By Mr. IVEY:
H.R. 10445.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article II Section2 clause 2
Article I Section 8 clasue 18
By Mr. LATIMER:
H.R. 10446.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, clause 1 (Taxing and Spending Clause)
By Ms. MACE:
H.R. 10447.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.
By Ms. McDONALD RIVET:
H.R. 10448.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
U.S. Constitution, Article 1, Sec. 8
By Mrs. MILLER of Illinois:
H.R. 10449.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS:
H.R. 10450.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. MORELLE:
H.R. 10451.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Pursuant to clause 18 of section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution
By Mr. NORCROSS:
H.R. 10452.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Art. 1, Sec. 8, Cl. 18
By Mr. PALLONE:
H.R. 10453.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: [The Congress shall have Power] To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes
By Ms. PINGREE:
H.R. 10454.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. POCAN:
H.R. 10455.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1 Section 8
By Mr. RASKIN:
H.R. 10456.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under clause 2 of section 3 of Article IV of the Constitution.
By Mr. RYAN:
H.R. 10457.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I
By Ms. SALINAS:
H.R. 10458.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3
By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:
H.R. 10459.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3
The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.
By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:
H.R. 10460.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:
H.R. 10461.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. SOTO:
H.R. 10462.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution
By Mrs. SPARTZ:
H.R. 10463.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
section 8 of article I of the Constitution
By Ms. STEVENS:
H.R. 10464.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.
By Ms. TITUS:
H.R. 10465.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, United States Constitution
By Mr. TONKO:
H.R. 10466.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, clause 1
By Mr. TONKO:
H.R. 10467.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, clause 1
By Mr. TONKO:
H.R. 10468.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, clause 1
By Mr. TONKO:
H.R. 10469.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, clause 1
By Mr. VAN EPPS:
H.R. 10470.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Art. 1, Sec. 8, Cl. 18
By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:
H.R. 10471.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3
The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.
By Mr. VINDMAN:
H.R. 10472.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution
By Mr. WALKINSHAW:
H.R. 10473.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, section 8
By Mr. WALKINSHAW:
H.R. 10474.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Ms. WILSON of Florida:
H.R. 10475.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Ms. WILSON of Florida:
H.R. 10476.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MEEKS:

H.J. Res. 217.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 7: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
H.R. 45: Mrs. MCCLAIN and Mr. BIGGS of Arizona.
H.R. 116: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. MCDOWELL, and Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H.R. 381: Ms. ANSARI.
H.R. 987: Mrs. MCCLAIN, Mr. NUNN of Iowa, Mr. ROSE, and Mr. BIGGS of Arizona.
H.R. 995: Mr. MIN and Mr. BLAIR.
H.R. 1094: Mr. SELF.
H.R. 1394: Mr. BARRETT.
H.R. 1502: Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. BOEBERT, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. NEAL, Mr. EMMER, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mrs. LUNA, and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.
H.R. 1773: Mr. BIGGS of Arizona.
H.R. 1810: Mr. LICCARDO, Mr. HOYER, and Mr. HERNÁNDEZ.
H.R. 1845: Mr. CASE, Mr. GIMENEZ, and Ms. KING-HINDS.
H.R. 2040: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 2199: Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. HUDSON, and Mr. BERGMAN.
H.R. 2253: Mr. VAN ORDEN and Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ.
H.R. 2343: Mr. VAN ORDEN.
H.R. 2368: Mr. RYAN and Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 2369: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 2442: Mr. ROSE, Mrs. FISCHBACH, and Mr. BIGGS of Arizona.
H.R. 2531: Ms. BYNUM.
H.R. 2664: Mrs. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 2767: Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Mr. MOULTON, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 3069: Ms. BYNUM.
H.R. 3112: Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ and Mr. VAN ORDEN.
H.R. 3243: Mr. LICCARDO and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 3261: Ms. BYNUM.
H.R. 3310: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 3404: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 3508: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 3514: Mr. KNOTT.
H.R. 3532: Mrs. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 3551: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 3597: Mr. VAN ORDEN.
H.R. 3757: Mr. LICCARDO.
H.R. 3770: Mrs. FISCHBACH.
H.R. 3968: Ms. SALINAS.
H.R. 4104: Mr. CLEAVER and Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 4122: Mr. KENNEDY of Utah.
H.R. 4153: Mr. CUELLAR and Mr. CORREA.
H.R. 4382: Ms. KELLY of Illinois and Mr. BARRETT.
H.R. 4543: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 4545: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 4615: Mr. CISNEROS.
H.R. 4696: Ms. POU, Mr. TONKO, Mr. LICCARDO, and Ms. JACOBS.
H.R. 4831: Mr. MANN.
H.R. 4837: Mr. CASE, Mr. GIMENEZ, and Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 4863: Mr. VAN ORDEN, Ms. MACE, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. HARRIGAN, and Mr. GUEST.
H.R. 5035: Mr. FULLER.
H.R. 5206: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 5221: Mr. VAN DREW and Mrs. WAGNER.
H.R. 5269: Ms. STRICKLAND.
H.R. 5469: Mr. TORRES of New York and Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 5486: Mr. LICCARDO.
H.R. 5490: Mr. VAN ORDEN.
H.R. 5556: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 5645: Mr. COLE and Ms. POU.
H.R. 5689: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 5874: Mr. ROSE, Mr. BIGGS of Arizona, and Mrs. FISCHBACH.
H.R. 6088: Mr. LICCARDO.
H.R. 6130: Mr. MURPHY.
H.R. 6137: Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 6151: Mr. LICCARDO.
H.R. 6164: Ms. WAHAB.
H.R. 6199: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 6226: Mr. VARGAS.
H.R. 6509: Mr. VAN ORDEN.
H.R. 6538: Mr. MEUSER.
H.R. 6574: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 6610: Mrs. GRIJALVA and Mr. GUEST.
H.R. 6617: Ms. SALINAS.
H.R. 6683: Mr. BRESNAHAN, Mr. COSTA, and Ms. MALLIOTAKIS.
H.R. 6722: Mr. MANNION.
H.R. 6835: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 6849: Mr. MIN.
H.R. 6856: Mr. WALKINSHAW.
H.R. 6994: Ms. STEVENS.
H.R. 7190: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 7297: Mr. CORREA.
H.R. 7450: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 7506: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 7514: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 7815: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania and Mr. LAWLER.
H.R. 7836: Mr. CORREA, Mr. TONKO, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Ms. SCANLON.
H.R. 7853: Mr. TRAN, Mr. SUBRAMANYAM, Mr. LICCARDO, and Mr. HERNÁNDEZ.
H.R. 7945: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota and Mr. PALMER.
H.R. 7977: Mr. DELUZIO.
H.R. 8000: Mr. HARIDOPOLOS, Mrs. BICE, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. MCCORMICK, and Mr. MESSMER.
H.R. 8002: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 8101: Mr. SELF.
H.R. 8137: Mr. FINSTAD.
H.R. 8200: Ms. GILLEN.
H.R. 8241: Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 8378: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 8582: Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. TRAN, Ms. FRIEDMAN, Mr. SUBRAMANYAM, Mr. VINDMAN, Mr. HIMES, Mr. LICCARDO, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. HOYER.
H.R. 8606: Ms. SALINAS.
H.R. 8629: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 8705: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 8730: Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. VAN DREW, Mrs. BEATTY, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. FINE, and Mr. NEWHOUSE.
H.R. 8798: Mrs. FLETCHER, Mrs. FOUSHEE, and Mr. TORRES of New York.
H.R. 8933: Mr. KENNEDY of Utah and Mr. HUIZENGA.
H.R. 8990: Mr. GRIFFITH.
H.R. 9036: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 9043: Mr. HUIZENGA.
H.R. 9078: Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas.
H.R. 9106: Mr. NEWHOUSE.
H.R. 9131: Mr. BRECHEEN.
H.R. 9132: Mr. BRECHEEN.
H.R. 9211: Mr. HUDSON and Mr. HORSFORD.
H.R. 9236: Mr. CARSON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. EZELL.
H.R. 9298: Mr. ROSE and Mr. BIGGS of Arizona.
H.R. 9357: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 9423: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 9505: Mr. GOLDMAN of Texas.
H.R. 9519: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 9641: Ms. BYNUM, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. ADERHOLT.
H.R. 9693: Ms. NORTON and Mr. MOORE of North Carolina.
H.R. 9701: Mr. SMUCKER.
H.R. 9719: Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MORAN, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. GOODEN, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 9743: Mr. GUEST.
H.R. 9745: Ms. ROSS.
H.R. 9790: Mr. COHEN and Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 9827: Mrs. CAMMACK.
H.R. 9914: Mr. LICCARDO and Mr. HUIZENGA.
H.R. 9925: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina and Mr. VASQUEZ.
H.R. 9943: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 9952: Mr. HARRIGAN.
H.R. 10012: Mr. TURNER of Ohio.
H.R. 10032: Ms. STANSBURY.
H.R. 10052: Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. COLE, and Mr. MOSKOWITZ.
H.R. 10076: Mr. GOLDMAN of New York and Mr. KEAN.
H.R. 10092: Mr. VAN EPPS.
H.R. 10121: Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 10131: Ms. MENG.
H.R. 10163: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 10166: Mr. HARRIGAN.
H.R. 10184: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 10226: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 10249: Mr. VINDMAN.
H.R. 10272: Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS.
H.R. 10330: Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 10345: Ms. JAYAPAL.
H.R. 10352: Mr. CISNEROS.
H.R. 10360: Mr. VINDMAN.
H.R. 10361: Mr. SUOZZI.
H.R. 10365: Ms. CROCKETT.
H.R. 10375: Mr. TRAN and Mr. CISNEROS.
H.R. 10397: Mrs. SYKES.
H.R. 10401: Mr. CARSON, Mr. RUIZ, and Ms. JOHNSON of Texas.
H.J.Res. 63: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. OLSZEWSKI, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. FIELDS, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. COSTA, and Ms. SALINAS.
H.J.Res. 122: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H.J.Res. 152: Mr. GROTHMAN and Mr. PATRONIS.
H. Con. Res. 44: Mr. MORELLE.
H. Res. 897: Mr. CARTER of Louisiana.
H. Res. 1187: Mrs. GRIJALVA.
H. Res. 1286: Mr. GREEN of Texas.
H. Res. 1512: Ms. STRICKLAND.
H. Res. 1537: Mr. NEWHOUSE.
H. Res. 1539: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H. Res. 1542: Ms. SCHOLTEN.