



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 119th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 171

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 15, 2025

No. 8

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. DE LA CRUZ).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,

January 15, 2025.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MONICA DE LA CRUZ to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

MIKE JOHNSON,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2025, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with time equally allocated between the parties and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

REMEMBERING THE TRUTH ABOUT JANUARY 6

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Speaker, last week the House and Senate oversaw the certification of the 2024 election. It was a quick, smooth process. There were no riots, no violence. We completed the peaceful transfer of power as the Founding Fathers envisioned it.

Now compare last week's election certification with what we witnessed 4 years ago. Thousands attacked the

Capitol. They shattered windows, smashed down doors, assaulted police officers. It was a violent mob and people died as a result. It was all in an attempt to stop the certification of a legitimate election.

The insurrectionists and rioters threatened Vice President Pence and referred to him as "dead man walking" if he didn't illegally reject the election results.

Directly following January 6, leaders on both sides of the aisle spoke out against the antidemocratic acts of the day. Former Speaker KEVIN MCCARTHY said the violence, destruction, and chaos we saw earlier was unacceptable, undemocratic, and un-American. It was the saddest day I have ever had serving as a Member of this institution.

Former Senate Minority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL was even more clear in his condemnation and assignment of blame. He said: "There's no question, none, that President Trump is practically and morally responsible for provoking the events of the day," and, "It was a violent insurrection for the purpose of trying to prevent the peaceful transfer of power."

Now, 4 years later, there is a concerted effort to rewrite history. Our incoming President has called January 6 "a day of love," and others have claimed it was a legitimate form of protest.

Well, I was here. I saw the violence with my own eyes, and the scenes we witnessed will haunt this institution forever.

We need a clear accounting of what happened and a clear accountability to ensure this never happens again. Unfortunately, under this incoming President, it appears we will get neither.

The President-elect has said he wants to pardon the rioters. These are folks who have been convicted in a court of law. In a dark twist on accountability, the President-elect is threatening retribution against Democrats and Repub-

licans who served on the committee that investigated January 6. They should go to jail, he said, of Members of Congress who sought to uncover the truth about January 6.

Let's recap. The people who broke into the Capitol, and injured 147 officers, and threatened to kill the Vice President should be pardoned, and the elected officials who performed their constitutional duty to investigate the largest mass assault of law enforcement officers and the greatest assault on our democracy should be jailed.

This is a perversion of the truth and justice.

For those of us who were here on Capitol Hill that day, who saw the violence, smelled the pepper spray, and heard the screams, we have an opportunity to remember that day for what it was: a dark stain on our Nation's history.

We have an opportunity to commemorate those in uniform who bravely stood up to the rioters. They didn't just protect me; they protected our Republic.

In 2022, Congress commissioned a memorial to be installed on the front of the Capitol listing the names of those who defended the Capitol on that fateful day. Three years later, it has yet to be mounted.

We should expect more. If we can't be honest about what happened on that day, if we can't, at a minimum, come together to put up a plaque commemorating those who protected us and some who gave their last full measure of devotion, then perhaps we should install a plaque like the one from "Dante's Inferno," "Abandon all hope, ye who enter here."

HONORING JANUARY VETERAN OF THE MONTH MICHAEL "MIKE" TRACY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ALFORD) for 5 minutes.

☐ 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.



Printed on recycled paper.

H151

Mr. ALFORD. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to honor our January Veteran of the Month, Michael "Mike" Tracy.

Mike entered the Air Force Delayed Entry program in 1975 where he reported to basic training, Air Force leadership school, and Air Force Security Police School at Lackland Air Force Base in San Antonio, Texas.

After graduation, he was placed on orders to the 20th Security Police Squadron RAF Upper Heyford, England, home to the F-111E, NATO, and USAFE nuclear deterrent to the former Soviet Union.

When he returned to the U.S., he maintained his service after being discharged in the inactive reserve. In 1982, Mike rejoined the military as a private in the USAR in Spokane, Washington. He attended drill sergeant school and U.S. Armor School. He served as a preventive medicine specialist in Germany and participated in Operation Desert Storm.

Throughout injuries, surgeries, and reassignments, Mike served his country in many different roles. His final assignment brought him to Missouri at Whiteman Air Force Base in our district.

Madam Speaker, I thank Mike for his dedication and service. We appreciate him, and we are so glad that his journey brought him to the great State of Missouri. We salute him today.

HONORING JANINE'S FLOWERS, SMALL BUSINESS OF THE MONTH

Mr. ALFORD. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to honor our January small business of the month, Janine's Flowers.

This fantastic business in Camdenton has been serving the lake area with floral artistry through weddings, proms, first dates, and so many other special occasions.

Janine's is a one-stop destination for all floral arrangements, special gifts, tuxedos, event supplies, and much more.

Back in September, Janine's celebrated their 45th anniversary where Janine Bullock, the original owner, shared captivating stories about the humble beginnings of this business.

It is now owned by Cassidy Dickerson, and Janine's Flowers will continue to make special occasions even more special. Janine was thrilled to pass the torch to Cassidy and knows she will build upon the strong foundation that was established.

Madam Speaker, I thank Janine's Flowers for providing Missouri's Fourth Congressional District with the highest quality floral arrangements and event services. I ask Missourians to not forget about Janine's as Valentine's Day is coming up.

Again, I congratulate Janine's Flowers as our January small business of the month.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF BRENDA LOVELADY SPAHN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SEWELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary life and legacy of Brenda Lovelady Spahn, the founder of The Lovelady Center in Birmingham, Alabama, who passed away on December 18, 2024, at the age of 75.

Miss Brenda founded The Lovelady Center in 2004 to rehabilitate women involved in the criminal justice system. Beginning with just seven inmates, the program rapidly grew into what is now the only State-supervised reentry program in Alabama and the largest faith-based recovery facility for women and children in the Nation.

Through the work of The Lovelady Center, Miss Brenda has touched the lives of more than 20,000 women and children, helping them to walk forward with faith-driven hope for the future. Guided by her abiding faith in God and her steadfast belief in the value of human life, Miss Brenda made it her mission to spread empowerment, hope, and redemption among the women she served.

Throughout her extraordinary life, she has received numerous awards and honors, including an honorary degree in humanitarian studies from Tennessee Temple University in 2012.

On a personal note, I am forever grateful for the opportunity I had to partner with Miss Brenda on behalf of the women and children of Jefferson County, Alabama, including the \$2 million investment that we secured for The Lovelady Center in the fiscal year 2023 from the Federal budget.

I will always remember the warm, selfless, and kindhearted nature of Miss Brenda, and above all, her devotion to serving the most vulnerable members of our community.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the extraordinary life and legacy of Miss Brenda Lovelady Spahn. May her legacy live on in the many lives that she touched.

CELEBRATING THE RETIREMENT OF DR. CHARLES STEELE, JR.

Ms. SEWELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary career and achievements of Dr. Charles Steele, Jr., as he celebrates his retirement after 17 years as the president and CEO of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

A true trailblazer, Dr. Steele has an accomplished career in both public service and civil rights advocacy. A native of Tuscaloosa, Alabama, he was elected to the Tuscaloosa City Council in 1985, a position he held for 2 years before being elected to the Alabama State Senate in 1994.

After serving three terms, Dr. Steele stepped down in 2004 to take over as the head of the SCLC. As the organization's president and CEO, Dr. Steele raised over \$10 million and oversaw the groundbreaking of SCLC's new inter-

national headquarters in Atlanta, Georgia.

Dr. Steele's reputation has always been one of great purpose and great passion. He is an honorable man, guided by an abiding faith in God and a love of country.

While his retirement will allow him some well-earned rest and time with loved ones, I know that his commitment to service will continue for years to come.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of a grateful Nation, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the retirement of Dr. Charles Steele, Jr., after 17 years as president and CEO of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

HONORING THE RETIREMENT OF GUADALUPE COUNTY COMMISSIONER GREG SEIDENBERGER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALFORD). The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. DE LA CRUZ) for 5 minutes.

Ms. DE LA CRUZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Guadalupe County Commissioner Greg Seidenberger on his well-deserved retirement after a lifetime of extraordinary service to our country and community.

Greg began his career with 20 years in the United States Air Force, serving as a command pilot during the Vietnam war and leading the squadron operating out of Seguin Auxiliary. He then served as a pilot for American Airlines for 18 years.

For the past 12 years, Greg has dedicated himself to Guadalupe County as commissioner for precinct 1, transforming the county and ensuring the foundation for a brighter future.

Mr. Speaker, I wish Commissioner Seidenberger a joyful retirement.

CALIFORNIA WILDFIRES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. RIVAS) for 5 minutes.

Ms. RIVAS. Mr. Speaker, just 5 days into my tenure as a Member of the House of Representatives, several large wildfires broke out across Los Angeles County: the Palisades fire, the Eaton fire, and the Hurst fire, which broke out in Sylmar on the northern end of my district.

I was born and raised in the San Fernando Valley, and I consider myself incredibly fortunate to represent it in Congress. The valley is a special place to so many people, including my own family, which makes the heartbreak of seeing images of it in danger sting deeper.

□ 1015

I flew home last week as soon as I saw the images of footage coming out of Los Angeles County to be home with my community and be helpful in any way that I could.

I have immense gratitude for the Los Angeles Fire Department, the first responders, and the firefighters who arrived from across the country and from

Mexico who have been working nonstop to put out these fires. I met with community leaders, including the brave men and women of Fire Station 87 in Granada Hills. Due to their bravery, courage, and action in responding to the Hurst fire, they were able to minimize danger and keep our neighbors safe. Our community thanks them.

I also visited one of the evacuation centers at the Ritchie Valens Recreation Center to learn more about how staff and volunteers have been working around the clock to help those who were forced to evacuate.

I visited the burn sites of the Hurst and Eaton fires, where I was able to assess the damage firsthand and tried to get a better understanding of what Federal resources would be needed to help communities rebuild.

Throughout the week, I was in contact with the Federal Government, including the White House and FEMA, where I was able to advocate for the Federal support necessary to keep constituents safe during the emergency.

My congressional colleagues and I are focused on making sure our constituents and our communities have what they need to get through and recover from this emergency without any conditions.

This isn't about party or politics, and I am proud to have joined both of our Senators and 46 other bipartisan Members of California's congressional delegation in urging President Biden to sign a major disaster declaration so that the Federal Government can provide public assistance, individual assistance, and direct Federal assistance to our communities.

We are grateful that President Biden quickly signed the declaration, and my hope is that President-elect Trump will continue to provide resources so our constituents can immediately access the funds and resources that they need to rebuild their lives.

These fires are the costliest in California's history, and they are impacting everyone, regardless of income or party. Lives and livelihoods have been lost, and many more continue to be in danger. We want our constituents to know that disaster assistance is available and will be available to them. This assistance may include rental payments for temporary housing for those who lost their homes, grants for home repairs, unemployment payments for workers who have lost their job because of the fires, and crisis counseling for those who have been traumatized by this disaster.

Additionally, FEMA disaster assistance may be able to help those who have lost a home regardless if they were uninsured, had insurance, or underinsured. Visit disasterassistance.gov to get started.

My office is also ready to help those who have been impacted by the fires. If my constituents need assistance, I encourage them to reach out to my office, and we will be able to start advocating on their behalf to get the Federal resources that they need.

The San Fernando Valley is home, and I am honored to represent my home in Congress. That is why I am committed to working with our local, State, and Federal officials to make sure our community has the resources that it needs to rebuild stronger. Our community is strong and resilient, and we will help each other come back from this disaster.

CONGRATULATING A. MICHAEL HICKOX ON HIS RETIREMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. DE LA CRUZ). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BEAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BEAN of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the important contributions of A. Michael Hickox and his retirement as the property appraiser for Nassau County, Florida.

For 12 years, Mike has been an amazing public servant, committed to fairness and customer service. Let's be honest, Madam Speaker, being a property appraiser is probably one of the toughest jobs around, but Mike has done it well, skillfully, and leaves the office in a much better place.

While he was leading, Mike also served as the president of the Florida Association of Property Appraisers and then served on the boards of the Nassau Education Foundation and the Nassau County Economic Development Board.

To put it simply, Madam Speaker, Mike has spent his career serving others. Mike may not be our property appraiser anymore, but I know he is not done. I can't wait to see what he does next.

Madam Speaker, I ask you and our colleagues to join me in congratulating Mike on a job well done. Go get 'em, Mike.

HONORING ROMULUS COUNCILWOMAN VIRGINIA WILLIAMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB) for 5 minutes.

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I honor the incredible life and legacy of Romulus Councilwoman Virginia Williams, who unexpectedly passed away. She has left a void in our community and in our hearts.

Councilwoman Williams was a relentless advocate for our families, ensuring that no one in our community lacked basic necessities. Her work with organizations like Forgotten Harvest and her creating her own organization because of her passion for organizing food drives, holiday giveaways, and joyful community events embodied her unwavering love for the city of Romulus and our families.

She was committed to always lifting up her neighbors, often going above and beyond to bring hope and resources to those in need. Her dedication reminds us all that even the smallest acts of kindness can build stronger, more connected communities.

Her legacy lives on in the countless lives she has touched. We are forever grateful for her service. I thank her family for sharing her with all of us and allowing us to honor her. My deepest condolences go out to them and all her loved ones during this difficult time.

Rest in peace, Councilwoman Williams.

HONORING DEARBORN MAYOR JACK O'REILLY, JR.

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I honor the life of former Dearborn Mayor Jack O'Reilly, Jr. Our community lost an extraordinary leader whose dedication to public service shaped the city of Dearborn and our communities in Michigan forever.

Mayor O'Reilly served as the president of Dearborn City Council for nearly two decades and served a 15-year tenure as Dearborn's sixth mayor.

I still remember my first meeting with him when he was a council president during the time I was a young law student. Mayor O'Reilly was so patient in teaching me about how some community programs were successful while others struggled. He was a champion for workforce development. His patience and his depth of knowledge and willingness to teach me and so many others left a lasting impression, I know, on me.

I would have never thought that I would have the honor to be able to represent him here in the United States Congress. Mayor O'Reilly's kindness and thoughtful approach to leadership embodied what it truly means to be a public servant.

I thank Mayor O'Reilly, Jr.'s family for sharing him with all of us. I know it wasn't easy. My thoughts are with his family, his loved ones, and all who were fortunate enough to know him.

His legacy will continue to inspire future generations not only in Dearborn but throughout southeastern Michigan and beyond.

CONGRATULATING ABDUL "AL" HAIDOUS ON HIS RETIREMENT

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I recognize Wayne County Commissioner Abdul "Al" Haidous for his more than 40 years of public service to the city of Wayne and Wayne County and congratulate him on his retirement.

We lovingly call him Al. He was born in Lebanon and came to the city of Wayne five decades ago. He made a name for himself in the community, running Al's Friendly Market with the help of his wife, Mary, who I love dearly, for 35 years.

As the first Arab-American mayor in Wayne County, his leadership paved the way for future leaders and was an inspiration to so many of us. In 2014, he was elected to the Wayne County Commission. For 14 years, he served our residents with dedication and resilience, always focusing on bringing people together.

I thank Commissioner Haidous for his decades of public service. His legacy will continue to inspire our community in years to come. Please join

me in recognizing Commissioner Al Haidous as we wish him well in his retirement.

THANKING NICK BOSTIC FOR HIS COURAGEOUS ACTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Alabama). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BAIRD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Nick Bostic, a former pizza delivery man who saved five sisters from a burning house.

Just after midnight, July 11, 2022, Bostic was driving nearby when he saw the house in flames. Bostic entered the home, where he found an 18-year-old woman, a toddler, and two 13-year-olds outside the upstairs bedroom. He led them out of the house before running back inside to rescue the 6-year-old girl.

For his actions, Nick Bostic received the Carnegie Medal, given to American and Canadian citizens who put themselves in extreme danger while saving and attempting to save the lives of others. It is North America's highest honor for civilian heroism.

The entire Lafayette community is grateful for his courageous actions to save the lives of these young girls.

CONGRATULATING BROWNSBURG BULLDOGS ON THEIR IHSA 6A VICTORY

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Brownsburg High School football team for winning the IHSA 6A State championship this year.

The Brownsburg Bulldogs took on Westfield High School in the State finals in Lucas Oil Stadium and emerged victorious, with a final score of 22-17. This was Brownsburg's first State title in nearly 40 years, and I know this win has meant so much to the Brownsburg community cheering them on to victory.

I congratulate these outstanding student athletes on becoming State champions. They should be incredibly proud of their hard work and dedication that brought them this victory. I also congratulate the parents, coaches, and faculty who gave their time and talent to this team. They couldn't have done it without them.

Congratulations again to the Brownsburg Bulldogs.

HONORING DR. MARK RUSSELL ON HIS RETIREMENT

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor Dr. Mark Russell, who recently retired from his position as a professor of agricultural sciences education and communication at Purdue University. Dr. Russell joined Purdue in 1982. From August of 2015 to September of 2022, Dr. Russell served as the head of the agricultural sciences department.

Dr. Russell has truly been a leader in the Purdue community. Thanks to his expertise, he has judged over 1,100 horse shows for national breed associations in 14 countries. Dr. Russell has also established and expanded multiple

exchange programs around the world, growing the university's global presence and relationships.

He has been a stalwart professor at Purdue University's ag department, and his loss will be felt by the Purdue community and beyond. We wish him the very best as he begins this next chapter in his well-earned retirement.

HONORING CHIEF WARRANT OFFICER DANIEL PETERSON'S LIFE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the life of retired Chief Warrant Officer Daniel Peterson, a champion for southern Nevada's veteran community.

Chief Peterson was a highly decorated Army veteran and unrelenting advocate for those around him. After flying helicopters in the Army for more than 20 years, he came home to serve as the commander of the Henderson chapter of the Military Order of the Purple Heart, to be a member of the Henderson Vietnam Veterans of America, and attend as many unaccompanied veteran burial ceremonies as he could find. He also went to every Veterans Treatment Court graduation and never hesitated to offer his support to fellow veterans in need.

To be clear, it is impossible to sum up Chief Peterson's decades of service in just one speech on the House floor. That is part of the reason why I had the privilege of working with the Library of Congress for his story to be part of the Veterans History Project.

While he has too many medals to name here, I can say this: Chief Peterson was a mentor, a father, a spouse, a leader, a friend, a protector, and a servant to both southern Nevada and our entire country.

I extend my condolences and prayers to Dan's wife, Eileen, and his four children and stepchildren. We all owe Dan a debt of gratitude. We will all miss him.

□ 1030

UNCONDITIONAL AID FOR EATON FIRE VICTIMS

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, this week, I returned from my district in southern California, which has been completely devastated by the Eaton fire.

In Altadena and northern Pasadena, the fire took our neighbors' lives and destroyed the structures that provided stability to countless families' hopes, dreams, and memories. The fire has destroyed over 7,000 structures; left 20,000 people homeless; forced numerous health centers to close; and burned schools, businesses, and community institutions to the ground.

This is just one of six serious fires across Los Angeles, including the more than 23,000-acre Palisades fire. Places that served as safe havens for generations of Angelenos and where community was built across the San Gabriel Valley are now unrecognizable.

The Altadena Community Church, Altadena mosque, Pasadena Jewish Temple, Armenian school, mom-and-pop business centers, Eliot Arts Magnet School, and Altadena Country Club were all burned to the ground.

When Black Americans fled racial segregation in the Jim Crow South and came to Los Angeles, many made Altadena their home because there was no redlining there preventing them from owning homes. It has remained a hub of Black culture and civic life in Los Angeles. After being forced into incarceration in camps during World War II, many Japanese Americans came to Pasadena and built their lives back up.

Last week, thousands had to flee their homes at a moment's notice, frantically searching for pets and crying out to loved ones, many with nothing more than the clothes on their backs. Thousands of people have lost their homes and a lifetime's worth of belongings and memories.

Tragically, first responders have found 16 people who lost their lives, and they expect that number to rise.

Anthony Mitchell, Sr., a dedicated father, died alongside his son while waiting for help. Just a week before the fires began, Anthony told his son that what he treasured most in life was not money or possessions but his family.

Victor Shaw died outside of his longtime family home with a garden hose in his hand. He did everything he could to save it.

Erliene Louise Kelly bought her home in Altadena with her late husband, Howard, in the late 1960s. Together, they raised two kids, watched their grandchildren and great-grandchildren grow, and celebrated holidays, birthdays, and anniversaries.

The Los Angeles wildfires are on track to become one of the most costly and devastating natural disasters in our country's history. Yet, scores of Republicans, led by President-elect Trump and Speaker JOHNSON, are threatening to place conditions on the State of California for disaster assistance to flow to these victims.

This is truly unprecedented. Never in our history has the Federal Government placed conditions on emergency disaster aid to our own citizens. I invite any Republican in Congress who is entertaining these demands to visit my district, see the devastation for yourself, and look the victims in the eye when you tell them they don't deserve help from their country because you disagree with certain policies passed by their State.

This is the United States of America. We help our citizens when they fall victim to a natural disaster, regardless of their political party or opinions. We do it without strings attached, like we did just in December, 4 weeks ago, for victims of Hurricanes Milton and Helene.

I look forward to working with the majority to secure critical disaster relief funding that is necessary for this vibrant, beautiful, unique region to recover and rebuild.

PROSPECT MEDICAL FILING FOR BANKRUPTCY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. MAGAZINER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MAGAZINER. Mr. Speaker, this week, Prospect Medical Holdings, which owns Our Lady of Fatima Hospital in North Providence and Roger Williams Medical Center in Providence, filed for bankruptcy, threatening to undermine Rhode Island's already-stressed healthcare system.

Unfortunately, this is a day that many of us feared would come because, for years, Leonard Green & Partners, the private equity firm that owned Prospect Medical, and executives of the company engaged in outrageous profiteering, buying up hospitals and extracting hundreds of millions of dollars of management fees and dividends, money that should have been spent on patient care.

In the decade that private equity firm Leonard Green owned Prospect Medical, they extracted over half a billion dollars from the hospitals they owned. Their partner, Prospect CEO Sam Lee, personally made more than \$100 million, buying luxury properties for himself at the same time that he shut down emergency rooms. Shameful.

When I was State treasurer in 2020, I sent a letter to Leonard Green, expressing my frustration at their unethical practices and the impact they were having on healthcare in Rhode Island. In response, they put out a statement insisting that all was well and that the operations at Fatima and Roger Williams were doing just fine.

Now, 4 years later, wouldn't you know it, Prospect is declaring bankruptcy, threatening the health and safety of thousands of Rhode Islanders who rely on Fatima and Roger Williams and the livelihoods of the hundreds of healthcare workers who work in those hospitals.

The executives at Leonard Green and Prospect, who sucked all the money out of those hospitals, are long gone, counting their millions. It is greed, plain and simple.

I commend Senator SHELDON WHITEHOUSE and Attorney General Peter Neronha, who have been sounding the alarm about Prospect for years. I am committed to working with State officials and my colleagues in the Rhode Island congressional delegation to clean up the mess that Leonard Green left behind and to do our best to save Fatima and Roger Williams and stabilize our State's healthcare system.

Mark my words, we will not stop there. The time has come for Congress to take a hard look at the consequences of private equity ownership of hospitals. Rhode Islanders and the American people are counting on us for action, and they are going to get it.

HONORING OFFICERS FOR SERVING ON
JANUARY 6

Mr. MAGAZINER. Mr. Speaker, 4 years ago last week, a violent mob at-

tacked our Nation's Capitol, assaulted police officers, and threatened to kill elected officials, all with the goal of blocking the results of the Presidential election and denying the will of the American people. They did it because the losing candidate in that election, President Donald Trump, incited them by falsely claiming he won.

On that dark day, hundreds of Capitol and Metropolitan Police officers bravely did their duty, putting their lives in harm's way to protect this building, the people in it, and our very democracy.

Over 140 police officers suffered injuries, including broken bones, concussions, and PTSD. They were attacked with baseball bats, axes, and chemicals, among other deadly weapons. In the weeks that followed, five officers died from their injuries.

The officers who served that day are all heroes who fought for our country and deserve our thanks and praise. Congress passed, and President Biden signed, a law to honor the Capitol Police officers who defended our country during the January 6 riots with a plaque here in the Capitol Building that they fought to defend.

Shamefully, Republicans in Congress continue to refuse to hang that plaque. Every day that my Republican colleagues delay is an insult to the brave officers who served on January 6 and who continue to protect us day in and day out.

Mr. Speaker, I say to my Republican colleagues: No more delays, no more disrespect. Hang the plaque now.

Every pivotal event in American history has heroes and cowards. January 6 is no different. History will always remember the heroic officers who risked their lives to defend our country and will also remember the cowards who refused to honor them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President-elect.

HONORING MARINE CORPS LEAGUE EL PERRO DIABLO DETACHMENT 478

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. VASQUEZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. VASQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the exceptional service of the Marine Corps League El Perro Diablo Detachment 478, based in Las Cruces, New Mexico.

New Mexicans have a long history of stepping up to serve our Nation, and these marines continue to honor that commitment. For decades, the members of this detachment have provided military funeral honors for our veterans, with several members participating in over 1,000 ceremonies and winning multiple awards at honor guard conferences.

During times when military families are experiencing one of the most dif-

ficult moments of their lives, marines step forward with unwavering dedication to ensure our Nation's heroes are laid to rest with the dignity they deserve. Their service to our community is a profound reminder of the values instilled in these marines: honor, courage, and commitment.

We must continue to support our veterans and their families, ensuring that they also receive the benefits and recognition that they have earned.

On behalf of all New Mexicans, I extend my deepest gratitude to the Marine Corps League El Perro Diablo Detachment 478.

ENSURING EVERY STUDENT FEELS SAFE, SEEN, SUPPORTED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. TOKUDA) for 5 minutes.

Ms. TOKUDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my deep concern and disappointment with the passage of H.R. 28.

As a mother of teenagers in public schools, I am appalled that instead of addressing urgent challenges, like the youth mental health crisis, gun violence in our schools, and the growing teacher shortage, this legislation diverts our attention to dangerous and divisive policies.

H.R. 28, under the guise of protecting fairness in sports and safety in schools, risks undermining the rights and dignity of girls and young women. Let me be clear: This bill threatens the very foundation of Title IX, the landmark legislation that, for over 50 years, has protected millions from gender-based discrimination in education.

Patsy Mink, the trailblazing Congresswoman who championed Title IX, understood the deep injustices women face in education and beyond. As a woman and a Japanese American, she fought so that her daughter and all future generations could pursue their dreams without fear of prejudice or exclusion. They fought this hard fight, and for us, this bill betrays her legacy and all of her efforts by turning back the clock on these hard-won rights.

Growing up, I experienced firsthand the pain of being bullied for the way I looked and being judged for not fitting traditional expectations of what a girl should look or act like.

I remember vividly being told by the school administrator: "Tuck in your shirt, boy." I was just a middle schooler, tall for my age, wearing my hair short, and pants, not dresses. The shock and humiliation of that moment stayed with me, and it fuels my resolve that no child should ever be made to feel ashamed of being authentically who they are.

Our students already face incredible pressures and challenges. Instead of making their lives harder by policing their identities and questioning their worth, we should be supporting them, fostering environments where they can grow, thrive, and succeed as their true, authentic selves.

Transgender girls are girls. Transgender women are women. If we truly want to protect girls and women, we must stand for inclusion, dignity, and respect, not division and exclusion.

This isn't just about a policy. It is about our values. It is about ensuring that every student feels safe, seen, and supported. That is how we protect our children. That is how we honor the spirit of Title IX.

Let's move forward with solutions that uplift and unite our schools, not tear them apart.

IN SOLIDARITY WITH THOSE IMPACTED BY
CALIFORNIA WILDFIRES

Ms. TOKUDA. Mr. Speaker, over the past 10 days, our Nation has watched with horror and sadness the harrowing scenes coming out of southern California, as these fires tore through homes, neighborhoods, and communities.

On behalf of my constituents who know the terror and trauma of wildfire all too well, I rise today in solidarity with our California and Los Angeles "ohana," "family," and I am outraged over the callous and heartless remarks that conditions should be applied to their aid.

Within days of our Maui fires, teams from CAL FIRE were by our side on the ground to help deliver relief and organize the cleanup.

In our hour of greatest need, they stood by us without expectation of any reward. They simply stepped up for their fellow Americans. They showed us in Hawaii aloha.

That is what we need to do as a nation, as one people. We help each other out in our times of need, regardless of where we come from, our beliefs, or how we vote. We as Members of Congress pledge to do this every single day when we convene for business: one nation, unconditionally, under God.

Now, in California's time of greatest need, the President-elect, the Speaker, and other colleagues here in the House want to impose policy conditions on Federal disaster aid.

□ 1045

Mr. Speaker, this will endanger innocent lives and delay the ability of our fellow Americans to rebuild and recover from this disaster.

Never before in our history has the Federal Government imposed conditions on disaster aid for its own citizens.

This is just more than unprecedented. To deny our fellow Americans the help they need after losing loved ones, their homes, and their businesses in their darkest hour because of political differences, it is not just cruel; it is immoral. It is un-American. It is not who we are as a country.

It is an affront to our most basic values, one that transcends any law or policy and lives at the core of our faith. We should do to others as we would do to us. We must love our neighbor.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me and our fellow Americans in

solidarity in delivering the aid that California desperately needs without political conditions.

In doing so, I urge my colleagues to do the right thing and stand up for our values as a Nation. Let us send the right message to the American people that their government of the people, by the people, and for the people will always stand by them unconditionally, no matter what.

ENDANGERED SPECIES IMPACT ON
CALIFORNIA'S WATER SUPPLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the Endangered Species Act. Indeed, it was designed back in the early seventies and passed with bipartisanship. It was signed by Richard Nixon to protect endangered species.

What we see with its implementation in my home State of California and many other areas around this country, especially in the West, is significant misinterpretation of it.

Indeed, it has been weaponized to stop many things that would be good for people, even for the environment. We are talking about forestry, forestry practices that would make our lands safer and less fire prone. We are talking about the water supply that would help valley farmers. It would help urban areas, and it certainly would help the situation in Los Angeles right now.

What I have depicted here is a brush clearing project that was just above Pacific Palisades and other areas in L.A. that they actually had underway for a while until a national monument was declared above an area called Altadena. It stopped the ability to keep clearing brush. With national monuments, you are not allowed to go in there and do anything because it has to be left pristine and preserved. That ties in with the endangered species as well.

We see the results. Instead of clearing this brush, we get results like this. This is happening right now in southern California, tragically, needlessly. We will continue to see this.

I have seen it in my district. I have lost 3½ of my small towns in my district in the last 6 years, including the Paradise fire which took 85 lives, 90 percent of the town, Greenville, Canyon Dam, and a smaller town called Doyle that was burned on the east side. Again, the Endangered Species Act being manipulated and weaponized against doing the work we need to do is partly at fault.

For example, when we talk about water in California, let's look at the delta smelt for a moment. The water supply we should be building in California is impeded because the water has to be shipped out to the Pacific Ocean, supposedly to help the delta smelt. The water increases have hap-

pened since 1992. The legislation here increased another 800,000 acre-feet per year. Then it is built up from there to, hopefully, or somehow help the delta smelt.

This is Shasta Dam in northern California which we are trying to get filled right now but is going to be less useful for people as more of this water is dumped out to the delta.

What does that mean for southern California? Well, for example, let's take a look at this. This is the Santa Ynez Reservoir which currently is empty, supposedly for rehab and some maintenance. This is what it is supposed to look like full. That is what it looks like right now. It seems people in southern California who are supposed to be in charge didn't even know it was empty. This holds approximately 40 acre-feet when it is full, which is 117 million gallons.

When full, the Shasta Dam here holds 4½ acre-feet. We have been discussing a raise of Shasta Dam. It would be easy to raise it 18 feet. That would cause about 630,000 more acre-feet to be available to be stored in California.

With that, can you imagine what 600,000 acre-feet could do to help? It could fill this in minutes with the amount of water going out to the Pacific Ocean. The Endangered Species Act is being used as a weapon against raising an existing dam that was built in the thirties there that would do that. They will find a species of the week to do that. In this case I believe it is a salamander.

Let's go back in time a little bit. You have probably heard of the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Tellico Dam. That project was an idea that came about in the late sixties, and the construction was going to happen pretty soon after that. What they did is some biologists, I think from the University of Tennessee, were out on a hike and discovered, he thought, she thought, whoever it was, that there was something called a snail darter in the river there.

Starting in about 1973, or soon after the ESA was put in place, it was listed in 1975 as endangered under the Endangered Species Act, leading to a legal battle that took a long time and was finally settled. It went to the Supreme Court and was finally settled by legislation passed in Congress in 1979, which exempted the Tellico Dam from the ESA protections and allowed the giant project. It was going to make so much hydroelectric power, store water, and be available for agriculture and people. They actually got it done.

Instead, the biologists took this so-called snail darter and moved populations to other rivers in the area. The species was then reclassified downward from endangered to threatened in 1984. Finally, in 2022, it was removed from the list.

Interestingly, when we talk about the weaponization of ESA, a study that was just released revealed that the snail darter isn't an actual distinct

species but is actually just another population of one called the stargazing darter. This raises concern about a species' identification when really what it is being used for is a weapon.

This is what the snail darter actually looks like because it doesn't exist as its own.

This is what they are doing in southern California. I just showed you the picture of the fires. There is a project near Pacific Palisades that was going to remove some vulnerable power pole lines that were made of wood and some lower hanging wires and other equipment with some stronger, more fire-resistant ones. They started on the project, but they discovered a species of vetch which is grown as a crop in many other areas, as a cover crop or what have you. They discovered one called, I think, Braunton's milkvetch. We grow cow vetch all the time in other areas. I have another picture in another speech.

When placed side by side, they are the same picture. These are weaponized to stop a project that could have been helpful in keeping Pacific Palisades from burning due to downed power lines. It probably wouldn't have been the key piece, but that has certainly happened in plenty of other areas around the State where downed power lines, due to the wind or branches and stuff blowing into them, have caused several fires, including the Camp fire in Paradise I mentioned that killed 85 people, and started a fire called the Dixie fire which burned a million acres.

Frequently, we have in northern California what we call public safety power shutoffs where people just have their power shut off because the wind might blow hard enough to blow branches into power lines somewhere. We sit without power like a Third World country.

This all traces back to the inability to do the forestry management where I was talking about water storage and to have a water supply for southern California.

What it boils down to is we need the leadership like President Trump is going to provide and what Gavin Newsom has been stopping as far as helping us with water storage and helping us get the water to the farmers and urban areas as needed.

ADDRESSING SOCIAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the concern that faces the United States Congress, one that it has avoided and neglected for more than 54 years.

Richard Nixon was the last President to enhance Social Security. That was in 1971. All of us are concerned on both sides of the aisle, but concern is no substitute for action. It is long overdue that Congress takes a vote on behalf of the American people.

Social Security is more than a pension program. I think the American public knows it and is getting aroused because there are 70 million Americans that are on Social Security and 10,000 baby boomers a day become eligible for Social Security.

Mr. Speaker, for example, in your district alone there are over 175,000 Social Security recipients. It is broken down into those who receive pensions, those who get spousal benefits, those who get widow benefits, children, and, of course, disabilities. More veterans rely on Social Security disability than they do on the VA.

It is not emphasized enough, but the other key thing is: Social Security is the best economic development program that there is in the country. Every district, on average, gets over \$200 million coming into that district on a monthly basis.

Where do they spend that money? Nobody gets wealthy on Social Security. That is for sure. That money goes right back into the economy. It becomes something that Congress hasn't adjusted since 1971. I think there are a few things everyone would acknowledge that have happened to the economy since 1971.

Certainly, Congress is neglecting its responsibility. We can point fingers every way, but the bottom line is Congress needs to act. Congress needs to vote.

President Trump has called for tax cuts for people on Social Security. I applaud him. We have had tax cuts in our proposal for the last decade. There has been no action on that.

The difference between what we are proposing and what President Trump is proposing is that we pay for ours because if it is not paid for, what ends up happening is the Social Security fund will be bankrupted. It is still the number one antipoverty program for the elderly and the number one antipoverty program for children.

This economic development piece is something, again, that all of us ought to be able to embrace. I will provide every Member of Congress with a card that will demonstrate how many recipients they have and how much money comes into their district on a monthly basis.

For us, meaning the United States Congress, we are the only body that can act. The President can't do it through executive order. The Supreme Court isn't going to take it up. Only the United States Congress can. Inaction means the fund will be cut. Unpaid action means the fund will be cut drastically.

Imagine there are more than 5 million people that get a below-poverty-level check from Social Security, having paid in all their lives. That was not the guarantee that they signed up for.

There are close to 35 million people in total. This is the only benefit they have, again, attesting to the great vision and leadership of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, knowing this is actually the

safety net of capitalism. This allows people to take risks because even if people were to fail, there is something there to catch them and help them and their families through this.

Congress has not acted since 1971. Some will say: No, no, wait a minute. Didn't Tip O'Neill? Yes, they did. It was primarily led by Senator Bob Dole, but Tip O'Neill got together with Ronald Reagan who was adamantly opposed to Social Security. Mr. Dole convinced him, no, this is the right thing to do.

What they did is they extended the solvency of Social Security to its current position. It is not as long as it should have been, but, nonetheless, it is an action that went in the right direction.

I know the Speaker to be a man of good will and integrity. I hope this is something that we can bring up and work on to get this done on behalf of the American people.

□ 1100

REPUBLICANS STAND WITH WOMEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEUSER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MEUSER. Mr. Speaker, this past week, House Republicans passed the Protection of Women and Girls in Sports Act, which ensures that biological men cannot compete in women's and girls' sports. It makes sense to about 99 percent of America.

The idea that we even need a bill like this is disturbing in itself. Think about it. We are debating whether boys or men should compete against girls or women in athletics, all athletics.

When Title IX was enacted back in 1972, Mr. Speaker, it opened the doors for women and girls to have equal opportunities in sports. When Title IX was enacted back 1972, it opened the doors for women and girls to have equal opportunities in sports. It is worth repeating.

Before Title IX, women's sports were almost nonexistent, but since then, we have seen great progress. Women's sports have flourished, and we have seen amazing accomplishments in basketball, soccer, swimming, and so much more.

Athletes like Caitlin Clark, Angel Reese, Simone Biles, and Lindsey Vonn are now household names, inspiring young girls everywhere.

Yet we have been faced with a narrow but loud group of activists and media who think it is acceptable for a 6-foot-4-inch biological male to compete against an average-sized, yet athletic, woman in sports.

Let's be clear, it is not acceptable. Also, it is not acceptable to force women to share a locker room with a biological man, forcing them to shower and change together.

This is not an overstatement, Mr. Speaker. It is happening, and it is traumatizing to women and girls to have a

man walking around naked in their locker room or spiking a volleyball full force into their face.

This failed ideological social experiment is disrupting the very fabric of what Title IX was designed to protect.

One example, without mentioning names, is a male swimmer, who was ranked 554th among male athletes, but became the top-ranked female swimmer in the women's category in the Nation.

We can go back to Caitlyn Jenner, who as Bruce Jenner competed in the Olympics and won the decathlon. As Caitlyn Jenner, she stated that if she would have transitioned earlier, she would have won every gold medal. Clearly, that is not fair.

This does not respect the hard work, dedication, and sacrifices made by female athletes.

This was a commonsense bill, and there was a right way and a wrong way to vote on it.

In my view, as I stated earlier, 99 percent of Americans agree that men and boys should not be competing in women's and girls' sports, which is why my Republican colleagues and I voted to pass this bill yesterday with only two Democrats voting along with us. That is kind of disturbing in itself.

Our Republican Conference will continue to stand with women throughout this Congress and advocate for the protection of their rights.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 3 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. STRONG) at noon.

PRAYER

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

Lord, our God and our protector, who with a word can calm the storms and hold back the Sun, we pray that You would move Your spirit over the chaos that ravages our country and speak Your word of peace.

Arrest the fire that still burns in Los Angeles and its surrounding communities. Bring relief to those who found themselves in the paths of the hurricane that devastated Tennessee and North Carolina, who feel its destruction all the more keenly in the depth of winter.

Be merciful to those, O Lord, who remain fearful in the surround of danger. Be merciful to those who feel helpless and hopeless before the great power of

fire and wind. Be merciful to those who have lost hearth and home, who seek refuge for their bodies and their souls.

In the shadow of Your wings, may they take shelter until the storms of ruin pass by. Behind the hedge of Your protection, may they find safety from the afflictions bearing down on them from all fronts.

Encourage and equip with fortitude and perseverance all those who remain in the fight against the unrelenting fires and who continue to strive to build defenses against even more harm.

For You, O Lord, are our deliverer. In You will all be restored. In the strength of Your name we 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 gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. ANSARI) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. ANSARI 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.

MILLIN FAMILY FARM RECEIVES CENTURY FARM DESIGNATION

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

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Millin family, located in Bedford County, Pennsylvania. The Millin family owns the Millin Family Farm. It has received the designation of a Century Farm from the Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture.

A Century Farm is a farm that has been owned by the same family for at least 100 consecutive years, has a family member who still lives on that farm, and has at least 10 acres of the original holding.

The Millin family has farmed in Bedford County, Pennsylvania, since 1874, when Sandra Millin's great-grandfather purchased the property. Today, the Millins manage an over-200-acre grain operation on that exact same land. They even have the farm's original log structure dating to pre-1874.

On behalf of everyone in Pennsylvania's 13th Congressional District, I offer heartfelt congratulations to the Millin family and express gratitude for their enduring commitment to one of Pennsylvania's most vital industries: agriculture.

HONORING SUZANNE EVANS SHEPPARD

(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, I rise to honor and celebrate the remarkable life of Dr. Suzanne Evans Sheppard, an exceptional member of our community who touched many lives.

She was a devoted mother, educator, and wife, an inspiring figure who cherished her church, Victory & Dominion World Outreach Center.

To serve as a reminder of her tremendous contributions, her church has renamed its family life center in her honor. On her birthday, family and community members gathered to celebrate. We released balloons into the sky, and Pastor Dr. Zebedee Sheppard, her beloved husband, made the heartfelt announcement. The new name is fitting, reflecting the center's role in serving the community to which she dedicated so much of her life.

I am truly grateful for Dr. Suzanne Sheppard, and the new name of this incredible facility in our community now makes it complete.

CONGRATULATING GREG SEIDENBERGER ON HIS RETIREMENT

(Ms. DE LA CRUZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. DE LA CRUZ. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor Guadalupe County Commissioner Greg Seidenberger on his well-deserved retirement after a lifetime of extraordinary service to both our country and our community.

Greg began his career with 20 years in the United States Air Force, serving as a command pilot during the Vietnam war and leading the squadron operating out of the Seguin Auxiliary Airfield. He then served as a pilot for American Airlines for 18 years.

For the past 12 years, Greg has dedicated himself to Guadalupe County as the commissioner for Precinct 1, transforming the county and ensuring the foundation for a bright future.

I wish Commissioner Greg Seidenberger a joyful retirement. Again, I congratulate him.

ATTACK ON NORTH CAROLINA ELECTIONS

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

Ms. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with grave concern about the effort in North Carolina to overturn the will of the voters of our State.

In November, Justice Allison Riggs won the election to retain her seat on the North Carolina Supreme Court. Her victory was confirmed by two separate recounts, but her opponent refuses to concede. Instead, he is seeking to overturn the results of the election with the help of our Republican majority on the court. He is arguing that 60,000 valid votes should be thrown out.

Four years after January 6, we are once again reminded about how fragile our democracy truly is. A judicial candidate does not accept the results of an election, so he is trying to silence voters in the pursuit of power. This is an attack on North Carolina voters, the integrity of our elections, and our system of justice.

CONGRATULATING NORTH CROWLEY PANTHERS

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the North Crowley Panthers for their decisive 50–21 win over Austin Westlake to become the UIL Class 6A Division 1 State champions.

The Panthers finished the season with an impressive record of 15 wins and no losses, earning their first State championship victory since 2003.

Throughout many early mornings, long hours on the field, and staying focused in school, these young men and women showed dedication, strength, and overwhelming commitment to victory. I am proud that their hard work has paid off.

As some of these bright and talented men and women prepare for their next endeavors, I wish them the best of luck and blessings for an even brighter and more victorious future. Go, Panthers.

In God we trust.

CONGRATULATING PASTOR WARREN STEWART, SR., ON HIS RETIREMENT

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

Ms. ANSARI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the remarkable legacy of Pastor Warren Stewart, Sr., of Phoenix, Arizona.

At First Institutional Baptist Church, Pastor Stewart has been a beacon of hope, faith, and justice in our district for decades. His tireless work has gone beyond his pastoral role. He has always been a leader for social change in our community.

In fact, his efforts were key to securing Arizona's recognition of Martin Luther King Jr. Day long after many other States had added the holiday to their calendars.

As he steps into retirement, we are deeply grateful for his leadership. I thank Pastor Stewart for his decades of service to our community. His legacy is one of love, inclusivity, and hope.

I wish Pastor Stewart the very best in this next chapter.

UPLIFTING AND EMPOWERING OUR SKILLED WORKFORCE

(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 to recognize the uplifting and empowering of our skilled workforce.

Across the country, skills gaps are plaguing employers and barring workers from filling millions of open job opportunities. That is why today I was proud to introduce the bipartisan Skills Investment Act.

This commonsense legislation allows workers at any point in their career to contribute to Coverdell lifelong learning accounts, which are tax-advantaged savings opportunities that will allow Americans to pursue new job skills and better career prospects.

Workers of all ages would be eligible to use Coverdell lifelong learning accounts to pay for skills training, apprenticeships, and other workforce-focused programs.

As a senior member of the Education and Workforce Committee and co-chair of the bipartisan Career and Technical Education Caucus, I am proud to sponsor the Skills Investment Act to provide additional resources for workers to climb to the next rung on the ladder of opportunity. I thank my colleagues, Congresswoman BONAMICI, Congressman FITZPATRICK, and Congressman SCHNEIDER, for joining me in this effort.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in uplifting our workforce through this bipartisan legislation.

U.S.-MOROCCO PARTNERSHIP IS ESSENTIAL

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the rule of gun axis of invasion continues murderous conduct. Sadly, war criminal Putin, the Iranian regime, and the Cuban Communist dictatorship are working to destabilize West Africa with the terrorist Polisario Front, a murderous threat to the Kingdom of Morocco, an American partner for 250 years.

Records of the deposed Assad Syrian dictatorship confirm Polisario sent militias for training. Last week, the Polisario invited PKK terrorists to a summit, threatening our valued NATO ally Türkiye. President Donald Trump stood with Morocco, recognizing West-

ern Sahara as Moroccan. I appreciate chairing the Morocco Friendship Caucus.

In conclusion, God bless our troops as the global war on terrorism continues. Open borders for dictators put all Americans at risk of more 9/11 attacks imminent, as warned by the FBI. Trump will reinstitute existing laws to protect American families with peace through strength.

Best wishes to Pete Hegseth. I was grateful to attend the hearing where he qualified for Secretary of Defense, ably conducted by Chairman ROGER WICKER.

CELEBRATING NORTHEAST COMMUNITY COLLEGE

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

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate one of northeast Nebraska's most important institutions, Northeast Community College.

This year, the NJCAA Men's Soccer National Champions hail from Nebraska's First Congressional District, our very own Northeast Hawks.

Throughout the national tournament, Northeast consistently defied the odds. They fought through several close matches, claiming victories against teams that had bested them in previous seasons. They even beat the odds in the championship game. While ranked fifth, our Hawks triumphed with a 2–1 victory over the second-ranked team to secure their historic title.

From Head Coach Adam Potter to every single player, the Hawks have displayed remarkable team spirit on their journey to this historic success. Their work is a testament to the character and values of our national champions, as well as the entire Northeast student community.

On behalf of Nebraska's First Congressional District, congratulations to the Northeast Community College men's soccer team on becoming the first in school history to win an NJCAA national title.

□ 1215

HONORING CONSTITUENTS OF TEXAS' 26TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

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

Mr. GILL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is the honor of my life to serve the people of Texas' 26th Congressional District. My district encompasses parts of Denton, Cooke, Wise, and Tarrant Counties, all the way north to the Oklahoma border.

Our district offers a tapestry of landscapes that reflect the best of Texas, but what truly makes our district special is its people. From the ranchers

who raise horses, beef cattle, sheep, and goats to the entrepreneurs driving new innovation, the healthcare workers caring for our loved ones, and the educators shaping the minds of tomorrow, we are guided by our patriotic love of country.

Our district has a legacy of strong leadership, and I thank and congratulate Dr. Burgess for his service to our district.

Today, I honor the kind and hard-working men and women from Texas' great 26th Congressional District who entrusted me to serve on their behalf. I am honored to call it my home, and I am honored to be their Representative in Washington.

RECOGNIZING SOUTHEASTERN LOUISIANA UNIVERSITY'S CENTENNIAL

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

Ms. LETLOW. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to recognize Southeastern Louisiana University in Hammond, Louisiana, for 100 years of educating students in our State.

My background is in higher education, and I know a good school when I see one. I can confidently say that Southeastern is hitting the mark.

With more than 150 academic programs and over \$1 billion in annual economic impact, Southeastern is truly changing lives. This year, the school saw its highest ever graduation rate and freshman retention rate.

Hitting the century mark is no small achievement, and Southeastern's momentum is only increasing. With their recent record-breaking enrollment increase, Southeastern will continue to shape our Nation's leaders for years to come.

A quality education sets students up for a lifetime of success. By that measure, Southeastern has had a tremendous impact. I thank the wonderful faculty and staff who have made 100 years possible. Under President William Wainwright's leadership, Southeastern is moving in the right direction. I look forward to seeing the great work they do in the school's second century and beyond.

WOMEN'S SPORTS FOR WOMEN ONLY

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

Mr. FULCHER. Mr. Speaker, biological men should not be competing in women's athletics. This is a common-sense sentiment that most Americans agree with, especially back in my home State of Idaho.

However, under the Biden administration, the integrity of women's and girls' sports has come under threat. In fact, just this last year, President

Biden rolled out a regulation attempting to usurp States' ability to protect women and girls and make sure they have a safe and fair playing field in sports.

That is why, this week, my House colleagues and I passed the Protection of Women and Girls in Sports Act of 2025. This bill strengthens Title IX protections to ensure the definition of an individual's gender in an athletic competition is based solely on their genetics at birth.

Mr. Speaker, women's and girls' sports are for women and girls only. I proudly voted "yes" on this legislation and encourage my Senate colleagues to do the same.

REMEMBERING SONNY SMART

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mourn the loss of Sonny Smart, who unfortunately passed away this month at the age of 76.

Mr. Smart graduated from Samford in 1970, where he played the position of center on the football team. He joined Holtville High School as an assistant coach shortly after his graduation. Soon, Mr. Smart began his 23-year head coaching career.

At the beginning of his career as a head coach, Mr. Smart was a high school football coach at Bainbridge High School in south Georgia from 1988 to 1994. He then moved on to become the head coach at Rabun County High School of north Georgia in 1995 where he remained until his retirement.

The father of Georgia football Coach Kirby Smart, Sonny Smart was a valued member of the Georgia community. During his time at Bainbridge, he even had the opportunity to coach his son Kirby.

Mr. Smart is survived by his wife, Sharon, and his three children, Karl, Kirby, and Kendall. He will always be remembered as an incredible father, husband, coach, and friend.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1300

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WEBER of Texas) at 1 p.m.

UNITED STATES-TAIWAN EXPEDITED DOUBLE-TAX RELIEF ACT

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 5, I call

up the bill (H.R. 33) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide special rules for the taxation of certain residents of Taiwan with income from sources within the United States, 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 5, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 33

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

TITLE I—UNITED STATES-TAIWAN EXPEDITED DOUBLE-TAX RELIEF ACT

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "United States-Taiwan Expedited Double-Tax Relief Act".

SEC. 102. SPECIAL RULES FOR TAXATION OF CERTAIN RESIDENTS OF TAIWAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart D of part II of subchapter N of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after section 894 the following new section:

"SEC. 894A. SPECIAL RULES FOR QUALIFIED RESIDENTS OF TAIWAN.

"(a) CERTAIN INCOME FROM UNITED STATES SOURCES.—

"(1) INTEREST, DIVIDENDS, AND ROYALTIES, ETC.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of interest (other than original issue discount), dividends, royalties, amounts described in section 871(a)(1)(C), and gains described in section 871(a)(1)(D) received by or paid to a qualified resident of Taiwan—

"(i) sections 871(a), 881(a), 1441(a), 1441(c)(5), and 1442(a) shall each be applied by substituting 'the applicable percentage (as defined in section 894A(a)(1)(C))' for '30 percent' each place it appears, and

"(ii) sections 871(a), 881(a), and 1441(c)(1) shall each be applied by substituting 'a United States permanent establishment of a qualified resident of Taiwan' for 'a trade or business within the United States' each place it appears.

"(B) EXCEPTIONS.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to—

"(I) any dividend received from or paid by a real estate investment trust which is not a qualified REIT dividend,

"(II) any amount subject to section 897,

"(III) any amount received from or paid by an expatriated entity (as defined in section 7874(a)(2)) to a foreign related person (as defined in section 7874(d)(3)), and

"(IV) any amount which is included in income under section 860C to the extent that such amount does not exceed an excess inclusion with respect to a REMIC.

"(ii) QUALIFIED REIT DIVIDEND.—For purposes of clause (i)(I), the term 'qualified REIT dividend' means any dividend received from or paid by a real estate investment trust if such dividend is paid with respect to a class of shares that is publicly traded and the recipient of the dividend is a person who holds an interest in any class of shares of the real estate investment trust of not more than 5 percent.

"(C) APPLICABLE PERCENTAGE.—For purposes of applying subparagraph (A)(i)—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), the term 'applicable percentage' means 10 percent.

"(ii) SPECIAL RULES FOR DIVIDENDS.—In the case of any dividend in respect of stock received by or paid to a qualified resident of Taiwan, the applicable percentage shall be 15

percent (10 percent in the case of a dividend which meets the requirements of subparagraph (D) and is received by or paid to an entity taxed as a corporation in Taiwan).

“(D) REQUIREMENTS FOR LOWER DIVIDEND RATE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The requirements of this subparagraph are met with respect to any dividend in respect of stock in a corporation if, at all times during the 12-month period ending on the date such stock becomes ex-dividend with respect to such dividend—

“(I) the dividend is derived by a qualified resident of Taiwan, and

“(II) such qualified resident of Taiwan has held directly at least 10 percent (by vote and value) of the total outstanding shares of stock in such corporation.

For purposes of subclause (II), a person shall be treated as directly holding a share of stock during any period described in the preceding sentence if the share was held by a corporation from which such person later acquired that share and such corporation was, at the time the share was acquired, both a connected person to such person and a qualified resident of Taiwan.

“(ii) EXCEPTION FOR RICS AND REITS.—Notwithstanding clause (i), the requirements of this subparagraph shall not be treated as met with respect to any dividend paid by a regulated investment company or a real estate investment trust.

“(2) QUALIFIED WAGES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—No tax shall be imposed under this chapter (and no amount shall be withheld under section 1441(a) or chapter 24) with respect to qualified wages paid to a qualified resident of Taiwan who—

“(i) is not a resident of the United States (determined without regard to subsection (c)(3)(E)), or

“(ii) is employed as a member of the regular component of a ship or aircraft operated in international traffic.

“(B) QUALIFIED WAGES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘qualified wages’ means wages, salaries, or similar remunerations with respect to employment involving the performance of personal services within the United States which—

“(I) are paid by (or on behalf of) any employer other than a United States person, and

“(II) are not borne by a United States permanent establishment of any person other than a United States person.

“(ii) EXCEPTIONS.—Such term shall not include directors’ fees, income derived as an entertainer or athlete, income derived as a student or trainee, pensions, amounts paid with respect to employment with the United States, any State (or political subdivision thereof), or any possession of the United States (or any political subdivision thereof), or other amounts specified in regulations or guidance under subsection (f)(1)(F).

“(3) INCOME DERIVED FROM ENTERTAINMENT OR ATHLETIC ACTIVITIES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—No tax shall be imposed under this chapter (and no amount shall be withheld under section 1441(a) or chapter 24) with respect to income derived by an entertainer or athlete who is a qualified resident of Taiwan from personal activities as such performed in the United States if the aggregate amount of gross receipts from such activities for the taxable year do not exceed \$30,000.

“(B) EXCEPTION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply with respect to—

“(i) income which is qualified wages (as defined in paragraph (2)(B), determined without regard to clause (ii) thereof), or

“(ii) income which is effectively connected with a United States permanent establishment.

“(b) INCOME CONNECTED WITH A UNITED STATES PERMANENT ESTABLISHMENT OF A QUALIFIED RESIDENT OF TAIWAN.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In lieu of applying sections 871(b) and 882, a qualified resident of Taiwan that carries on a trade or business within the United States through a United States permanent establishment shall be taxable as provided in section 1, 11, 55, or 59A, on its taxable income which is effectively connected with such permanent establishment.

“(B) DETERMINATION OF TAXABLE INCOME.—In determining taxable income for purposes of paragraph (1), gross income includes only gross income which is effectively connected with the permanent establishment.

“(2) TREATMENT OF DISPOSITIONS OF UNITED STATES REAL PROPERTY.—In the case of a qualified resident of Taiwan, section 897(a) shall be applied—

“(A) by substituting ‘carried on a trade or business within the United States through a United States permanent establishment’ for ‘were engaged in a trade or business within the United States’, and

“(B) by substituting ‘such United States permanent establishment’ for ‘such trade or business’.

“(3) TREATMENT OF BRANCH PROFITS TAXES.—In the case of any corporation which is a qualified resident of Taiwan, section 884 shall be applied—

“(A) by substituting ‘10 percent’ for ‘30 percent’ in subsection (a) thereof, and

“(B) by substituting ‘a United States permanent establishment of a qualified resident of Taiwan’ for ‘the conduct of a trade or business within the United States’ in subsection (d)(1) thereof.

“(4) SPECIAL RULE WITH RESPECT TO INCOME DERIVED FROM CERTAIN ENTERTAINMENT OR ATHLETIC ACTIVITIES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to the extent that the income is derived—

“(i) in respect of entertainment or athletic activities performed in the United States, and

“(ii) by a qualified resident of Taiwan who is not the entertainer or athlete performing such activities.

“(B) EXCEPTION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply if the person described in subparagraph (A)(ii) is contractually authorized to designate the individual who is to perform such activities.

“(5) SPECIAL RULE WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN AMOUNTS.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any income which is wages, salaries, or similar remuneration with respect to employment or with respect to any amount which is described in subsection (a)(2)(B)(ii).

“(c) QUALIFIED RESIDENT OF TAIWAN.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘qualified resident of Taiwan’ means any person who—

“(A) is liable to tax under the laws of Taiwan by reason of such person’s domicile, residence, place of management, place of incorporation, or any similar criterion,

“(B) is not a United States person (determined without regard to paragraph (3)(E)), and

“(C) in the case of an entity taxed as a corporation in Taiwan, meets the requirements of paragraph (2).

“(2) LIMITATION ON BENEFITS FOR CORPORATE ENTITIES OF TAIWAN.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraphs (E) and (F), an entity meets the requirements of this paragraph only if it—

“(i) meets the ownership and income requirements of subparagraph (B),

“(ii) meets the publicly traded requirements of subparagraph (C), or

“(iii) meets the qualified subsidiary requirements of subparagraph (D).

“(B) OWNERSHIP AND INCOME REQUIREMENTS.—The requirements of this subparagraph are met for an entity if—

“(i) at least 50 percent (by vote and value) of the total outstanding shares of stock in such entity are owned directly or indirectly by qualified residents of Taiwan, and

“(ii) less than 50 percent of such entity’s gross income (and in the case of an entity that is a member of a tested group, less than 50 percent of the tested group’s gross income) is paid or accrued, directly or indirectly, in the form of payments that are deductible for purposes of the income taxes imposed by Taiwan, to persons who are not—

“(I) qualified residents of Taiwan, or

“(II) United States persons who meet such requirements with respect to the United States as determined by the Secretary to be equivalent to the requirements of this subsection (determined without regard to paragraph (1)(B)) with respect to residents of Taiwan.

“(C) PUBLICLY TRADED REQUIREMENTS.—An entity meets the requirements of this subparagraph if—

“(i) the principal class of its shares (and any disproportionate class of shares) of such entity are primarily and regularly traded on an established securities market in Taiwan, or

“(ii) the primary place of management and control of the entity is in Taiwan and all classes of its outstanding shares described in clause (i) are regularly traded on an established securities market in Taiwan.

“(D) QUALIFIED SUBSIDIARY REQUIREMENTS.—An entity meets the requirement of this subparagraph if—

“(i) at least 50 percent (by vote and value) of the total outstanding shares of the stock of such entity are owned directly or indirectly by 5 or fewer entities—

“(I) which meet the requirements of subparagraph (C), or

“(II) which are United States persons the principal class of the shares (and any disproportionate class of shares) of which are primarily and regularly traded on an established securities market in the United States, and

“(ii) the entity meets the requirements of clause (ii) of subparagraph (B).

“(E) ONLY INDIRECT OWNERSHIP THROUGH QUALIFYING INTERMEDIARIES COUNTED.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Stock in an entity owned by a person indirectly through 1 or more other persons shall not be treated as owned by such person in determining whether the person meets the requirements of subparagraph (B)(i) or (D)(i) unless all such other persons are qualifying intermediate owners.

“(ii) QUALIFYING INTERMEDIATE OWNERS.—The term ‘qualifying intermediate owner’ means a person that is—

“(I) a qualified resident of Taiwan, or

“(II) a resident of any other foreign country (other than a foreign country that is a foreign country of concern) that has in effect a comprehensive convention with the United States for the avoidance of double taxation.

“(iii) SPECIAL RULE FOR QUALIFIED SUBSIDIARIES.—For purposes of applying subparagraph (D)(i), the term ‘qualifying intermediate owner’ shall include any person who is a United States person who meets such requirements with respect to the United States as determined by the Secretary to be equivalent to the requirements of this subsection (determined without regard to paragraph (1)(B)) with respect to residents of Taiwan.

“(F) CERTAIN PAYMENTS NOT INCLUDED.—In determining whether the requirements of subparagraph (B)(ii) or (D)(ii) are met with respect to an entity, the following payments shall not be taken into account:

“(i) Arm’s-length payments by the entity in the ordinary course of business for services or tangible property.

“(ii) In the case of a tested group, intra-group transactions.

“(3) DUAL RESIDENTS.—

“(A) RULES FOR DETERMINATION OF STATUS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—An individual who is an applicable dual resident and who is described in subparagraph (B), (C), or (D) shall be treated as a qualified resident of Taiwan.

“(ii) APPLICABLE DUAL RESIDENT.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘applicable dual resident’ means an individual who—

“(I) is not a United States citizen,

“(II) is a resident of the United States (determined without regard to subparagraph (E)), and

“(III) would be a qualified resident of Taiwan but for paragraph (1)(B).

“(B) PERMANENT HOME.—An individual is described in this subparagraph if such individual—

“(i) has a permanent home available to such individual in Taiwan, and

“(ii) does not have a permanent home available to such individual in the United States.

“(C) CENTER OF VITAL INTERESTS.—An individual is described in this subparagraph if—

“(i) such individual has a permanent home available to such individual in both Taiwan and the United States, and

“(ii) such individual’s personal and economic relations (center of vital interests) are closer to Taiwan than to the United States.

“(D) HABITUAL ABODE.—An individual is described in this subparagraph if—

“(i) such individual—

“(I) does not have a permanent home available to such individual in either Taiwan or the United States, or

“(II) has a permanent home available to such individual in both Taiwan and the United States but such individual’s center of vital interests under subparagraph (C)(ii) cannot be determined, and

“(ii) such individual has a habitual abode in Taiwan and not the United States.

“(E) UNITED STATES TAX TREATMENT OF QUALIFIED RESIDENT OF TAIWAN.—Notwithstanding section 7701, an individual who is treated as a qualified resident of Taiwan by reason of this paragraph for all or any portion of a taxable year shall not be treated as a resident of the United States for purposes of computing such individual’s United States income tax liability for such taxable year or portion thereof.

“(4) RULES OF SPECIAL APPLICATION.—

“(A) DIVIDENDS.—For purposes of applying this section to any dividend, paragraph (2)(D) shall be applied without regard to clause (ii) thereof.

“(B) ITEMS OF INCOME EMANATING FROM AN ACTIVE TRADE OR BUSINESS IN TAIWAN.—For purposes of this section—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the preceding paragraphs of this subsection, if an entity taxed as a corporation in Taiwan is not a qualified resident of Taiwan but meets the requirements of subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1), any qualified item of income such entity derived from the United States shall be treated as income of a qualified resident of Taiwan.

“(ii) QUALIFIED ITEMS OF INCOME.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘qualified item of income’ means any item of income which emanates from, or is incidental to, the conduct of an active trade or business in Taiwan (other than operating as a holding company, providing overall supervision or administration of a group of companies, providing group financing, or making or managing investments (unless such making or managing

investments is carried on by a bank, insurance company, or registered securities dealer in the ordinary course of its business as such)).

“(II) SUBSTANTIAL ACTIVITY REQUIREMENT.—An item of income which is derived from a trade or business conducted in the United States or from a connected person shall be a qualified item of income only if the trade or business activity conducted in Taiwan to which the item is related is substantial in relation to the same or a complementary trade or business activity carried on in the United States. For purposes of applying this subclause, activities conducted by persons that are connected to the entity described in clause (i) shall be deemed to be conducted by such entity.

“(iii) EXCEPTION.—This subparagraph shall not apply to any item of income derived by an entity if at least 50 percent (by vote or value) of such entity is owned (directly or indirectly) or controlled by residents of a foreign country of concern.

“(d) OTHER DEFINITIONS AND SPECIAL RULES.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) UNITED STATES PERMANENT ESTABLISHMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘United States permanent establishment’ means, with respect to a qualified resident of Taiwan, a permanent establishment of such resident which is within the United States.

“(B) SPECIAL RULE.—The determination of whether there is a permanent establishment of a qualified resident of Taiwan within the United States shall be made without regard to whether an entity which is taxed as a corporation in Taiwan and which is a qualified resident of Taiwan controls or is controlled by—

“(i) a domestic corporation, or

“(ii) any other person that carries on business in the United States (whether through a permanent establishment or otherwise).

“(2) PERMANENT ESTABLISHMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘permanent establishment’ means a fixed place of business through which a trade or business is wholly or partly carried on. Such term shall include—

“(i) a place of management,

“(ii) a branch,

“(iii) an office,

“(iv) a factory,

“(v) a workshop, and

“(vi) a mine, an oil or gas well, a quarry, or any other place of extraction of natural resources.

“(B) SPECIAL RULES FOR CERTAIN TEMPORARY PROJECTS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—A building site or construction or installation project, or an installation or drilling rig or ship used for the exploration or exploitation of the sea bed and its subsoil and their natural resources, constitutes a permanent establishment only if it lasts, or the activities of the rig or ship lasts, for more than 12 months.

“(ii) DETERMINATION OF 12-MONTH PERIOD.—For purposes of clause (i), the period over which a building site or construction or installation project of a person lasts shall include any period of more than 30 days during which such person does not carry on activities at such building site or construction or installation project but connected activities are carried on at such building site or construction or installation project by one or more connected persons.

“(C) HABITUAL EXERCISE OF CONTRACT AUTHORITY TREATED AS PERMANENT ESTABLISHMENT.—Notwithstanding subparagraphs (A) and (B), where a person (other than an agent of an independent status to whom subparagraph (D)(ii) applies) is acting on behalf of a trade or business of a qualified resident of Taiwan and has and habitually exercises an

authority to conclude contracts that are binding on the trade or business, that trade or business shall be deemed to have a permanent establishment in the country in which such authority is exercised in respect of any activities that the person undertakes for the trade or business, unless the activities of such person are limited to those described in subparagraph (D)(i) that, if exercised through a fixed place of business, would not make this fixed place of business a permanent establishment under the provisions of that subparagraph.

“(D) EXCLUSIONS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subparagraphs (A) and (B), the term ‘permanent establishment’ shall not include—

“(I) the use of facilities solely for the purpose of storage, display, or delivery of goods or merchandise belonging to the trade or business,

“(II) the maintenance of a stock of goods or merchandise belonging to the trade or business solely for the purpose of storage, display, or delivery,

“(III) the maintenance of a stock of goods or merchandise belonging to the trade or business solely for the purpose of processing by another trade or business,

“(IV) the maintenance of a fixed place of business solely for the purpose of purchasing goods or merchandise, or of collecting information, for the trade or business,

“(V) the maintenance of a fixed place of business solely for the purpose of carrying on, for the trade or business, any other activity of a preparatory or auxiliary character, or

“(VI) the maintenance of a fixed place of business solely for any combination of the activities mentioned in subclauses (I) through (V), provided that the overall activity of the fixed place of business resulting from this combination is of a preparatory or auxiliary character.

“(ii) BROKERS AND OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENTS.—A trade or business shall not be considered to have a permanent establishment in a country merely because it carries on business in such country through a broker, general commission agent, or any other agent of an independent status, provided that such persons are acting in the ordinary course of their business as independent agents.

“(3) TESTED GROUP.—The term ‘tested group’ includes, with respect to any entity taxed as a corporation in Taiwan, such entity and any other entity taxed as a corporation in Taiwan that—

“(A) participates as a member with such entity in a tax consolidation, fiscal unity, or similar regime that requires members of the group to share profits or losses, or

“(B) shares losses with such entity pursuant to a group relief or other loss sharing regime.

“(4) CONNECTED PERSON.—Two persons shall be ‘connected persons’ if one owns, directly or indirectly, at least 50 percent of the interests in the other (or, in the case of a corporation, at least 50 percent of the aggregate vote and value of the corporation’s shares) or another person owns, directly or indirectly, at least 50 percent of the interests (or, in the case of a corporation, at least 50 percent of the aggregate vote and value of the corporation’s shares) in each person. In any case, a person shall be connected to another if, based on all the relevant facts and circumstances, one has control of the other or both are under the control of the same person or persons.

“(5) FOREIGN COUNTRY OF CONCERN.—The term ‘foreign country of concern’ has the meaning given such term under paragraph (7) of section 9901 of the William M. (Mac) Thornberry National Defense Authorization

Act for Fiscal Year 2021 (15 U.S.C. 4651(7)), as added by section 103(a)(4) of the CHIPS Act of 2022).

“(6) PARTNERSHIPS; BENEFICIARIES OF ESTATES AND TRUSTS.—For purposes of this section—

“(A) a qualified resident of Taiwan which is a partner of a partnership which carries on a trade or business within the United States through a United States permanent establishment shall be treated as carrying on such trade or business through such permanent establishment, and

“(B) a qualified resident of Taiwan which is a beneficiary of an estate or trust which carries on a trade or business within the United States through a United States permanent establishment shall be treated as carrying on such trade or business through such permanent establishment.

“(7) DENIAL OF BENEFITS FOR CERTAIN PAYMENTS THROUGH HYBRID ENTITIES.—For purposes of this section, rules similar to the rules of section 894(c) shall apply.

“(e) APPLICATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—This section shall not apply to any period unless the Secretary has determined that Taiwan has provided benefits to United States persons for such period that are reciprocal to the benefits provided to qualified residents of Taiwan under this section.

“(2) PROVISION OF RECIPROCITY.—The President or his designee is authorized to exchange letters, enter into an agreement, or take other necessary and appropriate steps relative to Taiwan for the reciprocal provision of the benefits described in this section.

“(f) REGULATIONS OR OTHER GUIDANCE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall issue such regulations or other guidance as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this section, including such regulations or guidance for—

“(A) determining—

“(i) what constitutes a United States permanent establishment of a qualified resident of Taiwan, and

“(ii) income that is effectively connected with such a permanent establishment,

“(B) preventing the abuse of the provisions of this section by persons who are not (or who should not be treated as) qualified residents of Taiwan,

“(C) requirements for record keeping and reporting,

“(D) rules to assist withholding agents or employers in determining whether a foreign person is a qualified resident of Taiwan for purposes of determining whether withholding or reporting is required for a payment (and, if withholding is required, whether it should be applied at a reduced rate),

“(E) the application of subsection (a)(1)(D)(i) to stock held by predecessor owners,

“(F) determining what amounts are to be treated as qualified wages for purposes of subsection (a)(2),

“(G) determining the amounts to which subsection (a)(3) applies,

“(H) defining established securities market for purposes of subsection (c),

“(I) the application of the rules of subsection (c)(4)(B),

“(J) the application of subsection (d)(6) and section 1446,

“(K) determining ownership interests held by residents of a foreign country of concern, and

“(L) determining the starting and ending dates for periods with respect to the application of this section under subsection (e), which may be separate dates for taxes withheld at the source and other taxes.

“(2) REGULATIONS TO BE CONSISTENT WITH MODEL TREATY.—Any regulations or other guidance issued under this section shall, to

the extent practical, be consistent with the provisions of the United States model income tax convention dated February 7, 2016.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT TO WITHHOLDING TAX.—Subchapter A of chapter 3 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 1447. WITHHOLDING FOR QUALIFIED RESIDENTS OF TAIWAN.

“For reduced rates of withholding for certain residents of Taiwan, see section 894A.”.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) The table of sections for subpart D of part II of subchapter N of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 894 the following new item:

“Sec. 894A. Special rules for qualified residents of Taiwan.”.

(2) The table of sections for subchapter A of chapter 3 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“Sec. 1447. Withholding for qualified residents of Taiwan.”.

TITLE II—UNITED STATES-TAIWAN TAX AGREEMENT AUTHORIZATION ACT

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “United States-Taiwan Tax Agreement Authorization Act”.

SEC. 202. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) AGREEMENT.—The term “Agreement” means the tax agreement authorized by section 203(a).

(2) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Finance of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

(3) APPROVAL LEGISLATION.—The term “approval legislation” means legislation that approves the Agreement.

(4) IMPLEMENTING LEGISLATION.—The term “implementing legislation” means legislation that makes any changes to the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 necessary to implement the Agreement.

SEC. 203. AUTHORIZATION TO NEGOTIATE AND ENTER INTO AGREEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsequent to a determination under section 894A(e)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as added by the United States-Taiwan Expedited Double-Tax Relief Act), the President is authorized to negotiate and enter into a tax agreement relative to Taiwan.

(b) ELEMENTS OF AGREEMENT.—

(1) CONFORMITY WITH BILATERAL INCOME TAX CONVENTIONS.—The President shall ensure that—

(A) any provisions included in the Agreement conform with provisions customarily contained in United States bilateral income tax conventions, as exemplified by the 2016 United States Model Income Tax Convention; and

(B) the Agreement does not include elements outside the scope of the 2016 United States Model Income Tax Convention.

(2) INCORPORATION OF TAX AGREEMENTS AND LAWS.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the Agreement may incorporate and restate provisions of any agreement, or existing United States law, addressing double taxation for residents of the United States and Taiwan.

(3) AUTHORITY.—The Agreement shall include the following statement: “The Agreement is entered into pursuant to the United States-Taiwan Tax Agreement Authorization Act.”

(4) ENTRY INTO FORCE.—The Agreement shall include a provision conditioning entry into force upon—

(A) enactment of approval legislation and implementing legislation pursuant to section 207; and

(B) confirmation by the Secretary of the Treasury that the relevant authority in Taiwan has approved and taken appropriate steps required to implement the Agreement.

SEC. 204. CONSULTATIONS WITH CONGRESS.

(a) NOTIFICATION UPON COMMENCEMENT OF NEGOTIATIONS.—The President shall provide written notification to the appropriate congressional committees of the commencement of negotiations between the United States and Taiwan on the Agreement at least 15 calendar days before commencing such negotiations.

(b) CONSULTATIONS DURING NEGOTIATIONS.—

(1) BRIEFINGS.—Not later than 90 days after commencement of negotiations with respect to the Agreement, and every 180 days thereafter until the President enters into the Agreement, the President shall provide a briefing to the appropriate congressional committees on the status of the negotiations, including a description of elements under negotiation.

(2) MEETINGS AND OTHER CONSULTATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In the course of negotiations with respect to the Agreement, the Secretary of the Treasury, in coordination with the Secretary of State, shall—

(i) meet, upon request, with the chairman or ranking member of any of the appropriate congressional committees regarding negotiating objectives and the status of negotiations in progress; and

(ii) consult closely and on a timely basis with, and keep fully apprised of the negotiations, the appropriate congressional committees.

(B) ELEMENTS OF CONSULTATIONS.—The consultations described in subparagraph (A) shall include consultations with respect to—

(i) the nature of the contemplated Agreement;

(ii) how and to what extent the contemplated Agreement is consistent with the elements set forth in section 203(b); and

(iii) the implementation of the contemplated Agreement, including—

(I) the general effect of the contemplated Agreement on existing laws;

(II) proposed changes to any existing laws to implement the contemplated Agreement; and

(III) proposed administrative actions to implement the contemplated Agreement.

SEC. 205. APPROVAL AND IMPLEMENTATION OF AGREEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Agreement may not enter into force unless—

(1) the President, at least 60 days before the day on which the President enters into the Agreement, publishes the text of the contemplated Agreement on a publicly available website of the Department of the Treasury; and

(2) there is enacted into law, with respect to the Agreement, approval legislation and implementing legislation pursuant to section 207.

(b) ENTRY INTO FORCE.—The President may provide for the Agreement to enter into force upon—

(1) enactment of approval legislation and implementing legislation pursuant to section 207; and

(2) confirmation by the Secretary of the Treasury that the relevant authority in Taiwan has approved and taken appropriate steps required to implement the Agreement.

SEC. 206. SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS OF AGREEMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION POLICY.

(a) SUBMISSION OF AGREEMENT.—Not later than 270 days after the President enters into the Agreement, the President or the President's designee shall submit to Congress—

(1) the final text of the Agreement; and
(2) a technical explanation of the Agreement.

(b) SUBMISSION OF IMPLEMENTATION POLICY.—Not later than 270 days after the President enters into the Agreement, the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit to Congress—

(1) a description of those changes to existing laws that the President considers would be required in order to ensure that the United States acts in a manner consistent with the Agreement; and
(2) a statement of anticipated administrative action proposed to implement the Agreement.

SEC. 207. CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL LEGISLATION AND IMPLEMENTING LEGISLATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The approval legislation with respect to the Agreement shall include the following: "Congress approves the Agreement submitted to Congress pursuant to section 206 of the United States-Taiwan Tax Agreement Authorization Act on _____," with the blank space being filled with the appropriate date.

(b) APPROVAL LEGISLATION COMMITTEE REFERRAL.—The approval legislation shall—

(1) in the Senate, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; and
(2) in the House of Representatives, be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

(c) IMPLEMENTING LEGISLATION COMMITTEE REFERRAL.—The implementing legislation shall—

(1) in the Senate, be referred to the Committee on Finance; and
(2) in the House of Representatives, be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SEC. 208. RELATIONSHIP OF AGREEMENT TO INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986.

(a) INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986 TO CONTROL.—No provision of the Agreement or approval legislation, nor the application of any such provision to any person or circumstance, which is inconsistent with any provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, shall have effect.

(b) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this title shall be construed—

(1) to amend or modify any law of the United States; or
(2) to limit any authority conferred under any law of the United States,

unless specifically provided for in this title.

SEC. 209. AUTHORIZATION OF SUBSEQUENT TAX AGREEMENTS RELATIVE TO TAIWAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsequent to the enactment of approval legislation and implementing legislation pursuant to section 207—

(1) the term "tax agreement" in section 203(a) shall be treated as including any tax agreement relative to Taiwan which supplements or supersedes the Agreement to which such approval legislation and implementing legislation relates; and
(2) the term "Agreement" shall be treated as including such tax agreement.

(b) REQUIREMENTS, ETC., TO APPLY SEPARATELY.—The provisions of this title (including section 204) shall be applied separately with respect to each tax agreement referred to in subsection (a).

SEC. 210. UNITED STATES TREATMENT OF DOUBLE TAXATION MATTERS WITH RESPECT TO TAIWAN.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The United States addresses issues with respect to double taxation with foreign coun-

tries by entering into bilateral income tax conventions (known as tax treaties) with such countries, subject to the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification pursuant to article II of the Constitution.

(2) The United States has entered into more than sixty such tax treaties, which facilitate economic activity, strengthen bilateral cooperation, and benefit United States workers, businesses, and other United States taxpayers.

(3) Due to Taiwan's unique status, the United States is unable to enter into an article II tax treaty with Taiwan, necessitating an agreement to address issues with respect to double taxation.

(b) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States to—

(1) provide for additional bilateral tax relief with respect to Taiwan, beyond that provided for in section 894A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as added by the United States-Taiwan Expedited Double-Tax Relief Act), only after entry into force of an Agreement, as provided for in section 205, and only in a manner consistent with such Agreement; and
(2) continue to provide for bilateral tax relief with sovereign states to address double taxation and other related matters through entering into bilateral income tax conventions, subject to the Senate's advice and consent to ratification pursuant to article II of the Constitution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the majority leader and the minority leader, or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and submit extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the United States-Taiwan Expedited Double-Tax Relief Act, bipartisan legislation that will unleash more American manufacturing investment and jobs and help combat China's harmful influence.

For too long, America has been too dependent on China. It comes at a high price, as communities across this country lose jobs and live with little hope for the future. It also puts America's national security at risk.

This bill before us establishes fair tax treatment for both American workers and businesses operating in Taiwan and puts Americans on equal footing with our competitors around the world.

Enacting this legislation will help create jobs right here at home. U.S. exports to Taiwan support 188,000 American jobs, and Taiwanese investment in the United States supports another 21,000. Reducing burdens on Taiwanese

investment in America will help aid in building new cutting-edge manufacturing plants staffed by American workers. It will help support our domestic semiconductor and chip manufacturing capabilities, securing strategic supply chains and helping us further move away from China.

Citizens and companies from countries like Great Britain, Japan, Australia, and New Zealand and the European Union all enjoy better tax treatment than Americans in Taiwan currently do. That is not right. In fact, the United States is Taiwan's largest trading partner without a tax treaty.

Enhancing our relationship with Taiwan will strengthen the U.S. economy and our national security. Instead of leaving critical supply chains in the hands of the Chinese Communist Party, we need to be making more goods in America, or in partnership with allies like Taiwan that share our interests, to reduce our dependence on China.

This legislation has strong bipartisan support. Last Congress, we took action in authorizing and establishing the first steps in a free trade agreement between the U.S. and Taiwan. As we continue to grow our economic relationship together, a tax treaty represents the logical next move. Advancing this legislation to President Trump's desk is the right thing to do for American workers and our economy as a whole.

I thank Ranking Member NEAL for helping lead this effort and introducing this legislation with me. Today, we are showing the world that American leaders are united in standing up for our workers and businesses.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill to help critical American manufacturing sectors and to protect our national and economic security, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 33, the United States-Taiwan Expedited Double-Tax Relief Act. I thank Ranking Member NEAL and Chairman SMITH for working on this significant legislation, which was reported out of the Ways and Means Committee unanimously last Congress.

I also thank Representative SUZAN DELBENE as well as Representatives ADRIAN SMITH and NICOLE MALLIOTAKIS for their partnership. Together, we introduced a resolution last Congress calling to advance legislation to address that barrier, the issue of double taxation on income earned in the United States and Taiwan.

Today, Americans who do business in Taiwan, and those from Taiwan who do business from America, must pay income tax in both places on the same earnings. That hurts businesses of all sizes, as well as individuals who spend time in each market.

For example, without a double-tax treaty, workers from the United States who are sent to Taiwan to train for

their jobs in a domestic chip facility can be taxed twice on the income they earn on that trip.

The U.S. has eliminated this problem through bilateral income tax treaties with more than 60 countries, but not with Taiwan. That is because of its unique political status which prevents us from negotiating a traditional tax treaty. As a result, among our top 10 trading partners, only Taiwan lacks a double-tax agreement.

We should forge an agreement both because Taiwan is a leading democracy in Asia and because their investment in the United States supports at least 188,000 American jobs, including many in my southern California district, which is home to one of the largest communities of people from Taiwan in the U.S.

In 2023, I met with some of them here in Washington, D.C., to discuss the barrier posed by this double taxation. They told me stories of facing huge tax bills after doing business in both markets and having to curtail their cross-border investment as a result.

The American Institute in Taiwan conducted a survey of Taiwanese companies with a presence here in the United States, and 79 percent of them reported that double taxation of income is a considerable factor that prevents them from investing more in the U.S.

There is a solution, which is the legislation before us today. Specifically, this bill reduces the withholding of taxes and lays the groundwork for the Treasury Department to finalize the details of a permanent arrangement, based on the model income tax treaty that we have with scores of other countries, to mitigate double taxation, prevent abuse, allow for dispute resolution, and exchange key tax information that will help revenue authorities in both jurisdictions.

This bill would ensure that our Nation can take full advantage of the historic investments that we have made under the Biden-Harris administration, like the bipartisan CHIPS and Science Act. Because of that law, new chip fabs are under construction in places like Ohio and operational and producing chips in Arizona, but these factories are enormously complicated and expensive. Even with the billions of dollars in investments from the Department of Commerce, the math simply might not pencil out for a project if the company will be subject to double taxation as soon as they turn a profit.

From major chip companies to small businesses in southern California and across the country, it is clear that mitigating double taxation between the U.S. and Taiwan is crucial. It will only become more important as Congress continues to work in a bipartisan manner to strengthen our economic relations with Taiwan.

Last Congress, we approved the first phase of the U.S.-Taiwan Initiative on 21st Century Trade negotiated by USTR and TECRO, and I have ex-

pressed my support for going even further and negotiating a comprehensive bilateral trade agreement with Taiwan.

To unlock the benefits made possible by our strengthening partnership, we must ensure that businesses are not at a competitive disadvantage.

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

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), who is the chairman of the Tax Subcommittee.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 33, the United States-Taiwan Expedited Double-Tax Relief Act.

This bill would be the first step in establishing an informal tax treaty with our ally Taiwan. Currently, Taiwan is our largest trading partner without a tax treaty. Through fair and reciprocal tax treatment, H.R. 33 would deepen our economic relationship with Taiwan, specifically our semiconductor and chip manufacturing industries, and secure strategic supply chains.

America should not have to rely on foreign adversaries like China for our supply chains when we can partner with better allies like Taiwan. If we have learned anything from the pandemic, it is that we cannot rely on people who do not feel the same as we do to supply us with needed products.

As conflicts continue to rise across the globe, we must build our relationships with strong democracies like Taiwan. In recent years, we have watched China strengthen trade ties with nations across the globe, including American adversaries Iran and North Korea. China is also expanding its influence throughout the Western Hemisphere.

The Monroe Doctrine and the Roosevelt Corollary stated very clearly back at the turn of the century what could happen from the 1800s going to the 2000s. When you look at what is happening now, Mr. Speaker, China is now at both ends of our Panama Canal. As you follow that 51 miles of the Panama Canal, China is on both sides of the canal. They are saying that, no, we don't understand and that this is just for trade. Mr. Speaker, this can quickly be converted into something else.

As President Trump and I recently noted, the Panama Canal is a vital trade global route that includes 40 percent of all U.S. container shipping. At some point, America must wake up to what is happening. We cannot rely on an adversary to supply us with needed goods, and then they make the decision of what they will send us and what they will not send us.

Our ally is Taiwan, and we need to have a stronger tie with them.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman SMITH for sponsoring this critical piece of legislation. All of my colleagues from Ways and Means are here to talk on the same subject, and we will continue this work. I think, as we go into the 21st day of January, we will see this incredible movement toward making America great again.

I thank, again, Chairman SMITH for sponsoring this, my Ways and Means colleagues for their continuous work, and Speaker JOHNSON for bringing this bill to the floor. I look forward to working with the Senate and President-elect Trump to get the bill signed into law.

□ 1315

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 33, the United States-Taiwan Expedited Double-Tax Relief Act. This bill represents a bilateral tax agreement that prevents doubling taxation on U.S. and Taiwanese businesses and workers.

This bill helps promote Taiwanese investment in the United States and job creation. The bill provides benefits to Taiwanese residents similar to those provided in the 2016 U.S. model tax treaty.

Importantly, these new provisions do not take effect until Taiwan offers American residents the same benefits. The bill, H.R. 33, would strengthen trade relations, increase manufacturing production, boost innovation, create economic growth for the U.S. and Taiwan, and allow our country to compete more effectively with China by increasing trade and business commerce in both goods and services.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues to vote "yes" for H.R. 33. It is good for Americans, as well as Taiwanese, and good for both countries.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD), the chair of the Work and Welfare Subcommittee.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his leadership on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the United States-Taiwan Expedited Double-Tax Relief Act.

In today's global economy, it is customary for the United States to enter into tax treaties with like-minded allies to lessen potential double-tax burdens and encourage cross-border investment.

The United States currently has tax agreements with over 60 foreign tax jurisdictions. Yet, due to its unique political status, even as our seventh largest trading partner, we do not have a formal tax arrangement in place with Taiwan.

This bipartisan legislation before us today would finally change that. This bill makes necessary changes to our tax code to provide much-needed certainty to businesses and workers between our two countries.

As a member of both the Ways and Means Trade Subcommittee and our Select Committee on the Strategic Competition Between the United States and the Chinese Communist Party, I know how important our relationship with Taiwan is, both in terms of trade and national security.

This bill will open the door for us to continue to develop a strong economic partnership, especially in the technology and semiconductor sectors, and help the United States reduce our reliance on China.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman, Speaker JOHNSON, and all the members of the Ways and Means Committee for bringing this legislation to the floor today.

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA).

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I thank the chairman for bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the United States-Taiwan Expedited Double-Tax Relief Act.

This is a bipartisan bill that would address the issue of double taxation between Taiwan and the United States. That is an issue that has long impaired our mutual investment opportunities, including the ability of the United States to shore up the semiconductor supply chain and fully capitalize on the potential of our partnership with Taiwan.

Mr. Speaker, I don't need to remind my colleagues of the security challenges that we faced during the pandemic, when we dealt with the overwhelming supply chain issues, especially for semiconductor chips.

That shortage led to sky-high prices for everyday items, and it impacted critical industries in healthcare, defense, and the technology sector.

What we quickly realized is that one of the ways that we can prevent such shortages is to partner with trusted producers like Taiwan and increase mutual investment that can lead to supply chain security.

However, that type of investment that is needed for this type of partnership is hard to do when there is double taxation. It simply won't happen when income is taxed in the country where it is earned and then taxed again when it is repatriated back to its home country.

That is just not a recipe for investment, for partnership, for success, and for our security. That is why we need to pass this legislation that allows us to enter into a treaty with Taiwan that limits that type of double taxation.

Mr. Speaker, as was just heard from my colleague from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD), Taiwan is the seventh largest trading partner of the United States, yet it is also the largest trading partner without this type of tax agreement.

During both of my two visits to Taiwan last year, this issue came up with President Lai in that he said to our delegation: This is a way to improve our economies and our security.

He knows and we know that the Taiwanese companies that are investing in semiconductor facilities right here in America and are helping fulfill the objectives of the CHIPS and Science Act need the tax relief and regulation clarity now more than ever.

The bipartisan legislation that we are considering today would address this issue by setting a framework for such a treaty, reducing tax withholding rates, and providing clear guidelines for what is taxed, who is taxed, and when it is taxed.

Putting it simply, Mr. Speaker, it would establish clarity and certainty by ending double taxation, encouraging investment, and strengthening our economic partnership.

Mr. Speaker, despite the policy of strategic ambiguity when it comes to the defense of Taiwan, what is clear is that the United States supports the people of Taiwan and a strong economic partnership with Taiwan with this bipartisan legislation that ultimately bolsters our stability, our prosperity, and the security of both of our great nations.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman SMITH for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 33. Taiwan and the United States have a long and productive relationship. Last fall, I had the opportunity to visit Taipei and learn about the robust investments Taiwan is making right there in semiconductor manufacturing. Taiwanese companies are also making large investments right here in the United States.

Ending double taxation between our two countries will be beneficial to both the American businesses in Taiwan and the Taiwanese businesses investing in the United States. I deeply value our continued partnership with our ally Taiwan, and I know that this bill will go a long way to secure our economic relationship for years to come.

As a member of the Trade Subcommittee, ensuring mutually beneficial relationships with our allies is very important to me. Of course, being a West Virginian, I always welcome our friends from Taiwan to come visit our beautiful State.

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

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 33.

This legislation, supported by the Biden-Harris administration, is an opportunity for the United States to strengthen its economic ties with Taiwan. H.R. 33 creates a new section within the tax code to facilitate mutual investment from the United States into Taiwan and vice versa by reducing double taxation traps for Taiwanese residents with income from sources within the United States.

By removing these traps, H.R. 33 facilitates the creation of a strong domestic semiconductor ecosystem, creates jobs, and incentivizes investments in semiconductor technology and our American economy.

Securing our Nation's position at the forefront of the chip manufacturing

race is possible only if we constantly work to remove the barriers to developing American manufacturing, both in our tax code and regulatory environment.

The United States and Taiwan have long shared a strong economic partnership powered by extensive two-way trade, and we must ensure that this partnership remains robust. It is critical that we work to improve our existing trade agreement with Taiwan and ensure that future trade agreements continue to facilitate the development of domestic American manufacturing.

As elected officials, it is our responsibility to ensure the tax code works for the benefit of all. Supporting H.R. 33 makes certain that our tax code reflects the values of fairness and trust.

As a member of the Intelligence Committee in the 118th Congress, I can tell my colleagues that this increased trade, both in the Pacific and viewed throughout the world, is helpful to America's strength.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. HERN).

Mr. HERN of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, combating the CCP's malign influence across the globe demands strong partnerships and a steady backbone. Our partnership with Taiwan is critical to that goal.

In 2023, I led a delegation to Taiwan, where we met with former President Tsai and current President Lai. We saw firsthand the importance of the economic partnership between our great nations, a partnership meaningful not only in economic terms, but in the true friendship and goodwill we share, as well as our common values. Taiwan is fighting for the very thing that our Founding Fathers did: freedom and opportunity.

Taiwan does not ask for our support without bringing their own strengths to the table. They have increased investment in domestic research and development to improve their own deterrence capabilities and are invested heavily in the semiconductor industry here in the United States of America.

Unfortunately, without a formal tax treaty with Taiwan, double taxation is deterring further Taiwanese investments in the United States. This unique issue requires a unique solution. H.R. 33 will alleviate the double taxation burden and, in turn, bolster the U.S. supply chain.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support H.R. 33 today, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes."

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. AUCHINCLOSS).

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 33, the United States-Taiwan Expedited Double-Tax Relief Act.

This bill codifies the strong partnership between the United States and

Taiwan by granting benefits to Taiwan's residents that invest in the United States without the undue burden of additional taxation.

Taiwan's vibrant democracy and strong economy represent opportunity in the Indo-Pacific. In 2024, the United States was Taiwan's largest destination for its direct foreign investment, totaling more than \$14 billion.

To date, the United States has signed double taxation agreements with over 60 countries, including the People's Republic of China. It does not have one with Taiwan. The scope and severity of the threat from the Chinese Communist Party is crystallized in the Taiwan Strait, which is under constant harassment.

The United States and Taiwan should help support each other's democracies through collaboration on countering disinformation and propaganda. We should go further to strengthen one another's economies through increased flows of trade and investment by negotiating expanded market access, common rules, and the end of this double taxation on Taiwanese investment in the United States. This is especially critical as we look to revive U.S. semiconductor manufacturing.

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

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, as the United States seeks to strengthen our position in the Indo-Pacific, let us commit to Taiwan as a long-term ally.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MORAN), one of our newest members of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the United States-Taiwan Expedited Double-Tax Relief Act.

Taiwanese companies in America, including those in critical semiconductor sectors, face double tax burdens due to the lack of a U.S.-Taiwan tax agreement.

Taiwan is one of our largest trading partners without such a treaty, yet it supports more than 22,000 U.S. jobs and contributed \$185 million to U.S. research in 2021.

This bill addresses these issues by eliminating double taxation, reducing withholding tax rates, and clarifying residency rules. It strengthens our economic alliance with Taiwan, ensuring a reliable supply chain for semiconductors and reducing dependence on China and our adversaries.

In my home State of Texas, Taiwanese tech companies are investing billions in advanced manufacturing, but double taxation threatens their ability to operate effectively. Today's bipartisan bill equips us to expand cross-border investment, safeguard critical supply chains, and push back against China's growing influence.

Without this legislation, we will risk alienating Taiwan, one of our strongest

partners in the Indo-Pacific region. We also risk ceding more power to China in the Taiwan Strait and isolating ourselves further on the global economic stage. That is simply unacceptable.

This bill is critical to reaffirming our commitment to economic growth, national security, and the U.S.-Taiwan partnership.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in Congress to support this vital legislation to do just that.

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

Mr. MIN. Mr. Speaker, I was just elected to represent California's 47th Congressional District in the heart of Orange County, and we have quite a sizeable Chinese-American population.

I have spoken with many constituents who are deeply concerned about the future of Taiwan, particularly in the face of increased aggression and a lot of rhetoric.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that we signal here that we are strengthening the relationship between our two countries.

For the past 75 years, the United States and Taiwan have enjoyed a special relationship, one rooted in our shared values of freedom and democracy.

□ 1330

That has also been bolstered by a strong national security relationship founded on Ronald Reagan's Six Assurances to Taiwan. Of course, we have had a strong economic relationship based on a lot of mutual trade and investment, including around semiconductor chips and other critical goods.

Now, this is the seventh largest trading partner of the United States. It is a large trading partner of my State of California. I think it is important we end this regime of double taxation, continue strengthening our ties, encouraging more economic investments, and ensuring that we are bolstering our national security.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "aye."

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BEAN), one of the newest members to the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BEAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman SMITH for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, standing up to the Chinese Communist Party is a no-brainer, and standing up to Communist China means standing with Taiwan.

Mr. Speaker, Taiwan's security and economic prosperity are important to the United States and the rest of the world. Why? That is because if anything were to happen to Taiwan, the effect on the global economy would be devastating.

Here are the numbers: Taiwan is the United States' 7th largest trading partner, 10th largest export market, and 8th largest source of imports. Taiwan is the biggest trading partner without a deal with the United States.

Today, Taiwan is and will remain one of our most strategic partners and allies in the region. This is not only because of our shared values of democracy, peace, and freedom, but also our economic ties.

As Communist China continues to threaten America's interests, we must do all we can to strengthen our partnership with Taiwan. That is why, Mr. Speaker, we need H.R. 33, the United States-Taiwan Expedited Double-Tax Relief Act.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to stand with me and support my friend from Missouri, Chairman JASON SMITH, and his timely bill to strengthen our economic ties with Taiwan and empower Americans doing business in the country.

The correct answer on H.R. 33 is a "yes" vote.

Mr. Speaker, this bill makes it clear that the United States stands with our economic ally and supports a strong and prosperous Taiwan.

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

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YAKYM), another new member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. YAKYM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the United States-Taiwan Expedited Double-Tax Relief Act.

The EU, U.K., Japan, Australia, and New Zealand are among the countries that have a tax treaty with Taiwan. The U.S. is not one of them. In fact, Taiwan is our largest trading partner and ally that isn't covered by a tax treaty.

This puts American companies and citizens at a competitive disadvantage. The bill before us would level the playing field. It would incentivize Taiwan to provide tax benefits to Americans that are similar to those of a tax treaty. Once Taiwan has done so, the United States would provide those same benefits to Taiwan.

Taiwan is a key partner in derisking our supply chains away from China. Taiwanese investment already supports 21,000 American jobs, and over \$1.5 billion in American exports. Reducing double taxation will strengthen our partnership, increase bilateral investment, and create jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman SMITH and Ranking Member NEAL for their leadership on this issue. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Trade.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the United States-Taiwan Expedited Double-Tax Relief Act.

The bill, as we have been hearing, would align the tax treatment of income earned in the U.S. by Taiwanese

residents and businesses with that of any other foreign national from a country with whom the United States has a tax treaty, preventing the double taxation of Taiwanese residents and businesses engaging in business with Americans.

As we know, Taiwan is an important and strategic ally in the Indo-Pacific region, and a democratic success story, I might add a lowercase democratic success story, but we know that it is the eighth largest trading partner to our country.

U.S. exports to Taiwan support hundreds of thousands of American jobs, and cumulative Taiwanese investment in the U.S. totals more than \$137 billion.

Taiwan also plays a critical role in our technology supply chains as we have been hearing and is certainly a key national security partner.

Despite this, on the list of the 66 countries the U.S. currently has income tax treaties with, including China, Taiwan is conspicuously absent.

Eliminating the undue double taxation of Taiwanese residents and businesses promotes economic efficiency and integration, strengthens our strategic partnership with Taiwan, and reinforces the long-term economic stability American businesses and our trusted allies need to invest for the future and combat the influence of bad actors.

In the face of regular threats to its security and economic stability by a predatory adversary, Taiwan and its people have called on us to live up to our commitment as a strategic partner and friend to freedom-loving nations.

This is a good bill which delivers an overdue solution to an issue which has strong bipartisan support. I appreciate the discussions that we have been having here today. This strengthens ties that we have with a trusted ally, as well.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly encourage all my colleagues to support the bill.

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

In closing, Taiwan is the only one of our top 10 trading partners with whom we do not have an income tax agreement, and we need to solve this problem by taking advantage of our robust and growing economic partnership. That is why the Ways and Means Committee favorably reported this bill in a unanimous bipartisan vote last Congress. I enthusiastically support this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

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

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

Mr. Speaker, to continue to rely on China for critical items like semiconductors and chips is very dangerous. There is no reason America can't make those same items. This bipartisan bill will remove unfair tax barriers for American workers and businesses, strengthen our Nation's

manufacturing base, and grow jobs right here at home.

The United States is Taiwan's largest trading partner without a tax treaty, and that means American workers are at a disadvantage. If the relationship between the United States and Taiwan is to serve as a defense against China, our workers must be on equal footing with one another. I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this critical bill that will shift control over our economy away from China and back toward American workers and businesses.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NUNN of Iowa). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 5, 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 yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. 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.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Ms. Avery M. Stringer, one of his secretaries.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1600

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. VAN DREW) at 4 p.m.

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:

Motions to suspend the rules and pass:

H.R. 164, and

H.R. 144; and

Passage of H.R. 33.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, remaining elec-

tronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROMOTING OPPORTUNITIES TO WIDEN ELECTRICAL RESILIENCE ACT OF 2025

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. 164) to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to authorize Federal agencies to provide certain essential assistance for hazard mitigation for electric utilities, 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 Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 419, nays 2, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 13]

YEAS—419

Adams	Ciscomani	Finstad
Aderholt	Cisneros	Fischbach
Aguilar	Clark (MA)	Fitzgerald
Alford	Clarke (NY)	Fitzpatrick
Allen	Cleaver	Fleischmann
Amo	Cline	Fletcher
Amodei (NV)	Cloud	Flood
Ansari	Clyburn	Fong
Arrington	Clyde	Poster
Auchincloss	Cohen	Foushee
Babin	Cole	Foxx
Bacon	Collins	Frankel, Lois
Baird	Comer	Franklin, Scott
Balderson	Conaway	Friedman
Balint	Connolly	Frost
Barr	Correa	Fry
Barragán	Costa	Fulcher
Barrett	Courtney	Garamendi
Baumgartner	Craig	Garbarino
Bean (FL)	Crane	Garcia (CA)
Beatty	Crank	Garcia (IL)
Begich	Crawford	Garcia (TX)
Bell	Crenshaw	Gill (TX)
Bentz	Crockett	Gillen
Bera	Crow	Jimenez
Bergman	Cuellar	Golden (ME)
Beyer	Davids (KS)	Goldman (NY)
Bice	Davidson	Goldman (TX)
Biggs (AZ)	Davis (IL)	Gomez
Biggs (SC)	Davis (NC)	Gonzales, Tony
Bilirakis	De La Cruz	Gonzalez, V.
Bishop	Dean (PA)	Gooden
Boebert	DeGette	Goodlander
Bonamici	DeLauro	Gosar
Bost	DelBene	Graves
Boyle (PA)	Deluzio	Gray
Bresnahan	DeSaulnier	Green (TN)
Brown	DesJarlais	Green, Al (TX)
Brownley	Dexter	Greene (GA)
Buchanan	Diaz-Balart	Griffith
Budzinski	Dingell	Grothman
Burchett	Doggett	Guest
Burlison	Donalds	Guthrie
Bynum	Downing	Hageman
Calvert	Dunn (FL)	Hamadeh (AZ)
Cammack	Edwards	Harder (CA)
Carbajal	Elfreth	Haridopolos
Carey	Ellzey	Harrigan
Carson	Emmer	Harris (MD)
Carter (GA)	Escobar	Harris (NC)
Carter (LA)	Espaillat	Harshbarger
Carter (TX)	Estes	Hayes
Casar	Evans (CO)	Hern (OK)
Case	Evans (PA)	Higgins (LA)
Casten	Ezell	Hill (AR)
Castor (FL)	Fallon	Himes
Castro (TX)	Fedorchak	Hinson
Cherfilus-	Feenstra	Horsford
McCormick	Fields	Houchin
Chu	Figures	Houlihan

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)
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Letlow
Levin
Liccardo
Lieu
Lofgren
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luna
Luttrell
Lynch
Mace
Mackenzie
Magaziner
Malliotakis
Maloy
Mann
Mannion
Mast
Matsui
McBath
McBride
McCaul
McClain Delaney
McClellan
McClintock
McCollum
McCormick
McDonald Rivet
McDowell
McGarvey

McGovern
McGuire
McIver
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Messmer
Meuser
Mfume
Miller (IL)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Mills
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)
Oberholte
Ocasio-Cortez
Ogles
Olszewski
Omar
Onder
Owens
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Perez
Perry
Peters
Pfluger
Pingree
Pocan
Pou
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Randall
Raskin
Reschenthaler
Riley (NY)
Rivas
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Ross
Rouzer
Roy
Ruiz
Rulli
Rutherford
Ryan
Salazar
Salinas
Sánchez
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schmidt
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Schweikert

Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Self
Sessions
Sewell
Sherrill
Shreve
Simon
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Sorensen
Soto
Spartz
Stansbury
Stanton
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stevens
Strickland
Strong
Stutzman
Subramanyam
Suozi
Swalwell
Sykes
Takano
Taylor
Tenney
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Tran
Turner (TX)
Underwood
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyn
Van Orden
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Velázquez
Vindman
Wagner
Walberg
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westerman
Whitesides
Wied
Williams (GA)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY SALARY TRANSPARENCY 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. 144) to provide that the Federal Reports Elimination and Sunset Act of 1995 does not apply to certain reports required to be submitted by the Tennessee Valley Authority, 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 Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 423, nays 0, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 14]

YEAS—423

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 (AZ)
Biggs (SC)
Bilirakis
Bishop
Boebert
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle (PA)
Brecheen
Bresnahan
Brown
Brownley
Buchanan
Budzinski
Burchett
Burlison
Bynum
Calvert
Cammack
Carbajal
Carey
Carson
Carter (GA)
Carter (LA)
Carter (TX)
Casar
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cherfilus-
McCormick
Chu

Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flood
Fong
Foster
Foushee
Foxy
Frankel, Lois
Franklin, Scott
Friedman
Frost
Fry
Fulcher
Garamendi
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gill (TX)
Gillen
Gimenez
Golden (ME)
Goldman (NY)
Goldman (TX)
Gomez
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez, V.
Gooden
Goodlander
Gosar
Graves
Gray
Green (TN)
Green, Al (TX)
Greene (GA)
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
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
LaMalfa
Landsman
Langworthy
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latimer
Latta
Lawler
Lee (FL)
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Letlow
Levin
Lieu
Lofgren
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luna
Luttrell
Lynch
Mace
Mackenzie
Magaziner
Malliotakis
Maloy
Mann
Mannion
Mast
Matsui
McBath
McBride
McCaul
McClain Delaney
McClellan
McClintock
McCollum
McCormick
McDonald Rivet
McDowell
McGarvey
McGovern

Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Self
Sessions
Sewell
Sherrill
Shreve
Simon
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Sorensen
Soto
Spartz
Stansbury
Stanton
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stevens
Strickland
Strong
Stutzman
Subramanyam
Suozi
Swalwell
Sykes
Takano
Taylor
Tenney
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Tran
Turner (TX)
Underwood
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyn
Van Orden
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Velázquez
Vindman
Wagner
Walberg
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westerman
Whitesides
Wied
Williams (GA)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NAYS—2

Brecheen

Massie

NOT VOTING—12

Gottheimer
Grijalva
LaMalfa
McClain

Norman
Pelosi
Pettersen
Rogers (AL)
Scalise
Sherman
Turner (OH)
Waltz

□ 1627

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.

NOT VOTING—10

Gottheimer
Grijalva
Liccardo
McClain

Pelosi
Pettersen
Scalise
Sherman
Turner (OH)
Waltz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1634

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.

Stated for:

Mr. LICCARDI. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 14, H.R. 144.

UNITED STATES-TAIWAN EXPE- DITED DOUBLE-TAX RELIEF 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. 33) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide special rules for the taxation of certain residents of Taiwan with income from sources within the United States, 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 423, nays 1, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 15]
YEAS—423

Adams	Chu	Figures
Aderholt	Ciscomani	Finstad
Aguiar	Cisneros	Fischbach
Alford	Clark (MA)	Fitzgerald
Allen	Clarke (NY)	Fitzpatrick
Amo	Cleaver	Fleischmann
Amodei (NV)	Cline	Fletcher
Ansari	Cloud	Flood
Arrington	Clyburn	Fong
Auchincloss	Clyde	Foster
Babin	Cohen	Foushee
Bacon	Cole	Fox
Baird	Collins	Frankel, Lois
Balderson	Comer	Franklin, Scott
Balint	Conaway	Friedman
Barr	Connolly	Frost
Barragán	Correa	Fry
Barrett	Costa	Fulcher
Baumgartner	Courtney	Garamendi
Bean (FL)	Craig	Garbarino
Beatty	Crane	Garcia (CA)
Begich	Crank	Garcia (IL)
Bell	Crawford	Garcia (TX)
Bentz	Crenshaw	Gill (TX)
Bera	Crockett	Gillen
Bergman	Crow	Gimenez
Beyer	Cuellar	Golden (ME)
Bice	Daids (KS)	Goldman (NY)
Biggs (AZ)	Davidson	Goldman (TX)
Biggs (SC)	Davis (IL)	Gomez
Billrakis	Davis (NC)	Gonzales, Tony
Bishop	De La Cruz	Gonzalez, V.
Boebert	Dean (PA)	Gooden
Bonamici	DeGette	Goodlander
Bost	DeLauro	Gosar
Boyle (PA)	DelBene	Graves
Brecheen	Deluzio	Gray
Bresnahan	DeSaulnier	Green (TN)
Brown	DesJarlais	Green, Al (TX)
Brownley	Dexter	Greene (GA)
Buchanan	Diaz-Balart	Griffith
Budzinski	Dingell	Grothman
Burchett	Doggett	Guest
Burlison	Donalds	Guthrie
Bynum	Downing	Hageman
Calvert	Dunn (FL)	Hamadeh (AZ)
Cammack	Edwards	Harder (CA)
Carbajal	Elfreth	Haridopolos
Carey	Elzey	Harrigan
Carson	Emmer	Harris (MD)
Carter (GA)	Escobar	Harris (NC)
Carter (LA)	Espallat	Harshbarger
Carter (TX)	Estes	Hayes
Casas	Evans (CO)	Hern (OK)
Case	Evans (PA)	Higgins (LA)
Casten	Ezell	Hill (AR)
Castor (FL)	Fallon	Himes
Castro (TX)	Fedorchak	Hinson
Cherfilus	Feenstra	Horsford
McCormick	Fields	Houchin

Houlahan	McGarvey	Schrier
Hoyer	McGovern	Schweikert
Hoyle (OR)	McGuire	Scott (VA)
Hudson	McIver	Scott, Austin
Huffman	Meeks	Scott, David
Huizenga	Menendez	Self
Hunt	Meng	Sessions
Hurd (CO)	Messmer	Sewell
Issa	Meuser	Sherrill
Ivey	Mfume	Shreve
Jack	Miller (IL)	Simon
Jackson (IL)	Miller (OH)	Simpson
Jackson (TX)	Miller (WV)	Smith (MO)
Jacobs	Miller-Meeks	Smith (NE)
James	Mills	Smith (NJ)
Jayapal	Min	Smith (WA)
Jeffries	Moolenaar	Smucker
Johnson (GA)	Moore (AL)	Sorensen
Johnson (SD)	Moore (NC)	Soto
Johnson (TX)	Moore (UT)	Spartz
Jordan	Moore (WI)	Stansbury
Joyce (OH)	Moore (WV)	Stanton
Joyce (PA)	Moran	Staubert
Kamla-Dove	Morelle	Stefanik
Kaptur	Morrison	Stell
Kean	Moskowitz	Steube
Keating	Moulton	Stevens
Kelly (IL)	Mrvan	Strickland
Kelly (MS)	Mullin	Strong
Kelly (PA)	Murphy	Stutzman
Kennedy (NY)	Nadler	Subramanyam
Kennedy (UT)	Neal	Suozzi
Khanna	Neguse	Swalwell
Kiggans (VA)	Nehls	Sykes
Kiley (CA)	Newhouse	Takano
Kim	Norcross	Taylor
Knott	Norman	Tenney
Krishnamoorthi	Nunn (IA)	Thandekar
Kustoff	Oberholte	Thompson (CA)
LaHood	Ocasio-Cortez	Thompson (MS)
LaLota	Ogles	Thompson (PA)
LaMalfa	Olsewski	Tiffany
Landman	Omar	Timmons
Langworthy	Onder	Titus
Larsen (WA)	Owens	Tlaib
Larson (CT)	Pallone	Tokuda
Latimer	Palmer	Tonko
Latta	Panetta	Torres (CA)
Lawler	Pappas	Torres (NY)
Lee (FL)	Perez	Trahan
Lee (NV)	Perry	Tran
Lee (PA)	Peters	Turner (TX)
Leger Fernandez	Pfleger	Underwood
Letlow	Pingree	Valadao
Levin	Pocan	Van Drew
Liccardo	Pou	Van Dine
Lieu	Pressley	Van Orden
Lofgren	Quigley	Vargas
Loudermilk	Ramirez	Vasquez
Lucas	Randall	Veasey
Luna	Raskin	Velázquez
Luttrell	Reschenthaler	Vindman
Lynch	Riley (NY)	Wagner
Mace	Rivas	Walberg
Mackenzie	Rogers (AL)	Wasserman
Magaziner	Rogers (KY)	Schultz
Magliotakis	Rose	Waters
Maloy	Ross	Watson Coleman
Mann	Rouzer	Weber (TX)
Mannion	Roy	Webster (FL)
Mast	Ruiz	Westerman
Matsui	Rulli	Whitesides
McBath	Rutherford	Wied
McBride	Ryan	Williams (GA)
McCaul	Salazar	Williams (TX)
McClain Delaney	Salinas	Wilson (FL)
McClellan	Sánchez	Wilson (SC)
McClintock	Scanlon	Wittman
McCollum	Schakowsky	Womack
McCormick	Schmidt	Yakym
McDonald Rivet	Schneider	Zinke
McDowell	Scholten	

NAYS—1

Massie
NOT VOTING—9

Gottheimer	Pelosi	Sherman
Grijalva	Petersen	Turner (OH)
McClain	Scalise	Waltz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1641

So 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. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, due to the devastating wildfire affecting my district and Southern California, I was not present for today's vote. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 13, H.R. 164; YEA on Roll Call No. 14, H.R. 144; and YEA on Roll Call No. 15, H.R. 33.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Speaker, I missed the following votes, but had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 13, YEA on Roll Call No. 14, and YEA on Roll Call No. 15.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. McCLAIN. Mr. Speaker, due to a death in the family, I needed to attend to the funeral proceedings and was unable to vote on the House floor. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 13, Passage of H.R. 164, YEA on Roll Call No. 14, Passage of H.R. 144, and YEA on Roll Call No. 15, Passage of H.R. 33.

□ 1645

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. HERN of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Republican Conference, I send to the desk a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 42

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE: Mr. Lucas, Mr. Austin Scott of Georgia, Mr. Crawford, Mr. DesJarlais, Mr. LaMalfa, Mr. Rouzer, Mr. Kelly of Mississippi, Mr. Bacon, Mr. Bost, Mr. Johnson of South Dakota, Mr. Baird, Mr. Mann, Mr. Feenstra, Mrs. Miller of Illinois, Mr. Moore of Alabama, Mrs. Cammack, Mr. Finstad, Mr. Rose, Mr. Jackson of Texas, Ms. De La Cruz, Mr. Nunn of Iowa, Mr. Van Orden, Mr. Newhouse, Mr. Wied, Mr. Bresnahan, Mr. Messmer, Mr. Harris of North Carolina, Mr. Taylor.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS: Mr. Smith of New Jersey, Mr. Wilson of South Carolina, Mr. McCaul, Mr. Perry, Mr. Issa, Mrs. Wagner, Mr. Burchett, Mr. Green of Tennessee, Mr. Barr, Mr. Jackson of Texas, Mrs. Kim, Ms. Salazar, Mr. Huizenga, Mrs. Radewagen, Mr. Davidson, Mr. Baird, Mr. Kean, Mr. Lawler, Mr. Mills, Mr. Self, Mr. Zinke, Mr. Moylan, Mrs. Luna, Mr. Shreve, Mrs. Biggs of South Carolina, Mr. Baumgartner, Mr. Mackenzie.

COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES: Mr. Wittman, Mr. McClintock, Mr. Gosar, Mrs. Radewagen, Mr. LaMalfa, Mr. Webster of Florida, Mr. Fulcher, Mr. Stauber, Mr. Tiffany, Ms. Boebert, Mr. Bentz, Mrs. Kiggans of Virginia, Mr. Hunt, Mr. Collins, Ms. Hageman, Mr. Amodei of Nevada, Mr. Walberg, Mr. Ezell, Ms. Maloy, Mr. McDowell, Mr. Crank, Mr. Begich, Mr. Hurd of Colorado, Mr. Kennedy of Utah.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY: Mr. Weber of Texas, Mr. Baird, Mr. Webster of Florida, Mr. Oberholte, Mr.

Fleischmann, Mr. Issa, Ms. Tenney, Mr. Scott Franklin of Florida, Mr. Miller of Ohio, Mr. McCormick, Mr. Collins, Mr. Fong, Mr. Rouzer, Mr. Self, Mr. Harrigan, Mrs. Biggs of South Carolina, Mr. Hurd of Colorado, Mr. Haridopolos, Mr. Kennedy of Utah, Mr. Begich.

Mr. HERN of Oklahoma (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOLDMAN of Texas). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR ATTENDANCE OF THE HOUSE AT THE INAUGURAL CEREMONIES OF THE PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HERN of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 43

Resolved, That at 10:30 a.m. on Monday, January 20, 2025, the House shall proceed to the West Front of the Capitol for the purpose of attending the inaugural ceremonies of the President and Vice President of the United States; and that upon the conclusion of the ceremonies the House stands adjourned until noon on Tuesday, January 21, 2025 for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. AGUILAR. 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. 44

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—Mr. David Scott of Georgia, Mr. Costa, Mr. McGovern, Ms. Adams, Mrs. Hayes, Ms. Brown, Ms. Davids of Kansas, Ms. Salinas, Mr. Davis of North Carolina, Ms. Tokuda, Ms. Budzinski, Mr. Sorensen, Mr. Vasquez, Mr. Jackson of Illinois, Mr. Thanedar, Mr. Gray, Ms. McDonald Rivet, Mr. Figures, Mr. Vindman, Mr. Riley of New York, Mr. Mannion, Mrs. McClain Delaney.

(2) COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS.—Mr. Sherman, Mr. Connolly, Mr. Keating, Mr. Bera, Mr. Castro of Texas, Ms. Titus, Mr. Lieu, Ms. Jacobs, Mrs. Cherfilus-McCormick, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Moskowitz, Mr. Jackson of Illinois, Ms. Kamlager-Dove, Mr. Costa, Mr. Amo, Mr. Mfume, Ms. Jayapal, Mr. Latimer, Mr. Olszewski, Ms. Johnson of Texas, Ms. McBride.

(3) COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.—Mr. Grijalva, Mr. Neguse, Ms. Leger Fernandez, Ms. Stansbury, Ms. Hoyle of Oregon, Mr. Magaziner, Mr. Golden of Maine, Mr. Min, Ms. Dexter, Mr. Hernández, Ms. Randall, Ms. Ansari, Ms. Elfreth, Mr. Gray, Ms. Rivas.

(4) COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY.—Ms. Bonamici, Ms. Stevens, Ms. Ross, Ms. Salinas, Mrs. Foushee, Mrs. Sykes, Mr. Frost, Mr. Amo, Mr. Subramanyam, Ms. Rivas, Mr. Turner of Texas, Ms. McBride, Ms. Gillen, Mr. Whitesides, Ms. Friedman, Mrs. McClain Delaney, Mr. Riley of New York.

Mr. AGUILAR (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 361

Mr. DUNN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I hereby remove my name as cosponsor of H.R. 361.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's request is granted.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. DUNN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE WIDESPREAD HUMANITARIAN CRISIS IN AFGHANISTAN AND THE POTENTIAL FOR A DEEPENING ECONOMIC COLLAPSE IN AFGHANISTAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 119-11)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Financial Services and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to

the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to the widespread humanitarian crisis in Afghanistan and the potential for a deepening economic collapse in Afghanistan declared in Executive Order 14064 of February 11, 2022, is to continue in effect beyond February 11, 2025.

The widespread humanitarian crisis in Afghanistan—including the urgent needs of the people of Afghanistan for food security, livelihoods support, water, sanitation, health, hygiene, and shelter and settlement assistance, among other basic human needs—and the potential for a deepening economic collapse in Afghanistan continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. In addition, the preservation of certain property of Da Afghanistan Bank (DAB) held in the United States by United States financial institutions is of the utmost importance to addressing this national emergency and the welfare of the people of Afghanistan. Various parties, including representatives of victims of terrorism, have asserted legal claims against certain property of DAB or indicated in public court filings an intent to make such claims. This property is blocked under Executive Order 14064.

Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 14064 with respect to the widespread humanitarian crisis in Afghanistan and the potential for a deepening economic collapse in Afghanistan.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 15, 2025.

TAKING ADDITIONAL STEPS WITH RESPECT TO THE SITUATION IN SYRIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 119-12)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.), and section 301 of title 3, United States Code, I hereby report that I have issued an Executive Order in order to take additional steps with respect to the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13894 of October 14, 2019 (Blocking Property and Suspending Entry of Certain Persons Contributing to the Situation in Syria).

The order makes minimal edits to Executive Order 13894 in light of the fact that certain operations referenced in that order ceased 5 years ago. In particular, under the amended order, the

United States may still sanction any person determined to be responsible for or complicit in, or to have directly or indirectly engaged in, or attempted to engage in actions or policies that further threaten the peace, security, stability, or territorial integrity of Syria or the commission of serious human rights abuse.

I am enclosing a copy of the Executive Order I have issued.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr.
THE WHITE HOUSE, January 15, 2025.

VIRGINIA IS A BORDER STATE

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

Mr. MCGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as the Representative of Virginia's Fifth Congressional District.

I am honored to serve nearly 800,000 Virginians.

Virginia, thousands of miles from the border, is a border State. Every county, city, and town is a border county, city, and town under the current administration.

Last week, I voted on my first bill, the Laken Riley Act. Illegal aliens are robbing, sexually assaulting, and murdering American citizens. This bill detains illegal immigrants who commit additional crimes, like theft, until they get deported.

Laken had a bright future, but her life was cut short when an illegal alien murdered her while she was jogging one morning. She fought and did everything right.

The perpetrator kept getting released from jail because of weak America-last policies.

I was proud to vote in favor of this legislation introduced by my good friend, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS), who is empowering law enforcement to do their job.

HONORING FORMER MINNESOTA SENATE MAJORITY LEADER KARI DZIEDZIC

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

Ms. OMAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the late former Minnesota Senate Majority Leader Kari Dziedzic.

Senator Dziedzic was an incredible public servant who transformed the lives of so many. During her historic tenure, Senator Dziedzic led the Minnesota Legislature in passing significant investments in our State's public education system, transportation infrastructure, affordable housing, and green economy.

Her efforts resulted in Minnesota passing universal school meals, protecting bodily autonomy, and ensuring paid family and medical leave for Minnesota's workers.

It was an honor to serve alongside her when I was first elected to the Min-

nesota Legislature and to continue to hold her leadership as an inspiration as I serve the communities of Minnesota's Fifth District.

Her legacy of dedication to inclusive, productive lawmaking and her steadfast commitment to her constituents will be remembered for years to come.

PROMPT RELIEF TO VICTIMS IN LOS ANGELES

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

Mr. KILEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to stress the importance of providing prompt relief to the victims of the ongoing disaster and nightmare in Los Angeles.

The relief measure should include direct support for rebuilding and recovery along with safeguards to assure that that support gets to victims as quickly and as efficaciously as possible.

Mr. Speaker, there will also need to be a thoroughgoing Federal inquiry into the causes of this catastrophe and into political failures that enabled this catastrophe.

We will need to use every tool that we have to inject some common sense into how California manages its forests and water supply, but that should not stand in the way of getting immediate relief to the victims. These folks have already paid an extraordinarily high price for the failures of their government, and they should not be punished again.

AMERICANS DON'T TURN THEIR BACKS ON EACH OTHER

(Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, this image could be from the California wildfires, but it is not. It is from New Mexico's Hermit's Peak and Calf Canyon Fires, which ravaged northern New Mexico. We are still recovering from the inferno with help from the Federal Government.

We might see a picture like this in Montana or Utah or anywhere there are droughts and extreme weather events.

When disaster hit New Mexico, my colleagues supported our State, including recently Speaker JOHNSON and my Republican friends. I am grateful that we acted as one.

When hurricanes hit North Carolina, Florida, and Georgia, we supported the recovery in those States without conditions because that is what we do.

Americans don't turn their backs on each other.

That should not change with California. They need our help. New Mexican firefighters are there helping, and Congress must also help without placing conditions on emergency disaster aid.

Let's act as one United States in the face of this disaster.

□ 1700

INCREDIBLE RETURN OF MR. MIKE KEITH AS THE NEXT "VOICE OF THE VOLTS"

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

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate and recognize the incredible return of my good friend, Mr. Mike Keith, as the next "Voice of the Vols," to the University of Tennessee's Vol Network.

Born in Knoxville and raised in Franklin, Mike started his career as WUTK's sports director in 1986 where he provided dynamic play-by-plays and captivating sports analysis.

Months after his initial appointment, he was hired by the legendary John Ward. Mike soon became the "Voice of the Baseball Vols" from 1992 to 1998.

It is not in my notes, but I will note that I did throw out the first pitch one time, and they said it was incredibly accurate and incredibly fast.

Mike's career did not stop there nor did his hard work. In 1999, Mike took over the play-by-play duties for the Tennessee Titans, with his career as an NFL broadcaster spanning a quarter century.

Mike's accolades speak for themselves. He is a member of five halls of fame, including the Tennessee Sports Hall of Fame, TSSAA Hall of Fame, BGA Hall of Fame, Tennessee Radio Hall of Fame, the University of Tennessee Baseball Athletics Hall of Fame, and being named Tennessee's Sports-caster of the Year 12 times.

Mike has now returned to Rocky Top as the lead play-by-play announcer for UT football and men's basketball games. He is a pioneer of radio broadcasting and represents his alma mater well.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Mike on his return.

Go Big Orange.

REMEMBERING THE VICTIMS OF THE BOURBON STREET TERRORIST ATTACK

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

Mr. CARTER of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of Martin "Tiger" Bech, William "Billy" DiMaio, Elliot Wilkinson, Nicole Perez, Kareem Badawi, Brandon Taylor, Nikyra Dedeaux, Matthew Tenedorio, Hubert Gauthreaux, Edward Pettifer, Reggie Hunter, Drew Dauphin, Terrence Kennedy, and LaTasha Polk.

These precious lives were taken from us far too soon. We honor them not just as names but as fathers, mothers, children, and friends who brought light to New Orleans and to this world.

Last week, I stood with President Biden at the Bourbon Street memorial. We reflected on the profound loss felt by our community and our Nation. In the quiet of St. Louis Cathedral, we lit candles and prayed for healing for the injured survivors, for the grieving families, and for a city shaken but not broken.

This was not just an attack on New Orleans; it was an assault on our shared humanity, our spirit of joy, and our enduring strength.

Let me be clear: New Orleans will never let these lives be forgotten. We will rise from this pain with unity, love, and resilience as we always do.

Mr. Speaker, may God continue to bless the victims, their families, the great city of New Orleans, the great State of Louisiana, and the great United States of America.

RECOGNIZING THE FIRST RESPONDERS OF MONTANA'S SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT COMBATING THE CALIFORNIA WILDFIRES

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

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the first responders of Montana's Second Congressional District who are sacrificing time and treasure to combat the ongoing wildfires in southern California.

Firefighters from Columbus and Red Lodge are joining groups like the Billings Flying Service and other crews and individuals from across the State to help those in need.

I applaud the leadership of these groups, including Columbus Fire Rescue Chief Rich Cowger and Red Lodge Fire Rescue Chief Tom Kuntz for setting an example of service before self.

During my time as a combat search and rescue enlisted aviator in the U.S. Air Force, we had a motto: These things we do, that others may live.

Mr. Speaker, these men and women exemplify that motto, so I ask that you join me in praying for and honoring these brave Montanans who have traveled far and wide and put themselves in harm's way to protect the lives and property of their fellow Americans.

God bless and Godspeed to these heroes.

RECEIVING DISASTER AID SHOULD NOT BE CONDITIONAL

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, some House Republicans are threatening to withhold disaster aid to California unless certain unknown conditions are met. There is even talk about attaching disaster aid to an increase in the debt ceiling.

Mr. Speaker, this could be your State. Never in our Nation's history has the Federal Government placed such politically driven conditions on disaster aid to its own citizens. We can have good-faith debates about water policy and infrastructure deficiencies, and we should, but that is not what this is about.

This is a bad-faith effort to use California as a punching bag. This is about the promotion of half-truths, conspiracy theories, and outright lies, not to mention it is a way out for House Republicans.

They can't raise the debt ceiling on their own, so they want to tie that to disaster aid. It is unconscionable.

Mr. Speaker, I say to my Republican friends that it is unacceptable and downright shameful to use the suffering of Californians in need, or anyone in need, to solve your internal political disputes. Please stop playing games. Let's get the disaster aid to the people who need it, and let's do it now.

HONORING GERRI McDANIEL

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

Mr. FRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a dear friend and dedicated public servant, Gerri McDaniel.

Gerri had a fierce determination to better her community not just with her words but with her actions, as well.

She was a resident of North Myrtle Beach for nearly 22 years, where she was active in her community, including the Horry County Republican Women's Club. She was a true pillar of the South Carolina conservative movement.

In 2016, Gerri worked for President Donald Trump, helping to secure a historic victory.

In 2020, she served as an elector to our electoral college, helping to assign our States' nine votes to President Donald Trump.

Gerri's personality was infectious. She was an incredibly hard worker, and she had the unique ability to inspire others to work diligently for the conservative cause.

Mr. Speaker, through all that she accomplished, one thing remained constant: her passion for improving the lives of South Carolina and our great country. Her conviction, her fearless leadership, and willingness to serve will no doubt leave a lasting legacy for all who knew her.

RECOGNIZING CHRISTOPHER BROOKS AS OHIO'S 13TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT CHAMPION OF THE WEEK

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

Mrs. SYKES. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to recognize Christopher Brooks as

Ohio's 13th Congressional District champion of the week.

Christopher is a senior AP art student at Canton McKinley High School. This year, he was awarded a Gold Key, two Silver Keys, and an honorable mention in the regional scholastic art competition.

Christopher's beginnings in art started in kindergarten, where he used his creative skills to make unique constructions out of LEGO blocks. Fast-forward to high school, and he has taken his passion for art to the next level by creating beautiful color pencil works and oil paintings.

Christopher's work that earned him a Gold Key will now be considered for a national award.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Christopher on this fantastic accomplishment, and wish him good luck as he moves on to represent our region on the national stage. He is a shining example of why Ohio's 13th Congressional District is known as the birthplace of champions.

HIGH-SPEED RAIL PROJECT HAS BEEN A SYMBOL OF FISCAL MISMANAGEMENT

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, Governor Gavin Newsom's High-Speed Rail project has been a symbol of fiscal mismanagement, and now the Department of Government Efficiency here in D.C., known as DOGE, is stepping in to examine the situation, as well.

Originally projected to cost \$33 billion back in 2008, the price tag has now ballooned closer to \$130 billion.

Despite an initial completion date for 2020, now it is, at best, by about 2030, maybe even 2035. Zero passengers have ridden on it because it is not possible yet.

This boondoggle has already consumed \$6.8 billion in Federal funds of all U.S. taxpayers. Now they are asking for \$8 billion more, which is way short of \$130 billion.

DOGE's analysis paints a grim picture of a project spiraling out of control with no end in sight.

Governor Newsom keeps funneling California tax dollars into this never-ending pit, ignoring needs like critical water infrastructure which could be helping all of our State, including southern California, if we could raise Shasta Dam and gain 600,000 new acres.

We would have the ability to not be short-funded on the brush removal that needs to be happening in southern California, as well as the forestry management all over California. Instead of empty-handed promises by Governor Newsom, we need to have President Trump leading the way.

FIRES DON'T DISCRIMINATE

(Ms. LOFGREN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise as the chair of the California Democratic Congressional Delegation to urge that we focus our energy on standing with firefighters, businesses, and families impacted by the Los Angeles County fire, not politics.

I have been hearing unprecedented political attacks, lies, and threats of conditioning disaster aid, even while these fires rage. This is the largest urban fire in the history of the United States.

Our rule has always been disaster help without conditions.

Mr. Speaker, if you want to change our longstanding policy, remember, your constituents could be the next ones to be abandoned. As my California colleague Congresswoman YOUNG KIM said this week, “fires don’t discriminate,” and she is right.

In December, when disaster aid went to victims in Republican-led States, including North Carolina, South Carolina, Arkansas, and Florida, Democrats overwhelmingly voted for that aid.

Mr. Speaker, we didn’t discriminate then, and we must not discriminate now during Californians time of need.

DEFENDING THE CONSTITUTION AGAINST ALL ENEMIES, FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC

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

Mr. KENNEDY of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce myself as I undertake this awesome responsibility to serve the citizens of Utah’s Third Congressional District.

My name is MIKE KENNEDY, and I am both a physician and an attorney.

As a doctor, I am a trained listener. As a lawyer, I am a trained advocate. As a legislator, I intend to honor the promises I made to my constituents when I asked for their votes: to take seriously the problems we confront, which include a porous border and a massive national debt. I will be a foe to those who would work to turn the people over to the government and a friend to those who will turn the government over to the people.

Our common oath, when we begin this service, is to defend the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic. It is a call to actively search for all that unites us in our common citizenship without fear or favor.

The vision of our Founders, that we be “one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all,” burns brightly in me and will be my daily touchstone as I do the work of the people.

Mr. Speaker, let us go forward with renewed energy to keep all that makes America the great country that we know it to be.

PRIDE AND GRATITUDE FOR THE BRAVERY AND DEDICATION OF OUR 911 FIRST RESPONDERS AND FIREFIGHTERS

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

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today filled with immense pride and gratitude for the incredible bravery and dedication of our 911 dispatchers, first responders, and firefighters across California.

These men and women, many of whom work around the clock, have been on the front lines fighting tirelessly to protect our homes and communities from devastating impact of the ongoing fires.

I am also deeply proud of the way our communities have come together. From local volunteers to neighbors checking on one another and organizations offering aid, California’s spirit of unity and resilience shines brighter than ever.

Mr. Speaker, as we continue to navigate these difficult times, I urge my colleagues to not play politics and ensure we provide the disaster relief aid that California deserves and needs now more than ever.

□ 1715

REMEMBERING GOVERNOR KENNETH “BUDDY” MACKAY

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor a treasured Florida statesman, the Honorable Governor Kenneth “Buddy” MacKay.

Today, his hometown and family will celebrate this compassionate fighter who served 26 years in the State house and senate, Congress, as Florida’s Lieutenant Governor, and briefly as Governor.

A righteous fighter for what he believed in, he fought the Cross Florida Barge Canal and defended a fellow University of Florida classmate from racist taunts.

When others of his generation saw an issue to exploit, Buddy remained steadfast to protect civil rights, reproductive freedoms, and our precious ecosystem. Political foes used his decency against him, but Buddy MacKay remained a man of principle. He was a proud liberal who never abandoned causes that helped the less fortunate, even if it cost him votes.

I came of age watching Buddy MacKay masterfully maneuver against powerful adversaries and work tirelessly behind the scenes to help people. Buddy MacKay embodied all the values of decency and honesty, and his public service legacy is a model we desperately need.

May his memory be for a blessing.

LAYING A FOUNDATION FOR PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

(Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to say thank you to President Biden and his team for their relentless perseverance and leadership in securing a needed agreement between Israel and Hamas that includes the release of 33 hostages, who have endured unimaginable suffering.

This breakthrough is a testament to unwavering U.S. diplomacy and steadfast support for Israel and is a profound moment of relief and joy for loved ones who never gave up hope.

With that said, Mr. Speaker, this mission is not over. We must remain resolute, bringing every hostage home, delivering humanitarian relief where needed, ensuring Israel’s security, and laying the foundation for lasting peace in the Middle East.

THE LEAST OF MY BRETHREN

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, during this week in Washington, I have heard certain cunning, power-hungry individuals invoke the name of Jesus to blasphemously whitewash their own awful transgressions against the Ten Commandments and the dehumanization of God’s precious creatures.

I don’t expect the coarse subjects of my concern will hear nor even comprehend the Biblical verse I wish to enter into the RECORD—Matthew 25:31–46. Some day may these prevaricators face a reckoning in which the Lord of all lords will judge: Truly I tell you, whatsoever you do for the least of my brethren, that you do unto me. So be it.

NO CONDITIONS ON AID

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

Mr. LIEU. Mr. Speaker, less than 4 weeks ago, Congress passed the American Relief Act, which provided disaster aid to States such as Florida, South Carolina, and Oklahoma. Did Democrats demand conditions on this aid because it went to red States? No, because we are all Americans. We are all God’s children.

Congress has never put conditions on disaster aid because when Mother Nature strikes, she doesn’t ask for your party affiliation before she hurts you. The people who were hurt in the fires in southern California were parents, children, and grandchildren who lost their homes or lost their loved ones.

I am asking Republican Members of Congress to please stop using the pain and suffering of disaster victims for

their own political purposes. It is not American. It is not Christian. It is not moral.

REMEMBERING DR. AL MIJARES

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

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of my very good friend, Orange County Superintendent of Schools, Dr. Al Mijares, who passed away after a long battle with cancer.

Dr. Mijares was a champion for our students to prepare them for college and careers. During the 2022 school year, over 90 percent of Orange County High School graduates graduated on time, beating the California average.

During Dr. Mijares' tenure, he also fought to make Orange County a better place to live for everyone. He established the One Billion Acts of Kindness initiative, allowing Orange County residents to honor acts of kindness. He never stopped fighting to make our communities better.

The legacy of Dr. Mijares, my good friend, lives. We will never forget the passion for education that he showed us and his efforts to create future leaders for our great Nation. We will miss Al.

HUMANITY MUST ALWAYS TAKE PRECEDENCE

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about Americans who are hurting, who have been suffering over the last 10 days as a result of the fires that have occurred in Los Angeles and south coast basin.

What we are talking about is the moral imperative of what America has always done to help the American people when they are in need, whether it is hurricanes, tornadoes, flooding, earthquakes, fires, or natural disasters of every kind you can imagine.

In the wildfires that have ravaged Los Angeles and south coast basin, over 40,000 acres have burned, 12,000 buildings have been destroyed, and 24 lives and counting have been lost. There certainly will be more. That is more than 30,000 football fields. Think about it.

The pain, the suffering, the social, and the economic losses—from homes to businesses to churches and synagogues—have changed people's way of life.

I am appalled to hear that some of my Republican friends are openly discussing conditioning wildfire relief upon their partisan agendas. That is wrong. We should not forget that over \$120 million of hurricane relief was provided to the State of Louisiana when they needed it over the last 20 years. Humanity must always take precedence over partisanship.

CALIFORNIA WILDFIRES

(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, my name is DAVE MIN. I was just elected to represent the 47th Congressional District in Orange County, California, just south of the fires. While we are not affected by these, we are subject to the same fire risks on a year-by-year basis.

What we are seeing right now is a biblical-level disaster in California. The scope of this devastation is unprecedented. Now, as has been mentioned before, is a time when we need to come together, understanding that with climate change we are going to continue seeing biblical-level events going forward.

When we have had past disasters, whether hurricanes in southeastern United States, Florida, the Gulf Coast, tornadoes, flooding, and, yes, wildfires, we have stepped up. The people of southern California have stepped up to help those in need. That is the American way. That is the California way.

What is being proposed right now in tying conditions to aid is un-American. It is despicable. It is pathetic. We have never done this before. I urge my Republican colleagues to think about the precedent they will be setting if they set conditions, political conditions to this aid because the next time a disaster strikes, it could be their district, their area, and they do not want to set this precedent right now. People are struggling. Thousands of firefighters are exhausted. We need your help.

GRAPPLING WITH HORRIBLE DEVASTATION

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

Ms. BALINT. Mr. Speaker, as families in Los Angeles and the surrounding areas grapple with horrible devastation, loss of homes, community, loss of life and livelihoods, I am disgusted to hear that Republican leadership—Speaker JOHNSON—is planning to use this tragedy for political gain and withhold aid from California.

Americans are evacuating their homes, watching their communities burn, and the Speaker and Trump and some of my Republican colleagues in Congress want to punish Americans for not voting their way in November? This is morally bankrupt.

Californians obviously need this help now. I am standing up here because I am a Vermonter who just endured two horrible summers of devastating floods. I know what it feels like to go house to house and talk to people who have lost everything.

I remember talking to one man who had lost his home and his livelihood and was out of his home. He said to me: I didn't vote for you. I said: It doesn't

matter that you didn't vote for me. I am still showing up for you.

We need to show up for all Americans, regardless of political party.

CELEBRATING LEBANON, OHIO'S 215TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. LANDSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 215th anniversary of Lebanon, Ohio. Lebanon is the birthplace of The Western Star, Ohio's oldest weekly newspaper, the home of the historic Golden Lamb Inn, Ohio's oldest hotel, which has hosted 12 United States Presidents and literary giants like Mark Twain, Charles Dickens, and Harriet Beecher Stowe.

After walking on the Moon and seeing the Earth from space, Neil Armstrong could go anywhere, and he chose Lebanon as his home for 23 years. It is that special.

Today, Lebanon continues to bring people together, including one of my favorite events, the Warren County Fair. It is a place where neighbors gather to celebrate community and tradition. We have an office there, and it is one of my favorite places. It is still remarkable 215 years later.

Congratulations to all my friends in Lebanon.

PROTECTING THE RIGHTS AND SAFETY OF WOMEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MOORE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the topic of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Republicans are doubling down on our commitment to supporting and protecting the rights and safety of women and girls across the country. We are doing this by championing bills that fight back against unfair competition in sports and dangerous immigration policies.

Yesterday, we passed Congressman STEUBE's Protection of Women and Girls in Sports Act, which is now on its way to the Senate. This legislation prevents biological males from competing in school athletic programs for women and girls by requiring that sex in athletic competition be determined by genetics at birth.

House Republicans are also supporting Congresswoman MACE's Violence Against Women By Illegal Aliens Act, which amends the Immigration and Nationality Act to make illegal immigrants inadmissible and deportable from the United States if they are convicted of or have admitted to committing sex offense or domestic violence.

I am grateful to my colleagues for joining me this evening to discuss these important measures and our commitment to delivering for our daughters, sisters, nieces, and granddaughters.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today before you to reaffirm the House Republicans' efforts to empower and protect American women and girls. By passing legislation such as Congressman GREG STEUBE's Protection of Women and Girls in Sports Act, Congressman MIKE COLLINS' Laken Riley Act, and Congresswoman NANCY MACE's Preventing Violence Against Women by Illegal Aliens Act, we address significant lapses in our justice, legal, and educational systems, and we push back against a radical left agenda that leaves our society in moral tatters.

Individually, these bills tackle critical issues, and collectively they create a safer, healthier, and more prosperous Nation for our women and girls. That is really important to me and should be to every American. However, as a father of two girls, specifically, I want my girls to have the opportunity to thrive in a society that gives equality to both men and women, that nurtures their growth, and protects their well-being. I do not want to be part of a society that places them at greater risk and reduces their opportunities in this country.

Our daughters should not be forced to adhere to radical policies that undermine truth, safety, and reality, policies that have been pushed for the last 4 years by the Biden-Harris administration. We as a Republican Conference will not sit idly by on this issue, nor have we, as evidenced by the bills that I referenced today.

Let me personally thank, again, Congressman STEUBE, Congressman COLLINS, and Congresswoman MACE for their dedication to protecting my two daughters and every daughter, mother, and sister across this Nation.

□ 1730

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for being willing to carve out time in their schedules to come down and share this message.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mrs. FEDORCHAK).

Mrs. FEDORCHAK. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent all North Dakotans in the United States House of Representatives. This is my first speech on the House floor, and I want to take this opportunity to tell you a little bit

about our State and what I hope to accomplish during the 119th Congress.

North Dakotans are hardworking, independent, resourceful people who are dedicated to their faith, families, and communities. From Abercrombie to Zap, and every place in between, North Dakotans show up every day, regardless of rain, snow, or subzero temperatures. That is what I will do here.

Our biggest industries in North Dakota are agriculture and energy. We are very proud of those, but we have so many other innovative things taking place: autonomous systems, artificial intelligence, defense technology, and more.

This is why I sought a seat on the Committee on Energy and Commerce, one of the best and most powerful committees on Capitol Hill. From my seat there, I will help advance the interests of our State, particularly in energy.

Before I became a Member of Congress, I served as a public service commissioner for 12 years. I regulated five multistate monopoly utilities, permitted \$15 billion worth of new energy infrastructure, and advocated for market rules and policies to support reliable and affordable energy resources.

I saw firsthand the challenges to our energy policy and the direct and dire consequences it has. North Dakotans, and Americans, too, have also seen the impacts of these policies and the prices they pay at the grocery store, at the gas pump, and to power their homes.

American energy reliability, affordability, sustainability, and security are the weakest they have been in years. Take yesterday's action by the Biden administration to lock up millions of acres of oil, gas, and coal leases in North Dakota through the Bureau of Land Management's resource management plan for the State. This is absolutely the wrong direction.

As demand for energy reaches record highs, we should be unleashing American energy production, not shutting it down. It is time to abandon the one-size energy strategy that stifles domestic energy production and jeopardizes hardworking Americans' jobs.

I am eager to work with the Trump administration, Governor Burgum, and my colleagues in the House to invest in a true all-of-the-above energy strategy and regain American energy dominance. Doing so will help reduce America's debt, lower prices for hardworking families, reduce global emissions, and bolster our national security.

I also rise today in support of H.R. 28, the Protection of Women and Girls in Sports Act of 2025. This legislation seeks to make sure women and girls have the opportunity to compete on a fair playing field by requiring schools to comply with Title IX recognition of a person's gender at birth.

Competing in girls' sports as a kid gave me strength, taught me resilience, and helped me form lifelong friendships. My experience as a kid would have been completely different if I had been forced to compete against biological males.

Let's let our kids be kids. Let's let our daughters dream big, train hard, and compete on a level playing field.

H.R. 28 is a commonsense bill. It strengthens protections for women, and I was proud to vote for it. Men simply do not belong in women's sports, and House Republicans are leading the charge to ensure fairness for women and girls.

Yet, our commitment to women and families doesn't just stop there. Last week, we also passed the Laken Riley Act, which will give Immigration and Customs Enforcement the tools it needs to hold illegal immigrants who commit theft and other crimes accountable.

This is the Republican agenda in action. We are protecting women, supporting families, and making our communities safer. This is just the beginning of our work.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, North Dakota, like Utah, definitely hits above its weight, and the gentleman from North Dakota's presence is key on all of these particular issues.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mrs. HOUCHIN), our Conference secretary.

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Republicans stood united to pass the Protection of Women and Girls in Sports Act of 2025, reaffirming a simple but critical truth: Men are men, and women are women. It is that simple.

As the mother of two daughters who are athletes, I have seen firsthand the hard work and dedication it takes for girls to compete in sports. Sadly, we have witnessed biological men entering women's competitions, robbing female athletes of fair opportunities and, in some cases, even causing injuries.

Under House Republican leadership, that ends now. This legislation, which I am proud to cosponsor, sends a clear message: Female athletes deserve fair competition, secure locker rooms, and a safe and level playing field.

Thanks to House Republicans, the days of biological men competing in women's sports are over. This legislation is about restoring common sense. It is about standing up for objective truth.

The American people have called for this national mandate supporting women and girls in their sports and spaces, and thanks to Republican leadership, we are delivering on that promise. I am proud to stand with Congressman STEUBE on the side of fairness, safety, integrity, and the protection of women's sports.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA), who has been through the devastation that we are seeing there, and our hearts go out to those in California. His district has been hit by this several times, and I will say that hearing the stories and conversations he has from his district, it just puts it into perspective. This is tough stuff. He has been down this road before and has been a strong leader on communicating

what we need to do to keep it from continuing to happen.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, California has had a lot of problems inflicted upon it, partly by nature and partly self-inflicted by governing.

As we bring resources and aid to southern California and reflect here on these horrific events happening with the fire down there in the Pacific Palisades and surrounding communities, it is very sobering but also points out the need for leadership and competency in preparing for it. It is really basic stuff.

The north part of the State has been through it many times, with the losses of communities. We all remember the Paradise fire. Eighty-five people lost their lives, and 90 percent of the town was consumed.

We have to do better in the preparation ahead of time before fire season on how we treat the lands and have the apparatus ready, instead of complications due to contracts, for example, with the Forest Service not being ready to have the equipment that would be there in the forests, and on and on.

I appreciate that, and we are going to do the best we can to move as quickly as possible for the folks in southern California and then ongoing to build up the infrastructure and the work that needs to be done.

As tonight's topic has been, when we are talking about protecting our citizens and our border, California, as well, under the direction of Gavin Newsom, has become a haven for illegal immigration. The taxpayers are footing the bill for an ever-expanding list of unbelievable benefits that are being given to illegal immigrants.

From healthcare to education, sex changes, homes, the whole works, California is pouring resources into supporting those here illegally while our own citizens, as we mentioned, are struggling with many things in burning communities, as well as the more day-to-day stuff: overcrowded schools, strained healthcare systems, and increasing public safety concerns with gangs, crime, and on and on.

We have sanctuary policies statewide, not just in cities, like we see around the country. This is a statewide sanctuary policy that protects illegal immigrants from ICE being able to pick them up when it is found that we have illegals in this country that could be processed federally and, hopefully, deported.

Cities across California are openly defying Federal immigration laws, creating safe havens for those who have broken the law. These sanctuary cities as well are not just a burden on our resources; they are a threat, as I said, to public safety. We have seen this firsthand, most recently in this country with the tragic loss and death of Laken Riley, and you will remember a few years ago in San Francisco on the wharf there, Kate Steinle was killed by a bullet from a gun that an illegal immigrant had found, taken, stolen, or

whatever. Those lives are gone, and it is a tragedy for their families.

What are we going to do to avenge them? What are we going to do to make it right? These two innocent women lost their lives due to these violent crimes committed by illegal immigrants who are protected by these sanctuary policies.

Tomorrow, hopefully, we will take up the Preventing Violence Against Women by Illegal Aliens Act, introduced by my colleague NANCY MACE from South Carolina. This crucial bill aims to close the loopholes that would allow violent offenders to slip through the cracks and continue to pose a threat to our country.

It is high time we prioritize the safety and security of our citizens and the needs of our people, particularly women, who would be and have been the victims of these violent crimes.

In my home State, California's approach is not sustainable. We are overcrowded and overrun with crime, gangs, and broken services, as I mentioned.

Governor Newsom's policies are draining our resources and compromising public safety. His priorities are illegal aliens and all sorts of benefits for them, which we keep seeing on and on, again and again, as the State is running a deficit and spending on things like high-speed rail instead of helping on fire safety and having our water supply renewed for all those good reasons.

Instead of prioritizing the well-being of California, the State is offering a free pass again and again to those coming into the country illegally. We have become the State that is the magnet for all of it, away from the other States.

As we have said, it is high time to put a stop to this. Let's stand behind this legislation, the Preventing Violence Against Women by Illegal Aliens Act, and ensure that we are doing everything possible to protect our cities and the people who live within them, especially the women, as we think of Laken Riley, Kate Steinle, and too many others who have already paid the ultimate price.

We need to focus entirely on the needs of folks like that, and hopefully, there will be some sense of closure or satisfaction for their families to see that at least we have done the right thing ultimately.

With President Trump coming in, in just a few short days, I think we can finally get the momentum to do what we need to do with enforcing our border and allowing legal immigration, allowing people who we invite into the country.

We are still for immigration, just follow our rules, follow our laws, and pass a few reasonable tests in order to be part of the American Dream. We extend that. That is what the country was based on for so many years, and it has completely gone awry in the last

Why does the Biden administration and my colleagues on the other side believe that this is good policy and keep getting away with it politically? Why is that seen as a good thing?

I think folks have really had their fill of it now because they are seeing it really showing up in their pocketbooks and their ability to afford a home, have a job, and not continue to get further and further behind, as this country has always aspired to have the next generation be just a little bit better off than the previous one.

□ 1745

Mr. Speaker, that is not happening now. You can lay policies such as this right at the feet of our poorest border, as well as bad energy policies and other things causing inflation.

With that, this is a very important thing we are working on this week, so we can assure the women of this country that we are behind them. We do have their backs on this violence, as well as the previous legislation mentioned, on women and girls in sports having a safe place to play and enjoy and excel without men somehow interfering on those fields, in those locker rooms.

It is common sense. I can't believe we are here at this point. We are battling back here in this Congress with Republican leadership doing so.

I appreciate Mr. MOORE leading us here tonight, and I thank him for the time.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California. Again, we continue to pray that the best outcomes possible will continue to happen for California.

Mr. Speaker, my next speaker from Montana (Mr. DOWNING) is a brand-new Member and our concluding speaker here today. We consider ourselves, as a Utahn and Montanan, the greatest portion of the country, wouldn't you say, out West? We have a lot to prove that.

The gentleman is a new Member but a very experienced, thoughtful, and strong Member that I look forward to working with. I thank him for being here.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. DOWNING).

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, House Republicans have hit the ground running in the 119th Congress.

Last week, we considered bills to hold accountable illegal aliens who break our laws and defend U.S. national sovereignty against a rogue international judicial body.

This week is about protecting the women in all of our lives. I am a father to two wonderful daughters and a husband to my amazing wife, Heather. Never in a million years did I think that one day I would need to take the floor of the United States House of Representatives to defend their right to compete in athletic competitions without unfair competition from biological males or to denounce acts of violence perpetrated against them as

wrong and deserving of punishment, but here I stand.

Just yesterday, we passed H.R. 28, the Protection of Women and Girls in Sports Act. This bill ensures fair competition in women and girls' sports by rightfully defining gender based on reproductive biology and genetics and prohibiting males identifying as women from competing in federally funded sporting competitions.

I was proud to add my support to this critical legislation, and I look forward to voting for a second bill, the Preventing Violence Against Women by Illegal Aliens Act, on the House floor tomorrow.

H.R. 30 will ensure that illegal aliens who have been convicted of or admit to committing sex offenses or domestic violence can be deported by closing a loophole in existing law.

Needless to say, the fact that we need to consider legislation of this kind is ludicrous. Simple truths that we once took for granted are under assault from ideological corners of our Nation that do not represent the vast majority of Americans and certainly not the vast majority of Montanans.

When America overwhelmingly elected Donald Trump to be our next President, they gave Republicans a clear mandate to reverse course on the progressive policies threatening the safety and well-being of our daughters, nieces, granddaughters, and sisters. This week Democrats have a chance to show us whose side they are on. I know where I stand.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Montana. I appreciate all that we have been able to enact thus far.

Mr. Speaker, I close tonight and just thank my colleagues for being here tonight and for taking the time to speak on this important issue.

As I mentioned earlier, House Republicans are committed to advancing legislation that supports our women and girls and gives them a fair chance to excel in their athletic endeavors.

The Protection of Women and Girls in Sports Act ensures biological males are unable to compete in female-designated sports, giving women and girls the opportunity to compete on a fair playing field by requiring schools to comply with the Title IX recognition of a person's genetics at birth. This bill withholds Federal funding from schools that facilitate athletic programs where biological men compete against biological women.

To be clear, this is not about disrespecting anyone. Everyone is worthy of dignity and respect. However, protecting women and girls from feeling uncomfortable in their locker rooms, sustaining major sports injuries because of unfair competition, or simply losing out on well-deserved athletic accolades because they are genetically unable to beat a male is not purely political effort. It is simply what is right.

This is a line that we must draw, and we know that Americans agree with this.

I have joked before about a couple of things. I have four boys. I wasn't blessed with a girl. We lament it every day. I do love those boys, though. I push them hard in sports.

I reflect on this about my nieces, and they are dynamite athletes and, candidly, can probably beat me in most of their assigned sports, such as tennis and soccer, across the board. That is what motivates me on this.

The amount of confidence that you get from sports is key. The ability to compete and play and enjoy this, above anything else, with all of the extra pressures that are placed on kids nowadays with social media pressure and everything, the concepts of teamwork that you learn, achieving something, getting better at something, and having the ability to say that you have a shot to win that competition cannot be beaten into my nieces.

They have to be able to say, with a level playing field, they can go win this, not because it is important to win that gold ribbon or this or that or win the track meet. It is because they need to know that the effort they put in can achieve something.

That is going to translate into a career, into anything that they get involved with where they have to accomplish something. It is not just about sports. It is a psychological element that we need to make sure exists.

Sports is such a key, important aspect for growth in people, and that is what we are trying to do here. Let's not make this a political endeavor. At least you won't ever get that from me and my office and the way we communicate about this.

Additionally, House Republicans this week are standing up for women's safety by bringing to the floor Congresswoman MACE's Preventing Violence Against Women by Illegal Aliens Act to uphold the U.S. border laws and make illegal immigrants who have been convicted of or admitted to sex offenses or domestic violence inadmissible and deportable.

This bill is about closing critical gaps in our crimes. Last year, over 20,000 illegal immigrants were not detained for sexual assault. As of July, over 650,000 with criminal histories were on the ICE non-detained docket. This must change. This bill takes action to get these violent offenders off of our streets and make our communities safe again.

I am grateful for the work my Republican colleagues have done to push these bills forward. We are wasting no time to get some of the sensible legislation that we were able to get passed and went nowhere in the Senate in the last Congress, and we want to give the Senate an opportunity to vote on this again.

I sincerely believe there will be Democrats who see the sensible approach with this. We are also seeing it with the bill we passed last week, the Laken Riley Act.

Again, I thank Congressman STEUBE and Congresswoman MACE for their

leadership on these critical issues. To my colleagues, again, I appreciate their willingness to spend some time down here today.

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

MATH ISSUES

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

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Utah for his remarks and all of the good stuff we have started off with as Republicans in this Congress and his remarks about athletics.

I was a walk-on in college. I hope all of us might be able to work together to figure out how to deal with this bit of a mess that the NIL is creating with respect to college athletics.

I watched significant fallout and wondered what it meant for good programs and coaches, like Tony Bennett at the University of Virginia and others, who have been raising red flags about what is happening with respect to the NIL. We can also figure out how to cut spending.

Mr. Speaker, I am not here to talk about the NIL. I will save that for another day, notwithstanding the national championships coming up around the country which the University of Texas should be playing in. Unfortunately, they are not.

Republicans were given the opportunity to have control of the United States House of Representatives, the United States Senate, and the White House. Come Monday, President Trump will be sworn in as the 47th President of the United States, and it can't come a moment too soon.

For everybody watching what is happening to our country, what this current administration is doing to our border, to our national security, to our spending, to the state of our culture, to the rule of law in the streets, the use of lawfare, the abuse of power, this can't come fast enough for most Americans.

The question before us right now as Republicans is whether or not we are going to deliver. Last time I checked, the American people did not send us to Washington and they did not give us the majority in the United States House of Representatives, the people's House, to rack up more deficits.

With all due respect to my Republican colleagues, we are currently on track to do just that. We are projected to have a \$2 trillion deficit next year. As we speak, interest rates are going up, our debt is getting refinanced at higher interest rates, and we have more debt that we are going to have to finance at higher rates. That means interest is going up. We have a job to do right now to cut spending, cut deficits, and save our country for our children.

I would wager that if I looked at the campaign materials or the speeches of

every single Republican in the House of Representatives and the Senate, they all ran on cutting spending and balancing budgets.

The question before this body is going to be: Will they do it?

I need to clear the record because my name has been invoked, and that of a number of my friends, for standing for things that are not true. My name has been invoked by people in this room, by colleagues about what I believe and don't believe.

Let me set the record straight right here, right now. Yes, I believe that we should make permanent the Trump tax cuts from 2017. I think that would be good for our economy. I think that would be good for the American people. I think that would help create more economic growth, and I think that economic growth would yield revenue to the Treasury.

I believe in what people call dynamic scoring; some people in this town say that I do not. What I do not believe in is making up numbers. What I do not believe in is magic fairy dust that says the budget will magically balance if you cut taxes and never cut spending because that is simply not true.

If I come to the floor and this Chamber is full and I ask any one of my colleagues to stand up and look the camera in the eye and tell their people back home on C-SPAN or on the news that, for example, child tax credits pay for themselves or changing certain rates pay for themselves, not one of them will stand up.

I promise you that we are going to be facing votes on this floor this year to extend the tax cuts that include, for example, child tax credits and other tax policies that in no way, shape, or form, economically speaking, pay for themselves.

We are going to be told to do that on faith, that the growth in the economy will magically produce revenue and cause deficits to go down. Nothing in our history would tell you that is true.

How do you think we got to \$36 trillion in debt? It was by refusing to do basic math.

We are told we are not going to touch any kind of reforms in healthcare or Medicare to drive down the price of healthcare so that we can save Medicare from its clear insolvency, and Social Security from its clear insolvency. It is going to go bankrupt in, what, 8 years. So we are not going to talk about those things.

What we are going to talk about, we are told, is to extend the tax cuts and then sit around and try to figure out how to cut other mandatory spending without regard to whether or not that will be deficit reducing.

□ 1800

I think it is really important for the American people to understand this: There are games being played in Washington right now to put pressure on people to box them in, to box Members of this body in.

Right now, conservatives in the House Freedom Caucus are often maligned on the pages of publications as being the rightwing guys because oddly enough we believe in freedom, balanced budgets, and securing the border. Yes, we are the crazy ones. The House Freedom Caucus has proposed, put forward, a plan to raise the debt ceiling over \$4 trillion over 2 years; fund the border at \$86 billion, the request by the incoming administration and border czar Tom Homan; fund defense modernization at \$200 billion plus-up, a separate fund through reconciliation, so we can modernize our defense and do what we need to do to beat China.

What we are asking for for that is to reverse some of Biden's policies, which are all things that the President campaigned on. Reversing the EV mandate is \$117 billion. Medicaid work requirements and SNAP work requirements are \$120 billion. Undo the student loan bailouts, which are an unfair shift of money from the working population to those who took on student loans, that is 100 to \$270 billion of savings.

Again, I want to be very clear because here is what you are going to hear in the coming weeks: The House Freedom Caucus refuses to do a debt ceiling so reasonable Republicans are going to have to go cut a deal with Democrats to increase the debt ceiling, increase appropriations over our current spending levels, including defense and nondefense, and, oh, by the way, give a crud ton of money to California.

That is coming. That is coming.

They will try to blame the Freedom Caucus and conservatives like me who dare say, hold on a second, maybe we shouldn't do that. Maybe we should come up with another path forward to actually honor our commitments to cut spending and reduce the size and scope of government while we cut taxes, secure the border, and do the things we are supposed to do.

Again, we have put forward a plan. We have shared it with our colleagues. We have shared it with the incoming administration. We are making it public. That plan will increase the debt ceiling so that CHUCK SCHUMER can't play games with the bond market, fund border, fund defense, cut some of the disastrous Biden policies to pay for those things the American people prioritize, and in so doing, free up defense to be modernized and built so that when we come to March we don't have to do what happens every year where defense hawks sell their souls to the devil to raise defense spending all driven by K Street lobbyists and the defense contractors in this town who define our defense policy so that Democrats can get increases in nondefense spending, which is an increase in programs, and our discretionary budget keeps going up and up and up and up, and you keep funding the very bureaucrats that the DOGE folks say they want to cut.

I have this wild idea for these crazy conservatives in the Freedom Caucus

that maybe, just maybe, we should change the game. Maybe, just maybe, we should take that money, go build our defense through reconciliation, level the playing field, pass either a continuing resolution or spending at the caps that we put in place this last year, hold spending frozen for the rest of this year, go do the appropriations process, let DOGE do its work, cut spending to pre-COVID levels, save about a trillion dollars over a decade, do our job to actually deliver on the promises that we made, give wins to the President of the United States, give wins to Republicans, unite the party, unite the country, and demonstrate that we can do our job.

But you know why we can't? You know why we can't do that right now? Because the forces in this town who want nothing but tax cuts and no spending cuts are telling you, you can't do it. That is what is happening.

The lobbyists, the people in this town, Members of Congress are saying that we can't cut because there is some program, there is something in Medicaid, there is some reason, there is some excuse, but, gosh, we are definitely going to go ahead and reinstate all the tax policies because they read in some book a long time ago that they all pay for themselves irrespective, by the way, of the Laffer curve or any commonsense economics.

What I will say to you right now is that if any of my Republican colleagues want to come down to the floor and tell me that each one of those tax provisions pay for themselves, I want to see it. Show me that the child tax credits pay for themselves. I am not saying the child tax credits may not be decent policy. I will tell you right now I would love to vote on a bill right now to just eliminate the tax code and zero it out. Maybe we will do that before this year is over. Maybe everybody will have to put their money where their mouth is. Do you believe in taxation or not? Because if you think you can just freely print money and fund all the things you are too afraid to go back to your district and say that there is a limit on what you can spend while out of the other side of your mouth you talk about tax cuts, let's vote on a bill to zero out the tax code because if you're going to constantly live with \$2 trillion deficits, which is where we are right now, why not \$6 trillion? Why does it matter? That is a genuine question. Anybody in the complex can feel free to come down here and explain to me why my family, your family, my constituents' families should pay taxes into a system that is designed by this body to bleed 2 trillion-plus dollars a year.

They keep talking about tax policy that is good for economic growth. Okay. Yes, I agree. I support it. I started this speech by saying I support it, but I don't support it blindly. I don't support it without recognizing our responsibility and our need to cut spending. There ain't no free lunch. You

can't make up math. You can't just go blame it on the CBO or blame it on scores. Show the American people the math, and don't go run and hide behind a vote on a balanced budget amendment because I promise you that is what my colleagues will say. They will say, oh, man, we need a balanced budget amendment. Do you think they would follow it? That is a genuine question. Pass a balanced budget amendment.

By the way, when all the people out there on Twitter say CHIP ROY is railing against a balanced budget amendment, I would respond, no, I am not. I am for a balanced budget amendment. Sign me up. I have cosponsored it. I will vote for it. In the odd event we pass it when it has whatever line it is going to have in it in an exception for national security, do you not believe that everything will be a national emergency?

Do you believe that the insatiable appetite of your Members of Congress to spend money on programs will end because you inserted an amendment in the Constitution that says we must balance the budget? I can promise you every time we hit a debt ceiling, what will happen is we are going to raise the debt ceiling.

The American people sent us here to actually change things. The American people didn't send us here to keep racking up debt. We are \$36.3 trillion in debt. It is piling up around our ears. As my friend DAVID SCHWEIKERT from Arizona points out every time he comes to the floor of the House, the interest is piling up. It is going up. We are refinancing our debt. We are paying a trillion dollars a year in interest, and that is about to be 1.2, about maybe 1.4. It is going to be \$2 trillion pretty soon.

My colleagues are running around like chickens with their heads cut off squawking about what they need to do on tax policy—again, a policy I support—but without recognizing the mathematical need to have spending cuts at least or more than what you think will happen with respect to revenue when you change the tax policy.

The American people expect us to be adults. You cannot have your cake and eat it too. You cannot just go straight to the dessert of going home to your constituents and saying, I cut your taxes, aren't you proud? You can't just get on your donor calls and say, man, I really made sure that your corporate rates are great, and we are making sure your capital gains rates are great, and then not do the other side of the work. You have got to eat your vegetables. You have got to actually do the job.

As I said, I will vote to zero out taxes. We didn't have an income tax for the first half of this country's existence. I think that is great.

You know what else? We didn't take on every single issue in the Federal Government because the Constitution didn't contemplate it. Now we take on all the issues, and we don't pay for

them. We sprinkle magic fairy dust around here, borrow money, print money, mortgage our kids' future, and pretend to be adults. I do not for the life of me believe that we can actually change this all in a year. This is the last argument I want to present, and then I am going to recognize my good friend from Pennsylvania.

I said there are people out there who are saying that I don't believe in the dynamic impact of tax policy. That is false. I very much believe in the dynamic impact of tax policy. If we leave money in the hands of the American people and we produce revenue, we produce growth, and that means some additional revenue will come into the Treasury because of the economic growth—yes, but not all of it.

Other people will say, well, gosh, you guys, dollar for dollar you want to make sure that all these cuts are going to add up to the debt ceiling. No, I just want some common damn sense. Just show me some actual cuts up front. Again, I want to reiterate, the House Freedom Caucus conservatives, have put forward a plan and shared it. It will accomplish the objectives. The media and our colleagues will say that they don't want to do that, they can't do that. Well, we have done it. We have put it forward.

Now I want to call on my colleagues and ask them: Well, what is your plan? Because we have a plan, and that plan is to deliver right out of the gate. The President gets sworn in on Monday. Let's secure the border. Let's fund it. You want to have a strong national defense that is not woke, fund it. Do it now, and take it off the ledger in March when we are going to be told that we must eat more spending in government and California money and a \$10 trillion debt ceiling increase.

Let's do it right now. Let's do the hard work. Let's extend the debt ceiling 2 years, fund the border, fund defense, give the cuts and the EV mandates, put in Medicaid work requirements. These are all things the American people want us to do. Let's end the student loan bailouts, save money, end bad programs, advance good programs. Let's secure our country, help the President, give him wins, give the American people wins, give us a chance to actually freeze spending in March and in September to stop the growth of the bureaucracy. Let's give Elon and Vivek and DOGE the ability to do what they want to do, which is cut the bureaucracy, which they can't do if we keep funding it.

We can do that, but if my colleagues are going to insist on putting us in a box and telling the world because CHIP says, you know what, I think we should put everything on the table, all taxes, until we make sure we are getting enough cuts with respect to the tax policy, and then they have the audacity to go out and say, CHIP won't vote for a bill unless there is a corporate tax increase. That is a lie. Anybody who says that is a liar because that is not

what I am saying. Anybody who says I don't believe in dynamic scoring is lying. That is the truth.

What I want to do is make sure we save our country. What I don't want to do is play games. Unfortunately, all too often too many of my colleagues want to play games.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

□ 1815

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

I am happy to join him, and I am happy to join him in what I think he is saying, which is what I am saying. I am saying yes to fulfilling the President's agenda and mandate to secure the border, yes to the President's agenda and mandate to strengthen our military, and yes to the President's agenda and mandate to reduce the cost-of-living and inflationary pressures that printing—creating out of whole cloth, out of nothing—money floating around in the economy making every single good, service, and purchase more expensive.

I say yes to fixing all that. As one of the people who, like CHIP, is often maligned and people characterize us as part of the no caucus, we are here saying yes. Yes, we want to fix it.

We don't want to increase the debt limit, but we understand that we have to pay the Nation's bills. So, all we are saying is that as long as there is a plan to stop increasing the ever-increasing debt, then we can be on board, and we have a plan.

We have offered a plan, and we can be onboard with that to not let CHUCK SCHUMER decide what the cost of increasing the debt ceiling is going to be and not force the American people to keep on paying for things that this government shouldn't be buying and can't afford, that taxpayers can't afford.

We want to do this. We are here to say yes and here to save our country, but we are not signing up for fake savings and spending: If you raise the debt ceiling, then we will make sure we grow our way out of it by projecting 3.5 or 4 percent growth for the next 10 years.

Let's quit fooling ourselves. That is not going to happen. We absolutely want to say yes to making sure that the American people continue to enjoy the tax cuts that we gave them, that we got, that we secured, and that we fought for during the first Trump administration. We want to continue that. We want to secure that.

We wish we could have done that then, but since that time, the Biden administration has increased spending by \$6 trillion. Somehow, something has to give.

Mr. Speaker, look at the recent bond market sales. Interest rates are going up. My good friend from Texas already mentioned the fact that every time it goes up 100 basis points, it increases the cost of the debt that we have to

pay for. We pay for it here by creating money that doesn't exist digitally. We can't even print it fast enough.

We get nothing for it. All we are paying for is interest on the debt. We don't get any new government programs, and we don't get any new and better military programs. We don't get anything for it. It is just debt and interest payments that we are paying for things that we bought in the past.

All that we are saying is, look, if you have a better plan than we do, God bless it. Let's see it, and let's see the real cuts.

Like I said, I am with CHIP. We want to pay for the border and our military, and we want to use things like EV mandates to pay for that stuff.

As far as student loan giveaways that aren't constitutional, which the Biden administration is offering, we are saying, look, let's repurpose that money for things that we do need to pay for, like the border and the military.

Let's have some reasonable cuts. Let's increase the debt ceiling as necessary, but only as necessary. We are not even asking for dollar for dollar on the debt ceiling.

If you have something better and more reasonable, I am standing here, so let's see it.

The clock is ticking. The President is inaugurated in a couple of days here. We are supposed to be after this, and here we stand.

As far as I know, with all due respect to everybody in the Chamber, the only plan I have seen is the one we have offered.

We stand ready to save our country in any way that we can, but the clock is ticking, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Pennsylvania for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, he is right. The clock is ticking. We can't let another legislative day go and another legislative day go in which we don't deliver. The American people expect us to deliver.

We can and will deliver tax policy that is progrowth and that extends what we did in 2017. We will deliver spending cuts if we get in the room and work, but it is going to take time.

It is going to take time to undo the damage of the Biden administration and for us to go through everything that we need to go through to identify the cuts that we can all work through,

but we will do it if we have the willpower to do it and if we can do math and understand that we need deficits to go down.

What we are saying is, let's deliver right now. Do not risk border security by pushing it off months into the future.

Mr. PERRY. Right now, while we are talking about it, there are criminal aliens convicted of murder in their country, some more than one time, walking around our country. They are going to stay here until we can deport them, and we are not offering the money to the incoming administration to do that work.

Mr. ROY. We could do that right now if the House would act. Right now, pass the budget, pass the instructions, and do exactly what we just laid out. Do the debt ceiling increase, do the funding for the border, and give it to Tom Homan tomorrow.

In a matter of 1 or 2 weeks, we can get that out of this Chamber and over to the Senate. By February, they would have money for defense, money for the border and a fence, and a debt ceiling that is gone.

We would have undone some of the worst Biden policies and paid for all of it. That is precisely what the American people sent us here to do.

Instead, this Chamber currently is locked in a cycle of talking about what we might do. We have to move for the American people. That is why we put forward an approach that we believe will work.

It is really important—really important—for the American people to understand that what is happening in this town is that games are being played by people who want to try to leverage those of us who want to cut spending. That is the bottom line.

I am speaking for myself right here. There are some of my colleagues who want to attach the border funding to the bills that we are moving forward without—they don't believe that we will get to the spending cuts that will make those of us who believe we need deficits to go down happy. They want to try to force us to eat increased deficits in order to achieve the border security funding.

I don't think we should play games with the border security. I don't think we should play games with defense. I don't think we should play games with

getting the debt ceiling cleared off without giving more power to CHUCK SCHUMER and Democrats to mess with us in March.

We can win across the board if we adopt this plan, and I would strongly recommend that we move forward with this plan so that we can deliver for the President and deliver for the American people.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from Texas. We don't have much time to do this. While we talk and talk, we have also been given a mandate for transformational change.

To my good friend from Texas, transformational change doesn't include doing the same thing we always do around here, which is cram a bunch of garbage into one big bill, put one thing in that somebody has to have, that we have to have it, which is border security, and say: Suck down all that garbage for the one thing that you need and force the American people to do it, too.

We don't have to accept bad choices for the one thing that we need. We can have all good choices.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I would remind people that what happened before Christmas was precisely that, trying to cram down a bunch of stuff in a big bill, and it met with resounding failure.

Let's not do that. Let's make the 119th Congress be about success, delivering on the President's agenda and on the Republican agenda, the agenda we ran on, and, most importantly, delivering for our kids and grandkids a world in which they can actually live free from worrying about China, free from worrying about debt, and free from worrying about open borders and criminals on the streets.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Pennsylvania for his remarks, and I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 16, 2025, at 9 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the fourth quarter of 2024, pursuant to Public Law 95-384, are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO LUXEMBOURG, EXPENDED BETWEEN DEC. 12 AND DEC. 15, 2024

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Michael McCaul	12/12	12/15	Luxembourg	1,140.66	(3)	1,140.66
Hon. Gary Palmer	12/12	12/15	Luxembourg	1,140.66	(3)	1,140.66
Hon. Mike Bost	12/12	12/15	Luxembourg	1,140.66	(3)	1,140.66
Hon. Nancy Pelosi	12/12	12/15	Luxembourg	1,140.66	(3)	1,140.66

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO LUXEMBOURG, EXPENDED BETWEEN DEC. 12 AND DEC. 15, 2024—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Mark Takano	12/12	12/15	Luxembourg	1,140.66	(3)	1,140.66
Hon. Joe Wilson	12/12	12/15	Luxembourg	1,140.66	(3)	1,140.66
Hon. Ann Wagner	N/A	N/A	Luxembourg	882.00	N/A	882.66
Hon. Brian Babin	N/A	N/A	Luxembourg	882.00	N/A	882.66
Hon. Salud Carbajal	12/12	12/15	Luxembourg	1,140.66	(3)	1,140.66
Hon. Neal Dunn	12/12	12/15	Luxembourg	1,140.66	(3)	1,140.66
Hon. Lloyd Smucker	12/12	12/15	Luxembourg	1,140.66	(3)	1,140.66
Hon. John Joyce	12/12	12/15	Luxembourg	1,140.66	(3)	1,140.66
Hon. Andrew Clyde	12/12	12/15	Luxembourg	1,140.66	(3)	1,140.66
Hon. Scott Fitzgerald	12/12	12/15	Luxembourg	1,140.66	(3)	1,140.66
Hon. Scott Franklin	12/12	12/15	Luxembourg	1,140.66	(3)	1,140.66
Hon. Mariannette Miller-Meeks	12/12	12/15	Luxembourg	1,140.66	1,140.66
Hon. Jake Elizey	N/A	N/A	Luxembourg	882.00	N/A	882.66
Hon. Tom Kean, Jr.	12/12	12/15	Luxembourg	1,140.66	1,140.66
Hon. Nathaniel Moran	12/12	12/15	Luxembourg	1,140.66	1,140.66
Hon. Keith Self	12/12	12/15	Luxembourg	1,140.66	1,140.66
Hon. Derrick Van Orden	12/12	12/15	Luxembourg	1,140.66	1,140.66
Garrett Fultz	12/12	12/15	Luxembourg	1,140.66	1,140.66
Ashley Callen	12/12	12/15	Luxembourg	1,140.66	1,140.66
Alison Babb	12/12	12/15	Luxembourg	1,140.66	1,140.66
Cullen Murphy	12/12	12/15	Luxembourg	1,140.66	1,140.66
Jordan Dayer	12/12	12/15	Luxembourg	1,140.66	1,140.66
Griffin Neal	12/12	12/15	Luxembourg	1,140.66	1,140.66
Emily Cassil	12/12	12/15	Luxembourg	1,140.66	1,140.66
Steven Bertolini	12/12	12/15	Luxembourg	1,140.66	1,140.66
Terri McCullough	12/12	12/15	Luxembourg	1,140.66	1,140.66
Kate Knudson	12/9	12/15	Luxembourg	2,539.38	(3) 13,605.00	16,144.38
Meghan McCann	12/9	12/15	Luxembourg	2,539.38	(3) 13,605.00	16,144.38
Committee Totals	65,734.56

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
² Military air transportation.

HON. MIKE JOHNSON, Jan. 8, 2025.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2024

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☐

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. GLEN THOMPSON, Jan. 7, 2025.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2024

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☐

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. BRYAN STEIL, Jan. 2, 2025.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

EC-32. A letter from the Senior Congressional Liaison, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, transmitting the Bureau's advisory opinion rescinding previous advisory opinion — Truth in Lending (Regulation Z); Consumer Credit Offered to Borrowers in Advance of Expected Receipt of Compensation for Work [Docket No. CFPB-2024-0032] received January 8, 2025, 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-33. A letter from the Chairman, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's Fair Hiring in Banking Act Report to Congress, pursuant to Public Law 117-263, Sec. 5705(c)(3); (136 Stat. 3411); to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC-34. A letter from the Biologist, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Emergency Listing of the Blue Tree Monitor as an Endangered Species [Docket No. FWS-HQ-ES-2023-0033; FXES1113090FEDR-256-FF09E22000] (RIN: 1018-BH98) received January 7, 2025, 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-35. A letter from the Senior Congressional Liaison, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, transmitting the Bureau's Major final rule — Civil Penalty Inflation Adjustments received January 8, 2025, 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.

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. CLINE (for himself, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. ESTES, Mr. MOORE of West Virginia, Mr. BEAN of Florida, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. NEHLS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. HUDSON, Mrs. LUNA, Mrs. CAMMACK, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. PERRY, Mr. BOST, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. FINSTAD, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. FULCHER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MCGUIRE, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. MCDOWELL, Mr. HARRIS of Maryland, Mr. BURCHETT, Mr. KUSTOFF, Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. CRANK, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. HERN of Oklahoma, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. BABIN, Ms. MALOY, and Mr. COMER):

H.R. 404. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to remove silencers from the definition of firearms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means,

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. FULCHER (for himself and Mr. RULLI):

H.R. 405. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude overtime compensation from gross income for purposes of the income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YAKYM (for himself and Ms. SCHOLTEN):

H.R. 406. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require institutions of higher education, as a condition of participation in programs under title IV of such Act, to include a prohibition of antisemitic conduct in all documents relating to student or employee conduct; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Ms. DELBENE (for herself, Mr. BEYER, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. CHU, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. SALINAS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. KENNEDY of New York):

H.R. 407. A bill to exclude the imposition of duties and import quotas from the authorities provided to the President under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act; 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 Mr. ARRINGTON:

H.R. 408. A bill to nullify the Presidential memoranda on the withdrawal of certain areas of the outer Continental Shelf from oil or natural gas leasing; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS (for himself, Mr. LAWLER, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 409. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow employers to deduct certain transportation fringe benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BEGICH:

H.R. 410. A bill to extend the Alaska Native Vietnam era veterans land allotment program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BERGMAN:

H.R. 411. A bill to provide compensation to the Keweenaw Bay Indian Community for the taking without just compensation of land by the United States inside the exterior boundaries of the L'Anse Indian Reservation that were guaranteed to the Community under a treaty signed in 1854; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BERGMAN:

H.R. 412. A bill to authorize the Bay Mills Indian Community of the State of Michigan to convey land and interests in land owned by the Tribe; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. BICE (for herself, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. FEENSTRA, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. NUNN of Iowa, Mr. TORRES of New York, and Mr. MAGAZINER):

H.R. 413. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to index dependent care assistance programs to inflation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 414. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to strengthen student visa background checks and improve the monitoring of foreign students in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 415. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to prohibit individuals holding Federal office from directly soliciting contributions to or on behalf of any political committee under such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CLINE (for himself, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. BRECHEEN, and Mr. GREEN of Tennessee):

H.R. 416. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to close the nominal benefits loophole; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CLINE (for himself, Mr. CLOUD, and Mr. OGLES):

H.R. 417. A bill to prohibit the use of United States contributions to the United Nations to support the iVerify tool developed by the United Nations Development Programme, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CLINE (for himself, Mr. GOLDEN of Maine, Ms. HAGEMAN, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. BRECHEEN, Mr. FITZGERALD, and Mr. GREEN of Tennessee):

H.R. 418. A bill to require the head of an agency to issue and sign any rule issued by that agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLINE (for himself, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. OGLES, and Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana):

H.R. 419. A bill to amend section 212 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to ensure that efforts to engage in espionage or technology transfer are considered in visa issuance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLINE:

H.R. 420. A bill to impose limitations on the amount of indirect costs allowable under Federal research awards to institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. CLINE (for himself, Ms. HAGEMAN, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. BRECHEEN, and Mr. FITZGERALD):

H.R. 421. A bill to amend chapter 6 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the "Regulatory Flexibility Act"), to ensure complete analysis of potential impacts on small entities of rules, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Small Business, 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. CLINE (for himself, Mr. CLYDE, and Mr. HARRIS of Maryland):

H.R. 422. A bill to establish Federal research award reimbursement limits for indirect costs for institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Workforce, 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. COHEN (for himself, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SWALWELL, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, and Ms. BROWNLEY):

H.R. 423. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to modify the dischargeability of debts for certain educational payments and loans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRENSHAW (for himself and Mr. ROY):

H.R. 424. A bill to reimburse the States for border security expenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIDSON (for himself, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. BIGGS of Arizona, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BURLISON, Mrs. CAMMACK, Mr. CISCOMANI, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. CLYDE, Mr. CRANE, Mr. DUNN of Florida, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. ESTES, Mr. EZELL, Mr. FINSTAD, Mrs. FISCHBACH, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Ms. FOXX, Mr. FULCHER, Mr. GRAVES, Ms. GREENE of Georgia, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. GUEST, Ms. HAGEMAN, Mr. HERN of Oklahoma, Mrs. HOUGHIN, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. LANGWORTHY, Ms. LEE of Florida, Ms. MACE, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. OGLES, Mr. PERRY, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. ROSE, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. ROY, Mr. RULLI, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. STAUBER, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. TIFFANY, Ms. VAN DUYN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. BOST, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mr. BEAN of Florida, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. GILL of Texas, Mr. YAKYM, Mr. VAN ORDEN, Mrs. BICE, Mr. ONDER, and Mr. GRIFFITH):

H.R. 425. A bill to repeal the Corporate Transparency Act; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ESPAILLAT (for himself and Mrs. KIM):

H.R. 426. A bill to make available necessary disaster assistance for families affected by major disasters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on 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 Mr. FITZGERALD (for himself, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. TIFFANY, and Mr. STELL):

H.R. 427. A bill to amend Public Law 86-272 to expand the prohibition of State taxation relating to certain solicitation of orders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLEISCHMANN:

H.R. 428. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to enhance the authority under which Federal agencies may pay cash awards to employees for making cost saving disclosures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. GARAMENDI (for himself, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. CISCOMANI, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. RULLI, Mr. PETERS, Mr. AMO, Mr. TORRES of New York, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. KEATING, Mr. POCAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BEYER, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. NEAL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRJALVA, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. MCCLELLAN, Ms. TLAI, Ms. TITUS, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. NADLER, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. EVANS of Pennsylvania, Mr. POSTER, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. BACON, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Mr. CARSON, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. AMODEI of Nevada, Mr. CASTEN, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. COSTA, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms.

DELAURO, Mr. FROST, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Ms. BUDZINSKI, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mrs. TRAHAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. KHANNA, Mrs. FOUSHEE, Mr. TONKO, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. KILEY of California, Mr. CUELLAR, Ms. SCHOLTEN, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. CASAR, Ms. STANSBURY, Ms. SALINAS, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. VAN ORDEN, Ms. ROSS, Mr. DELUZIO, Mr. DOGETT, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. HOULAHAN, and Mrs. HAYES):

H.R. 429. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the women who contributed to the Home Front during World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GARBARINO (for himself, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mrs. KIM, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. LAWLER, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. CASTEN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KEAN, Ms. CHU, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. NADLER, Ms. SHERRILL, Ms. GILLEN, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. RYAN, Mr. RASKIN, and Mr. GOMEZ):

H.R. 430. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the limitation on the deduction for certain taxes, including State and local property and income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAVES (for himself, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. ALFORD, Mr. BOST, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. STAUBER, and Mr. MANN):

H.R. 431. A bill to require the United States Postal Service to reimburse fees charged for the late payment of bills that were delayed in the mail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. HAGEMAN:

H.R. 432. A bill to authorize the removal of an action from an administrative law judge of any administrative agency to a district court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HAYES (for herself, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. MCIVER, Ms. SALINAS, Ms. TOKUDA, and Mr. QUIGLEY):

H.R. 433. A bill to prohibit funds made available to the Department of Education by previous Appropriations Acts from being used for any activity relating to implementing a reorganization of the Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana:

H.R. 434. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to improve U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) identification of staffing needs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself, Mr. KILEY of California, and Mr. OBERNOLTE):

H.R. 435. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide direct hire authority to appoint individuals to Federal wildland firefighting and firefighting support positions in the Forest Service or the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, 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. KEATING (for himself and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 436. A bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds to support or facilitate the participation of the Russian Federation in the Group of Seven, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY of New York:

H.R. 437. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to expand assistance related to winter storms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LALOTA (for himself, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. GARBARINO, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. BACON, Mr. RYAN, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, and Ms. SALINAS):

H.R. 438. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make grants to State and local entities to carry out peer-to-peer mental health programs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LALOTA:

H.R. 439. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Department of Veterans Affairs to furnish hospital care and medical services outside a State to veterans with service-connected disabilities rated as permanent and total, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. LEE of Florida (for herself, Mr. MOSKOWITZ, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida):

H.R. 440. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for Residential Emergency Asset-accumulation Deferred Taxation Yield (READY) accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LETTLOW:

H.R. 441. A bill to improve drought related disaster assistance programs of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. LETTLOW:

H.R. 442. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to modify a provision relating to quality loss adjustment coverage; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. MACE (for herself, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. BIGGS of South Carolina, Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. NORMAN, and Mr. FRY):

H.R. 443. A bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds to close or realign the Marine Corps Recruit Depot located at Parris Island, South Carolina; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MOOLENAAR (for himself and Mr. RUIZ):

H.R. 444. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit individuals eligible for Indian Health Service assistance to qualify for health savings accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. SELF, Mr. BABIN, Mr. GOODEN, Mr. NEHLS, and Mr. WEBER of Texas):

H.R. 445. A bill to establish trust funds relating to border security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on Financial 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. NEHLS (for himself and Ms. BOEBERT):

H.R. 446. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the rate of the excise tax on investment income of private colleges and universities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. PEREZ (for herself and Mr. NEWHOUSE):

H.R. 447. A bill to provide compensation flexibility to address retention and hiring issues at the Bonneville Power Administration; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. PETTERSEN (for herself and Ms. BOEBERT):

H.R. 448. A bill to direct the United States Postal Service to designate a single, unique ZIP Code for Silver Cliff, Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. RADEWAGEN:

H.R. 449. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to waive certain naturalization requirements for United States nationals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SALAZAR (for herself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. GIMENEZ,

Mr. SELF, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. MILLS, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mrs. WAGNER, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. ISSA, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mrs. BICE, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. BURCHETT, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. LAWLER, and Mr. TIFFANY):

H.R. 450. A bill to prohibit the removal of Cuba from the list of state sponsors of terrorism until Cuba satisfies certain conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska (for himself, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. GARBARINO, Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. HERN of Oklahoma, Mr. ALFORD, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. WOMACK, Ms. VAN DUYN, and Mr. BACON):

H.R. 451. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prohibit certain activities constituting preparation of tax returns by the Secretary of the Treasury, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STAUBER (for himself, Mrs. MCCLAIN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. KEATING, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. CRANK, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. BOST, Ms. FEDORCHAK, Mr. NEHLS, Mr. BABIN, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. SMUCKER, Ms. MALOY, Mr. JACK, Mr. FONG, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. GUEST, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. KNOTT, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. MESSMER, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. OBERNOLTE, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. BARR, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. GIMENEZ, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. COLE, Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. FEENSTRA, Mr. CASTEN, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. GARBARINO, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. GARCIA of California, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. CISCOMANI, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. MORRISON, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. EZELL, Mr. HARIDOPOLIS, Mr. MOORE of West Virginia, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. BEAN of Florida, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MCCORMICK, Mr. STEIL, Mrs. HINSON, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. HARRIS of North Carolina, Mr. HARRIGAN, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. VAN ORDEN, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. HURD of Colorado, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. WIED, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. MAST, Mr. BRESNAHAN, Mr. LAWLER, Mr. LALOTA, Mr. LANGWORTHY, Mr. MOYLAN, Mr. BENTZ, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. MEUSER, Mrs. CAMMACK, Mr. ALFORD, Mr. KEAN, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York,

Mr. TIFFANY, Ms. OMAR, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. TITUS, Mr. CAREY, Mr. KILEY of California, Ms. LEE of Florida, Mr. BACON, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BALDERSON, Ms. TENNEY, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. MOORE of Utah, Mr. COSTA, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. EMMER, Mr. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mrs. BICE, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Ms. CRAIG, Ms. DE LA CRUZ, Mr. YAKYM, Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, Mr. RULLI, Mr. PALMER, Mr. STANTON, Mr. MANN, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. AMODEI of Nevada, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. LATTA, Mr. FINSTAD, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mrs. FISCHBACH, and Mr. BUCHANAN):

H.R. 452. A bill to award 3 Congressional Gold Medals to the members of the 1980 U.S. Olympic Men's Ice Hockey Team, in recognition of their extraordinary achievement at the 1980 Winter Olympics where, being comprised of amateur collegiate players, they defeated the dominant Soviet hockey team in the historic "Miracle on Ice", revitalizing American morale at the height of the Cold War, inspiring generations and transforming the sport of hockey in the United States; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 453. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to revise and update the Department of Defense regulations to allow trademarks owned or controlled by the Department of Defense to be combined with religious insignia on commercial identification tags (commonly known as "dog tags") and to be sold by lawful trademark licensees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 454. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to establish an authority to issue permits to certain members of the Armed Forces who seek to carry concealed firearms while on military installations; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 455. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to prohibit the award of Federal funds to institutions of higher education that employ instructors funded by the Chinese Communist Party, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 456. A bill to prohibit the provision of Federal funds to the National Institutes of Health for the purposes of conducting biological, medical, or behavioral research involving the testing of dogs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 457. A bill to direct the Assistant Secretary of State for Consular Affairs to notify United States citizens regarding passport expiration and renewal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 458. A bill to prohibit the purchase of public or private real estate located in the United States by foreign adversaries and state sponsors of terrorism; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 459. A bill to withhold bilateral, multilateral, and humanitarian non-defense foreign assistance with respect to which the President has declared a disaster under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 460. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security and Secretary of State to require aliens applying for certain visas to disclose if they receive funds from the Government of the People's Republic of China or the Chinese Communist Party, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 461. A bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds for any DEI activity in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on 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. STEUBE:

H.R. 462. A bill to prevent allocations of Special Drawing Rights at the International Monetary Fund for countries that are perpetrators of genocide or state sponsors of terrorism, and to prevent United States tax dollars from directly going to the Taliban or other terrorists or terrorist-harboring nations; to the Committee on Financial Services, 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 Mrs. SYKES:

H.R. 463. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the earned income and child tax credits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (for himself, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. SCHNEIDER):

H.R. 464. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for lifelong learning accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIMMONS (for himself, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. FRY, Mr. BURCHETT, Mr. OGLES, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mr. BOST, and Mr. EZELL):

H.R. 465. A bill to prohibit the flying of any flag other than the United States flag over United States diplomatic and consular posts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. TITUS (for herself, Mr. HORSFORD, and Ms. LEE of Nevada):

H.R. 466. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to obtain the consent of affected State and local governments before making an expenditure from the Nuclear Waste Fund for a nuclear waste repository, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. VAN DREW:

H.R. 467. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to eliminate the requirement of a service-connected disability to furnish veterans with medical care outside of a State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK, and Mrs. McIVER):

H.R. 468. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require institutions of higher education, as a condition of participation in programs under title IV of such Act, to establish a policy to award posthumous degrees to certain deceased students, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN (for herself, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. EVANS of Pennsylvania, and Mr. ADERHOLT):

H.R. 469. A bill to provide for the creation of a Congressional time capsule in commemoration of the semiquincentennial of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on 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. CRENSHAW (for himself, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. VALADAO, Mrs. CAMMACK, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. CISCOMANI, Ms. DE LA CRUZ, Mr. CAREY, and Mr. BABIN):

H.J. Res. 19. A joint resolution to acknowledge the courage and sacrifice of veterans of the Vietnam war and formally apologize for the treatment they received upon returning home; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Workforce, 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. PALMER (for himself, Mr. BURLISON, Ms. LETLOW, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mrs. BICE, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. OGLES, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. FULCHER, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mrs. FISCHBACH, Mr. HURD of Colorado, and Mr. BAIRD):

H.J. Res. 20. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Energy relating to "Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Consumer Gas-fired Instantaneous Water Heaters"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HERN of Oklahoma:

H. Res. 42. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. HERN of Oklahoma:

H. Res. 43. A resolution providing for the attendance of the House at the Inaugural Ceremonies of the President and Vice President of the United States; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. AGUILAR:

H. Res. 44. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. ADAMS (for herself, Ms. NORTON, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Ms. MCCLELLAN, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. SYKES, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. UNDERWOOD, and Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania):

H. Res. 45. A resolution honoring Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Inc., on reaching the historic milestone of 117 years of serving communities; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. Res. 46. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to exclude employees of the offices of Members who serve on certain committees of the House from the allotment of the number of employees of the office who may hold security clearances processed by the Office of House Security if such employees are members of the armed forces who hold a security clearance issued by the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. STEUBE (for himself, Ms. HAGEMAN, Mr. MOORE of West Virginia, Ms. BOEBERT, Mr. WEBSTER of

Florida, Mr. OWENS, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. McCORMICK, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. NORMAN, and Mr. GUEST):

H. Res. 47. A resolution concerning the National Collegiate Athletic Association policy for eligibility in women's sports; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

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. CLINE:

H.R. 404.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. FULCHER:

H.R. 405.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 provides Congress with the power to 'lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises' in order to 'provide for the general Welfare of the United States.'

By Mr. YAKYM:

H.R. 406.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. DELBENE:

H.R. 407.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. ARRINGTON:

H.R. 408.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H.R. 409.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. BEGICH:

H.R. 410.

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 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BERGMAN:

H.R. 411.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. BERGMAN:

H.R. 412.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mrs. BICE:

H.R. 413.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 414.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section

By Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 415.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CLINE:

H.R. 416.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. CLINE:

H.R. 417.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. CLINE:

H.R. 418.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. CLINE:

H.R. 419.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 4 and clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. CLINE:

H.R. 420.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. CLINE:

H.R. 421.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. CLINE:

H.R. 422.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 423.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CRENSHAW:

H.R. 424.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H.R. 425.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. ESPAILLAT:

H.R. 426.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . .

By Mr. FITZGERALD:

H.R. 427.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. FLEISCHMANN:

H.R. 428.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18, which states the Congress shall have the power "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or office thereof."

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 429.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 6 empowers Congress to coin money.

By Mr. GARBARINO:

H.R. 430.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. GRAVES:

H.R. 431.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. HAGEMAN:

H.R. 432.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

By Mrs. HAYES:

H.R. 433.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana:

H.R. 434.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution, Congress has the power "to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any Department or Officer thereof"

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 435.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. KEATING:

H.R. 436.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. KENNEDY of New York:

H.R. 437.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3, Section 8, Article 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. LALOTA:

H.R. 438.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. LALOTA:

H.R. 439.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. LEE of Florida:

H.R. 440.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Ms. LETLOW:

H.R. 441.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Ms. LETLOW:

H.R. 442.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Ms. MACE:

H.R. 443.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. MOOLENAAR:

H.R. 444.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, 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 Defence and general Welfare of the United States; and

Article I, Section 8, clause 3: To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several

By Mr. MORAN:

H.R. 445.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

By Mr. NEHLS:

H.R. 446.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. PEREZ:

H.R. 447.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 of the US Constitution

By Ms. PETERSEN:

H.R. 448.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article 1

By Mrs. RADEWAGEN:

H.R. 449.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. SALAZAR:

H.R. 450.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska:

H.R. 451.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. STAUBER:

H.R. 452.

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 5 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 453.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 454.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 455.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 456.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 457.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 458.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 459.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 460.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 461.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 462.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mrs. SYKES:

H.R. 463.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 464.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution in that the legislation exercises legislative powers granted to Congress by that clause "to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States or any Department or Office thereof."

By Mr. TIMMONS:

H.R. 465.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 466.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. VAN DREW:

H.R. 467.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Sec. 8

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 468.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . .

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN:

H.R. 469.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. CRENSHAW:

H.J. Res. 19.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. PALMER:

H.J. Res. 20.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 21: Mr. CLINE, Mr. CRANK, Mr. GARBARINO, Ms. LETLOW, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. TIMMONS, and Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 24: Mr. HARRIS of Maryland.

H.R. 30: Mr. KNOTT, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. GUEST, Mr. TIFFANY, and Mr. BEGICH.

H.R. 31: Mr. MEUSER.

H.R. 36: Mr. HARIDOPOLIS.

H.R. 38: Mr. HAMADEH of Arizona and Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia.

H.R. 45: Mr. MEUSER, Ms. LETLOW, and Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 51: Mr. TURNER of Texas, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. SUBRAMANYAM, and Ms. MORRISON.

H.R. 68: Mrs. FLETCHER.

H.R. 137: Mr. SELF.

H.R. 142: Mrs. HINSON.

H.R. 151: Mr. KNOTT, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. FEDORCHAK, Mr. ISSA, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mr. ALFORD, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BRECHEEN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Mr. TIFFANY.

H.R. 158: Mr. DELUZZIO.

H.R. 176: Mr. HURD of Colorado.

H.R. 178: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 212: Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. AMO, Mrs. FLETCHER, and Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 221: Mrs. LUNA, Mr. FULCHER, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. STUTZMAN, and Mr. BURCHETT.

H.R. 236: Mr. BARRETT, Mr. HARRIS of Maryland, and Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 253: Mr. DELUZZIO.

H.R. 264: Mrs. MCIVER and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 265: Mrs. MCIVER and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 268: Mr. HARRIS of Maryland.

H.R. 271: Mr. SHREVE.

H.R. 283: Mr. HARRIS of Maryland and Mr. GUEST.

H.R. 288: Ms. DELAURIO.

H.R. 294: Ms. TENNEY.

H.R. 295: Mr. MEUSER.

H.R. 304: Mr. DONALDS.

H.R. 307: Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 309: Mr. HARDER of California.

H.R. 323: Mr. LANGWORTHY and Mr. RYAN.

H.R. 326: Mr. MEUSER.

H.R. 327: Mr. BAIRD, Mr. LANGWORTHY, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. HUDSON, and Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 335: Mr. GOSAR, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. BURCHETT, and Mr. STUTZMAN.

H.R. 337: Mr. GRAY and Mr. HARDER of California.

H.R. 338: Mr. GRAY and Mr. HARDER of California.

H.R. 342: Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, and Mr. ROY.

H.R. 361: Mr. STEUBE, Mr. HARRIS of Maryland, and Mr. GUEST.

H.R. 383: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 387: Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas.

H.R. 391: Ms. RANDALL.

H.R. 393: Mr. GILL of Texas.

H.R. 394: Mr. GILL of Texas.

H.R. 395: Mr. GILL of Texas.

H.R. 396: Ms. HOYLE of Oregon and Ms. FRIEDMAN.

H.R. 397: Mr. GARBARINO, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. LAWLER, Ms. TENNEY, and Mr. RYAN.

H.R. 403: Ms. NORTON.

H.J. Res. 10: Mrs. FISCHBACH.

H. Res. 23: Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. MULLIN, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. LANDSMAN, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. GOLDEN of Maine, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. SANCHEZ, Ms. ANSARI, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MAGAZINER, and Mrs. TRAHAN.

H. Res. 33: Ms. TLAIB.

H. Res. 35: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H. Res. 36: Mr. BAIRD.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 361: Mr. DUNN of Florida.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 119th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 171

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 15, 2025

No. 8

Senate

The Senate met at 12 noon and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, You are our rock and fortress. Keep us from disappointing You.

Help our lawmakers to walk in Your precepts so that they can remain within the circle of Your protection and blessings. Lord, turn their ears to listen to Your admonition as You infuse them with the courage to obey Your commands. We have trusted You since the birth of this land we love. That is why we will declare Your glory all day long. Lord, as our Senators strive to please You today, we declare that You alone are our hope.

And, Lord, continue to be with those who battle the catastrophic wildfires in Southern California.

We pray in Your strong Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore 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.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARSHALL). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

The President pro tempore.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I would like to speak for 2 or 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ISRAEL

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, the Jewish people have faced many libels

and many libels over their history—in their case, for millennia. Today, the Jewish State faces the dirty libel—can you believe it?—of committing genocide, all while defending themselves from Hamas.

Remember, Hamas has pledged to destroy the Jewish people in their homeland. Now, that happens to be real genocide. Israel's accusers cite large civilian casualty numbers traced to Hamas's self-reporting. As we know, Hamas has a history of inflating numbers, of not distinguishing fighters from civilians, and of listing male soldiers as women or children. A recent report by the Henry Jackson Society confirms that the widely cited Gaza casualty statistics suffer from all forms of falsifications.

Still, as we would all agree, any civilian death in Gaza is a real tragedy. While Israel goes out of its way to issue warnings to civilians, Hamas actually encourages civilians to ignore evacuation warnings while embedding in schools and hospitals to use civilians as human shields. Hamas officials are on record that they seek civilian casualties for propaganda effect.

The definition of "genocide" in the United States and also under international law focuses on the intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national ethnic, racial, or religious group.

A very recent Amnesty International report adopts a new definition just to tar Israel with that disgusting libel. Amnesty International Israel was not involved in the report and, as you might expect, rejects its central claims.

So I want my fellow Senators to know that I, too, reject this bias and this misleading report, and I say: Shame on them.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

LAKEN RILEY ACT

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, it is more than 1,000 miles from El Paso, TX, to Athens, GA, yet a man who crossed the border illegally near El Paso was able to wreak havoc in Athens.

Last February, an illegal immigrant murdered nursing student Laken Riley while she was out for a morning run on the Athens campus of the University of Georgia. This was a tragedy, and it was preventable. The man who killed Laken Riley should not have been in the United States in the first place. He definitely shouldn't have been on the streets after previously being involved in two crimes, but he was. It is, unfortunately, just one example of how the Biden border crisis has made every State a border State.

Like many illegal immigrants whom law enforcement encounters at the border, Laken's killer was released on parole into the interior of the United States. He made his way to New York City, where he was arrested and released before a detainer could be issued and he could be turned over to immigration authorities. Then he went to Athens, GA. He was cited in Georgia for shoplifting. Once again, he was released, and now we know what happened next.

Laken's killer is now serving a life sentence for murder, and while her family can perhaps take at least some comfort in the fact that justice has been served, Laken Riley should be alive today.

The truth is that what happened to Laken Riley could have happened anywhere. That is why the Senate is currently considering Senator BRITT's Laken Riley Act. This bill would help reduce the chances of another tragedy like this one by requiring that illegal immigrants be detained when they are charged with theft-related crimes like the one for which Laken's killer was cited less than 5 months before he killed her. If this bill had been law then, Laken Riley might well be alive today.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S159

I hope to see this bill become law, and I hope that my Democrat colleagues are as committed to making it law as we are on this side of the aisle. This is not a comprehensive bill, but it is an important step toward keeping Americans safe, and it should be an easy “yes” vote for every Senator. We have had strong bipartisan votes for this bill in recent days, and I hope that will continue.

We are going to have an amendment process here on the floor, the type of amendment process that has been lacking in recent years. We will push for votes on amendments that make this bill even stronger.

One of the amendments that would do that is Senator ERNST's amendment known as Sarah's Law. Like Laken Riley, Sarah Root was killed by an illegal immigrant. Soon after graduating from college in 2016, Sarah was killed by a drunk driver who was in the country illegally. The driver was arrested, but he posted bond and fled shortly after the crash that took Sarah Root's life. The Root family didn't get justice. So Senator ERNST's amendment would require ICE to detain illegal immigrants accused of a crime that resulted in death or serious bodily injury.

Every Member of the Senate should be able to agree that illegal immigrants who commit a crime that kills or seriously injures another person should, at the very least, be detained.

In the coming days, the Senate will have a serious debate about this and other amendments and about the Laken Riley Act. That is the Senate's role. We will have a debate, and we will aim to produce the strongest bill that we can pass into law. That is our goal, and I hope our Democrat colleagues are as interested in making a law as we are.

Mr. President, time will tell.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

ISRAEL

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, let me begin by speaking of the recent news of a cease-fire agreement in the Middle East. I have good news. I have just been informed by the administration that a deal has been agreed to. It is welcome news that there is an agreement that will free many of the hostages. A cease-fire is very good news for Israel, for America, for the Pales-

tinian people, and particularly for the hostage families, who have waited so long in agony.

A cease-fire will reduce violence in Gaza and harm to innocent civilians. It couldn't have happened without steadfast diplomacy and until the potency of Hamas was radically reduced. We will not rest until every hostage comes home.

CABINET NOMINATIONS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, now, on the Hegseth hearing, the takeaway from yesterday's hearing on Pete Hegseth is very clear: Pete Hegseth is woefully unfit for the job of Secretary of Defense.

For Mr. Hegseth, yesterday's hearing was an exercise in obfuscation. When confronted about the serious accusations against his character, Mr. Hegseth repeatedly dismissed them as “smear tactics” but refused to respond to how these character issues impact his qualifications for the job.

When asked if being guilty of sexual assault is disqualifying for the job of Secretary of Defense, Mr. Hegseth refused to answer. Imagine if any other American interviewing for any other job refused to answer that question.

Clearly, more information is needed about Hegseth's background. But when Democrats asked to make Mr. Hegseth's full FBI background documents available to all members of the committee, the Republican chair said no.

Why? Why is the Republican chair insistent on keeping relevant information about Mr. Hegseth locked away from committee members?

Perhaps the reason for Republican stonewalling is that the more evidence that is revealed about Mr. Hegseth, the more obvious it will become that he is woefully unfit for the job.

For Mr. Hegseth, when there are serious allegations, to not answer them directly and instead just call them “smear tactics”—especially in such an important job like Secretary of Defense, where people's lives are on the line—is just totally unacceptable, totally inadequate, and, basically, a nominee for a very important position just ducking the most important questions he faced.

Now, let me say a few things about why these hearings are so important for our country and to our side.

By all indications, our Republican colleagues seem perfectly comfortable with advancing Mr. Hegseth through the Senate, despite his lack of qualifications. Many of our colleagues have private doubts about the nominees, but, publicly, they are still willing to embrace them.

Donald Trump's hold on Senate Republicans has become very powerful. Nevertheless, we Democrats will continue to push and pressure and scrutinize each nominee in committee because it is so important to get them on record. Americans need to see that

many of Donald Trump's nominees are simply unfit for the jobs they have been chosen for. Americans need to hear these nominees answer for Donald Trump's harmful policies.

And if some of these nominees are severely unqualified—and many of them are—these hearings are essential for exposing that. Even if they get confirmed in the end, the information must come out. Even if they get confirmed, it is so important to have all these questions asked and to see what the answers, or lack of answers, are.

If the time comes, months from now, that some of Donald Trump's Cabinet members fail on the job, these hearings will have served as an important warning for the American people to see. That is why Democrats are committed to ensuring each nominee is vetted thoroughly and scrutinized during the testimony.

One other point, by the way, on why we think the hearings are important: The hearings are also an opportunity to show whose side each party is on. Are these nominees in favor of tax cuts for very wealthy people? Are they in favor of keeping programs that help working-class people, keep prices down, such as making sure that Medicare can negotiate drug prices, which brings down the price for everybody? Where do they stand?

Where do they stand? The hearings glaringly show that Donald Trump and his nominees are on the side of the very powerful and that we Democrats who are asking the questions are on the side of working people.

And as the hearings wind through and we go through more and more witnesses, it will become clearer and clearer to the American people who is on whose side.

So it is important to have a record of these nominees even if they get confirmed in the end to see who they are and to guard against the dangers that might occur with them in office and to show who is on whose side.

Now, a couple more of today's nominees are very troubling. One is Mr. Vought. Few nominees illustrate what is at stake for working-class families better than Donald Trump's pick for OMB director, Mr. Russell Vought. This is one of the most influential positions in the entire White House, responsible for not only producing the President's budget but also executing the President's agenda across the executive branch.

I will be candid, Mr. Vought's appointment to OMB director would be a nightmare scenario for working Americans. It is difficult to imagine a worse choice to implement White House policy than the chief architect of Project 2025. Let me repeat that, because our Republican friends don't want to talk about 2025, but at the same time, they are likely to vote for someone who was the chief architect of the project in a powerful position to implement it: head of OMB.

You cannot, you simply cannot be proworker and support the nomination

of Russell Vought. The last time he worked at the White House, Mr. Vought pushed radical budget proposals that gutted Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and funding for public health.

During the last default crisis, Mr. Vought was a key advisor to hard-right Republicans who pushed America to the brink of disaster by using the debt ceiling as blackmail to cut trillions in funding for healthcare, for seniors, for hungry kids.

When Congress did not appropriate Donald Trump's border wall, Vought raided the accounts of the Pentagon and the Treasury Department to pay for it. And on top of it all, Mr. Vought put America's national security at risk by illegally withholding foreign aid to Ukraine in an attempt to help Donald Trump on the campaign trail.

To call Mr. Vought an extremist would, frankly, give extremists a bad name. The only people in America who can be happy about Mr. Vought are the richest of the rich, who would make a killing if Donald Trump and Republicans hand them another trillion-dollar tax cut. And, again, just let me repeat, this man is the chief architect of Project 2025. Republicans are running away from that project now, but at the same time, they are putting its chief architect in one of the most powerful positions in the Federal Government, which had a broad range across just about every policy.

So today's hearing with Mr. Vought is a reminder to the American people that Donald Trump does not intend to keep his promises to working people. If Donald Trump were serious about being proworker, he would not have turned to the godfather of the ultraright to oversee White House policy.

And on Chris Wright, the tragic fires in California are another warning that the climate crisis continues to grow in strength. The scientific community across the world from the U.N. to NASA to even national security experts agree that ignoring climate change is dangerous.

So Donald Trump's nominee for Energy Secretary is truly alarming: oil executive Chris Wright. Everything you need to know about who Mr. Wright is and what he will fight for can be found in the following quote he once gave in an interview. Mr. Wright said:

Oil and Gas make the world go round.

Mr. Wright amassed his wealth in fracking and is an oil executive, so, of course, he thinks oil and gas are the only things that count in the world. An article from the New York Times this morning called him an evangelist for fossil fuels.

What makes Mr. Wright so troubling, however, is that he is perfectly willing to admit climate change is happening while rejecting that we should do anything about it.

He says calling climate change a crisis is pure fearmongering. He says the real crisis is that not enough people

are using hydrocarbons. Imagine, that is what he said, not enough people are using hydrocarbons. That is the crisis in the world. Can you believe it?

He even says that roadblocks to unrestrained fossil fuel development are outright "immoral." This man is an extremist when it comes to energy issues. He is not even among the conservative mainstream he is so far over.

What a shock this is, a wealthy oil executive thinks that the solutions to the world's problems are to produce more oil. This is who Donald Trump wants leading America's energy policy.

Mr. Wright's nomination should be an alarm bell for every single American who has gotten a job recently at battery plants, EV factories, and other good-paying clean jobs. Many of these Americans are in red States that trusted Donald Trump to look after them. But as far as Donald Trump's pick for Energy Secretary is concerned, he thinks "we're not in the midst of an energy transition." That is his words.

Tell that to the workers in rural America rebuilding EV batteries and wind and solar. I hope our Republican colleagues will repeat those words to the employees in their districts who have gotten good-paying jobs in these new clean energy industries.

Everyone knows we still have a lot of work to do before we reach our clean energy goals, and everybody knows it is not going to be easy. The question is whether or not Donald Trump's administration is going to protect the clean energy jobs we have created or kill them and put people out of work for the sake of Big Oil.

Mr. Wright's nomination suggests that Donald Trump is willing to let all those good-paying clean energy jobs we have created disappear.

And to my Republican colleagues, when Donald Trump and Mr. Wright start cutting the jobs that have come from clean energy that are in your States, don't say we didn't tell you so. And remember, the voters are going to know who you voted for, for the head of Energy.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

LAKEN RILEY ACT—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 5, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 5) to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to take into custody

aliens who have been charged in the United States with theft, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Thune (for Ernst/Grassley) Amendment No. 8, to include crimes resulting in death or serious bodily injury to the list of offenses that, if committed by an inadmissible alien, require mandatory detention.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

CABINET NOMINATIONS

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, yesterday I watched closely the nomination hearing for Pete Hegseth. He is President Trump's nominee to be Secretary of Defense.

For the safety and security of our Nation, Pete deserves a swift, swift confirmation. I am going to vote for him to be the next Secretary of Defense, and I believe that vote is going to happen soon.

He was very clear in the hearing yesterday, the incoming administration is going to refocus the Pentagon on American strength and on hard power—not a woke agenda, which is what we have seen for the last 4 years.

To me, this is very welcome news, and I believe it is welcome news to Americans all across this country who are worried about the security of our Nation and the strength of our Nation.

We have a significant problem in the military today. It is a problem with morale and a problem with recruitment. Pete Hegseth is the right person to address both of these issues and to make sure that we—America—have a military that is ready to fight. Pete served in combat at the height of the war on terror. He deployed overseas to Iraq, to Afghanistan, and to Guantanamo Bay in Cuba.

He is a decorated veteran. He has earned two Bronze Stars. He also earned the Combat Infantryman's badge. When Pete's executive officer evaluated his performance in Iraq, the feedback was glowing. Pete, he said, was "an incredibly talented, battle-proven leader."

Incredibly talented, battle-proven leader.

He "always [completed] every mission to high standards with minimal guidance or supervision." That is what you want.

Now, I heard Senator SCHUMER ask on this floor: Why should Americans entrust Pete to lead our military? Well, Pete Hegseth answered that question yesterday.

Senator SHEEHY asked during the hearing: Are you going to have the backs of the warfighters? To which our nominee said, yes, he will have their backs. That is why Americans should trust Pete to lead our military.

It is interesting to hear my Democrat colleagues dismiss Pete's years of military service. They sounded angry about his plan to restore American strength. They seemed frustrated that he clearly loves our country and wants to continue to serve. Democrats tried to turn yesterday's hearing into a kangaroo court. They claimed that Pete isn't qualified.

So let's talk about his military experience. The Department of Defense is filled with people who have decades of experience working in the Pentagon. The Pentagon just failed its seventh—seventh—consecutive audit. Think about that for a second.

Each year, the American taxpayers send the Pentagon more than \$850 billion—billion with “b”—yet the Pentagon can't pass a single audit. Look, it sounds like we don't need more experience like that. We need a fresh set of eyes, a soldier—as Pete said himself—with dirt on his boots.

Being Secretary of Defense isn't just about managing a bureaucracy; it is about making America's military the best and most lethal fighting force in the world. Pete is going to be a Secretary of Defense who respects the warfighter and who respects the taxpayer. He is a bold choice for the future of our military, a bold choice for the future of our Nation, and the right choice to be Secretary of Defense.

A Senate confirmation is not an easy process, and the Secretary of Defense is not an easy job. Yesterday, Pete gave strong answers to tough questions. He is confident, and he is knowledgeable. He is ready to lead the Department of Defense.

He knows the cost of war. He knows the price of weakness, and the true value and the valor of American soldiers.

As Secretary of Defense, he is going to reestablish deterrence and rebuild our military. He is going to champion American servicemembers and restore American military readiness.

Pete is going to bring the Pentagon back to what its mission should be: lethality, accountability, transparency, merit. The focus is going to be on military readiness, not social experiments and partisan policies.

America needs a strong Secretary of Defense now, immediately. Senate Republicans will get it done.

S. 5

Mr. President, today the Senate is considering amendments to the Laken Riley Act. The Laken Riley Act is actually bipartisan legislation. It is a lifesaving bill. It is a lifesaving bill that is going to lock up illegal immigrants and then deport them.

Republicans are offering targeted amendments to make this bill even stronger. Senator ERNST has an amendment that would detain illegal immigrants who commit murder or cause serious bodily injury. Senator CORNYN has an amendment that will detain illegal immigrants who attack law enforcement officers.

Those are the type of amendments that Republicans are discussing to strengthen the bill. I know there is some Democrats who are trying to undermine the bill. They want to replace it with thousands of pages of immigration reform.

I have said this before, and it bears repeating: Republicans are not going to undermine or weaken this lifesaving bill.

The Laken Riley Act is not comprehensive immigration reform. It is a targeted piece of tough immigration enforcement. Republicans aren't going to trade American lives for amnesty. We will make the law that puts the safety of the American people first. That is what Americans voted for in November: safety, security, for our communities, for our citizens.

Senator JOHN FETTERMAN of Pennsylvania was recently asked about the bipartisan Laken Riley Act. This is what he said, he said: Pretend that you are in a parking lot in a Wal-Mart in Scranton, PA, as we are out traveling around the State in our own home States.

He said: Well, I am going to vote against a bill that allows people to deport people that are charged with a crime or have a criminal record?

To me, I hope others will listen to Senator FETTERMAN and hear those words and realize how ridiculous it sounds that anyone would vote against the Laken Riley Act.

The Laken Riley Act deserves strong, targeted amendments and swift passage in this body and then signed into law by the President.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MULLIN). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Tennessee.

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND WORKS AGENCY

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I have to say, I think the remarks I planned today are so pertinent to what is taking place in our world as we are hearing about the Trump effect actually bringing forward a deal with Israel, Hamas, and the hostages because my remarks today are centered on UNRWA, the U.N. Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees.

Now, this has been one of the biggest obstacles to peace in the Middle East. To the world, UNRWA presents itself as an aid group for Palestinians. But, in reality, this agency—this U.N. agency that has been the recipient of 7.1 billion U.S. taxpayer dollars—is nothing more than a terror group that works to undermine Israel's security and safety. We have known this for years, but in the aftermath of the Hamas barbaric October 7 attack on the Jewish State, we have learned much more about UNRWA's terror ties.

Early last year, the Wall Street Journal reported that 10 percent of UNRWA's staff have ties to Islamist militant groups. Among them, 6 took part in the October 7 assault that left 1,200 Israelis dead and hundreds more in captivity.

After reports emerged that an UNRWA teacher held an Israeli hostage in his attic, I pressed the agency to in-

vestigate that employee. Instead of taking action, the group dismissed this request and this claim as “unsubstantiated” and called on the Israeli journalist who reported the news to “immediately delete the post.”

We also know that UNRWA has indoctrinated Palestinian children with schools that glorify terrorism and promote violent hatred of Jews, allowed Hamas to store weapons in their buildings, and provided support and aid to the terror group.

Now, a new report from UN Watch, the top watchdog for holding the U.N. accountable, shows that UNRWA works with Hamas, as well as Palestinian Islamic Jihad, at the highest level of the agency. To quote the report, “this secret relationship allows the terrorist organizations to significantly influence the policies and practices of a UN agency with 30,000 employees, and \$1.5 billion annual budget that is funded primarily by Western states.

The evidence is overwhelming. In 2017, UNRWA's then-Commissioner General met with leaders of Hamas and Palestinian Islamic Jihad to strengthen—in his words—“a spirit of partnership.” To protect the agency's credibility, however, the Commissioner General urged the terror leaders to ensure that “discussions not be made public.”

Of course, open collaboration with U.S.-designated terror groups could jeopardize the millions it receives from Western countries every year. So they tried to cover it up so that they could keep getting these millions and billions of dollars—as I said, U.S. taxpayers, 7.1 billion that has gone into this group.

In the years since, UNRWA leaders have repeatedly pledged support for Palestinian terrorists. That same year, the agency's Lebanon director told terror leaders that UNRWA hoped to have a strong partnership with them. A year later, their program director in Lebanon met with a Hamas official to discuss “ongoing cooperation and coordination.”

Also in 2018, a former UNRWA official appeared at a rally alongside Hamas terror leaders who urged support for UNRWA “until we return to Palestine”—meaning the end of Israel as a Jewish State. The UNRWA official, of course, thanked the terrorist “for their understanding.”

In 2021, the former Deputy Commissioner General of UNRWA met with Sinwar—now, that is the Hamas leader who later planned the October 7 attack—after one of her employees admitted on TV that Israel's strikes on Hamas are “very precise.”

In response, the Deputy Commissioner General removed the employee from his position and thanked Sinwar for “his positivity and desire to continue cooperation in facilitating the agency's work in the Gaza Strip.”

You see there is a pattern here of participation between UNRWA and between Hamas and Palestinian Islamic Jihad. This is just a sample of the

high-level meetings between leaders of UNRWA and these groups. The list could go on and on and on. What this report makes very clear is that UNRWA's support for terror groups is not something that happens at the agency's fringes. Instead, supporting and enabling terrorism against Israel is UNRWA's main purpose.

I want to say that again: UNRWA's support for these terrorist groups is not just at the fringes. It is with their leadership. They are supporting and enabling terrorism against Israel, and we need to realize this.

This is why President Trump canceled U.S. funding to the agency during his first administration, and it is why President Biden's decision in 2021 to restore that funding—over \$730 million that year—was a huge mistake.

After the October 7 attack, I led the charge in introducing legislation to defund UNRWA, and, in March of last year, President Biden finally signed into law a 1-year ban on that funding.

With all we know about UNRWA, though, we need to make this ban permanent, which is why I am working on legislation that will do just that once we get a new President and once we begin to say no to these organizations who take taxpayer dollars and turn around and use it against the American people, use it for pro-terror, pro-violence organizations and groups.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 5

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, you will see for the next hour a whole group of Republicans coming to the floor to be able to talk about one issue: our need for border security and safer communities. This is something that not just Republicans in the Senate are talking about; this is something that the American people spoke loudly and clearly about during the last election when they elected President Trump, a Republican Senate, and a Republican House. There is not a single Member who is a Republican in this body, in the House, or, clearly, President Trump, who didn't talk about border security and safer communities throughout the entire election.

Every single poll showed that this was one of the priority issues that every single American was thinking about. A Gallup poll last year found that more than three-quarters of Americans support increasing the number of Border Patrol agents; that two-thirds of Americans want the President and the Homeland Security Secretary to temporarily halt all asylum requests when the border is overwhelmed; and third, a majority of Americans support

expanding border wall construction. People want a secure community.

On the floor this week—we started last week and are still debating it this week—is what to do on what is called the Laken Riley Act. Some Americans are familiar with Laken Riley's story; some are not. Laken Riley was a college student in Georgia who was brutally murdered by a Venezuelan who came into the United States illegally, was detained at the border, but then released. He traveled around the country wherever he wanted to under a parole system that was given to him at the border in 2022. He committed a crime, was arrested for that crime, and then was released. He committed another crime—shoplifting. He was arrested for that crime and was then released. The third crime, as far as we know—there might have been many more, but the third crime, as far as we know, was his murder of Laken Riley.

He should have never been in the United States. He should have never been paroled at the border. He should have been detained and then deported, but he wasn't. He was paroled into the United States. When he committed a crime in the United States, he should have been deported, but he was not. He was released. When he committed a second crime in the United States, he should have been deported, but he wasn't. He was released—before he ever got to murder.

The Laken Riley Act is pretty simple. It says: If someone is here illegally and they commit a crime in the United States of stealing Americans' stuff, like he did, that he is deported. I don't think it is a radical concept to be able to say that Americans don't want someone to come into the country illegally and take their stuff. Why this is even a challenge to be able to pass this, I have no idea. This passed in the House last session, but the Senate never took it up to even discuss it.

If I go to any of the great 4 million Oklahomans in my State and I say "What do you think about someone illegally coming into the country and stealing people's stuff? Do you think that is OK, that they should still be able to stay?" I don't think I would find anybody of the 4 million Oklahomans who would say "I am OK with someone illegally coming into the country, stealing people's stuff" and say "You can go ahead and stay."

That is all that this bill does. It says that if someone comes into this country illegally and starts stealing stuff, they are detained; they are held. They are not just allowed to be released to be able to drift around the country to steal other things or to commit a murder later. If they come into our country illegally and start stealing things, they are detained, and they will go through the rest of the legal process. It doesn't mean they are automatically deported the very next day. They still have a legal challenge there. They can have their legal challenge. But they are not going to just wander around the country.

That is why we believe this Laken Riley Act is so important. It is because we never, ever, ever, ever want to have another American who is murdered by someone illegally present here, especially someone who had already committed multiple crimes before they ever got to that murder.

So let's have the debate. I am willing to be able to talk to any one of my Democratic or Republican colleagues who has a question about this, but at the base of this is, why would we let someone who is already illegally present in the country and who we already know has committed additional crimes just continue to walk our streets just to commit more crimes? Why would we not detain those individuals?

On Monday, President Trump will be inaugurated. I am looking forward to working with him and seeing even what happens on day one to be able to secure the border. This is something the American people want. They want a border that is secure; they want communities that are secure; and they want just basic commonsense things done, like if someone breaks into our country and then steals stuff, they are actually detained rather than just released to go do it again. Let's at least do the basics that we can do while we continue to be able to work toward the big projects that still need to be done.

Multiple of my colleagues will be coming in the moments ahead to talk through this same issue because we feel like, on this side, it is incredibly important we get this done.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, this week, the Senate is proud to take another step forward toward securing our southern border as we consider the Laken Riley Act. I want to extend my deep gratitude to Senator KATIE BRITT and Senator TED BUDD for their leadership in bringing this bill forward.

First and foremost, I want to say that I strongly support this measure. With this bill, the Senate will be taking a bold step for the safety and prosperity of American citizens after 4 years of mismanagement and decline and, ultimately, chaos at the border.

The Laken Riley Act is the answer to a loud and clear call made at the ballot box by the American people to unite us as a country, to put America first, and to address the tragic lawlessness that we see on our southern border. So in the Senate's first order of legislative business, we are answering that call.

The radical open border policies of the left have caused untold suffering to families across the Nation—families like the Riley family, who is still grieving the unimaginable loss of their beautiful daughter Laken.

Laken was just 22 years old—a young nursing student with a promising future ahead of her. Tragically, she was stolen from this Earth by an individual who should have never been allowed to

room free in this country. Laken should be alive today, and she would have been if her killer had been brought to justice before it was too late. In Laken, we lost a bright and beautiful soul, as those who knew her will attest.

The law should serve our citizens, yet it has somehow been Laken's killer who has benefited from our system. It is time we honor Laken's legacy by putting American citizens first.

The Laken Riley Act, while too late to prevent Laken's tragedy, is a targeted bill that will save countless other lives. It will ensure that other illegal immigrants who are not dissimilar to her killer are detained for their crimes before they get a chance to commit another and maybe a more serious offense. Anyone who has entered the United States illegally and then committed a crime should and will face detention and deportation. It sounds like common sense to me. Laken's killer was arrested three times and released three times—once at the border, again in New York City, and a third time in Athens, GA, mere weeks before he took Laken's life. That will not happen and cannot happen under the Laken Riley Act.

This is a problem that cannot be ignored or explained away or made trivial. The American people demand change. The American people want us to fix this system that failed to uphold the law and failed to keep Laken safe. Her cause is their cause. It is the cause of every mother, every father, every brother, every sister—of a young girl who simply wants to go to school and then go out for a run in her neighborhood and feel safe.

I know, at its core, this is truly a bipartisan issue. We all want to keep our communities safe—all Republicans and Democrats. Our Republican conference is completely unified behind the Laken Riley Act, and we have managed to win over a majority of Senate Democrats for the bill's initial consideration, including two who have signed on as co-sponsors. As my Democrat colleague from Pennsylvania has noted, the failure to pass this bill would represent everything that is wrong with Congress.

The truth is, the American citizens have had enough talk, especially after these last 4 years. Now is the time for action. That is what the election was about—action, not empty words. This week, we will have before us a tranche of critical votes that America will be intently watching.

To the families watching who have lost loved ones, like the Riley family, we stand with you. We feel your grief and your pain, and we will guard against this heartbreak ever happening again.

Now more than ever, it is incumbent upon my colleagues and me to support America's families and pass the strongest possible bill for our communities.

With that, I look forward to advancing the Laken Riley Act this week.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, today I join my colleagues in looking forward to January 20, when we can turn the page on the failed border policies of the Biden-Harris administration and get back to the commonsense—commonsense—approach to border security under President Donald Trump.

During 4 years of the Biden-Harris border policies, our country saw the highest annual total of illegal alien crossings, the highest monthly total of illegal alien crossings, and the highest total of individuals on the Terror Watchlist attempting to cross our border.

These are the plain and simple facts. The Biden-Harris administration has made our country less safe, less secure, and more vulnerable to threats from abroad.

The American people saw beyond the Biden-Harris administration's false claims that the border was secure and last November gave a very clear and compelling mandate: Secure the border. Secure the border.

Already, the new Republican Senate majority is taking a first step to protect the American people against the consequences of the Biden-Harris administration's policies by working to pass the Laken Riley Act.

Under this bill, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement will be required to detain illegal immigrants who have committed theft-related offenses and issue an immigration detainer request to local law enforcement for illegal aliens who have committed related crimes.

The legislation can empower States to hold Federal officials accountable when they fail to enforce Federal immigration law.

This important legislation is one we should have never had to pass, but because the Biden-Harris administration played politics with our country's borders and immigration policy, Senate Republicans are here today ready to work on behalf of the American people.

Working with the Trump administration, we will prioritize the enforcement of policies that protect our southern border, which include reinstating the Migrant Protection Protocols or "Remain in Mexico" policy, enforcing safe third-country agreements, and resuming construction of the border wall.

In his first 100 days in office, President Biden revoked 94 Trump-era Executive orders and reversed crucial border security policies.

In less than a week, President-elect Trump will be sworn into office. He has committed to taking Executive action on day one to reinstate the policies that will secure our border. I look forward to these changes and working further to address the crisis created under the Biden-Harris administration.

I also look forward to the debate that will take place in the coming weeks regarding how Republicans will secure the border through reconciliation. We

are already hard at work on that. This will be an important legislative tool that will help refocus resources so that the professionals at ICE, CBP, and U.S. Border Patrol can focus on the mission of securing our border, removing criminal aliens who should not be in the United States, and addressing potential threats to the homeland.

To accomplish these goals, we must recruit and retain more border security professionals, modernize our border security tools like autonomous towers, and better utilize technology like the counter-unmanned aircraft systems along the border. The cause of these threats to our homeland is clear: President Biden's failure to secure the southern border.

Senate Republicans stand ready to work with President Trump to advance the policies that kept our border secure during his first administration. That is exactly what my colleagues and I will be working to accomplish every day in the coming months because border security is national security.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BUDD. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from North Dakota for his comments in support of this legislation.

One of the highest priorities of the next administration is securing the southern border, restoring law and order, and reversing the dangerous open border policies of President Biden. Too many Americans have felt the tragic consequences of these policies.

One of them was a woman named Laken Riley. She was a nursing student at the University of Georgia, and last year an illegal immigrant from Venezuela murdered her while she was out on an early morning jog.

What makes this story all the more devastating was that the killer should have been stopped but wasn't. He should have been stopped at the border in 2022, but he was paroled into this country. He should have been detained when he was arrested in New York in 2023 but wasn't. He should have been detained when he was arrested in Georgia for shoplifting, but he wasn't. The chain of these events is downright shameful.

We must make sure that these don't ever happen again, and that is why I worked with my good friend Senator KATIE BRITT of Alabama to reintroduce the Laken Riley Act.

This bill would require ICE to issue detainers and take into custody illegal aliens who commit crimes like theft and shoplifting.

We need to stop these individuals when they commit minor crimes before they are able to commit major crimes like the horrific murder of Laken Riley.

The Laken Riley Act will empower the Trump administration to enforce our laws, keep our Nation secure, and prevent—prevent—tragedies.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is common sense. But if you stay here in Washington long enough, you will sometimes feel that common sense is not all that common.

But I appreciate the newfound bipartisanship that seems to have broken out on Capitol Hill on this issue. It is wonderful. Dozens of Democrats have now supported the Laken Riley Act. I want to welcome them to the cause of law and order.

But a word here about amendments. And I thank Leader THUNE, who I think is off to a wonderful start, and I appreciate his leadership. He is open, as he promised, to amendments—several on this side of the aisle and several on the other. But let's just say that some of our friends on the other side of the aisle, they have an amendment. And let's say that it doesn't get the amount of votes. Let's not use that as a pretext for them not supporting this bill. Let's support this. And then you have our commitment to go back and work on that and take a look at that specific legislation that they were trying to introduce by amendment. But please don't use the failure of said amendment to not support this very important legislation.

It is my hope that we can continue in this spirit and make sure that the Laken Riley Act is passed by both Chambers and signed into law by our Nation's 47th President, Donald J. Trump.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, President Biden is spending his final days in office on a valedictory tour.

Now, here is one accomplishment he won't mention: a crisis on our southern border which has spread chaos across our country, flooded our communities with fentanyl, and cost innocent American lives.

Now, it is correct to call this one of President Biden's "accomplishments." He intentionally reversed the Trump administration's border policies as soon as he reached the Oval Office, and it was by design—by design—that millions of migrants who illegally crossed our southern border were released into our country. This self-inflicted disaster will be a major part of President Biden's ignominious legacy, and it is, in part, why Americans chose to return President Trump to office in November.

When the American people voted for a Republican President and a Republican Congress, they were voting to restore the rule of law at the border. They were demanding that their government fulfill its constitutionally delegated duty to provide for their national security. They were demanding that their government do that, and they were arguing, correctly, that it is not discrimination for a nation to demand that those who seek to call it home do so legally.

The American people want the return of commonsense immigration policy;

that is all. That is what I hear back home. But you see, this wasn't possible under President Biden.

Beginning next week, we will have a new President, and there will be no excuses. The open-border policies must end. Criminal migrants must go. The number of Border Patrol and Immigration and Customs Enforcement officers must be increased. Barriers to illegal entry must be expanded and enlarged. Republicans are working on legislation which will help accomplish all of these things and improve the security of our border, just like the American people expect.

It will be too little, too late for the family of Laken Riley, though. Of course, she should still be with us today. The man who murdered her last February should have never set foot in America. Her death was preventable. Her killer entered this country illegally and was quickly paroled. Then he was sent, at taxpayer expense, to New York, where he was arrested and released. If that was the end of the story, it would still be an outrage and an indictment of the failed Biden administration. But from there, he went to Georgia, you see—all courtesy of taxpayers—where he was arrested and freed again before brutally murdering Laken Riley.

Weakening border enforcement, incentivizing criminals with specious asylum claims to cross our border, failing to detain and deport these very same people for crimes committed far away from it—these were the policies that led to Laken's death. This cannot happen again. It can't happen again to another American or to their family. That is why we need to pass the Laken Riley Act. It won't singlehandedly end the crisis at our southern border, no. That is not its objective. But it is an important first step in the broader mission we have been assigned by the American people.

Homeland Security must detain migrants charged with crimes—here again, common sense—crimes like shoplifting, one of the crimes for which Laken's killer was arrested. The bill we are currently debating, the Laken Riley Act, requires that they do this and that we meet the objectives of the American people as it relates to border security.

You see, enforcing immigration law is a national security priority. I began emphasizing this years ago. I know so many other Americans believe this in their bones. It is time Washington started acting like it.

So this bill is one of many steps we should take to reverse the Biden administration's open border policies. Stop the madness. Stop the madness. I plead with my colleagues to support the Laken Riley Act. We should pass it now.

Let President Biden have his victory tour. But starting next week, the insanity ends, and we begin to secure our border.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. RICKETTS. Mr. President, President Biden's open border policies have created a national security, humanitarian, and drug catastrophe in our country. In 2023, law enforcement encounters at the border found 169 people on the FBI's Terrorist Watchlist. In previous years, under the Trump administration, that number was in the single digits. We have had 10.5 million border encounters since Biden took office.

On a single day in December, U.S. Customs and Border Protection encountered 12,600 people trying to illegally enter into our country. That is just along the southern border—12,600. It set an alltime, single-day record for the number of people trying to break into our country.

In years past, administration officials have said: If there are 1,000 people encountered at our southern border trying to get in, that is a crisis.

So 12,600 is a catastrophe.

Record amounts of deadly drugs have also flown into our country since President Biden opened our borders. We experienced this directly in Nebraska. In 2019, when I was Governor, Nebraska law enforcement took 46 pills laced with fentanyl off of our streets—46. Then, after Biden became President, in just the first 6 months of 2021, Nebraska law enforcement took 151,000 pills off our streets—from 46 to 151,000.

While I was Governor, after Biden became President, we saw that our law enforcement started confiscating twice as much methamphetamine, 3 times as much fentanyl, and 10 times as much cocaine because of our open southern border and the cartels taking advantage of it.

And just like all around the country, our young people paid the price as well. Taryn Lee Griffith was a young mom of two who took a pill that was laced with fentanyl and died because of it. The single largest killer of Americans 18 to 45 is fentanyl overdose, all facilitated by President Biden's open border policies along our southern border.

Jose Ibarra was a different kind of problem. Jose Ibarra was a Venezuelan national who crossed our border illegally in the Texas area and asked for asylum.

His wife said he just wanted a better job, but regardless, the Biden administration released him into this country. He was bused to New York City, and there he was arrested for "acting in a manner to endanger a child under the age of 17."

However, New York City is a sanctuary city. He was not detained or deported, as he ought to have been. He was released. He made his way to Georgia, and once again he was arrested; this time for shoplifting. But once again he was not detained or deported by Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

And because he was not, he went on to brutally murder Laken Riley. This

tragedy could have been avoided if President Biden had been protecting our southern border, if illegal immigrants were being detained and deported. People who break the laws in our country need to be held accountable. That is what the Laken Riley Act does.

It requires Immigration and Customs Enforcement to detain people who are breaking our laws. When people come here illegally, and they are breaking our laws, they need to be held accountable. With the Laken Riley Act, if you are committing theft, burglary, shoplifting, you will be detained and tragedies like Laken Riley can be avoided.

This is just common sense that we need to enforce our laws. To me, it is common sense that we need to protect our borders. And thank goodness, starting in a few days, we will have a President who understands the safety of the American people is the priority, and President Trump will secure our borders.

The election results were overwhelming; President Trump has a mandate to secure our borders. Senate Republicans will stand up to help him do just that. The Laken Riley Act is our first step to be able to help him do that. And I call upon my colleagues from the other side of the aisle to continue to support this bill as they have done on the previous votes.

Let's get this bill passed. Let's make sure other families don't have to live through the tragedy that Laken Riley's family had to live through.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, our Nation, this body, and the American people are all too familiar with stories like Laken Riley's, the 22-year-old nursing student beaten to death by an illegal immigrant, one who was already in police custody in New York City before being let go.

Unfortunately, after 4 years of Biden's open border, this heartbreaking story has become too commonplace. Hardly a day goes by without hearing of another American who has fallen victim to crimes perpetrated by the illegal immigrants the Biden administration let flood into our country.

And worse, too many times an illegal immigrant arrested for a violent crime posts bail, never to be heard from again, escaping through loopholes in the law.

This crisis only continues. While these tragedies should have never happened in the first place, my colleagues and I are taking action to ensure they never happen again.

My legislation, Sarah's Law, in conjunction with the Laken Riley Act will close these loopholes, so our laws no longer prioritize illegal immigrants over our own citizens.

Working to secure the border and protect Americans is not a new fight for me, but it became personal nearly 9 years ago. On January 31—so at the end

of this month—marks 9 years since Iowans Michelle Root and Scott Root, whom I know personally, woke up to every parent's worst nightmare. Their daughter, Sarah, was killed by a drunk driver who was an illegal immigrant.

Sarah—and she is a beautiful, young woman. She was 21 years old, she was from Council Bluffs, and she had just graduated from Bellevue University in Nebraska with a 4.0 GPA.

She had her bachelor's degree in criminal investigations. She was headed home after celebrating this really important milestone with her family and her friends. Sarah had her entire life ahead of her; but, instead, an illegal immigrant, Edwin Mejia, who was drunk driving with a blood alcohol level three times over the legal limit struck and killed her.

One would think that Sarah's killer would clearly meet Immigration and Customs Enforcement's enforcement priorities. But, no, citing the Obama administration's November 2014 memo, ICE declined to take custody of Mejia, despite his repeated driving offenses and history of skipping court dates.

Before the Root family could even lay Sarah to rest, her murderer posted bond and was released, never to be seen again.

To rub salt in the wound, the Biden administration removed Mejia from ICE's Most Wanted list.

Since then, I have warned repeatedly against the dangers of letting illegal immigrants—who have already broken our laws—roam the country and continue their lawlessness.

I have continually called on this body to step up and protect innocent Americans from criminals who are here in our country illegally and pass my bill: Sarah's Law.

A loophole in the law means Sarah's killer escaped justice. But today, we can do something to ensure no other family has to go through the pain and the grief that Sarah's parents, Scott and Michelle, still feel from their heartbreaking day.

My bill named in Sarah's honor would close the alarming loophole that let Sarah's killer go free.

It would simply require ICE to detain illegal immigrants charged with killing or seriously injuring another person, so they do not disappear before facing justice.

It is common sense, folks. No parent should have to endure the pain of losing a child like the Root family did. But, unfortunately, the Riley family is experiencing this same heartbreak.

Sarah's and Laken's deaths are both tragic and, unfortunately, are doomed to be repeated if we don't close the loopholes in that law. Those who come here illegally and harm our citizens should, without question, be detained so they face justice.

Again, folks, this is common sense. We can no longer prioritize illegal immigrants over public safety. We must pass the Laken Riley Act and Sarah's Law to send this message loud and

clear for Sarah's family, for Laken's family, and for the countless American families that this action would protect.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii is recognized.

TRUMP ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, after months of swearing up and down that they were focused on lowering the price of eggs, the price of groceries, the price of gas, the price of insurance—that was what the last election was about, right? It was about inflation. It was about the amount that people were paying. That is what the last election was about. Interestingly, the very first thing that Donald Trump and the Republicans have decided to do is to cut taxes for billionaire corporations, and they are going to pay for it by ripping off working Americans.

Now, that might sound like a political talking point. It sounds too convenient, too absurd. How can you spend 4 years pounding on the party in power about how much people are getting hit in the pocketbook—and they were. And they were. The price of eggs; the price of utilities; the price of gasoline—still in Hawaii around 4.59 a gallon. People are still paying too much. Yet the first order of business is not to do anything about that. It is not to do anything about that. It is to cut taxes for the wealthiest international corporations in human history.

I am here today with my Senate Democratic colleagues, and I want to make a sort of broader point. As Democrats struggle through, learn about, argue about what went wrong over the last 2 to 4 years politically, one of things that we did not do well enough is stay on the same theme. This place gets crazy, and it is especially crazy with Donald Trump as President. I remember, and it is distracting.

Even in the best of circumstances, people fly home, and then they arrive on Monday. There is a 5:30 vote, and oftentimes, the last vote is on Thursday at 1:45. So we talk about one thing from Monday at 5:30 until Thursday at 1:45, and the thing we talk about is often whatever is on the floor or whatever is in committee. We are going to do that. We have to do that. We have to comment on what we are working on. But we are also going to talk about this rip-off tax bill because that illustrates the difference between the parties. That is going to illustrate in three dimensions that all of this talk about lowering costs was a lie.

I am here with my Senate Democratic colleagues, including members of the Senate Finance Committee, led by Senator WYDEN on the Democratic side, who will be on the forefront of this particular fight. We are not here because we are surprised that Republicans are going to raise and not lower costs because we know that was the plan all along. We are not here because we are shocked that Republicans want to cut taxes for the ultrawealthy. They do that like clockwork every time they

win the House and the Senate and the Presidency. We are here because nothing can distract us from the reality of what is about to happen. This will be a giveaway of the worst kind at a time when people can least afford it.

So how do they plan to do it? And this is a little technical, so bear with me. House Republicans are saying that you have to pay for these tax cuts, right? You reduce revenue to the government. In order to pay for it, you have to find savings. You have to either get new revenue—that is kind of off the table for Republicans; they don't like new revenue unless it is tariffs, which Americans pay—or you have to cut something.

So last Friday, this document was released—and I understand, if you are watching this on your phone or even on CSPAN, it is kind of small, right? I get it. This document listed their so-called pay-fors; in other words, how are they going to pay for these massive tax cuts for the wealthiest individuals, the wealthiest privately held and publicly held corporations in human history?

Here are just a couple of things they are using as so-called pay-fors: \$700 billion in cuts, kicking millions of people off of Medicaid; \$500 billion out of Medicare, reducing access to care for seniors everywhere; more than \$150 billion in cuts to the Affordable Care Act subsidies. What does that mean? If you are on ACA, if you get your healthcare through ACA, the subsidy goes away, and your monthly insurance bill is about to skyrocket. Tens of millions of Americans who pay for their health insurance through the ACA exchange and receive that subsidy are going to have to pay more. What happens with that money? It doesn't go for roads. It doesn't go for firehouses. It doesn't go for public health. It goes to this tax cut.

I am not exaggerating. This is not a rhetorical flourish. This is not a political talking point. They are literally cutting Medicare, Medicaid, possibly Social Security, the Affordable Care Act, and they are going to take all these resources—these are their pay-fors—and shovel it to people so that they can continue their private jet subsidies, pay a lower tax rate, eliminate the 15-percent minimum billion-dollar corporation tax.

So before we passed the tax legislation when we were in charge, there were lots of the wealthiest corporations, international corporations, in the history of the planet that paid zero taxes—zero taxes. So what did we do both to generate money but also because it is a question of basic fairness? We established a minimum rate for these wealthy corporations. They want to eliminate that too. Why? Because this is what they do. Because that is actually their governing philosophy.

You know, they say: Campaign in poetry; govern in prose. That is not what is happening here. They campaigned on misleading people that their abiding concern, their main concern was, gosh,

people are paying too much for a dozen eggs. And I don't mean to diminish that. People were paying too much for a dozen eggs. But right now, inflation is 2.7 percent, and gas in a lot of places across the country is below 3 bucks. So people were paying too much, and people were rightly pissed off—by the way, at Democrats, too, for not recognizing how acute this problem was for a lot of American families. I get it. But I don't know anybody who thinks the solution to people paying too much out of pocket is to make them pay more out of pocket.

There is not a single voter that I know—not a single voter that I know—that I have interacted with who says: You know what. Gosh, I wish the highest corporate tax rate were just a little bit lower. Gosh, I wish the 15-percent minimum billion-dollar corporation tax were rescinded. Gosh, I wish people who are being subsidized so they can afford healthcare—I wish we would eliminate that. And, gosh, I wish we would use all that money and shovel it back to the wealthiest people in the world.

So we are not going to stop talking about this. I just had two hearings with Sean Duffy and MARCO RUBIO. I know Pam Bondi was today. Lots of very exciting and interesting things are happening, and we are going to have to comment on that. We are going to have to engage in that. But every week, we are going to be talking about this rip-off. Every week, every opportunity we get, we are going to be talking about this because this is the difference between the two political parties.

With that, I want to yield to my very good friend, who really understands tax policy and with whom I have been working on this and with whom—we fought together to win the ACA fight many, many years ago. Senator CHRIS MURPHY from Connecticut.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MURPHY. Thank you very much, Senator.

I just can't believe we are talking about something that nobody wants, right? That is what this comes down to. The No. 1 priority for Republicans is extending and likely expanding a tax cut that benefits the wealthiest 1 percent, .1 percent in this country at a rate that dwarfs—dwarfs—the help for anyone else.

The tax cut that we are talking about extending gives a tax cut to the top 1 percent of earners in this country that isn't 10 times bigger than working families at the bottom of the income scale; it is not 100 times bigger; it is not 500 times bigger. Taxpayers in the top 1 percent will get a tax cut 852 times larger than working families at the bottom of the income threshold—852 times bigger.

What we have seen coming out of the pandemic is that while the broad middle of the country has been struggling, the wealthy have gotten richer and richer and richer. We have more billionaires than ever before in this coun-

try. The folks that don't rely on salaries, that can just plow their income and their earnings into the capital markets, have reaped huge, huge rewards. So the very, very wealthy in this country right now, at this moment in time, don't need any more help, and yet the average family that is in that top 1 percent bracket is going to get a tax cut on average of \$70,000. Well, if you make \$30,000 in this country, you are going to get about \$100 back in your pocket.

Of course, the theory is that if you just layer on tax cuts for corporations and for billionaires and millionaires, that money will eventually trickle down to everybody else, right? That is a lie. That is not true. That is a fraud. It has never been true. It has been perpetuated on the American public because it is a great way to rationalize giving the bulk of tax cuts to the very, very wealthy. The idea is that somehow that will make it down to the rest of us. Go on to any Main Street of this country, go into any subdivision in your State—you won't find many of your constituents who make \$50,000 or \$100,000 or even \$200,000 who have had much of that trickle down to them.

To Senator SCHATZ's point, 8 years ago when this tax cut was first put into place, it was egregious not because of the balance only but also because the whole thing was borrowed. All that money was just put on the American credit card—a credit card that comes due and ends up getting paid by middle-class families one way or the other.

This time around, I guess the good news is that they are talking about paying for it, not borrowing, to give a huge tax cut to corporations and to billionaires and millionaires. Instead, they are talking about immediately taking money out of the pockets of working families and seniors and poor people. Instead of borrowing money and having the bill come due for middle-class families later, this new tax cut for billionaires and corporations is going to be financed by an immediate cut to services and benefits to some of the most vulnerable people in this country.

At the end of last year, as a means of passing the continuing resolution, there was a deal apparently cut—this is reported in the press—in which there was a promise made to finance this tax cut with \$2 trillion of cuts to Medicaid and Medicare. Medicaid—poor kids, poor families. Medicare—seniors in this country.

Now, \$2 trillion is a hard number to get your head wrapped around, but there is no way to enact \$2 trillion—\$2 trillion, a “t”—worth of cuts in Medicare and Medicaid without hundreds of thousands of people, senior citizens and poor kids, losing access to care. You are literally—this is not hyperbole—\$2 trillion worth of cuts means that nursing homes shut down. People are put out on the streets. It means that poor kids don't get access to mental health services.

So what happened 8 years ago was cruel—a tax cut put on the American public's credit card, 80 percent of the benefits going to the very, very richest, and none of it trickling down. This version that Republicans are talking about passing in a matter of weeks is even more cruel because it is the same balance: the benefit going to the very, very wealthy—President-elect Trump's friends who pay to get in and out of Mar-a-Lago—but financed immediately by cuts that are going to be devastating for the people in this country who get up every day relying on programs like Medicare and Medicaid. So I agree with my friend from Hawaii. We have to be down on the floor talking about this every single day.

Folks thought it was an inevitability 8 years ago when Republicans made it a priority to steal health insurance from 20 million Americans. And by the skin of our teeth, we were able to save health insurance for 20 million Americans. And maybe if we raise enough of a fuss about this massive transfer of wealth from the middle class and the poor to the very, very wealthy, we can stop this egregious policy as well.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, let's talk about Trump's betrayal of middle-class America. In 2017, many of us warned that Trump's tax giveaway was a disaster for working families. It was a giveaway to billionaires. It was a giveaway to powerful corporations. It stole from America's Treasury, increasing the debt of this country to gild the richest Americans. They wanted platinum treatment. They wanted more money than anybody else has ever imagined, and they got it from Trump by draining the American Treasury.

Well, that failed America's working families. There is nothing about giving several hundred thousand dollars to the richest Americans—that is each one of them—that helped a single working American.

These policies are coming to an end in 2025. But now, Trump 2 is coming along, and he says: I campaigned on working Americans, but I want to raid the programs for them and raid the Treasury to enrich them again. I didn't give them enough the first time around. The rich are not rich enough. I campaigned for working families, but I am going to betray them with tax cuts, tax giveaways, a tax raid on programs and the Treasury for the richest Americans. That is the Trump betrayal that we are facing right now.

CBO says extending the Trump tax cuts would blow a \$4.6 trillion hole in the Federal budget over the next 10 years. As my colleague just pointed out, Republicans are saying they might decrease the size of that hole by raiding healthcare for Americans. What an evil and twisted plot that is, what an assault on working families across our Nation.

That \$4.6 trillion—no, I did not say “m” for million or “b” for billion; we are talking trillion, \$4.6 trillion—should go to basic services for all Americans or reduce our deficit instead of going into the pockets of the very few.

So whom are you for? Are you for the very richest 1 percent and 0.1 percent of Americans who have so much money they don't know what to do with it or are you for working families? Because this Trump budget is the betrayal of working families.

If you are for working families, you invest in healthcare, you don't raid it; you invest in housing, you don't raid housing programs; you invest in education, you don't raid education programs.

Those are the foundations. Those are the good-paying jobs. Those are the four foundations for families to thrive.

If you work an hourly job and make less than \$34,000 a year—which is the case for 50 million American taxpayers—you would get back \$130 a year—\$2.50, roughly, two and a half dollars. All right. Right now, that is less than a cup of coffee. Enjoy that every week because that is what Trump cares about for those families who are working at the bottom of the ladder trying to move up.

Instead of helping move up, he wants to take the programs away from them and give them to these folks who are going to get a \$280,000 per-person tax break at the very top.

Look how skewed this is. Working families on the left get nothing. The richest on the right get everything. That is what we are looking at. That little tiny \$130—just a little change in the cost of drugs or your rent, your groceries wipes that out. Two thousand times the help for the richest compared to those who are struggling.

That is twisted. That is warped. That is the Trump betrayal of working families.

Let's stand for working families. Let's stand for healthcare and housing and education, the foundation for every family to move up the ladder because that is what it means to care about every American family, whether they are in the party of the elite rich like the Trump betrayal presents.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I join my colleagues on the same topic to talk about the forthcoming debate that we will have about tax policies in this Chamber. Since coming to Congress—really before, when I was a mayor and Governor—I advocated for smart, simple pro-growth and pro-family tax reform. Taxes should be fair. They should be consistent. They should be predictable. And they should generate the revenue that America needs to fund Social Security, Medicare, education, roads, national security, and the other critical investments that matter to our constituents.

I repeat what some of my colleagues said. In 2017, during the first Trump ad-

ministration, after the failed effort to take health insurance away from more than 20 million people and deprive all Americans of being protected from discrimination by insurance companies if they had preexisting conditions—and thank goodness that reconciliation effort failed when three Republicans joined Democrats to block that effort—the Trump administration colleagues turned to the idea of tax reform.

Democrats were very willing to work on deficit-neutral, pro-growth tax reform. But instead, Republicans chose: We don't want to have a committee process. We don't want to include Democrats. We want to write a bill, and we will write a bill that will pass partisan tax cuts that will dramatically expand the deficit.

At this time—and I know my colleagues remember this—economists were saying that America's corporate tax rate of 35 percent was high compared to global averages. So there was some suggestion that what we should do is lower the corporate tax rate to put it more in tune with what other nations were charging. There is a little bit of an apples to oranges difficulty in doing that because other nations use a VAT tax that we don't use.

Most economists said if we wanted to make our corporate tax rate equivalent to other nations, we should try to lower the corporate tax rate from 35 percent to, like, 28 percent. And many of my businesses in Virginia were coming to me saying: We have to be more competitive. We have to have a corporate tax rate that matches up more with global norms. Cut the global tax rate to 28 percent.

Instead, even though companies were only asking for that reduction, our Republican colleagues plummeted and slashed the corporate tax rate not to 28 percent, not to 25 percent but to 21 percent. And they didn't even pay for it—didn't even pay for it. As Senator MURPHY said, just racked up higher deficits.

There were a few individual tax cuts in this bill. If you look at the bill from 2017, it was mostly corporate tax cuts. There were a few, in that pie chart, individual tax cuts. But they were heavily tilted toward the wealthy, as my colleagues have described. Analysis at the time showed households in the top 1 percent would get an average tax cut of \$60,000, while households in the bottom 60 percent averaged only \$500 each.

The bill also left out our Nation's poorest children. Nearly 20 million children were left out of the full value of the child tax credit because it was not made refundable. Democrats demonstrated in the American Rescue Plan that when you expand the Child Tax Credit and allow it to be refundable, you could lead to a revolutionary drop in child poverty when it was in effect. But Republicans took a different route.

And on top of these inequities, that the bill was too heavily weighted toward corporations, too light toward individuals, and with individuals, too heavily weighted toward the wealthy

rather than lower and middle-income people, the Republican bill in 2017 did another thing that was entirely unjustified. The bill made the corporate tax cuts permanent and the individual tax cuts temporary. So big, permanent corporate tax cuts; tiny, temporary, heavily skewed individual tax cuts.

During the debate, I offered a simple amendment that virtually all my Democratic colleagues voted for. And we said: Hey, look, let's go ahead and reduce the corporate tax rate, but let's not reduce it to 21 percent. If we reduce it to 25 percent, which is a big reduction, we can make these individual tax cuts for everyday people permanent, so at least the individual tax cuts to everyday people would be permanent, like the corporate tax cuts. All of my Republican colleagues opposed it. The Senate was majority Republican so we were stuck with a bad bill.

And that brings us to today. Republicans are debating how to ram another \$4.6 trillion tax cut through the Senate. I will remind my colleagues that when the Senate Republicans did this in 2017, they were really proud because they thought it would help them in the 2018 midterms. I think it was heavily driven by an electoral strategy. What they found is after about 90 days of talking about it, the American public was so mad that these tax cuts went to the wealthy rather than everyday people that they dropped it as a campaign issue to talk about other things and still lost badly in those midterms.

The proposed extensions are going to tilt toward the wealthy, as my colleagues indicated. But get this, the deficit effects that are likely to be felt in some of these distributional effects President Trump is proposing, why not mitigate those by jacking up tariffs? OK. So we are going to do tax cuts that benefit the wealthy, but we are also going to do tariffs. And whom will tariffs impact? President-elect Trump often says tariffs won't affect Americans; it will hurt China and Mexico. But once the election was over, he acknowledged that he can't guarantee American families won't be affected by costs of tariffs.

I am going to guarantee this. If President Trump moves forward with broad-based universal tariffs, and they are not defeated in this body, American families will suffer. American families will pay the cost. We know it because we have seen it before. Study after study shows American consumers bore the brunt of Trump's first trade war, and this time it will be even more. Projections suggest that the tariffs will impact American families to the tune of either between \$2,500 and \$4,000 per American household in additional costs. So \$2,500 compared to this tiny, little tax benefit that everyday Americans will experience.

Talk about salt in a wound.

We are going to do a tax bill for the wealthiest when they don't need it, not do much for everyday people who do need it but put on the shoulders of

those same people tariffs that are going to increase the cost of goods. Imagine coming out of COVID and other things and having this kind of burden put on your shoulders.

There is a better path. Let me give you an example. Democrats are going to work with Republicans to do tax reform that will be fair. Just last year, we saw bipartisan negotiations in the House and how those negotiations can lead to more balanced, more smart, better for the deficit, bipartisan priorities.

Our colleague Senator WYDEN was able to reach a deal with House Chair JASON SMITH on a bipartisan tax package that would have lifted children out of poverty—the child tax credit—that would have incentivized investment into research and development, good for companies who then innovate, and that is good for jobs.

And also the third piece of this tax bill that was bipartisan would have expanded our ability to build affordable housing. And it was fully paid for.

This bill got 357 votes in the House. We can't get that for a Mother's Day resolution in the House of Representatives. But then it died here in the Senate because Republicans didn't want to take the bill up because they wanted to wait to do a bill that would benefit the wealthiest.

I urge my colleagues: You made a mistake before in 2017 by going down a path that busted the deficit and made the American voters really mad. Don't go down that path again. Work with us to find a tax bill that will appropriately prioritize the needs of everyday American citizens and small businesses.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BOOKER. Senator Kaine, would you yield for a question?

Mr. Kaine. I would yield for a question from my colleague from New Jersey.

Mr. BOOKER. That was the stunning thing: Whom are you for? Are you working for Americans, are you for American families, or are you for the wealthiest of the wealthy?

I watched this in slow motion, this disaster for our country economically, when I was getting lobbied by corporations in the same way that you said. They said: We are not globally competitive. We are not globally competitive.

Everybody here, all 100 of us, want American businesses to win. So, yes, I think that we should have—my opinion was, yes, let's make our tax rate globally competitive and get rid of some of these crazy corporate tax loopholes that people use. So many companies pay zero taxes.

So we could have had a bipartisan conversation that could have reflected our values, lowered the overall corporate tax rate, and found a way to get rid of loopholes so corporations don't find a way to exempt themselves from taxes when the average police officer is paying higher taxes than some of the biggest corporations.

I watched you during that time—this was 8 years ago—and you began to say: Let's make sure that this tax plan benefits working Americans because when you invest in middle-class Americans, in working-class Americans, it is a proven way to grow the economy other than this fallacy of trickle-down.

And so the stunning thing for me—and this is where I want you to—I think that was one of the most powerful points I heard. It was when people were coming to me and saying 28 percent, 27 percent, 26 percent. The biggest corporations were saying it publicly. I was reading it in the newspaper. The lowest thing I saw the corporations asking for was 25 percent. What were those conversations like when you were talking to our colleagues on the other side? How did they end up at 21 percent and then not even support an amendment to bring it back up to what the corporate leaders were asking for to the benefit of working-class people? How could that amendment not have passed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is reminded that the question did refer to the Chair.

Mr. BOOKER. Forgive me, especially with who the Chair is. I am afraid.

So I direct that question to the Chair to the person here.

Mr. Kaine. Mr. President, I will just direct it, and my answer is going to reveal my naivete because my corporate sector in Virginia—and my companies were like everybody's companies—were saying: Hey, drop that 35 percent rate to 28. I may have had one that said to 25, but they were basically saying: If you do it at 28, we are going to be equivalent to other nations.

When the bill was put on the table—and, remember, we got it with handwritten interlineations late in the evening when we didn't even have an ability to even decipher what some of the handwritten interlineations were, but we realized they had dropped it to 21 percent. I almost thought it was a typo. It was one of these handwritten things. I thought it was a typo because the companies were only asking for 28 percent. Then I looked further in this massive bill, and I realized that all the individual tax cuts were tiny, temporary, and expiring rather than being big and permanent.

So I went to my colleagues, and I said: Have I got a great idea for you. You can take all of these individual tax cuts, if you shave off some of the ones to the most wealthy, and you can make them permanent and still do what the corporations had wanted us to do by having a corporate tax rate equivalent to other nations.

I thought I was being helpful. I had a solution to a math problem that I thought they were going to like. Instead, what they said is, no, it has got to be 21 percent and these individuals are going to be weighted to the wealthy and they are going to be temporary.

Mr. BOOKER. Would the Senator yield for one last question. Then I will

yield to Senator LUJÁN for his presentation.

Mr. KAINE. I would be glad to yield.

Mr. BOOKER. Senator, I came to the floor—or to the Chair, I came to the floor to listen to the good-faith arguments of colleagues about the Trump tax cut. I heard them say they would pay for themselves. This was a mantra I heard over and over again: It will pay for itself. It will pay for itself.

But independent folks, like on the Federal Reserve Board and the Joint Committee on Taxation, found that their corporate tax cuts did not pay for themselves, but they drove our government into a multitrillion-dollar and more deficit. The benefits within this idea of trickle-down economics—said by the same groups I just mentioned—were that 90 percent of workers didn't see a dime. Overwhelmingly, it expanded corporate wealth and the wealth of the top 1 percent significantly and didn't inure to the benefit of the postal worker, the cop, the firefighter, the plumber, the teacher.

It is stunning to me that I sat here and listened to folks. But my challenge to you because you have been sort of a pragmatic, moderate guy for a long time, and we are seeing this coming around the corner—the estimates are now that their new tax plan that they are talking about could cause a deficit and expand, again, by now over \$4 trillion.

You have been around here longer than I have. When we start running budget deficits, and we know factually that their last tax plan expanded the deficit into the trillions—and this one is projected, if they do it again, to be to the benefit of the top 1 percent and, again, with very few of the benefits going to working Americans—what will that mean for America's fiscal stability going out 10 years from now or 15 years from now?

What kind of pressures will that create, and what kind of calls do we have from Republicans about how to fix the problem that their tax plan has caused?

Mr. KAINE. I hope we can take this up in the Budget Committee. I have some Budget Committee colleagues who are here on the floor. Senator WHITEHOUSE has been the lead Democrat on the Budget Committee for some time and is now at the helm of another committee. But Senator MERKLEY, who spoke passionately a couple of minutes ago, is now the lead Democrat on the Budget Committee. We need to take up the issue of these tax cuts as proposed and explore what the long-term consequences will be.

The consequence will be to bust the deficit. The consequence will be to put dollars in the hands of those who don't need them and take dollars out of the hands of those who do when you combine it with the tariff effect, but the consequence will also be significant on the national debt.

As Senator MURPHY said during his comments, the national debt gets fi-

nanced, and it gets financed in ways that ends up coming back. And who pays for it? Everyday folks. So you will have a compounding effect on everyday folks where they will not get tax relief. They may see their taxes increase. They will see their prices go up with this tariff blitz, and then they will end up being saddled with the consequences of debt.

We should take the time to do this right. We should take the time to do—again, I use the example of what the Finance Committee did last year on the R&D tax credit, the child tax credit, and the low-income housing tax credit. It is not that that bill was perfect, and it is not that it included everything that you might want to include, but it is an example of you don't have to jam this through with one party holding the pen and excluding the other party. You can do a tax bill that can get 357 votes in the House of Representatives on something that will be paid for, not increase the deficit, that will help businesses innovate, help children get a good start in life, and help people afford affordable housing. If you do it the right way, we will come up with a good plan, and I hope that we will.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. KAINE. I will yield for another question.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Through the Chair, the Senator mentioned the Budget Committee. In the hearings that we have had in the Budget Committee, during which we have discussed tax cuts and their effect on revenues and their ability to pay for themselves, how many times have our Republican colleagues been able to produce a witness who, under oath, would say that these tax cuts would actually pay for themselves?

Mr. KAINE. Precisely zero, even though that phrase that “they will pay for themselves” or that “they have paid for themselves” was used all the time, but no one would, under oath, say that that actually happened.

It reminds me of a great political maxim. I think it was Eugene McCarthy, a former Senator, who once said the issues candidate is the one who says the word “issues” the most times.

Just saying these cuts will pay for themselves is not the same as its being true. It wasn't true in the 2017 tax cuts, and we could never find any credible witness who would come and testify to that effect.

With that, I have other colleagues on the floor who are ready and raring to go, and I yield to them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BLACKBURN). The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. LUJÁN. Madam President, I especially want to start by giving thanks to our colleague from Hawaii for asking us to come together and have a conversation with the American people.

I am a proud Senator from the State of New Mexico—from a small, rural

community in the northern part of the State—and I wanted to come down to the floor to continue this conversation as we have heard from colleagues already talk about what this is and what this isn't. It seems to me, when my Republican colleagues last did this, what I heard in townhall after townhall across New Mexico was that, from Democrats, Republicans, Independents, voters, constituents, they just wanted to hear the truth. They wanted to hear what this is and what this is not.

So I am going to start off by holding up this report that says that almost 60 percent of the benefit of extending the Republican tax policies will go to the top 0.1 percent of the wealthiest in America—0.1 percent of the wealthiest in America—and I am not talking about the other 99.9 percent. Now let's define how much money people who are in the top 0.1 percent in America are making. They are doing very well. They are making \$2.8 million per year. It is a lot of money, and they are successful, but it is under the guise of giving middle-class families, hard-working families all across America a tax cut when the benefit goes to the top 0.1 percent. If you are making 2.8 million bucks a year, yes, this is for you.

The American people just want to hear the truth. This is not for those hard-working, middle-class families back home—my brothers and sisters, police men and women who fight to keep us safe, the EMS who respond when we need them the most, nurses, teachers, electricians, ironworkers, pipefitters. You know, they are all the folks across America who are doing everything they can to put some food on the table, to keep a roof over their heads, to provide for their kids, and maybe save for retirement if they have a little extra.

They are playing by the rules. This golden rule promised that, if you fight hard and you play by the rules, you will do better than the previous generation, and you are going to help your kids and everyone who follows you. So while you are playing by the rules all across the country—and I am talking to everyone not making 2.8 million bucks a year—my Senate Republican colleagues are getting ready to rig the system with a tax cut that is going to give more money to the people in the top 0.1 percent—remember, the people making \$2.8 million a year or more. Well, maybe that will let some of those folks buy another jet plane or another yacht if they are doing well as \$2.8 million is a lot of money.

Now, one of the concerns across the country is, just as it happened before, my Senate Republican colleagues are going to try to do this behind closed doors, all the while making false promises that this will be for you, working-class families, all across America, but at the end of the night, all they are going to do is stick you with the bill.

They are going to pay for this, as we have heard time and time again, by eliminating programs that support our

veterans, that feed young children or babies, that take care of our grandparents or elders, or by taking away your children's ability to see the same doctors they have been seeing since they were born. Studies show that just extending this Republican tax scam would blow a \$4 trillion hole. Let that sink in. Facts. We are talking about the realities of what this will and will not do.

The incoming administration is going to try and pass this off as—you heard it here—a middle-class tax cut. That is how they are going to sell this to the American people, but it is not. It is a handout to the wealthiest folks who are making more than \$2.8 million a year. The economic analysis makes it clear that this tax scam will drive up the debt and leave working families behind. We all know the way to grow the economy is to invest in the working class, to lower taxes for working families, and to bring industry and innovation back to our communities across the country. The success of our teachers, our nurses, our pipefitters, our firefighters, our police officers, and everyone in between will be the success of building up the economy across America.

Now, look, you have heard this from my Democratic colleagues: I and we are ready to work with my Republican colleagues to find better solutions for growing our economy and lowering taxes to prioritize them to target the middle class, to help them, but this scam is horrible. It is why I wanted to come to the floor today to have a conversation with my colleagues and to share the facts about what is happening here with the American people and let my colleagues know across the aisle: Let's work together. Let's truly deliver on a promise to help hard-working, middle-class families all across the country, including in the State of New Mexico.

I want to thank again Senator SCHATZ.

I yield to my colleague from Vermont as well, with whom I had the honor of serving in the House and being part of this debate when it happened.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. WELCH. Madam President, the situation for working families in Vermont is really, really hard. They show up and work. They get a paycheck. And, at the end of the month, when they try to pay their bills, there is not enough there.

The situation for families is enormously insecure when it comes to housing. We find Vermonters who are working at ski areas can't live within an hour of the ski lift that they are attending. We find that folks in factories who want to live in the community they grew up in can't afford a house. They are competing, oftentimes, with cash buyers, usually from out of State, and it is folks who are in the economy who have the assets and have ridden the rising stock market—and good for them.

But we need a tax system that is good for working families. People want to work. They want to pay their bills. They don't want to have the constant anxiety of whether they are going to miss a mortgage payment or they are going to miss a rent payment.

To have a discussion about a tax policy that essentially funnels money to folks who have done extremely well raises a fairness question, which my colleagues have talked to, but it also raises a very practical question about how do you grow an economy. You can only grow an economy if folks who are working and committed to the communities they are in can pay their bills, can earn what they need in order to pay the grocery bill and to pay rent and healthcare. That is why the starting point of tax reform should be addressing family needs that, by the way, are employer needs.

The childcare tax credit really worked. It meant that families were able to afford things, and we saw the results with a 50-percent reduction in childhood poverty. What we also see is that when we can put money into education so families can be secure about a safe place and a good place for their kids to go to school, that will work.

So our starting point should be: How does this help the paycheck for the working family? And that is pretty simple: the earned-income tax credit, the child tax credit, low-income housing credits to build the housing that we need. That is where we have to start.

Funneling money to folks who are doing really well and who have a massive amount of discretionary income and where, for corporations, the capital that they need to invest is there—there is not a capital shortage. We need to focus on families, not on the well-to-do and the corporations that got a reduction in taxes that was far more than they even requested.

The second point I want to make is about the process that is being used to pass the tax bill or to consider it. It is the reconciliation process. By definition, what that means is it will be a Republican-only bill. There will be no discussion among Democrats, where we have some point of views that, by the way, are really beneficial to folks in my State, whether they voted for Harris or they voted for Trump. A lot of working families need that childcare tax credit.

The reconciliation process means that the political tradeoffs have to all be in the direction of the most extreme wing of the House Republican Party. So that process is going to handcuff us right at the beginning.

The third point that many of my colleagues have made is that tax cuts do not pay for themselves. You know, dream on. Folks like to say that. It is as though it is magical. They don't pay for themselves. This tax cut will add about \$4 trillion to the deficit.

What is next? Then we say: Hey, we have got to cut spending. What spending do we have to cut? Healthcare, the ACA premium support.

To the Senator from Massachusetts that would mean—and for a family in Vermont—a lot of them will pay 300, 400, 500 bucks more each month. That is on top of the high grocery bill.

So the pressure, then, if we have this explosion in the deficit, is to cut spending, and it usually means that veterans are on the block. It means that the low-income folks are on the block. It means that healthcare for working families is on the block.

So let's have a tax system that is fair and also promotes growth and invests in the folks who want to work to make this economy strong, who want to build strong communities and take care of their families.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, we are in a climate emergency. Over just the past few months, powerful hurricanes and severe wildfires have caused nearly one-half of a trillion dollars in estimated damage.

The Los Angeles fires are estimated to be the costliest blaze in the history of our country. Insurance is becoming unaffordable. People have lost their lives. People have lost their livelihoods.

Rather than address our climate catastrophe, Republicans' highest priority is passing a new \$5 trillion tax scam to subsidize the ultrawealthy at the expense of working families.

Now, in Massachusetts, per capita, we are the wealthiest State in America. We are very proud of that. We believe in capitalism. But I haven't had one millionaire come up to me and say: I need a tax break—because they know they don't.

To pay for their tax scam, Republicans propose slashing Medicaid and the Affordable Care Act, ripping away food security and other supports that parents rely on to feed their children and keep a roof over their head, and ending support for clean energy, which would only add more fuel to the fires raging across our country. Los Angeles is just the most recent example.

House Republicans have said they want to pay for their tax cuts for the ultrarich with \$300 billion in "the Green New Deal Provisions in the 2021 Infrastructure Bill."

I don't know if that means cutting programs to get lead out of our drinking water or stopping programs to help struggling school districts buy new clean energy buses to cut costs and keep kids healthy. Maybe they have a problem with programs that let people walk and bike and live safely in communities across the country.

But we are watching hundreds of billions of dollars in climate-fueled tragedy in the past few months alone. The Green New Deal is a systemic response to this crisis.

I will give you a couple of numbers. Hurricane Milton, Hurricane Helene—remember them last fall—two storms, 2 weeks? It was \$300 billion worth of damage—\$300 billion.

They are saying: Let's cut the \$300 billion for clean energy programs.

Oh, sure, let's have the storms cost \$600 billion worth of damage, \$1 trillion worth of damage each time they come to shore. Sure. Why put prevention in place? Why have wind and solar ever be deployed?

That is what they are coming for. It is outrageous.

Donald Trump and Republicans would rather trade programs to help communities survive the climate crisis for tax cuts that help their ultrarich donors survive tax season.

This week, in a response, I will be introducing legislation to make polluters pay by increasing taxes on private jet fuel to \$2 a gallon. Do you know what these billionaires pay for their private jets today? Twenty cents. That is the tax on the jet fuel they put in their luxury jets to travel around America and the world. So we are just going to bump it up to \$2 a gallon.

That will ultimately raise \$1.8 billion. I think they can afford it, given what we are seeing happening in L.A. or Florida or North Carolina or State after State in the last 6 months.

The tax-dodging ultrawealthy need to stop fanning the flames and start supporting first-class solutions.

To tackle the climate crisis and to have a fair Tax Code, we need to ensure that those doing more than their fair share to fuel the problem are paying the bare minimum and are held accountable for contributing to the solution.

So if Donald Trump and his Cabinet of fat-cat billionaires and the three richest people in the world want to fly private jets to Monday's inauguration to pay tribute to Donald Trump, the very least they can do is to pay for the damage they are doing to our environment.

Per passenger, private jets pollute up to 14 times more than commercial flights, and they pollute 50 times more than trains, producing as much emissions as 5 million cars every single year. Do you hear that? Private jets emit as much pollution as 5 million cars a year.

Just a few hours of flying private offset the benefits of an entire year of driving an electric car. That is not fair.

In just 1 year, Elon Musk's two private jets produced nearly 5,500 tons of carbon emissions. That is more than 300 years' worth of emissions for the average American.

Everyday Americans should not have to subsidize the lavish lifestyle of the ultrarich. The world's wealthiest 1 percent burn through their entire carbon budget for the year in the first 10 days of January—10 days. So let's not let the 1 percent blow a \$5 trillion hole in our Federal budget as well.

Republicans just spent the past 2 years complaining about the Inflation Reduction Act. Yet Republicans are preparing to spend trillions on tax breaks.

They want to feed billionaires' greed instead of the families who will go hun-

gry when they cut SNAP. They want to grow billionaire excess while they cut people's healthcare, including the two-thirds of nursing home patients and 40 million children on Medicaid, and pursue work requirements that do little.

Let me just say this. Ronald Reagan, 1981? He set the playbook. Who followed it? Newt Gingrich, 1995. Who followed him? George W. Bush, 2021. Who followed him? Donald Trump, 2017. They each had the same plan because the Republicans have a remarkable ability to harness voluminous amounts of information to defend knowingly erroneous promises, and the central erroneous promise is that it is possible to dramatically increase defense spending, which they want to do and which those others guys did; cut taxes for the richest people in our country—that is what all these other guys did—and then to pretend with crocodile tears that they want to balance the budget because all that is left are the programs for regular families, for poor families.

We call it Medicaid. Do you want to hear another way of describing Medicaid? Two-thirds of all people in nursing homes are on Medicaid. Two-thirds of all people who are in nursing homes are being paid by Medicaid.

Do you want to know another number about them? Fifty percent of them have Alzheimer's.

How can families keep them in a nursing home? Medicaid.

Do you know another name we have for them? They are called Grandma and Grandpa. Grandma and Grandpa are in nursing homes with Alzheimer's because of Medicaid.

They want to cut that? Good. Come for it. We are ready for this discussion.

The poorest children in our country, 50 percent of all children in our country—50 percent—are on SNAP, on food stamps, at some point in their life. That is the poorest children in our country. That is who they are.

That is Medicaid. That is another way of talking about Medicaid—the poorest children, the most vulnerable seniors. That is the piggy bank they are going to use for tax breaks for billionaires. And they are then going to turn and say: We are going to the Affordable Care Act.

Do you know another way of talking about that? That is how people get the funding for opioid treatment and for mental health treatment. That is the Affordable Care Act. That is millions of people.

Yes, just slash it. Sure. Who needs to help families with mental health issues? Who needs to help families who have opioid addiction? Why do that?

Then they say: We are going to go to wind and solar, and we are going to cut that too. And we are going to keep the tax breaks for the oil and gas industry.

Kick them in the heart; you are going to break your toe. That is what this plan is all about. It is what the plan has always been about since 1981.

So we just can't let the ultrawealthy play while leaving hard-working Amer-

icans to pay with their healthcare, their financial security, and bearing the brunt of the climate atrocities.

We need economic justice. We need climate justice. We need wealthy polluters to pay, especially jet-setting billionaires who are polluting right now. And we need a system that works for the American people, not for the billionaire excess that the Republican Party is going to bring out to the Senate floor.

I yield to my friend from Rhode Island, a great leader, Senator WHITEHOUSE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I would make the point to my friend from Massachusetts that when Democrats used reconciliation, we used the reconciliation process to do the Inflation Reduction Act and help everyone. The Inflation Reduction Act meant green jobs to red States, and it meant less pollution for everyone. The Republicans are teeing up to use reconciliation to help big CEOs, billionaires, and big corporations that are already doing amazingly well.

If you feel you are being left behind by those folks, it is because you are. Look at what CEO pay has done, rocketing skyward, compared to the pay of the top 1 percent—other folks in the C-suite who may not be the CEO—compared to typical worker wages down here. Most Americans are right here, and most of the benefit of this tax reform will go to these folks.

CEOs are taking a larger and larger share for themselves of the resources of American corporations, leaving less and less to pay their workers, and that is the difference: rocketing upward and more or less flat. They want to make this worse through their reconciliation.

If you want to add another backdrop to what is going on here, this is the share of America's revenue that is contributed by corporations. A lot of people in this body seem to want to go back to the good old days of the 1950s when things were whatever they were then. Well, back in the 1950s, more than 30 percent of America's revenue came from our corporate community. Corporations were making a real and significant contribution to America's revenues and enjoying the significant growth that being an American corporation provides you. But politically they hacked and they hacked and they hacked away at their responsibilities, and now they are paying 6 percent of America's revenues. As wealthy as American corporations are, they add 6 percent now of America's revenues. And this, too, will be made worse by this Republican program.

Half the benefits go to the top 5 percent. If you are making over a million bucks, it is a \$78,000 tax cut; if you are making 50 grand, 273 bucks. Thanks a bunch. And the hit is going to come to regular Americans through Medicare, through Medicaid, and through support for their healthcare.

They will even lower taxes for companies moving jobs and profits offshore. How about that for “Make America Great Again.”

I tell you, when you actually take a look under the hood, what you see every time is that the benefits of these Republican tax cuts go to the biggest corporations, to the billionaires, and to corporate CEOs, and within those biggest corporations, the worst ones for moving jobs and profits offshore. It is as reliable as the sunrise, and it is as wrong as it can be.

I yield to my friend Senator ROSEN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Ms. ROSEN. Madam President, I thank Senator WHITEHOUSE.

As it is my first time addressing you from the Senate floor since I began my second term, I would like to start by saying how grateful I am that Nevadans have put their trust in me to serve another 6 years in the U.S. Senate. People in my State know that above all else, I am a Nevadan first before any political party or ideology, and my track record is clear. I will always support policies that work for everyone.

As Members of Congress, we have the opportunity to make a real and meaningful difference in people's lives, and that starts by working to make the American dream more affordable for hard-working people.

Heading into the new administration, I am deeply concerned about President Trump's plan to cut taxes for the ultrawealthy and billionaires on the backs of workers, senior citizens, and middle-class families. When the Trump tax cuts were first passed in 2017, they overwhelmingly benefited the wealthiest individuals and the largest corporations, while increasing our national debt and leaving the middle-class and working families—well, they just left them with much less to show for it.

Senate Democrats—we will fight. We will fight to stop this from happening again. As we negotiate the upcoming comprehensive tax reform package, we must focus on making sure it provides meaningful tax relief for hard-working families—for you, for all of us. While the Trump administration and Senate Republicans look out for billionaires and corporations, Senate Democrats are working for you.

For one, we should be working to restart or expand several key tax credits that help support American families, like expanding the child tax credit, which will increase the amount of hard-earned money families get to keep in their pockets. We also need to use this opportunity to address the high cost of housing, which is impacting families in Nevada and across the country. We must expand the low-income housing tax credit so that we can help build more housing and increase supply, and that ultimately lowers costs for you, for everyone.

As someone who grew up in a working-class family, I know what it is like to work multiple jobs and rely on tips

to make ends meet. That is why we need to make sure we put money back in the pockets of hard-working Nevadans, which is why any package—any package—should include the bipartisan plan to eliminate income tax on tips for service and hospitality workers. By ending income tax on tips and adding guardrails to prevent the ultrawealthy and CEOs from exploiting loopholes, we can make sure that Nevadans keep more of their hard-earned money.

We also need to provide a broad-based tax cut for working families and the middle class and make sure that families making less than \$400,000 a year don't see a tax hike.

Instead of lowering already low tax rates for corporations, we should be providing much needed tax relief for our businesses, like restoring research and development expensing.

Our country's strength has always come from the middle class—our teachers, our first responders, our small business owners, our factory workers—families who get up every morning, every day, and they send their kids off to school and then go out and work hard to make our Nation run. They deserve—they deserve—tax policies that work for them, not tax cuts that leave them behind while the wealthiest of us, the wealthiest of billionaires, the big corporations, reap the tax rewards.

So let's be clear, though. If President-elect Trump and Senate Republicans don't work with Democrats, Republican tax proposals—well, they won't help you. They won't help your family. Republican tax policies are only going to help billionaires.

We need to build an economy that works for everyone, for you, not just those at the top. So to all the families feeling the stress, know you are not alone. It is time for us to put your priorities first, to lower costs, and to expand opportunity. I see you—all of you—and I am ready and willing to fight for you and for all those you care about.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Madam President, I am joining my colleagues on the Senate floor today for the same reasons—and I so appreciate my friend and colleague from the great State of Nevada because she is absolutely right, and my colleagues as well—drawing attention to what really is happening here in Washington that has an impact on our individuals and families back home.

Quite often, I see so many decisions being made here in this bubble in Washington without any true regard or understanding of the impact on Main Street, where we all live and we come from. And what we are talking about today is what incoming President Donald Trump had passed previously when he was President, which is this massive tax giveaway to billionaires.

What the American people don't know, which we know and we are talking about—and that is why we are

here—is that tax cut for billionaires is about to expire, and many of my colleagues, Republican colleagues, want to extend the entire bill at the expense of middle-class families across the country.

Now, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office says that reauthorizing the Trump tax bill as-is would add \$4.6 trillion to our national debt. That would raise interest rates and make it more expensive for families to buy a home, to send their kids to college, or to start a business.

Based on how much time my colleagues across the aisle have spent the last 4 years—as I have sat in the Presiding Officer's seat listening to my colleagues, I have heard them say that we should be talking about the deficit and doing something about it. I would hope that they would want to avoid adding trillions of dollars to it, regardless of who is in the White House, even now. Unfortunately, that doesn't appear to be the case.

Instead, my colleagues now—my Republican colleagues—have come up with two options for selling this legislation to the American people—again, this legislation that will mainly benefit the very wealthy in this country, the billionaires—legislation that is going to add \$4 trillion to the deficit. This is how they plan to do it. One option is Republican leadership in the Senate has suggested that because they want to extend policy that currently exists, we should just ignore the cost of extending it; there shouldn't be a pay-for; we don't have to worry about it; that all of a sudden, that \$4 trillion increase in deficit just doesn't exist.

Now, I know we all wish we could forget about an actual debt sometimes, but that is not what the American people sent us here to do, and that is not what American people do. I can tell you that every family across this country has to live within their means and manage their budget—my family, my grandparents, my parents, everybody, every individual. So we should be working together to address this issue.

The other option that I have heard from some of my colleagues across the aisle to reauthorize this Trump tax bill is they have suggested a pay-for which is to gut Medicaid in order to pay for tax breaks, again, for the wealthiest people. I can't stress this enough: again, tax breaks for the very, very wealthy—the top 1 percent—on the backs of working families, on the backs of individuals, our middle class. To me, that is just outrageous. Padding the pockets of the top 1 percent at the expense of hard-working families is unacceptable, and nobody should stand for that.

I urge my Republican colleagues and leadership in this body to work in a bipartisan manner on this and find solutions that will benefit all Americans, not just CEOs and their board members. There is a way we can come together to make sure our middle class benefits, that our small businesses and

companies—by the way, that are essential for that middle class and our labor force, because you need both—work together to benefit, and really work and identify a pay-for and how we are not going to add to the deficit.

I can't stress this enough: We need to come together and build on spending reductions from the bipartisan Fiscal Responsibility Act instead of targeting Americans' healthcare. And let's ensure that the wealthiest pay their fair share to protect the middle class and their children from the exorbitant trillion-dollar bill the Republicans are currently going to send to them.

The two options just do not work, but there is an option that works, and I will stress it one more time. We need to work together in a bipartisan way. This should not be a partisan issue. This should not be done just through reconciliation without any input from the Democrats because, at the end of the day, our families are no different, our communities are no different.

My firefighters in Nevada are no different than firefighters in your State. My hard-working laborers in my State, whether they come from the service industry and it is somebody who is washing dishes in a restaurant in Nevada, are no different than that person washing dishes in some of my colleagues' States.

Everybody benefits if we come together in a bipartisan way, and that is how this should work. And I am hopeful my colleagues are willing to do so. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

CABINET NOMINATIONS

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, yesterday I came to the floor of the U.S. Senate to talk about the importance of promptly confirming President Trump's Cabinet. The American people having voted for President Trump, having said that they are unhappy with the direction the country is going in is entitled to his team to help him actually do what he said he would do during the campaign.

Well, today I would like to reiterate that message; but, in particular, I want to highlight some of the hypocrisy of our Democratic colleagues on this important matter as it pertains to our country's democratic processes.

We know that our colleagues are frequently warning that ways of the Republicans are allegedly undermining democracy, but this is like the little boy who cried wolf. If you cry wolf often enough, the people begin to believe that it is not really serious; and, indeed, it shouldn't be taken seriously in the case of the allegation that Republicans are somehow trying to undermine democracy.

Let me give you an example. Back in 2022, when Republicans passed State laws that included commonsense election integrity measures, like voter ID, Democratic Leader CHUCK SCHUMER criticized these initiatives, which were intended to ensure the integrity of our elections.

You would think that would be a no-brainer, that everybody would want to embrace measures that would protect the integrity of our elections. But he claimed somehow there was an attempt to suppress people from voting. Well, I remember it wasn't that long ago when Barbara Jordan, a Democrat from Texas, revered justly as an incredible leader for our State and country, along with James Baker III cochaired a commission that came out with voter ID as one of the consensus recommendations.

But now Democrats claim making sure that people are who they say they are and using the same sorts of things that you need in order to get on an airplane or to buy tobacco or a six-pack of beer, somehow that undermines democracy. It just doesn't make any sense.

But here is Senator SCHUMER on the Senate floor. He said, "Republicans across the country are trying to stop the other side from voting. That tears apart, rips apart, the very fabric of our democracy." I can almost see him crying crocodile tears as he says that.

Well, I did a rough check a moment ago, and 152 million Americans voted in 2024. If Republicans were trying to suppress the vote, we are doing a lousy job because you are seeing historic numbers of people, a lot of whom have not made a practice of voting before, showed up at the ballot box this time because they hated the direction our country was going in and they felt like this was our last chance, perhaps, to save our country as we know it.

Well, the Senator from New York used this argument to advocate for changes to the Senate filibuster rule—the requirement you get 60 votes to close off debate—in order to pass what he called Federal voting rights legislation. Well, first of all, what it would have done, it would have preempted the States' laws when it came to voting practices and created a single uniform standard here at the Federal level, which would have prevented some of these commonsense measures like voter ID from taking place.

Well, President Biden also expressed the same sentiment. He pressed for the filibuster to be changed to advance the so-called voting rights package, saying that the package must be passed "to defend our democracy." Well, actually, it would have made it easier to cheat.

Now, ironically, they used the same argument for democracy to undermine the Senate filibuster, which is one of the bedrocks of this institution. But what I have noticed is that if an issue can be framed as a threat to democracy, Democrats throw any other concerns out the window; hence, the sky is falling.

More recently, in 2023, Democrats brought up this same question of protecting democracy as a reason to advance legislation addressing artificial intelligence. Well, as it turns out, artificial intelligence has been around for decades. It has recently captured the popular imagination because technology has taken us to places we never dreamed we could go.

Well, in 2023, the Committee on Rules and Administration held a hearing on AI, and the Democratic leader said this:

If left unchecked—

Here he goes again. He said:

If left unchecked, [artificial intelligence]'s use in our elections could erode our democracy from within and from abroad, and the damage, unfortunately, could be irreversible.

That is a pretty common scare tactic. You scare people enough, well, maybe they are willing to let you do things that they, otherwise, wouldn't do upon calmer reflection.

He went on to stress the importance of Republicans and Democrats working together to protect and reinforce our democracy. We are for that. But here is what he said:

I can think of few issues that should both—unite both parties faster than safeguarding our democracy . . . It will take all of us, the Administration, the private sector, Congress working together to protect our democracy, ensure robust transparency and safeguards, and ultimately keep the vision of our founders alive in the 21st century.

Well, taken at face value, that sounds pretty good until you start beginning to look at the details about what he says we need to do in order to accomplish that goal. That is where you see—begin to see the huge disconnect. It is in pursuit of another agenda.

Democrats have become the party that cried wolf—or excuse me—threat to democracy; and the more they say it, the less meaning it actually holds. For what it is worth, I agree that the administration of private sector and Congress should work together to protect rather than undermine democracy. But we do have some different perspectives or points of view about how we might do it. That is a laudable goal, but not in pursuit of a fairly cynical and partisan policy agenda.

There is a very tangible way that Democrats can join with us to do this, this week. They can cooperate with the President that the people elected as Commander in Chief of the United States by confirming his Cabinet. How is that for protecting democracy?

The opposite, which is to stonewall the President's Cabinet nominees, to burn as much time as possible before we are able to get that done, is not preserving and protecting democracy; it is undermining it.

Our Democratic colleagues never seem to lose an opportunity to say that whatever the subject, it is a threat to democracy. But here they are today participating in a campaign to stonewall President Trump's nominees, which I would argue is undermining the democratic process. It is denying an elected President of the United States, who won not only the electoral college vote but the popular vote as well—to deny him his team so he can actually get to work on January 20th doing what he was elected to do.

Just yesterday, Senator SCHUMER, the Democratic leader, came to the

floor to air his grievances on each of the President's nominees for the Cabinet. He argued that many of the policies they would implement would be disastrous. But the fact of the matter is the American people have chosen. They did that on November 5 when they went to the polls and they gave President Trump a substantial majority and even a mandate for a new direction in the country.

They repudiated the failed policies of the Biden administration, starting with what has been happening at the border, which is an unmitigated disaster from a public health and public safety point of view. And it would, indeed, be a threat to democracy if our Democrat colleagues chose to ignore the will of the voters and deny the President his Cabinet or delay it for no good reason and prevent these nominees from going to work to implement the policies that the American people elected President Trump to enact.

Unfortunately, this is sort of reflexive, it is kind of what our Democratic colleagues do. I have been amazed to listen on television and hear in-person for the last—however it has been—hour, Democratic colleagues who came to the floor to speak, but they didn't talk about the pending business, the Laken Riley Act.

This young woman was killed by an illegal immigrant who should not have been in the country. I asked Pam Bondi, who is the nominee for Attorney General, this morning during her confirmation hearing, I said: If President Biden and Harris had secured the border, do you think Laken Riley would still be alive? And she said, yes, together with many others who have been victimized by illegal immigrants who come across the border to do Americans harm in one way or another. Not all of them. But when you open the border to 10 or more million people with 2 million of them “got-aways,” evading law enforcement, you don't know what you are going to get.

Well, I take that back, you do know what you are going to get. You are going to get some people who do not intend to come here for a better way of life; they come here to rape and pillage and rob and to commit crimes.

Well, Republicans are tired of hearing excuse after excuse from our Democrats, some of these hearings are being delayed due to incomplete background checks, but ask yourself who is responsible for the background checks? Well, it is Joe Biden's FBI. The FBI owes it to the American people to work around the clock, 24/7, to get these background checks done on a timely basis.

Otherwise, we are, literally, undermining a democratically elected President.

So I would urge our colleagues on the other side of the aisle to heed their own words when it comes to confirming President Trump's Cabinet.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle like to talk a big talk about defending democracy, but I would like

to see them put these commitments into practice by ending the undemocratic obstructionist tactics that they are using to deny this President his team.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Vermont.

H-1B VISA

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, as we go forward in this new session of Congress, I would hope very much that there will be a serious focus on the crises facing the working families of our country. We are the wealthiest nation on Earth. In fact, we are the wealthiest Nation in the history of the world. Yet, today, we have more income and wealth inequality than we have ever had. Sixty percent of our people live paycheck to paycheck. The life expectancy of working people is far below that in other wealthy countries. Eighty-five million Americans are uninsured or underinsured. Some 800,000 Americans are homeless. Twenty-five percent of seniors are trying to survive on \$15,000 a year or less. We have the highest rate of childhood poverty of almost any major nation on Earth. Further, we remain, shamefully, the only wealthy country not to guarantee healthcare to all people as a human right.

Meanwhile, while working families struggle to put food on the table and pay their bills, the wealthiest people in our country have never, ever had it so good. We are now in the absurd situation, the grossly unjust situation, where the 3 wealthiest people on top own more wealth than the bottom half of American society, some 170 million people. The 3 people on top have more wealth than 170 million on the bottom. That is not what America is supposed to be about.

In truth, there are a number of reasons why we are living in a nation today where the wealth of the billionaire class is exploding while the working class of our country struggles to keep their heads above water. There are many causes as to why, despite a huge increase in worker productivity, real weekly wages for the average American worker are less today than they were 50 years ago—real weekly wages are less than they were 50 years ago—and why, during that period, there was a \$50 trillion transfer of wealth from the bottom 90 percent to the top 1 percent.

Now, a lot of the reasons as to why the very rich are becoming richer and working-class families are struggling have to do with disastrous trade policies which have resulted in the loss of millions of good-paying jobs. The fail-

ure of Congress to raise the minimum wage to a living wage is another reason why millions and millions of workers today are forced to try to survive on starvation wages. Furthermore, we are seeing and have seen aggressive and often illegal union-busting activities on the part of major employers. All of those reasons, and more, are issues that we have to deal with.

Today, I want to focus on one more reason as to why the working class of this country is struggling, and that has to do with the H-1B guest worker program.

Elon Musk, the wealthiest man in the world, with a net worth of nearly \$430 billion, and other multibillionaires in the high-tech industry claim that the H-1B Federal guest worker program is vital to our economy because of the scarcity of highly skilled engineers and other technology workers in the United States. In other words, what they say is that they are trying desperately to find highly skilled American workers to do their jobs; just can't find them; just not there.

In my view, Musk and the other billionaires who are strongly supporting the H-1B Program are dead wrong. American workers are there; they are just not looking for them.

In my view, the main function of the H-1B Program is not to hire the best and the brightest. That is the theory—we have to bring in the best and the brightest to help our companies function and grow wealth in America. That is the theory, but in truth, the reality of what the H-1B Program is, is to replace good-paying American jobs with hundreds of thousands of lower paid guest workers from abroad who are often treated as indentured servants. The cheaper it is to hire guest workers, the more money the multibillionaire owners of large corporations make. In other words, this program is not only grossly unfair to American workers; in many ways, it is unfair to foreign workers as well.

According to the Economic Policy Institute, between 2022 and 2023, the top 30 companies using the H-1B Program laid off 85,000 American workers while simultaneously bringing in over 34,000 guest workers from abroad.

In 2019 and 2020, 85 percent of H-1B visas were awarded to entry level and junior guest workers, who are paid between 20 to 40 percent less than American workers in similar occupations.

So, No. 1, it is simply not true that the H-1B Program focuses on the very rare and highly skilled workers that American companies cannot find. Eighty-five percent, to repeat, of H-1B visas were awarded to entry level and junior guest workers, and they are paid 20 to 40 percent less than American workers in similar occupations.

Let me just give you a few examples as to how unfair the H-1B Program is. In Dallas, TX, H-1B software developers are making \$44,000 less than American workers doing the exact same job. This is information from the U.S. Department of Labor.

In Houston, TX, H-1B accountants—I did not know, to be honest with you, that we had a scarcity in accountants, but be that as it may, H-1B accountants are paid nearly \$40,000 less than American accountants doing the exact same work.

In Santa Barbara, CA, H-1B workers who are hired as computer system engineers make just \$45,000 a year. Does that sound like the kind of salary that would bring forth some extremely, highly skilled people for jobs that American workers cannot fill? Madam President, you tell me. Why would a corporation hire an American computer systems engineer at a salary of \$110,000 a year when it is \$65,000 cheaper to hire an H-1B worker for that same exact position?

That is basically what this whole debate is about, and that is that large corporations are paying foreign workers substantially lower salaries than they are paying American workers. Madam President, if you want to know why multibillionaire owners of high-tech companies love the H-1B Program so much, that is the reason why. They are using this program to substantially undercut the wages of American workers.

Moreover, there are estimates that as many as 33 percent of all new information technology jobs in America are being filled by guest workers. According to the Census Bureau data, there are millions of Americans with advanced degrees in science, technology, engineering, and math who are not currently employed in those professions. In other words, we tell kids “Go out and get involved in STEM work. Become a scientist. Become an engineer. Become a mathematician,” whatever, and then we bring in people from abroad to fill the jobs they were educated to do.

Adding insult to injury, half of the top 30 H-1B employers are companies whose major function in life is to outsource jobs, known in the industry as body shops. In other words, the same companies that are involved with supplying American companies with cheap foreign labor at home are the same exact companies that provide even cheaper labor to corporations when they move abroad. They are two sides of the same coin.

Madam President, if there is truly a major shortage of skilled tech workers in this country, as Elon Musk and others have argued, why did Tesla lay off over 7,500 American workers last year, including many software developers and engineers at its factory in Austin, TX, while, at the same time, applying to hire thousands of H-1B guest workers? If these jobs are only going to the “best and the brightest,” why has Tesla employed H-1B guest workers as associate accountants for as little as \$58,000 a year, associate mechanical engineers for as little as \$70,000 a year, and associate material planners for as little as \$80,000 a year?

I will admit, I am not a rocket scientist. But, to my mind, those occupa-

tions don't sound like highly specialized jobs that are primarily for the top 0.1 percent, as Mr. Musk claimed last month.

If this program is really supposed to be about importing workers with highly advanced degrees in science and technology, why are H-1B guest workers being employed as fashion models, lawyers, dog trainers, massage therapists, cooks, and English teachers? One might think that, in the United States of America, we could find English teachers and not need to bring in people from abroad. Further, does anyone really believe that in America we do not have enough lawyers and need to bring in more attorneys from abroad?

At a time of massive income and wealth inequality, we need fundamental changes in our economic policies. We need an economy that works for all, not just the few. And one small but very important way forward in that direction is to bring about major reforms to the H-1B Program in order to benefit American workers.

That is why I have filed an amendment to the Laken Riley bill that we are debating this week that will do just that. I hope very much that the leaders agree on allowing that amendment to be debated and voted upon. Let me very briefly describe what this amendment does in terms of reforming the H-1B Program.

First, this amendment would double the major H-1B fee that corporations pay before they can hire guest workers from abroad. This provision would generate over \$370 million in revenue each year. And what would we use that revenue for? Well, it would be used to provide nearly 20,000 scholarships each and every year for American students pursuing advanced degrees in science, technology, engineering, math, and other fields vital to the competitiveness of our Nation.

If the Members of this body truly believe we need H-1B visas in order to compensate for a shortage of skilled American professionals, this amendment will attract tens of thousands of America's best and brightest young people into those fields.

Second, this amendment requires corporations to substantially increase wages for the jobs they need before they would be allowed to hire H-1B guest workers. Specifically, this amendment would raise the prevailing wage for the H-1B Program to at least the median local wage. In other words, if the H-1B Program is truly meant for “the best and the brightest,” it should not be used as a tool to undercut the wages of highly skilled American workers. And that is what this amendment would prevent.

Third, this amendment would prohibit corporations from replacing laid-off American workers with H-1B guest workers from overseas. Corporations that are engaged in mass layoffs should not be allowed to replace American workers with guest workers.

Finally, this amendment would prevent corporations from treating H-1B

guest workers, for all intents and purposes, as indentured servants.

Under current law, H-1B guest workers are often locked into lower paying jobs and can have their visas taken away from them by their corporate bosses if they complain about dangerous, unfair, or illegal working conditions. That is unacceptable, and that has got to change. This amendment would make H-1B visas portable and give guest workers the ability to easily change jobs.

Mr. Musk and Mr. Ramaswamy and others have argued that we need a highly skilled and well-educated workforce. I agree. But the answer is not to bring in cheap labor from abroad through the H-1B Program. The answer is to hire qualified American workers first and to make certain that we have an education system that produces the kind of workforce that our country needs for the jobs of the future.

The bottom line: It must never be cheaper for a corporation to hire a guest worker from overseas than an American worker at home. And that is what this amendment is all about.

Let's be clear. Thirty years ago, the leaders of corporate America, the political establishment in both major parties, and the editorial boards of the most influential papers in our country told us not to worry about the loss of millions of blue-collar manufacturing jobs that would come as a result of unfettered free-trade agreements like NAFTA and permanent normal trade relations with China: Don't worry about the loss of those jobs.

And the reason they told us not to worry is that that job loss would be more than offset by the many good-paying, white-collar information technology jobs that would be created in the United States.

Yes, they said, you lose blue-collar manufacturing jobs, but not to worry. We will create zillions of good-paying, white-collar information technology jobs.

I, personally, was a Member of Congress at that time and never believed that. And I helped lead the effort against NAFTA and PNTR with China. Unfortunately, I and the many others who opposed those trade agreements were proven correct. NAFTA and PNTR cost us millions of good-paying manufacturing jobs as large corporations shut down here in America and fled to China, Mexico, and other low-wage countries in search of cheap labor.

And what about all of those great high-tech jobs that supposedly were going to be created? Well, that didn't quite happen either.

As a result of the H-1B guest worker program and other guest worker programs, major corporations are now importing hundreds of thousands of lower paid guest workers from abroad to fill the white-collar technology jobs that are currently available.

In other words, heads, billionaires win; tails, American workers lose.

In my view, we can and must change that reality. A good place to start

would be to pass this amendment and put American workers first. Multi-billionaires and Big Tech should not be allowed to hire guest workers to fill entry-level and mid-level information technology jobs. Those jobs should be going to American workers who have, among other things, the constitutional right to form unions and collectively bargain for better wages, benefits, and working conditions.

Madam President, I will be asking for a rollcall vote on this amendment, and I hope very much we can get it to the floor. In my view, the time has come for the American people to know which side their Senators stand on this issue.

In order to accomplish that goal, I very much appreciated the statement Majority Leader THUNE gave on the floor of the Senate last November about the need for more amendment votes in the Senate. Here is what the majority leader said on November 14 with respect to the amendment process:

[A]ll Members of the Senate—and not just the Members of a particular committee—should have a voice in final legislation through amendments on the floor. Members should assume that amendment votes will be the norm. That will mean taking tough votes at times, but that is part of our jobs.

I would very much agree with Majority Leader THUNE. The truth is that, in the past, whether it has been Republican leaders or Democratic leaders, no one debates that the amendment process has been thwarted. I hope we will see a new opening here where people will be allowed to offer amendments and take up votes. That is what we were elected to do.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHMITT). The Senator from Massachusetts.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 103

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I rise today to stop the unnecessary and devastating consequences that will result from a ban on TikTok in the United States. In a few moments, I will ask unanimous consent that the Senate pass my legislation with Senator WYDEN and Senator BOOKER, the Extend the TikTok Deadline Act, to extend the deadline by which ByteDance, TikTok's parent company, must sell TikTok or face a ban in 270 days.

This simple, one-sentence bill would avoid significant harm for TikTok's creators, who depend upon the app to make a living, to find community, to share resources during emergencies such as the Los Angeles wildfires, and to discuss everything from the latest pop culture trends to controversial political topics.

It is the home to 170 million American users—170 million American users. That is over half of the U.S. population and 65 percent of the United States adult population. It is 50 percent higher than the number of Americans who watch the Super Bowl.

Those 170 million Americans will be devastated by a TikTok ban. Many

make their living on the app and could face difficulties paying for groceries, rent, or medical care. Others may lose contact with a crucial support system, leaving them isolated and scared.

If you don't believe me, then I encourage my colleagues to view the thousands of videos posted by TikTok users over the past few days explaining why TikTok is so important to them. These testimonials are powerful evidence about TikTok's economic, social, and cultural importance, and I implore my colleagues to listen to these users.

Now, supporters of the TikTok ban will claim that any delay will threaten national security and allow China to, supposedly, indoctrinate the youth with anti-American views.

First, I stand behind no lawmaker here in my commitment to protecting children online. I am the original author of the only Federal online protection for children today: the Children's Online Privacy Protection Act. And I have authored legislation to update and modernize those protections. My Children and Teens' Online Privacy Protection Act to lift it up to age 16, that was blocked here on the Senate floor just 1 month ago in December. We had it out of committee. We could not get it passed.

And I repeatedly sent letters to the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice urging them to investigate and impose penalties on TikTok for putting their younger users at risk. When TikTok violates the law and puts its users at risk, I will call them out and I will demand accountability. In fact, the Federal Trade Commission has fined TikTok for violation of my law, so, obviously, I am concerned.

But I am also concerned about what American social media companies do to teenagers. They do the same thing. I am very concerned about what they do to young children. According to the Surgeon General, we have a mental health crisis in our country, pointing the finger at social media—not one company, but all the companies that are targeting teenagers and children in our country.

As for the national security arguments, I recognize that ByteDance's ownership of TikTok poses security risks. I do not want China to have significant influence over an important communications channel in the United States and access to Americans' data, but Congress must appropriately balance those risks with the serious hardship imposed on TikTok's 170 million American users and the unintended consequences of a nationwide TikTok ban.

With the impending TikTok ban, Congress has gotten that balance wrong, and most importantly, the proponents of the ban have repeatedly argued that TikTok is "brainwashing Americans," but these claims are, at best, just speculation. At worst, they are a disguised effort to target Americans' speech.

So don't take it from me. In an affidavit in the District of Columbia Circuit, a senior intelligence officer stated that the government has "no information" that China coerced ByteDance to covertly manipulate content on TikTok. That is coming from our own government. That alone should make us pause.

This is in the DC Circuit Court. They are not lying to a circuit court. So they don't have any information with regard to that accusation.

Even worse, rather than addressing China's supposed influence over a key communications channel, the TikTok ban appears to be driving users to alternative Chinese applications which we know even less about. In fact, on Monday, RedNote—a China social media app—became the No. 1 most downloaded app on the Apple app store.

Is that the outcome that the law's supporters were seeking or thought about?

The TikTok ban not only threatens to shut down a platform critical for 170 million Americans, but also, 7 million American businesses use TikTok. They use it as part of their business. All of that will shut down on Sunday, 4 days from now—just shut down—7 million businesses who use it.

And it is taking effect, at least in parts of America, at the single worst period of time, a moment when TikTok creators in Los Angeles are using the app to share their stories and find resources during the tragic wildfires; a moment when a new President is set to take office with different views on the ban—and President-elect Trump is asking for a pause right now, asked the Supreme Court of the United States for a pause—Donald Trump—a moment when the Supreme Court is still considering the case, hasn't even rendered a decision yet; a moment when the first official bid for TikTok was just submitted last week.

It is time for Congress to acknowledge that the rushed passage of this law was a mistake. There were no hearings in the Senate. There were no witnesses in the Senate. No one got to hear anything about this ban because they put it into the bill that was going to provide military aid for Ukraine, for Israel—humanitarian aid—and they just stuck the TikTok ban into the legislation over in the House of Representatives to send it over here.

We never had a hearing. We never had any consideration. And it is time for Congress to acknowledge that the rushed passage of this law was a mistake, that we need more time to let the courts and outside parties consider this issue. We need to do a better job of understanding the importance of the TikTok community and the impact of a TikTok ban.

That is why I introduced the Extend the TikTok Deadline Act. This bill does not repeal the underlying act. It simply gives TikTok, Congress, the people here in the Senate, parties that might want to buy TikTok, the incoming Trump administration—he himself

is asking for an extension—and outside stakeholders additional time to get this right.

We need time. We need time to figure this out. The court process is still going on for something that started last April. That would never have been expected to have occurred. We don't have any certainty as to the outcome, one way or the other.

If this had happened in September, October, or November—out of the courts—we could have then deliberated before the deadline on Sunday, 4 days from now. But it didn't happen that way.

So to the millions of creators who have bravely shared their stories and explained why TikTok is important to them, I hear you, I am listening, and I encourage my colleagues to listen as well and to give a short reprieve to TikTok's death sentence.

TikTok is far too important to let it die like this on Sunday without having given the extra time which is needed—time for President-elect Trump, time for everyone to think about what an alternative pathway could be to letting TikTok die.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 103, introduced earlier today; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. COTTON. Reserving the right to object, which I most certainly do, TikTok isn't just another social media platform, TikTok is a Chinese communist spy app that addicts our kids, harvests their data, targets them with harmful and manipulative content, and spreads communist propaganda.

Congress recognized the unique dangers of TikTok when we voted on a massive bipartisan basis last April to give its Chinese communist-influenced parent company ByteDance 270 days to sell TikTok to an American buyer or to be shut down in America. That deadline is Sunday.

What is more, ByteDance and TikTok had plenty of additional warning for years about the possibility of such action, long before Congress set this firm Sunday deadline. The Trump administration, in 2020, attempted to shut down TikTok.

So there was no rush as the Senator from Massachusetts asserted. We didn't pull the rug out from under TikTok, and we didn't ban it. Instead, Congress simply demanded that the app could no longer be owned and controlled by our Nation's worst enemy, communist China.

In other words, TikTok's owners had plenty of time to find a buyer, and there were plenty of willing buyers as well. Instead, TikTok whined, lied, complained, sued, and lobbied. Oh, how they lobbied.

One notable lobbyist told me that he was offered \$100,000 a month—\$100,000 a month—to represent TikTok, but he refused because TikTok is a sewer of vile anti-Semitism. Good for him.

Unfortunately, I can't say that for the army of lawyers and lobbyists who saddled up on behalf of communist China. They know who they are. They should be ashamed of themselves, and they should know that I, for one, won't forget it.

So let me be crystal clear. There will be no extensions, no concessions, and no compromises for TikTok. ByteDance and the Chinese communists had plenty of time to make a deal. In fact, the legislation allows the President to grant a 90-day extension to the Sunday deadline, though only if negotiations have substantially advanced, and the sale could likely close in 90 days.

Neither is true today so I expect President Biden will not grant the extension. And what President Biden cannot do under current law, this Congress—this Republican Congress—certainly won't do by changing the law, not over my objection, in any case.

And isn't it telling that ByteDance says communist China blocked the sale of TikTok for these last 9 months? What exactly does that tell us? Exactly what I said earlier: TikTok is a Chinese communist spy app. Consider one reason why the bill passed with such a huge bipartisan vote in April; namely, the backlash against TikTok for its deranged lobbying campaign against the bill.

As the bill was being considered by a House committee, TikTok sent push notifications to its users demanding that they call into Congress and express opposition to the bill. This wasn't a case of American citizens spontaneously rising up to exercise their First Amendment rights but rather a foreign power egging them on, meddling in our politics, influencing our legislative debates.

And what happened? Thousands of children—kids—called into congressional offices, some threatening to kill themselves or to assassinate Members of Congress. No foreign adversary should have that kind of power over our politics or our children.

Imagine how Chinese communists would use TikTok to influence our political debates during, say, a moment of heightened tensions over Taiwan. And let's examine a little more closely just what TikTok does to our country. Just last week, renowned social psychologist Jonathan Haidt wrote that "TikTok is Harming Children on an Industrial Scale."

China's version of TikTok promotes math, science, and learning, basically telling Chinese kids to do their homework and eat their vegetables and respect their elders—most especially Chairman Xi, the Chinese dictator. In America, by contrast, TikTok promotes violence, obscenity, eating disorders, drug use, and even suicide.

Internal company documents even revealed that content promoting pedophilia has long flowed right past TikTok's supposed moderators.

Without question, TikTok's lethal algorithm has cost the lives of many American kids. China also uses TikTok to amplify its propaganda and suppress information critical of the communist tyranny in Beijing. Compared to other platforms, TikTok suppresses content related to China's genocide against the Uighur people, Tibet, Taiwan, the South China Sea, Hong Kong, Tiananmen Square, and the origins of COVID, among other topics.

TikTok also meddles in the politics of other countries by amplifying divisive content in, for instance, Israel, India, and, of course, America. And don't forget that TikTok harvests a vast trove of user data, including name, age, email, address, phone number, credit card number, facial features, voiceprints, keystrokes, photos, videos, and viewing habits.

This data can make users susceptible to manipulation and even blackmail, not only today but also years from now when users may have become influential persons in the military, the intelligence community, business, media, and other walks of life.

We are sometimes assured that TikTok has taken security measures to prevent Chinese communists from accessing this data of American citizens, but according to whistleblower testimony and internal company materials, these protections are about as airtight as a screen door.

So the end is coming for Chinese communist-controlled TikTok. Perhaps the sale can be closed by Sunday, though I seriously doubt it. Even so, that sale would have to pass legal review and guarantee that China retains no residual influence at the company or through its algorithm, no residual influence whatsoever. But one way or the other, communist China will no longer exert this massive influence over our Nation and our kids.

I will now yield to Senator RICKETTS.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. RICKETTS. Reserving the right to object. The Chinese Communist Party is our chief foreign adversary in the world and the only external existential threat to our Nation.

They threaten our freedom, our prosperity, our security, and our very way of life. When I was Governor of Nebraska, I was the first Governor to ban TikTok on State devices because of the threat it posed. Why did I do that? Well, because Xi Jinping said that he wants to replace us as the world leader. Dictators tend to say what they are going to do and try and do it. We should take him seriously.

TikTok is one of the ways that he is trying to do it, trying to undermine what we do around the world. The Chinese Communist Party wants to replace us; TikTok is one of the ways they are trying to influence our downfall.

As many as 150 million Americans use TikTok. Fifty-two percent of them say they regularly get news through TikTok, and we know that the CCP uses TikTok to slant the news. This is part of their propaganda.

Data shows, for example, my esteemed colleague from Arkansas referenced it, the anti-Semitism on TikTok. If you go back and look, you can see 50 times the posts on pro-Hamas, pro-Palestinian content, 50 times the views, despite the fact that overwhelmingly Americans support Israel—the polling shows it—and that is just one of the issues that they get involved with.

We wouldn't allow any foreign adversary, TV stations, radio stations, or newspapers to reach 150 million Americans. Why are we allowing our chief adversary in the world, one that seeks our downfall, to have that kind of access? It makes absolutely no sense.

And, of course, the Chinese Communist Party has no free rights in America. Those belong to American citizens. We need to make sure we take a step against this. And last April, we did, overwhelmingly, bipartisan, bicameral because this Congress saw the threat that TikTok poses by the Chinese Communist Party being able to influence ByteDance because they have to. ByteDance is a Chinese company. It has to do whatever the Chinese Communist Party says. That is their law. They have to do what the Chinese Communist Party says, so, therefore, they push the propaganda.

As my colleague from Arkansas pointed out, they spy on Americans, collect data on Americans. So we saw a bipartisan effort, over 350 votes in the House, to pass this bill and, by the way, the same bipartisan support here in the Senate, passing 79 to 18.

The law gathered so much bipartisan, bicameral support because we recognized this was about keeping America and Americans safe; that ByteDance needed to divest TikTok so that we could be assured that the Chinese Communist Party wasn't pushing its propaganda or spying on us.

We acted with conviction against that threat, and of course we know from our classified briefings what that threat for TikTok was. And this threat is not something far off or imagined. We have seen TikTok's interference in elections elsewhere around the world, most recently in Romania. The European Commission just opened an investigation on TikTok's failure to limit election interference in Romania's election, and that has caused all sorts of disruption in that country.

India has banned TikTok for the very same reason that they are seeing the push of Chinese propaganda slants on their news media the same way we see it here in America.

Albania, worried about Romania, banned TikTok. We passed a law that did not ban TikTok. We passed a law that said you have to have an American owner like, I don't know, radio

stations, TV stations, newspapers. The Senator from Massachusetts would like to give us a 270-day extension. What is going to be different? What is going to be different?

ByteDance has had 270 days, and rather than making legitimate attempts to find a buyer—and, by the way, you all recall the news stories when this law was being discussed and being passed. There were a number of Americans who said they would be interested in buying them. ByteDance didn't do anything.

Rather than looking for an American buyer, they decided to hire an army of lobbyists and lawyers to try and subvert the will of the Congress. They spent the last 270 days trying to avoid being sold. As my colleague said, the Chinese Communist Party will not let them be sold.

That, in and of itself, should tell you everything you need to know about this. If the Chinese Communist Party is refusing ByteDance to sell TikTok to an American buyer, you know they are using it to push their propaganda and to collect data on us. They don't want those algorithms coming to America because then they will be exposed. That is what this is about.

This is a national security threat. That is why we took action last April. They have had these 270 days. They did nothing with them. To extend would mean nothing as well, except give the Chinese Communist Party another 270 days to push their propaganda and to spy on more Americans.

Finally, today, in our Foreign Relations Committee hearing, we had the confirmation hearing for Senator RUBIO, who has been nominated for Secretary of State.

I asked him in his confirmation hearing earlier today why average Americans in Nebraska should care about the threat the Chinese Communist Party poses to our way of life, and he had a great response, and I want to read it here.

He said:

If we stay on the road we're on right now, in less than ten years, virtually everything that matters to us in life will depend on whether China will allow us to have it or not.

Folks, this is a clear test of whether America is going to get off that road. Are we willing to change direction? Are we willing to say to the Chinese Communist Party enough, no further, not now? We are changing. We are getting away from the bad practices of the past that the Chinese Communist Party is taking advantage of.

Let's send a clear signal to Beijing that America's national security is going to take priority. Let's stand strong. Let's remember, we passed this law for a reason, and it is to keep Americans safe, and, therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I am disappointed that my colleagues have

objected to this simple legislation. I recognize the national security risk here. But the fearmongering about the supposed anti-American content on TikTok is the exact type of government overreach that has left tens of millions of Americans furious. The hyperbolic statements made by my colleagues are especially concerning, given that the intelligence community itself has acknowledged that it has no information that China is covertly manipulating content on TikTok—no information.

Let me say that again: In the DC Circuit Court of Appeals, the government was asked to present evidence that ByteDance was covertly manipulating content on TikTok for the benefit of the Chinese Government, and the intelligence community submitted an affidavit saying that the government has no information that it is being manipulated.

So as we are out here today—by the way, that would change the whole debate. If they had information, we would be having a different debate. If there were proof that they were manipulating, provided by the intelligence community, we would be having a different debate. They don't have any information.

And I sat in the same intelligence briefings that my colleagues did, and I kept waiting to hear that information. I never heard it. I don't think it is giving up secrets to say: I didn't hear any secrets.

I didn't hear them because there weren't any. And they made that filing in the DC Circuit Court of Appeals. They have no information.

And I have read the reports and news articles. I have tracked the court case closely. I am clear-eyed about the risk. But unlike many of my colleagues, I am also clear-eyed about the profound economic, political, and social importance of TikTok to 170 million users and 7 million businesses in the United States, and I understand how many creators depend on TikTok to find community, share their story, find resources.

So my ask again here is simple: 270 days, and we can try to find a resolution of this issue that doesn't have a draconian cutoff on Sunday afternoon.

So this is the issue that we are confronted with at this point. We don't have the evidence that is being cited by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. It doesn't exist. They may believe it, but they don't have the evidence to present to this body because the intelligence community has not provided it. Otherwise, again, as I am saying, we would have a very different debate.

And this is a very important issue because the Supreme Court just had a hearing—it is unbelievable that it is 9 months later—on the constitutionality of your ban. So I think that the colleagues of mine who spoke on the other side, they are saying: Well, they should have already sold it.

Well, they took it to court to find out if this law was constitutional. They have a right to do that. They have a right to go to the Supreme Court. They have a right to have a hearing. They have a right to make their case. They have a right to say it is unconstitutional. It hasn't been ruled on yet. It hasn't been ruled on.

And so because of that, all I am asking is more time.

Listen to Donald Trump. He is saying: Give it more time.

That is all I am asking for.

And I will say, as well, when my friend cites suicides and other incredible consequences of social media in our society, I do agree with him 100 percent. But it is not just TikTok. It is Instagram. It is Facebook. It is company after company after company that is targeting 14-year-old girls with bulimia, with anorexia, with information that is making them even sicker and sicker and sicker. That is why, when my bill was killed here in December to pass a law which said that parents can just say: Erase all that information you are gathering about my daughter—and it is the third Congress in a row that happened. Yes, TikTok should be stopped, and so should Facebook, and so should Instagram—so should all of them.

But just don't raise it in a TikTok context. Raise it in a Senate context.

That law should have passed. That should have already been on the President's desk. And it was bipartisan. It was bipartisan. You want to talk about lobbyists. You want to talk about stopping legislation.

So I agree with the gentleman on the fundamental fact that TikTok is a contributor to this problem, but it is a part of a larger problem. And I also want to make the point that there is no imminent threat of a compromise of this information that we are talking about here today because the intelligence community does not, in fact, have the information to say that that is accurate.

So I agree with Donald Trump. Give it more time. Allow for the process to play out. Allow for the Supreme Court to make a decision. Allow for potential buyers to step forth. Allow for the users of TikTok, the 7 million businesses that use it for their own families—allow for the families in the fire zone in L.A. to continue to use it to build community, to run their small businesses, and not cut it off on Sunday. And that is what I have been asking the Senate to do.

So I regret that the objection has been raised by my colleagues. But I tell you there is going to be real harm, and my hope is that I can partner with President-elect Trump to try to find a resolution of this issue so that we do it with the information that, right now, we do not have to take such an action.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. COTTON. I want to respond briefly to a few points from my friend from

Massachusetts, and he is my friend. I want to make an underlying statement, first off, for the RECORD, because this is a notable day. Direct quotes from the Senator from Massachusetts: "Listen to Donald Trump," and "I agree with Donald Trump." Underline that in the RECORD. I am not sure you are going to see that again for the next 4 years.

But, more importantly, on this issue, the Senator is correct that TikTok is not alone in causing harm for American kids. I agree with him. Other apps can result in eating disorders or depression or mental illness.

I voted for his legislation in December. I had my own online safety legislation. The difference is that TikTok is influenced and controlled by the Chinese Communist Party. And this bill did not just address TikTok; it addressed all foreign adversary-owned apps.

You raised the question of RedNote. Well, guess what. If TikTok users flood to RedNote, they are going to face the same challenge there because it is also controlled by the Communist Party.

Second, the Senator has made a lot about some affidavit by some intelligence community official in some case. I don't know what it is referring to. I do know this: I have been on the Intelligence Committee for 10 years. I chair it now. I have heard the testimony of senior leaders that TikTok poses a great threat to our national security and our people's well-being.

But I also know this: Third, you don't need intelligence. TikTok's own internal documents reveal the threat that it poses to Americans. The State attorneys general have brought lawsuits to defend their people. Those lawsuits have produced documents that showed, chapter and verse, exactly what TikTok has done to Americans.

And, finally, we keep hearing: It is only 270 days. It is only 270 days.

In 270 days, that is what TikTok will say again because it will not have been sold because Chinese communists won't allow it to be sold, because it is not just another app. It is not Instagram or Facebook or X or anything else. It is a Chinese communist spy app.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. RICKETTS. I just want to briefly build upon my colleague from Arkansas.

Two quick points: One, our colleague from Massachusetts has called this a TikTok ban. That is inaccurate. The law that was passed, as my colleague pointed out, was about foreign adversaries and required TikTok to be sold to an American owner.

If it had been sold, TikTok could continue to be in operation. And my understanding is, even if it is forced to close down because it hasn't sold by Sunday, if it is sold in the future, it will be able to reestablish operations, as long as it is to an American buyer.

So it is not a ban.

The reason it is a ban is because TikTok and the Chinese Communist Party chose to make it a ban. ByteDance has not tried to parallel-path this, which was my colleague from Massachusetts' point. They could have been trying to sell it, the same time they were going through the court, and had that ready. In fact, they could have written a document saying: I am only going to sell if the Supreme Court says I have to. They could have found a buyer and written a contract that way—absolutely. They didn't have to make this a ban.

And with regard to my colleague from Massachusetts' other point, I did offer a proof point based upon data here in the United States about how TikTok pushes a Chinese Communist Party agenda to push their propaganda. In this case, it was anti-Semitism against Israel by promoting pro-Hamas, the terrorist group, posts—its posts—and then pro-Palestinian posts versus Israeli pro-Israel ones. So I gave data there.

But this is exactly the same kind of pushing of propaganda which has led, I presume, India to ban TikTok, as well, because the Chinese Communist Party is doing the same thing to them.

So a couple of points on this, and, again, I don't think anything will be different 270 days from now because the Chinese Communist Party will not allow TikTok to be sold because their algorithm would be exposed.

With that, I would just end by saying that China must be deterred.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at 5:50 p.m. today, the Senate vote in relation to the following amendments: Cornyn No. 14 and Coons No. 23.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 TO AMENDMENT NO. 8

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, we just locked in a vote on my amendment.

I would like to call up my amendment No. 14 to Senate amendment No. 8 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CORNYN] proposes an amendment numbered 14 to amendment No. 8.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To expand the list of criminal offenses that subject inadmissible aliens to mandatory detention)

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

"(ii) is charged with, is arrested for, is convicted of, admits having committed, or admits committing acts which constitute the essential elements of any burglary, theft, larceny, shoplifting, or assault of a law enforcement officer offense, or any crime that

results in death or serious bodily injury to another person.”;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (4); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) DEFINITION.—For purposes of paragraph (1)(E), the terms ‘burglary’, ‘theft’, ‘larceny’, ‘shoplifting’, ‘assault of a law enforcement officer’, and ‘serious bodily injury’ have the meanings given such terms in the jurisdiction in which the acts occurred.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I want to offer an amendment that would add one more crime to the list covered by this legislation, and that would be assault of a law enforcement officer.

Anyone who comes into the country illegally and harms these brave men and women in uniform is dangerous, and dangerous not only to our first responders but also to the safety and security of all Texans and communities all around the country.

Unfortunately, we know, under the Biden-Harris administration, these people who are committing these kinds of crimes are routinely being released back into the streets, as we saw last February in New York City when seven people were arrested for assaulting a police officer—assaulting multiple police officers—outside of a migrant shelter in Times Square. Manhattan District Attorney Alvin Bragg made the decision to release five of these criminal suspects without bail.

There is no question that these criminals should have been detained and removed before they could go on and commit other crimes against innocent victims.

My amendment simply would require ICE to promptly take migrants who assault law enforcement officers into custody and ensure that illegal migrants who commit crimes against the men and women in blue are swiftly detained so they can be removed from our country.

I urge adoption of my amendment.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to finish my brief remarks before we proceed to the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 23

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, we are about to consider two amendments to the Laken Riley Act. I appreciate the opportunity to speak to amendment No. 23, which would strike section 3 of the Laken Riley Act.

I respect that colleagues on both sides of the aisle have expressed their intention to vote for the Laken Riley

bill and to advance it. I have not yet made any such commitment out of concern about the unintended consequences of several provisions of this bill. I want to briefly speak to the consequences of the section that my amendment would strike.

Amidst real resource constraints, unpredictable migration patterns, and fluctuating diplomatic sensitivities, our Federal law enforcement officers at ICE and CBP make thousands of complex decisions day in and day out about how to deal with interior enforcement, about border encounters, who to detain, and who to release. It is because these decisions involve so many complex factors that the Supreme Court has repeatedly recognized that the Federal Government is and should be the ultimate authority on enforcement of our immigration laws.

Section 3, however, would mark a sea change by inviting every State attorney general to sue whenever they disagree with even an individual-level Federal decision regarding detention and removal. This could create uncertainty or even chaos by encouraging conflicting lawsuits brought by different States in different courts.

I will remind my colleagues that this provision may have been drafted when the view was that Republican States’ attorneys general would sue a Democratic administration to move closer towards the enforcement vision that they prioritized. Roughly half of the State attorneys general belong to each political party.

I hope that my colleagues who have reflected upon the consequences of this provision will conclude that we should not have the division and, frankly, ultimately the chaos in the enforcement of our immigration laws that would likely result from having a raft of lawsuits brought by State attorneys general in courts all over the country testing and challenging almost literally every detention decision.

I believe it is possible for this act to be improved, for it to advance public safety, and for it to make a contribution to the country, and it is my hope that the amendments being offered will be taken up and passed.

I will urge a “yes” vote on my amendment for all of my colleagues because I think an improved bill should be the ultimate objective of this amendment process.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 14

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is on adoption of amendment No. 14 offered by the Senator from Texas, Mr. CORNYN.

Mr. CORNYN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Sen-

ator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. JUSTICE), and the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS).

Further, if present and voting: the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS) would have voted “aye” and the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY) would have voted “aye.”

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 70, nays 25, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 3 Leg.]

YEAS—70

Baldwin	Fischer	Ossoff
Banks	Gallago	Paul
Barrasso	Graham	Peters
Bennet	Grassley	Ricketts
Blackburn	Hassan	Risch
Blumenthal	Hawley	Rosen
Boozman	Heinrich	Rounds
Britt	Hickenlooper	Rubio
Budd	Hoeven	Schmitt
Cantwell	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Capito	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Kelly	Shaheen
Collins	Kennedy	Sheehy
Coons	Klobuchar	Slotkin
Cornyn	Lankford	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	Lee	Thune
Cotton	Lujan	Tillis
Cramer	Marshall	Tuberville
Crapo	McConnell	Warner
Cruz	McCormick	Warnock
Curtis	Moran	Wicker
Daines	Moreno	Young
Ernst	Mullin	
Fetterman	Murkowski	

NAYS—25

Alsobrooks	King	Schiff
Blunt Rochester	Markey	Schumer
Booker	Merkley	Smith
Duckworth	Murphy	Van Hollen
Durbin	Murray	Warren
Gillibrand	Padilla	Welch
Hirono	Reed	Whitehouse
Kaine	Sanders	
Kim	Schatz	

NOT VOTING—4

Hagerty	Lummis
Justice	Wyden

The amendment (No. 14) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BRITT). The Senator from Delaware.

AMENDMENT NO. 23

Mr. COONS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up my amendment No. 23, as provided under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment by number.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. COONS] proposes an amendment numbered 23.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To strike the section that authorizes State attorneys general to sue Federal immigration authorities for alleged violations relating to the detention of aliens)

Beginning on page 3, strike line 9 and all that follows through page 8, line 10.

Mr. COONS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute to this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COONS. Madam President, I ask my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment, which would focus and streamline this bill and make more likely its passage.

Many of us who have served here for many Congresses regret the falling away of the frequency of amendments intended to improve the bill. My amendment would remove the section that will encourage endless litigation by State attorneys general.

I will remind you, our States' attorneys general are roughly equally divided between the parties, and attorneys general can now and today sue against what they believe is manifest injustice in the Federal immigration system. This provision would encourage them to sue down to individual detention and release decisions.

I think it improves the bill to remove that section and focus on its critical public safety provisions.

I urge a "yes" vote on this amendment and the consideration of additional amendments in the future that will improve this bill.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 23

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on adoption of the amendment.

Mr. COONS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. JUSTICE), and the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS).

Further, if present and voting: the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS) would have voted "nay" and the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY) would have voted "nay."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 4 Leg.]

YEAS—46

Alsobrooks	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Baldwin	Hirono	Sanders
Bennet	Kaine	Schatz
Blumenthal	Kelly	Schiff
Blunt Rochester	Kim	Schumer
Booker	King	Shaheen
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Slotkin
Coons	Lujan	Smith
Cortez Masto	Markey	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warnock
Fetterman	Murray	Warren
Galleo	Ossoff	Welch
Gillibrand	Padilla	Whitehouse
Hassan	Peters	
Heinrich	Reed	

NAYS—49

Banks	Britt	Collins
Barrasso	Budd	Cornyn
Blackburn	Capito	Cotton
Boozman	Cassidy	Cramer

Crapo	Lankford	Rubio
Cruz	Lee	Schmitt
Curtis	Marshall	Scott (FL)
Daines	McConnell	Scott (SC)
Ernst	McCormick	Sheehy
Fischer	Moran	Sullivan
Graham	Moreno	Thune
Grassley	Mullin	Tillis
Hawley	Murkowski	Tuberville
Hoeven	Paul	Wicker
Hyde-Smith	Ricketts	Young
Johnson	Risch	
Kennedy	Rounds	

NOT VOTING—4

Hagerty	Lummis
Justice	Wyden

The amendment (No. 23) was rejected.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, filing cloture does not signal an end to our amendment process. We have been having constructive conversations all day. Those yielded the votes this evening, and I expect those conversations to continue tonight and into tomorrow so we can vote on more amendments this week. But at some point, we need to pass this commonsense legislation and get it to the House so that they can ratify what we have done.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk for Calendar No. 1, S. 5.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Calendar No. 1, S. 5, a bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to take into custody aliens who have been charged in the United States with theft, and for other purposes.

John Thune, John Barrasso, Steve Daines, Bill Cassidy, Katie Britt, Mike Lee, Kevin Cramer, Ted Budd, Jim Banks, Dave McCormick, John Cornyn, John Hoeven, Rick Scott of Florida, Roger Marshall, Tommy Tuberville, Ron Johnson, Dan Sullivan.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I ask consent that the mandatory quorum call be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNIZING THE STENNIS CENTER FOR PUBLIC SERVICE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, the Stennis Center for Public Service is a legislative branch Agency with a congressional mandate to attract young

people to careers in public service, provide training for leaders in, or likely to be in, public service, and offer training and development opportunities for senior congressional staff, Members of Congress, and other public service leaders.

A strong civil society is the foundation of a free society and essential for our republican form of government to work. That starts with public service minded individuals identifying problems and working together to solve them. This aspect of our society as-tounded Alexis de Tocqueville when he traveled our country in the early days of our Republic and compared what he saw to his native France.

But, as Ronald Reagan observed, "Freedom is never more than one generation away from extinction. We didn't pass it to our children in the bloodstream. It must be fought for, protected, and handed on for them to do the same, or one day we will spend our sunset years telling our children and our children's children what it was once like in the United States where men were free."

Part of perpetuating a free society is encouraging civic minded thinking and actions. So I am glad that the "Public Service Review," produced by the Stennis Center for Public Service, features stories from young leaders who are making a difference in their communities. The publication, available on the Stennis Center's website at www.stennis.gov, recognizes and highlights examples of young people engaging in public service.

I am particularly proud that the entire summer 2024 edition highlights the Legislative Practice Center at Drake University Law School in Des Moines, IA. I encourage everyone to read this edition of "Public Service Review" and learn about how, for 25 years, the Drake Law School Legislative Practice Center has equipped students for public service careers by blending rigorous academic training with invaluable hands-on experiences. You will hear from staff and students in the Legislative Practice Center, learn about prominent alumni of the program now working in public service, and read about prominent Iowans working in public service, with stories written by the students.

The Drake Law students featured in this edition of Public Service Review include:

Carter Forrest
Witt Harberts
Haley Ledford
Laura Book
Natalie Sherman
Charlotte Miller
Zach Goodrich
Taylor McDonald
Zach Engstrom
Tom Ashworth
Bernardo Granwehr
Jacob Shrader
J.T. Harris

I congratulate them on this recognition and thank them for their dedication to public service.

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATIONS

Mr. RISCH. Madam President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is still available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications that have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such an annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD-423.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Washington, DC.

Hon. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 24-125, concerning the Air Force's proposed letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Japan for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$39 million. We will issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale upon delivery of this letter to your office.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL F. MILLER,
Director.

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 24-125

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of Japan.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:
Major Defense Equipment* \$31 million.
Other \$8 million.
Total \$39 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):
Sixteen (16) AGM-158B/B-2 Joint Air-to-Surface Standoff Missiles with Extended Range (JASSM-ER).

Non-Major Defense Equipment: The following non-MDE items will also be included: AGM-158 JASSM Dummy Air Training Missiles (DATM) and containers; JASSM Anti-jam Global Positioning System Receivers (JAGR); munitions support and support equipment; spare parts, consumables, accessories, and repair and return support; integration and test support and equipment; classified and unclassified software delivery and support; classified and unclassified publications and technical documentation; personnel training and equipment; airlift and transportation support; U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical, and logistics support services; studies and surveys; and other related elements of logistics and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Air Force (JA-D-YBL).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: JA-D-YBH.
(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None known at this time.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: January 15, 2025.

*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Japan—Joint Air-to-Surface Standoff Missiles with Extended Range

The Government of Japan has requested to buy sixteen (16) AGM-158B/B-2 Joint Air-to-Surface Standoff Missiles with Extended Range (JASSM-ER). The following non-MDE items will also be included: AGM-158 JASSM Dummy Air Training Missiles (DATM) and containers; JASSM Anti-jam Global Positioning System Receivers (JAGR); munitions support and support equipment; spare parts, consumables and accessories, and repair and return support; integration and test support and equipment; classified and unclassified software delivery and support; classified and unclassified publications and technical documentation; personnel training and equipment; airlift and transportation support; U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical, and logistics support services; studies and surveys; and other related elements of logistics and program support. The estimated total cost is \$39 million.

This proposed sale will support the foreign policy goals and national security objectives of the United States by improving the security of a major ally that is a force for political stability and economic progress in the Indo-Pacific region.

The proposed sale will improve Japan's capability to meet current and future threats by providing stand-off capability via advanced, long-range strike systems for employment on Japan Air Self-Defense Force (JASDF) fighter aircraft, including but not limited to the F-15J and F-35A/B. Japan will have no difficulty absorbing these articles and services into its armed forces. The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The principal contractor will be Lockheed Martin, located in Orlando, FL. At this time, the U.S. Government is not aware of any offset agreement proposed in connection with this potential sale. Any offset agreement will be defined in negotiations between the purchaser and the contractor.

Implementation of this proposed sale will not require the assignment of any additional U.S. Government or contractor representatives to Japan.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 24-125

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The AGM-158B/B-2 Joint Air-to-Surface Standoff Missile with Extended Range (JASSM-ER) All Up Round (AUR) is a low-observable, highly survivable, subsonic cruise missile designed to penetrate next-generation air defense systems enroute to target. The JASSM-ER is designed to kill hard, medium-hardened, soft, and area-type targets. The extended range over the baseline was obtained by going from a turbo jet to a turbo-fan engine and by reconfiguring the fuel tanks for added capacity.

a. The AGM-158B-2 system capabilities include all the capabilities of the AGM-158B.

The AGM-158B-2 configuration will have different internal components to address multiple obsolescence issues as well as sub-component updates to position for M-Code and other potential upgrades. Global Positioning System/Precise Positioning Service (GPS/PPS) to be provided by either Selective Availability Anti-Spoofing Module (SAASM) or M-Code.

2. The highest level of classification of defense articles, components, and services included in this potential sale is SECRET.

3. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the specific hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures that might reduce system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

4. A determination has been made that Japan can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the Policy Justification.

5. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal have been authorized for release and export to the Government of Japan.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING 100 YEARS OF THE GRAND OLE OPRY

• Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, 100 years ago this November, the world of American music changed forever: Nashville's Grand Ole Opry hit the airwaves for the very first time. Ever since, "Country's Most Famous Stage" has hosted the music tradition's biggest stars, from Hank Williams and Dolly Parton to Patsy Cline and Johnny Cash. Along the way, the Opry has become the longest running radio show in U.S. history, reaching millions of listeners in America and across the world with its weekly broadcasts.

Today, the Grand Ole Opry is Nashville's most cherished institution, preserving country music's history while minting new stars who join the remarkable group of musicians who have stepped into its famous wooden circle. Earlier this month, the Opry kicked off its 100th anniversary celebrations with performances that brought together Country Music Hall of Fame members like Charlie McCoy, Don Schlitz, Connie Smith, and Bill Anderson—the Opry's longest serving cast member after joining in 1961.

On behalf of all Tennesseans, I extend my heartfelt congratulations to the Grand Ole Opry as it celebrates 100 years of incredible music, legendary performances, and musical heritage. Here is to 100 more.●

TRIBUTE TO MAJOR HEATH DRAKE

• Mr. TUBERVILLE. Mr. President, our time is one of the most valuable things that we can give. For MAJ Heath Drake of Leeds, he invests

countless hours in his local community. Heath was inspired to join the Army National Guard from his dad—an Air Force veteran—and his brother, who is currently a lieutenant colonel in the Air Force.

Heath decided to open two small businesses that employ Alabamians in his community. He developed an interest in vegetation management while doing summer jobs as a teenager, but credits the skills learned in the military for helping him build a successful company.

Despite his busy schedule, Heath never turns down an opportunity to give back to his community. His impact is perhaps best evidenced in his role as a coach. For the last 20 years, Heath has been a volunteer coach in the Leeds Youth Baseball League. He most recently began volunteering with the baseball team at Lawson State Community College. Heath has helped hundreds of young people learn life lessons through participating in sports. Despite the huge time commitment that comes with being a coach, Heath finds all the long hours worthwhile. His devotion has clearly made an impact on the many young men he has coached throughout the year, including Dax who nominated him for this recognition.

Dax says that to him, Heath is not only a coach but “a mentor and someone he can look up to.” Heath’s story is a reminder that our time is best spent helping those around us. He is a true role model for his players, employees, family, and friends. It is my honor to recognize Heath Drake as the January Veteran of the Month.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Hanley, one of his secretaries.

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGES

REPORT RELATIVE TO THE ISSUANCE OF AN EXECUTIVE ORDER IN ORDER TO TAKE ADDITIONAL STEPS WITH RESPECT TO THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE SITUATION IN AND IN RELATION TO SYRIA DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13894 OF OCTOBER 14, 2019—PM 6

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*), the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1601 *et seq.*), and section

301 of title 3, United States Code, I hereby report that I have issued an Executive Order in order to take additional steps with respect to the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13894 of October 14, 2019 (Blocking Property and Suspending Entry of Certain Persons Contributing to the Situation in Syria).

The order makes minimal edits to Executive Order 13894 in light of the fact that certain operations referenced in that order ceased 5 years ago. In particular, under the amended order, the United States may still sanction any person determined to be responsible for or complicit in, or to have directly or indirectly engaged in, or attempted to engage in actions or policies that further threaten the peace, security, stability, or territorial integrity of Syria or the commission of serious human rights abuse.

I am enclosing a copy of the Executive Order I have issued.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr.
THE WHITE HOUSE, January 15, 2025.

REPORT ON THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY THAT WAS ORIGINALLY DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 14064 OF FEBRUARY 11, 2022, WITH RESPECT TO THE WIDESPREAD HUMANITARIAN CRISIS IN AFGHANISTAN—PM 7

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to the widespread humanitarian crisis in Afghanistan and the potential for a deepening economic collapse in Afghanistan declared in Executive Order 14064 of February 11, 2022, is to continue in effect beyond February 11, 2025.

The Widespread humanitarian crisis in Afghanistan—including the urgent needs of the people of Afghanistan for food security, livelihoods support, water, sanitation, health, hygiene, and shelter and settlement assistance, among other basic human needs—and the potential for a deepening economic collapse in Afghanistan continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. In ad-

dition, the preservation of certain property of Da Afghanistan Bank (DAB) held in the United States by United States financial institutions is of the utmost importance to addressing this national emergency and the welfare of the people of Afghanistan. Various parties, including representatives of victims of terrorism, have asserted legal claims against certain property of DAB or indicated in public court filings an intent to make such claims. This property is blocked under Executive Order 14064.

Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 14064 with respect to the widespread humanitarian crisis in Afghanistan and the potential for a deepening economic collapse in Afghanistan.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr.
THE WHITE HOUSE, January 15, 2025.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:02 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 28. An act to amend the Education Amendments of 1972 to provide that for purposes of determining compliance with title IX of such Act in athletics, sex shall be recognized based solely on a person’s reproductive biology and genetics at birth.

H.R. 153. An act to provide for an online repository for certain reporting requirements for recipients of Federal disaster assistance, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 153. An act to provide for an online repository for certain reporting requirements for recipients of Federal disaster assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 6. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-70. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Implementing Statutory Addition of Certain Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances to Toxics Release Inventory Beginning with

Reporting Year 2025" (RIN2070-AL23) (FRL No. 9427.2-01-OCSPF) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 13, 2025; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-71. A communication from the Chair and President of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a transaction involving U.S. exports to Azerbaijan; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-72. A communication from the Senior Congressional Liaison, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Truth in Lending (Regulation Z); Consumer Credit Offered to Borrowers in Advance of Expected Receipt of Compensation for Work" (Docket No. CFPB-2024-0032) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 13, 2025; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-73. A communication from the Senior Congressional Liaison, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Civil Penalty Inflation Adjustments" received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 13, 2025; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-74. A communication from the Deputy Director of Congressional Affairs, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Framework for Artificial Intelligence Diffusion" (RIN0694-AJ90) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 13, 2025; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-75. A communication from the Senior Congressional Liaison, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defining Larger Participants of a Market for General-Use Digital Consumer Payment Applications" (RIN3170-AB17) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 13, 2025; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-76. A communication from the Senior Congressional Liaison, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Residential Property Assessed Clean Energy Financing (Regulation Z)" (RIN3170-AB17) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 13, 2025; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-77. A communication from the Senior Congressional Liaison, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Prohibition on Creditors and Consumer Reporting Agencies Concerning Medical Information (Regulation V)" (RIN3170-AA54) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 13, 2025; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-78. A communication from the Deputy Director of National Marine Sanctuaries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Papahānaumokuākea National Marine Sanctuary; Final Regulations" (RIN0648-BL33) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 14, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-79. A communication from the Deputy Director of National Marine Sanctuaries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulations for the Florida Keys Na-

tional Marine Sanctuary Management Review: Blueprint for Restoration" (RIN0648-BJ14) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 14, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-80. A communication from the Program Analyst, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "2025 Civil Penalties Inflation Adjustments for Oil, Gas, and Sulfur Operations in the Outer Continental Shelf" (RIN1010-AE22) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 13, 2025; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-81. A communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Department's proposal to accept a gift of lands in Washington County, Utah from The Wilderness Land Trust totaling approximately 715 acres; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. LANKFORD (for himself, Mr. BANKS, Mr. THUNE, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. RISCH, Ms. LUMMIS, Mrs. BRITT, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CRAPO, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. BUDD, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. SHEEHY, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. ROUNDS, Ms. ERNST, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. SCHMITT, Mr. LEE, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. HAWLEY, and Mr. MCCORMICK):

S. 6. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion; read the first time.

By Mr. CRAMER (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. ROUNDS, and Ms. SMITH):

S. 94. A bill to award 3 Congressional Gold Medals to the members of the 1980 United States Olympic Men's Ice Hockey Team, in recognition of their extraordinary achievement at the XIII Olympic Winter Games where, being comprised of amateur collegiate players, they defeated the dominant Soviet ice hockey team in the historic "Miracle on Ice", revitalizing morale in the United States at the height of the Cold War, inspiring generations, and transforming the sport of ice hockey in the United States; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina):

S. 95. A bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds to close or realign the Marine Corps Recruit Depot located at Parris Island, South Carolina; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. DAINES, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. SCHMITT, Mr.

HAGERTY, Mr. RISCH, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. CRAMER):

S. 96. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prohibit certain activities constituting preparation of tax returns by the Secretary of the Treasury, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. 97. A bill to require SelectUSA to coordinate with State-level economic development organizations to increase foreign direct investment in semiconductor-related manufacturing and production; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. CAPITO (for herself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. CURTIS):

S. 98. A bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to establish a vetting process for prospective applicants for high-cost universal service program funding; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

S. 99. A bill to require the Secretary of Commerce to produce a report that provides recommendations to improve the effectiveness, efficiency, and impact of Department of Commerce programs related to supply chain resilience and manufacturing and industrial innovation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. TUBERVILLE (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. MORENO, Ms. LUMMIS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. SHEEHY, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. BUDD, Mr. PAUL, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. SCHMITT, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. DAINES, Mr. RISCH, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. LEE):

S. 100. A bill to repeal the Corporate Transparency Act; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself and Ms. ROSEN):

S. 101. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to obtain the consent of affected State and local governments before making an expenditure from the Nuclear Waste Fund for a nuclear waste repository, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 102. A bill to require Federal agencies to impose in-person work requirements for employees of those agencies and to occupy a certain portion of the office space of those agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 103. A bill to amend the Protecting Americans from Foreign Adversary Controlled Applications Act to extend the deadline by which TikTok must be sold in order to avoid being banned; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CRUZ:

S. 104. A bill to rescind Presidential memoranda on the withdrawal of certain areas of the outer Continental Shelf from oil or natural gas leasing; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. ROUNDS (for himself and Mr. THUNE):

S. 105. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to complete all actions necessary for certain land to be held in restricted fee status by the Oglala Sioux Tribe and Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Mr. CRAMER):

S. Res. 27. A resolution congratulating the North Dakota State University Bison football team for winning the 2024 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Football Championship Subdivision title; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. BRITT (for herself and Mr. TUBERVILLE):

S. Con. Res. 5. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the proposed “joint interpretation” of Annex 14-C of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement prepared by United States Trade Representative Katherine Tai is of no legal effect with respect to the United States or any United States person unless it is approved by Congress; to the Committee on Finance.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 70

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 70, a bill to require the imposition of sanctions with respect to Ansarallah and its officials, agents, or affiliates for acts of international terrorism.

S. 74

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) were added as cosponsors of S. 74, a bill to require the Attorney General to submit to Congress a report relating to violence against women in athletics.

S. 83

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SCHMITT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 83, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide enhanced penalties for convicted murderers who kill or target America’s public safety officers.

S. 84

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. MCCORMICK) were added as cosponsors of S. 84, a bill to require U. S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement to take into custody certain aliens who have been charged in the United States with a crime that resulted in the death or serious bodily injury of another person, and for other purposes.

S. 89

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 89, a bill to reform restrictions on the importation of firearms and ammunition.

S. RES. 21

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. RICKETTS), the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) and the

Senator from Indiana (Mr. BANKS) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 21, a resolution designating October 10, 2025, as “American Girls in Sports Day”.

S. RES. 22

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 22, a resolution concerning the National Collegiate Athletic Association policy for eligibility in women’s sports.

AMENDMENT NO. 9

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGOS) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HICKENLOOPER) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 9 intended to be proposed to S. 5, a bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to take into custody aliens who have been charged in the United States with theft, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 10

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 10 intended to be proposed to S. 5, a bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to take into custody aliens who have been charged in the United States with theft, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 12

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HICKENLOOPER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 12 intended to be proposed to S. 5, a bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to take into custody aliens who have been charged in the United States with theft, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 17

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 17 intended to be proposed to S. 5, a bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to take into custody aliens who have been charged in the United States with theft, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 20

At the request of Mr. KING, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 20 intended to be proposed to S. 5, a bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to take into custody aliens who have been charged in the United States with theft, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 28

At the request of Mr. KING, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 28 intended to be proposed to S. 5, a bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to take into custody aliens who have been charged in the United States with theft, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 35

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from New Jersey

(Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) and the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 35 intended to be proposed to S. 5, a bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to take into custody aliens who have been charged in the United States with theft, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 36

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from Delaware (Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 36 intended to be proposed to S. 5, a bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to take into custody aliens who have been charged in the United States with theft, and for other purposes.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 27—CONGRATULATING THE NORTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY BISON FOOTBALL TEAM FOR WINNING THE 2024 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION DIVISION I FOOTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP SUBDIVISION TITLE

Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Mr. CRAMER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 27

Whereas, on January 6, 2025, the North Dakota State University (NDSU) Bison football team won the 2024 National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division I Football Championship Subdivision (FCS) title game in Frisco, Texas, in a well-fought victory over the Montana State University Bobcats by a score of 35–32;

Whereas, including the 2024 NCAA Division I FCS title, the NDSU Bison have won 18 national football championships;

Whereas the NDSU Bison have won 10 of the last 14 NCAA Division I FCS titles, from 2011 to 2024, an achievement that continues to be unmatched in modern collegiate football history;

Whereas the NDSU Bison have displayed tremendous resilience and skill since 2011, with 186 wins to 21 losses, including a streak of 39 consecutive wins from 2017 to 2021;

Whereas head coach Tim Polasek, his staff, and their victorious student-athletes led the NDSU Bison to a championship in his first year as head coach at NDSU, continuing the culture of excellence of the NDSU Bison;

Whereas thousands of NDSU Bison fans attended the championship game in Frisco, Texas, reflecting the tremendous pride and dedication of Bison Nation, which has supported and helped drive the achievement of the NDSU Bison; and

Whereas the 2024 NCAA Division I FCS title was a victory for both the NDSU Bison and the entire State of North Dakota: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the North Dakota State University Bison football team for winning the 2024 National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division I Football Championship Subdivision (FCS) title;

(2) commends the players, coaches, and staff of the North Dakota State University Bison football team for—

(A) their tireless work and dedication; and
(B) fostering a continued tradition of excellence;

(3) congratulates the North Dakota State University President David Cook, North Dakota State University Athletic Director Matt Larsen, and all the faculty and staff of North Dakota State University for creating an environment that emphasizes excellence in both academics and athletics; and

(4) recognizes the students, alumni, and fans of North Dakota State University and all of Bison Nation for supporting the North Dakota State University Bison football team so well during its successful quest to bring home yet another NCAA Division I FCS trophy for North Dakota State University.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 5—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT THE PROPOSED “JOINT INTERPRETATION” OF ANNEX 14-C OF THE UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA AGREEMENT PREPARED BY UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE KATHERINE TAI IS OF NO LEGAL EFFECT WITH RESPECT TO THE UNITED STATES OR ANY UNITED STATES PERSON UNLESS IT IS APPROVED BY CONGRESS

Mrs. BRITT (for herself and Mr. TUBERVILLE) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

S. CON. RES. 5

Whereas section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States vests Congress with authority over international trade and Congress has accordingly and unanimously found that the executive branch lacks authority to enter into binding trade agreements absent the approval of Congress;

Whereas Congress has delegated some of its authority to negotiate international trade matters to the executive branch provided the executive branch consults closely with Congress and Congress has final authority over the United States entering any binding international trade agreements;

Whereas the USMCA (as defined in section 3 of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementation Act (19 U.S.C. 4502)) is an international trade agreement that was approved by Congress with significant bipartisan support and replaced the North American Free Trade Agreement (commonly known as “NAFTA”);

Whereas Annex 14-C of the USMCA ensures that United States persons who make investments in Canada or Mexico have appropriate recourse for arbitrary or discriminatory treatment or expropriation of certain investments made when NAFTA was in force and for 3 years thereafter;

Whereas the United States Trade Representative, Ambassador Katherine Tai, is attempting to secure a “joint interpretation” with the governments of Canada and Mexico that could limit and curtail the rights of certain United States persons under Annex 14-C of the USMCA;

Whereas Ambassador Katherine Tai has failed to consult with Congress appropriately regarding the proposed “joint interpretation” of Annex 14-C, including by applying unreasonable procedures that have inhibited Members of Congress from viewing the text of the proposed “joint interpretation”; and

Whereas the approval of Congress is a necessary prerequisite for Ambassador Katherine Tai to agree to a “joint interpretation” with the governments of Canada and Mexico under the USMCA: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the proposed “joint interpretation” of Annex 14-C of the USMCA (as defined in section 3 of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementation Act (19 U.S.C. 4502)) prepared by Ambassador Katherine Tai is of no legal effect with respect to the United States or any United States person, unless it is approved by Congress; and

(2) the Office of the United States Trade Representative, the Department of State, or any other agency of the United States cannot invoke the “joint interpretation” in any legal proceeding or assert that it has any legal consequence for any claims made by a United States person, unless and until the “joint interpretation” is formally approved by Congress.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 50. Mrs. BLACKBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 5, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to take into custody aliens who have been charged in the United States with theft, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 51. Mrs. BLACKBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 52. Mr. HAWLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 53. Mr. KAINE (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. KING, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. LUJÁN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 54. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 55. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 56. Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Mr. WARNOCK, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 57. Mr. MURPHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 58. Mr. MURPHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 59. Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. SANDERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 60. Mr. KING submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 61. Mr. KING submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 62. Mr. MURPHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the

bill S. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 63. Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Mr. DURBIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 64. Mr. HEINRICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 65. Mr. CASSIDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 66. Mr. MURPHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 67. Mr. MURPHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 68. Mr. MURPHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 69. Mr. MARSHALL (for himself and Mr. GRAHAM) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 8 proposed by Mr. THUNE (for Ms. ERNST (for herself and Mr. GRASSLEY)) to the bill S. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 70. Mr. MARSHALL (for himself and Mr. GRAHAM) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 8 proposed by Mr. THUNE (for Ms. ERNST (for herself and Mr. GRASSLEY)) to the bill S. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 71. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 72. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 73. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 74. Mr. VAN HOLLEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 75. Mr. SCHMITT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 76. Mr. SCHMITT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 77. Mr. SCHMITT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 78. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 50. Mrs. BLACKBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 5, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to take into custody aliens who have been charged in the United States with theft, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 2, line 5, strike “Section” and insert the following:

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section

On page 2, line 21, strike “(4)” and insert “(5)”.

On page 3, line 8, strike the end quote and final period and insert the following:

“(4) CONSTRUCTION OR ACQUISITION OF FEDERAL DETENTION FACILITIES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall construct or acquire, in addition to existing facilities for the detention of aliens, as provided in paragraph (3), 20 detention facilities in the United States, which shall be used to temporarily house aliens detained pending removal from the United States or a decision regarding such removal. Each facility shall have a sufficient number of beds necessary to house such aliens.

“(B) DETERMINATIONS.—The location of any detention facility built or acquired pursuant to this subsection shall be determined by the Assistant Director of the Custody Management Division of Enforcement and Removal Operations.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 241(g)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1231(g)(1)) is amended by striking “may expend from the appropriation ‘Immigration and Naturalization Service—Salaries and Expenses,’” and inserting “shall expend from the appropriation ‘U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement—Operations and Support’.”.

SA 51. Mrs. BLACKBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 5, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to take into custody aliens who have been charged in the United States with theft, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 4. SHORT TITLES.

Sections 4 through 17 of this Act may be cited as the “Clear Law Enforcement for Criminal Alien Removal Act of 2025” or the “CLEAR Act”.

SEC. 5. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

(2) STATE.—The term “State” has the meaning given such term in section 101(a)(36) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(36)).

SEC. 6. FEDERAL AFFIRMATION OF ASSISTANCE IN THE IMMIGRATION LAW ENFORCEMENT BY STATES AND POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS OF STATES.

Reaffirming the existing inherent authority of States, law enforcement personnel of a State, or of a political subdivision of a State, have the inherent authority of a sovereign entity to investigate, identify, apprehend, arrest, detain, or transfer to Federal custody aliens in the United States (including the transportation of such aliens across State lines to detention centers), for the purposes of assisting in the enforcement of the immigration laws of the United States in the course of carrying out routine duties. This State authority has never been displaced or preempted by Congress.

SEC. 7. STATE AUTHORIZATION FOR ASSISTANCE IN THE ENFORCEMENT OF IMMIGRATION LAWS ENCOURAGED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Beginning on the date that is 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, a State, or a political subdivision of a State, that has in effect a statute, policy, or practice that prohibits law enforcement officers of the State, or of a political subdivision of the State, from assisting or cooperating with Federal immigration law enforcement in the course of carrying out the officers’ routine law enforcement duties may not receive any of the funds that would

otherwise be allocated to the State under section 241(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1231(i)).

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to require law enforcement officials from States, or from political subdivisions of States, to report or arrest victims or witnesses of a criminal offense.

(c) REALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—Any funds that are not allocated to a State, or to a political subdivision of a State, due to the failure of such State, or of the political subdivision of such State, to comply with subsection (a) shall be reallocated to States, or to political subdivisions of States, that comply with such subsection.

SEC. 8. LISTING OF IMMIGRATION VIOLATORS IN THE NATIONAL CRIME INFORMATION CENTER DATABASE.

(a) PROVISION OF INFORMATION TO THE NATIONAL CRIME INFORMATION CENTER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and periodically thereafter as updates may require, the Commissioner for U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall provide the National Crime Information Center of the Department of Justice with such information as the Commissioner may possess regarding any aliens—

(A) against whom a final order of removal has been issued;

(B) who have signed a voluntary departure agreement;

(C) who have overstayed their authorized period of stay; or

(D) whose visas have been revoked.

(2) IMMIGRATION VIOLATORS FILE.—The National Crime Information Center shall enter all of the information received pursuant to paragraph (1) into the Immigration Violators File regardless of whether—

(A) the alien concerned received notice of a final order of removal;

(B) the alien concerned has already been removed; or

(C) sufficient identifying information is available with respect to the alien concerned.

(b) INCLUSION OF INFORMATION IN THE NCIC INDEX.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 534(a) of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (5) and (6), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

“(4) acquire, collect, classify, and preserve records of violations by aliens of the immigration laws of the United States, regardless of whether—

“(A) any such alien has received notice of any such violation;

“(B) sufficient identifying information is available with respect to any such alien; and

“(C) any such alien has already been removed from the United States;”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The Attorney General shall implement the amendment made by paragraph (1) not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 9. STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT PROVISION OF INFORMATION ABOUT APPREHENDED ALIENS.

(a) PROVISION OF INFORMATION.—In compliance with section 642(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1373(a)) and section 434 of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1644), each State, and each political subdivision of a State, shall submit to the Secretary, in a timely manner, the information specified in subsection (b) with respect to each alien apprehended in the jurisdiction of the State, or of a political subdivision of the State, who is believed to be in violation

of the immigration laws of the United States.

(b) INFORMATION REQUIRED.—The information specified in this subsection is—

(1) the alien’s name;

(2) the alien’s address or place of residence;

(3) a physical description of the alien;

(4) the date, time, and location of the encounter with the alien and reason for stopping, detaining, apprehending, or arresting the alien;

(5) if applicable—

(A) the alien’s driver’s license number and the State of issuance of such license;

(B) the type of any other identification document issued to the alien, the designation number contained on the identification document, and the issuing entity for the identification document; and

(C) the license plate number, make, and model of any automobile registered to, or driven by, the alien; and

(6) if available or readily obtainable—

(A) a photo of the alien; and

(B) the alien’s fingerprints.

(c) ANNUAL REPORT.—The Secretary shall annually submit to Congress a detailed report listing the States, and the political subdivisions of States, that provided information pursuant to subsection (a) with respect to the preceding year.

(d) REIMBURSEMENT.—The Secretary shall reimburse States, and political subdivisions of a State, for all reasonable costs, as determined by the Secretary, incurred by each State, and each political subdivision of a State, as a result of submitting the information required to be submitted pursuant to subsection (a).

(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to require law enforcement officials of a State, or of a political subdivision of a State, to submit to the Secretary information related to a victim of a crime or witness to a criminal offense.

SEC. 10. FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES THAT ASSIST IN THE ENFORCEMENT OF IMMIGRATION LAWS.

(a) GRANTS FOR SPECIAL EQUIPMENT FOR HOUSING AND PROCESSING CERTAIN ALIENS.—The Secretary shall award grants to States and political subdivisions of States for the procurement of equipment, technology, facilities, and other products that facilitate and are directly related to investigating, apprehending, arresting, detaining, or transporting aliens who have violated the immigration laws of the United States, including additional administrative costs incurred to comply with the requirements under this Act.

(b) ELIGIBILITY.—A State or political subdivision of a State desiring a grant under this section shall have the authority to assist, and shall have a written policy and practice of assisting, in the enforcement of the immigration laws of the United States in the course of carrying out the routine law enforcement duties of such State or political subdivision. Entities covered under this section may not have any policy or practice that prevents local law enforcement from inquiring about a suspect’s immigration status.

(c) GAO AUDIT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct an audit of funds distributed to States and political subdivisions of a State pursuant to subsection (a).

SEC. 11. INCREASED FEDERAL DETENTION SPACE.

(a) CONSTRUCTION OR ACQUISITION OF DETENTION FACILITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall construct or acquire, in addition to existing facilities for the detention of aliens, 20 detention facilities in the United States, for aliens detained pending removal from the United States or a decision regarding such removal. Each facility shall have a sufficient number of beds necessary to effectuate the purposes of this Act.

(2) DETERMINATIONS.—The location of any detention facility built or acquired pursuant to this subsection shall be determined by the Assistant Director of the Custody Management Division of the Enforcement and Removal Directorate.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 241(g)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1231(g)(1)) is amended by striking “may expend” and inserting “shall expend”.

SEC. 12. FEDERAL CUSTODY OF ALIENS UNLAWFULLY PRESENT IN THE UNITED STATES APPREHENDED BY STATE OR LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT.

(a) STATE APPREHENSION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 4 of title II of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1221 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 240C the following:

“SEC. 240D. CUSTODY OF ALIENS UNLAWFULLY PRESENT IN THE UNITED STATES.

“(a) DEFINED TERM.—In this section, the term ‘alien who is unlawfully present in the United States’ means an alien who—

“(1) entered the United States without inspection or at any time, manner, or place not designated by the Secretary of Homeland Security;

“(2) was admitted as a nonimmigrant and who, at the time the alien was taken into custody by the State, or a political subdivision of the State, failed—

“(A) to maintain the nonimmigrant status in which the alien was admitted or to which it was changed pursuant to section 248; or

“(B) to comply with the conditions of any such status;

“(3) was admitted as an immigrant and subsequently failed to comply with the requirements of such status; or

“(4) failed to depart the United States under a voluntary departure agreement or under a final order of removal.

“(b) TRANSFER OF CUSTODY BY STATE AND LOCAL OFFICIALS.—If a State, or a political subdivision of the State, exercising authority with respect to the apprehension or arrest of an alien who is unlawfully present in the United States, submits to the Secretary of Homeland Security a request that such alien be taken into Federal custody, the Secretary—

“(1) not later than 48 hours after the conclusion of the State, or the political subdivision of a State, charging process or dismissal process, or if no State or political subdivision charging or dismissal process is required, not later than 48 hours after the alien is apprehended, shall take the alien into the custody of the Federal Government and incarcerate the alien; or

“(2) shall request that the relevant State or local law enforcement agency temporarily incarcerate or transport the alien for transfer to Federal custody.

“(c) POLICY ON DETENTION IN STATE AND LOCAL DETENTION FACILITIES.—In carrying out section 241(g)(1), the Attorney General or the Secretary of Homeland Security shall ensure that an alien arrested pursuant to this Act is detained, pending the alien being taken for an examination under this section, in a State or local prison, jail, detention center, or other comparable facility. Such a facility is adequate for detention if—

“(1) the facility is the most suitably located Federal, State, or local facility available for such purpose under the circumstances;

“(2) an appropriate arrangement for such use of the facility can be made; and

“(3) the facility satisfies the standards for the housing, care, and security of persons held in custody of a United States marshal.

“(d) REIMBURSEMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall reimburse States and political subdivisions of a State for all reasonable expenses, as determined by the Secretary, incurred by the State, or political subdivision as a result of the incarceration and transportation of an alien who is unlawfully present in the United States.

“(2) CALCULATION.—Compensation provided pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be equal to the sum of—

“(A) the average cost of incarceration of a prisoner in the relevant State for the period the alien was incarcerated, as determined by the chief executive officer of a State, or of a political subdivision of a State; and

“(B) the cost of transporting the alien from the point of apprehension to the place of detention, and to the custody transfer point if the place of detention and the place of custody are different.

“(e) SECURE FACILITIES.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall ensure that aliens incarcerated in Federal facilities pursuant to this section are held in facilities that provide an appropriate level of security.

“(f) TRANSFER.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall establish a regular circuit and schedule for the prompt transfer of apprehended aliens from the custody of States and political subdivisions of a State to Federal custody.

“(2) CONTRACTS.—The Secretary of Homeland Security may enter into contracts, including appropriate private contracts, to implement this subsection.”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 240C the following:

“Sec. 240D. Custody of aliens unlawfully present in the United States.”.

(b) GAO AUDIT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct an audit of compensation to States and political subdivisions of a State for the incarceration of aliens unlawfully present in the United States under section 240D of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by subsection (a)(1).

SEC. 13. TRAINING OF STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT PERSONNEL RELATING TO THE ENFORCEMENT OF IMMIGRATION LAWS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF TRAINING MANUAL AND POCKET GUIDE.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall develop—

(1) a manual to train law enforcement personnel of a State, or of a political subdivision of a State, on the investigation, identification, apprehension, arrest, detention, and transfer to Federal custody of aliens unlawfully present in the United States (including the transportation of such aliens across State lines to detention centers and the identification of fraudulent documents); and

(2) an immigration enforcement pocket guide for law enforcement personnel of a State, or of a political subdivision of a State, to provide a quick reference for such personnel in the course of carrying out their duties.

(b) AVAILABILITY.—The training manual and pocket guide developed pursuant to subsection (a) shall be made available to all State and local law enforcement personnel.

(c) COSTS.—The Secretary shall be responsible for any costs incurred in developing the training manual and pocket guide pursuant to subsection (a).

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to require State or local law enforcement personnel to carry the training manual or pocket guide with them while on duty.

(e) TRAINING FLEXIBILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall make training of State and local law enforcement officers available through as many means as possible, including through—

(A) residential training at the Center for Domestic Preparedness of the Federal Emergency Management Agency;

(B) onsite training held at State or local police agencies or facilities;

(C) online training courses by computer, teleconferencing, and videotape; or

(D) training courses made available on DVD.

(2) E-LEARNING.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall ensure that—

(A) an e-learning portal is made available through the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center’s Distributed Learning Program to train State and local law enforcement officers through a secure, encrypted distributed learning system; and

(B) the system described in subparagraph (A) is scalable and survivable and has all its servers based in the United States.

(3) PRIORITY.—In carrying out this section, priority funding shall be given for existing web-based immigration enforcement training systems.

(4) FEDERAL PERSONNEL TRAINING.—The training of State and local law enforcement personnel under this section shall not displace the training of Federal personnel.

(5) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Nothing in this Act or in any other provision of law may be construed as making any immigration-related training a requirement for, or prerequisite to, any State or local law enforcement officer assisting in the enforcement of Federal immigration laws in the normal course of carrying out the law enforcement duties of such officers.

SEC. 14. IMMUNITY.

(a) PERSONAL IMMUNITY.—A law enforcement officer of a State or local law enforcement agency who is acting within the scope of the officer’s official duties shall be immune, to the same extent as a Federal law enforcement officer, from personal liability arising out of the performance of any duty described in this Act.

(b) AGENCY IMMUNITY.—A State or local law enforcement agency shall be immune from any claim for money damages based on Federal, State, or local civil rights law for an incident arising out of the enforcement of any Federal immigration law, except to the extent a law enforcement officer of such agency committed a violation of Federal, State, or local criminal law in the course of enforcing such immigration law.

SEC. 15. INSTITUTIONAL REMOVAL PROGRAM.

(a) CONTINUATION AND EXPANSION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall continue to operate and implement the program known as the Institutional Removal Program, which—

(A) identifies removable criminal aliens in Federal and State correctional facilities;

(B) ensures such aliens are not released into the community; and

(C) removes such aliens from the United States after the completion of their respective sentences.

(2) EXPANSION.—The Institutional Removal Program shall be extended to all States. Any State that receives Federal funds for the incarceration of criminal aliens shall—

(A) cooperate with officials of the Institutional Removal Program;

(B) expeditiously and systematically identify all criminal aliens in its prison and jail populations; and

(C) promptly convey such information to officials of the Institutional Removal Program as a condition of receiving such Federal funds.

(b) **AUTHORIZATION FOR DETENTION AFTER COMPLETION OF STATE OR LOCAL PRISON SENTENCE.**—Law enforcement officers of a State, or of a political subdivision of a State, may—

(1) hold a criminal alien for a period of up to 14 days after the alien has completed the alien's State prison sentence in order to effectuate the transfer of the alien to Federal custody when the alien is removable or not lawfully present in the United States; or

(2) issue a detainer that would allow aliens who have served a State prison sentence to be detained by the State prison until personnel from U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement can take such alien into custody.

(c) **TECHNOLOGY USAGE.**—Technology, such as video conferencing, shall be used to the maximum extent practicable to make the Institutional Removal Program available in remote locations. Mobile access to Federal databases of aliens, such as IDENT, and live scan technology shall be used, to the maximum extent practicable, to make such resources available to State and local law enforcement agencies in remote locations.

SEC. 16. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Homeland Security, for fiscal year 2025 and for each subsequent fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary to carry out sections 4 through 15 of this Act.

(b) **STATE CRIMINAL ALIEN ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.**—Section 241(i)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1231(i)(5)) is amended to read as follows:

“(5) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 2025 and for each subsequent fiscal year.”.

SEC. 17. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act or of any amendment made by this Act, or the application of such provision or amendment to any person or circumstance, is held to be invalid, the remainder of the provisions of this Act and of the amendments made by this Act, and the application of any such provision or amendment to other persons not similarly situated or to other circumstances, shall not be affected.

SA 52. Mr. HAWLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 5, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to take into custody aliens who have been charged in the United States with theft, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 2, line 19, insert “any crime involving the use or operation of a motor vehicle, or any crime that victimizes a minor child,” after “offense.”.

SA 53. Mr. KAINE (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. KING, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. LUJÁN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 5, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to take into cus-

tody aliens who have been charged in the United States with theft, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Laken Riley Act”.

SEC. 2. MANDATORY DETENTION OF CERTAIN ALIENS.

Section 236(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1226(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (C), by striking “or”;

(B) in subparagraph (D), by striking the comma at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following:

“(E)(i) is inadmissible under paragraph (6)(A), (6)(C), or (7) of section 212(a); and

“(ii)(I) is convicted of a crime resulting in serious bodily injury;

“(II) is convicted of any burglary, theft, or larceny offense; or

“(III) has been arrested for, or is charged with, a criminal offense described in subclause (I) or (II) and was ordered removed in absentia under section 240(b)(5) or is subject to a bench warrant for failing to appear in connection with a criminal charge or citation described in subclause (I) or (II).”;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (6); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) **DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of paragraph (1)(E), the terms ‘burglary’, ‘theft’, and ‘larceny’, have the meanings given such terms in the jurisdiction in which the acts occurred.

“(3) **TREATMENT OF CHILDREN.**—No child who is younger than 16 years of age may be detained pursuant to subclause (II) or (III) of paragraph (1)(E)(ii). A child who is 17 or 18 years of age may not be detained pursuant to subclause (II) or (III) of paragraph (1)(E) unless the Secretary of Homeland Security determines, based on available evidence, that the child poses a danger to the community or is a flight risk.

“(4) **PROCEDURE.**—Any alien detained longer than 3 months pursuant to paragraph (1)(E) may request a custody determination hearing before an immigration judge, who shall determine bond or other conditions for release only after determining that such alien does not poses a danger to the community.

“(5) **DETAINDER.**—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall—

“(A) issue a detainer for any alien described in paragraph (1)(E); and

“(B) if such alien is not otherwise being detained by Federal, State, or local law enforcement officials, effectively and expeditiously take custody of such alien.”.

SA 54. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 5, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to take into custody aliens who have been charged in the United States with theft, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 2, line 21, strike “(4)” and insert “(5)”.

On page 3, line 8, strike the end quote and final period and insert the following:

“(4) **EXCEPTION.**—The requirement to take into custody an alien described in paragraph (1)(E) shall not apply if such detention would

result in the release of, or the inability to detain or remove, an alien determined to be a more serious public safety threat or flight risk.”.

SA 55. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 5, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to take into custody aliens who have been charged in the United States with theft, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 7, line 2, strike the period at the end.

On page 7, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

“(D) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION WITH RESPECT TO UKRAINIAN AND AFGHAN NATIONALS.**—Nothing in subparagraph (C) may be construed to limit the authority or impose liability on any Department or officer of the Federal Government pursuant to a determination to provide humanitarian parole to Afghan nationals who entered the United States after August 1, 2021 or Ukrainian nationals who entered the United States after February 24, 2022.”.

SA 56. Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Mr. WARNOCK, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 5, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to take into custody aliens who have been charged in the United States with theft, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 4. IMMIGRATION-RELATED ARREST WARRANTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Improving Public Safety Through Immigration Warrant Issuance Act”.

(b) **WARRANT AUTHORITY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 9 of title II of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1351 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 287 the following:

“SEC. 287A. AUTHORIZATION OF FEDERAL COURTS TO ISSUE ARREST WARRANTS.

“(a) **AUTHORIZATION OF FEDERAL COURTS TO ISSUE ARREST WARRANTS.**—Upon receiving an application from a Federal law enforcement officer or an attorney for the Federal Government, a magistrate judge is authorized to issue a warrant to seize an alien located within the district over which the magistrate judge has jurisdiction if there is probable cause to believe that the alien—

“(1) is removable (as defined in section 240(e)(2)); and

“(2)(A) has been charged with, or convicted of, a felony;

“(B) has been charged with, or convicted of, a crime of violence, including any crime that endangers the safety or welfare of children; or

“(C) is a threat to national security.

“(b) **ENSURING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF WARRANTS FOR PERSONS IN STATE OR LOCAL CUSTODY.**—

“(1) **ADDITIONAL AUTHORITIES.**—If such actions are reasonably necessary to ensure the effectiveness of an arrest warrant issued pursuant to subsection (a), a magistrate judge may order the State or local jurisdiction with custody over the alien subject to such warrant—

“(A) to transfer the alien to Federal custody;

“(B) to notify the Federal Government of the impending release of the alien to facilitate such transfer; and

“(C) to hold the alien for such time as may be necessary to facilitate such transfer, which may not exceed 48 hours.

“(2) **TIMING OF ORDER.**—An order described in paragraph (1) may be issued contemporaneously with an arrest warrant issued pursuant to subsection (a) if, based on reliable evidence, a State or local jurisdiction with custody over the alien subject to such warrant is unlikely to assist in effectuating the warrant.

“(3) **RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this subsection may be construed—

“(A) to limit any inherent or statutory power of the Federal courts to issue orders in aid of their jurisdiction, including writs of habeas corpus and writs authorized under section 1651 of title 28, United States Code (commonly known as the ‘All Writs Act’); or

“(B) to interfere with the Department of Homeland Security’s ability to issue detainer requests, as authorized by law.

“(C) **ISSUING THE WARRANT.**—Each warrant issued pursuant to this section shall—

“(1) be issued to an officer authorized to execute it;

“(2) identify the alien to be seized and designate the magistrate judge to whom the warrant shall be returned;

“(3) require the officer to submit the issued warrant to any State or locality with custody over the alien subject to the warrant as quickly as practicable; and

“(4) be returned to the magistrate judge designated in the warrant.

“(d) **PROCEDURE FOR OBTAINING A WARRANT.**—

“(1) **EX PARTE PROCEEDINGS.**—Warrant proceedings under this section may be conducted ex parte.

“(2) **WARRANT ON AN AFFIDAVIT.**—When a Federal law enforcement officer or an attorney for the Federal Government presents an affidavit in support of a warrant, the magistrate judge may—

“(A) require the affiant to appear personally before the judge; and

“(B) examine under oath the affiant and any witness produced by the affiant.

“(3) **RECORDING TESTIMONY.**—Testimony taken in support of a warrant shall be recorded by a court reporter or by a suitable recording device. The magistrate judge shall file the transcript or recording with the clerk, along with any related affidavit.

“(4) **REQUESTING A WARRANT BY TELEPHONIC OR OTHER RELIABLE ELECTRONIC MEANS.**—In accordance with rule 4.1 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, a magistrate judge may issue a warrant based on information communicated by telephone or other reliable electronic means.

“(e) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) **ATTORNEY FOR THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.**—The term ‘attorney for the Federal Government’ means an attorney representing the Federal Government, as authorized by the Attorney General.

“(2) **CRIME OF VIOLENCE.**—The term ‘crime of violence’ has the meaning given such term in section 16 of title 18, United States Code.

“(3) **FELONY.**—The term ‘felony’ means a crime classified as a felony in the convicting jurisdiction, excluding Federal, State, or local offenses for which an essential element was the alien’s immigration status.

“(4) **MAGISTRATE JUDGE.**—The term ‘magistrate judge’ means a United States magistrate judge appointed pursuant to section 631 of title 28, United States Code.”

(2) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents for the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 287 the following:

“Sec. 287A. Authorization of Federal courts to issue arrest warrants.”

SA 57. Mr. MURPHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 5, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to take into custody aliens who have been charged in the United States with theft, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 3, strike line 9 and all that follows through page 8, line 10, and insert the following:

SEC. 3. ENFORCEMENT BY ATTORNEY GENERAL OF A STATE.

(a) **STANDING.**—The attorney general of a State, or other authorized State officer, alleging that firearms shipped, transported, transferred, or otherwise disposed to another person across the border of the United States in or otherwise affecting interstate or foreign commerce, harms such State or its residents shall have standing to bring an action against the Secretary of Homeland Security on behalf of such State or the residents of such State in an appropriate district court of the United States to obtain appropriate injunctive relief.

(b) **DISPOSITION OF CIVIL ACTION.**—The court shall advance on the docket and expedite the disposition of a civil action filed pursuant to subsection (a) to the greatest extent practicable.

(c) **HARM DEFINED.**—For purposes of this section, a State or its residents shall be considered to have been harmed if such State or its residents experience harm, including financial harm in excess of \$100.

SA 58. Mr. MURPHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 5, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to take into custody aliens who have been charged in the United States with theft, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 2, line 15, insert “after the date of the enactment of the Laken Riley Act,” before “is charged with”.

SA 59. Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. SANDERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 5, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to take into custody aliens who have been charged in the United States with theft, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 4. NONDISPLACEMENT REQUIREMENT FOR UNITED STATES WORKERS.

Section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b)) is amended by inserting “will not displace United States workers capable of performing such occupations and” after “the intending employer”.

SA 60. Mr. KING submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 5, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to take into custody aliens who have been charged in the United States with theft, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 4. ALTERNATIVES TO DETENTION FOR CERTAIN ALIENS.

Section 236(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1226(c)), as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5) **ALTERNATIVES TO DETENTION FOR CERTAIN ALIENS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall impose ankle monitoring or a similar level of supervision, as an alternative to detention, in the case of an alien described in paragraph (1)(E)—

“(i) who does not pose a threat to public safety; and

“(ii) with respect to whom there are extenuating circumstances.

“(B) **EXTENUATING CIRCUMSTANCES.**—In determining whether there are extenuating circumstances for purposes of subparagraph (A)(ii), the Secretary shall consider as relevant factors—

“(i) whether the alien’s detention would result in the loss of a provider or caregiver for a child or dependent; and

“(ii) whether the alien is pregnant or suffering from a serious medical condition.

“(C) **PROCEDURES AND GUIDANCE.**—The Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, shall—

“(i) establish procedures for an alien detained pursuant to paragraph (1)(E) to petition U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement for an alternative mandatory custodial arrangement; and

“(ii) issue guidance to U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement for determining whether an alien described in paragraph (1)(E) poses a threat to public safety.”

SA 61. Mr. KING submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 5, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to take into custody aliens who have been charged in the United States with theft, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 2, line 21, strike “and”.

On page 3, line 8, strike the period at the end and insert “; and”.

On page 3, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:

(4) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

“(5) **EXCEPTION.**—Paragraph (1)(E) shall not apply with respect to the following individuals:

“(A) An individual under the age of 18.

“(B) An individual eligible for relief under the deferred action for childhood arrivals program described in the memorandum of the Department of Homeland Security entitled ‘Exercising Prosecutorial Discretion with Respect to Individuals Who Came to the United States as Children’ issued on June 15, 2012 (commonly known as the ‘DACA program’).”

SA 62. Mr. MURPHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 5, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to take into custody aliens who have been charged in the United States with theft, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, strike lines 9 and 10 and insert the following:

SEC. 3. CONTINUANCE FOR IMMIGRATION PROCEEDINGS.

The Executive Office of Immigration Review shall grant at least 1 motion for a continuance of any hearing for a period of not less 6 months if such continuance is requested in writing before such scheduled hearing, on behalf of an alien detained pursuant to section 236(c)(1)(E) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by section 2(1)(C).

SEC. 4. ENFORCEMENT BY ATTORNEY GENERAL OF A STATE.

SA 63. Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Mr. DURBIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 5, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to take into custody aliens who have been charged in the United States with theft, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 4. PROTECTING WORKERS.

(a) **MEDIAN LOCAL WAGE LEVEL FOR H-1B NONIMMIGRANTS.**—Section 212 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182) is amended—

(1) in subsection (n)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A)(i)(II), by striking “prevailing wage level” and inserting “the higher of the median local wage level or the actual wage of similarly employed workers”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(H)(iii), by striking “prevailing wage” each place such term appears and inserting “the higher of the median local wage level or the actual wage of similarly employed workers”;

(2) by striking subsection (p);

(3) by redesignating subsections (q), (r), and (s) as subsections (p), (q), and (r), respectively; and

(4) by redesignating subsection (t), as added by section 1(b)(2)(B) of Public Law 108-449, as subsection (s).

(b) **INCREASE OF H-1B FEES AND USE OF FEES FOR NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION SCHOLARSHIPS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 214(c)(9)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1184(c)(9)(B)) is amended by striking “\$1,500” and inserting “\$3,000”.

(2) **NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION SCHOLARSHIPS IN SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, ENGINEERING, AND MATHEMATICS PROGRAM.**—Fifty percent of the funds available under section 286(s)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1356(s)(2)), shall be made available for the Scholarships in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics program of the National Science Foundation.

(c) **CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.**—Section 214(c)(14) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1184(c)(14)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (G); and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

“(D) Except as provided in subparagraph (F), a petition by an employer seeking to hire an alien described in section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) may not be approved until such employer has provided written certification, under penalty of perjury, to the Secretary of Labor that—

“(i) the employer or employer under common law has not been required by law to provide a notice of a mass layoff pursuant to the Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act (29 U.S.C. 2101 et seq.) during the 12-month period immediately preceding the date on which the alien is to be hired; and

“(ii) the employer or employer under common law does not intend to provide a notice of a mass layoff pursuant to such Act.

“(E) Except as provided in subparagraph (F), if an employer or employer under common law is required by law to provide a notice of a mass layoff pursuant to such Act after hiring nonimmigrants granted status pursuant to section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b), the status of such nonimmigrants shall expire on the date that is 120 days after the date on which such notice is provided.

“(F) An employer shall be exempt from the requirements under subparagraphs (D) and (E) if such employer provides written certification, under penalty of perjury, that the total number of the employees of the employer or the employer under common law in the United States will not be reduced as a result of a mass layoff.”.

(d) **ELIMINATING IMPEDIMENTS TO WORKER MOBILITY.**—

(1) **EFFECT OF ENDING EMPLOYMENT RELATIONSHIP.**—Section 214(n) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1184(n)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) A nonimmigrant admitted under section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) whose employment relationship ends (either voluntarily or involuntarily) before the expiration of the nonimmigrant's period of authorized admission shall be deemed to have retained such legal status throughout the 120-day period beginning on such employment ending date if an employer files a petition to extend, change, or adjust the status of the nonimmigrant during such period.”.

(2) **VISA REVALIDATION.**—Section 222(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1202(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following: “The Secretary of State shall authorize an alien admitted under subparagraph (E), (H), (L), (O), or (P) of section 101(a)(15) to renew his or her nonimmigrant visa in the United States if the alien has remained eligible for such status.”.

SA 64. Mr. HEINRICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 5, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to take into custody aliens who have been charged in the United States with theft, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 4. IMPROVING BORDER SECURITY.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Stop Fentanyl at the Border Act”.

(b) **FUNDING.**—

(1) **ENHANCING LAW ENFORCEMENT CAPABILITIES AT THE BORDER.**—There is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, \$3,409,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2028, to support and enhance law enforcement capabilities at land borders of the United States, of which—

(A) \$300,000,000 shall be for additional civilian U.S. Border Patrol processing coordinators;

(B) \$1,750,000,000 shall be for additional U.S. Customs and Border Protection officers, U.S. Border Patrol agents, and mission support staff within the Office of Field Operations and U.S. Border Patrol;

(C) \$950,000,000 shall be for hiring bonuses, retention bonuses, and retention-focused support services, including mental health services, for U.S. Customs and Border Protection officers, U.S. Border Patrol agents, U.S. Border Patrol processing coordinators, and any other U.S. Customs and Border Protection staff whose work supports operations at the land borders of the United States; and

(D) \$409,000,000 shall be for “U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services—Operations

and Support” to contribute to improved operations along the land borders of the United States.

(2) **INCREASING FENTANYL INTERDICTION AND ENHANCING PROCESSING CAPABILITIES AT THE BORDER.**—There is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for U.S. Customs and Border Protection for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, \$1,090,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2028, to increase drug interdiction and processing capabilities at land borders of the United States, of which—

(A) \$960,000,000 shall be for technology improvements and upgrades, which may include—

(i) the procurement and deployment of large-scale, small-scale, and handheld non-intrusive inspection scanning systems at ports of entry along the land borders of the United States; and

(ii) upgrades to the information technology infrastructure upon which these systems and associated software are operated;

(B) \$30,000,000 shall be for technological and procedural improvements to the process of analyzing and adjudicating images from non-intrusive inspection scanning technology at land ports of entry, which may include support for the continued development of anomaly detection algorithms to enhance detection of illegal drugs at land ports of entry; and

(C) \$100,000,000 shall be for other technology and infrastructure upgrades that the Commissioner for U.S. Customs and Border Protection deems necessary for the agency's drug interdiction work.

(3) **DISRUPTING THE OUTBOUND FLOW OF FIREARMS AND CURRENCY FROM THE UNITED STATES.**—There is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for U.S. Customs and Border Protection for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, \$285,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2028, for increasing outbound inspection capabilities, including disrupting the flow of firearms and currency out of the United States, of which—

(A) \$10,000,000 shall be for supporting the Outbound Enforcement Branch within the Office of Field Operations to develop and implement a comprehensive outbound inspection policy and performance metrics to measure the impact of outbound inspections; and

(B) \$275,000,000 shall be for outbound inspections infrastructure projects at the land borders of the United States, including—

(i) technology and connectivity improvements at rural ports of entry; and

(ii) safety and technology upgrades to outbound inspection lanes at ports of entry.

(4) **DISRUPTING TRANSNATIONAL FENTANYL NETWORKS.**—There is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026—

(A) \$223,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2028, to U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement to expand efforts to interdict fentanyl and other illegal drugs, and disrupt networks operated by transnational criminal organizations within the United States, of which—

(i) \$113,000,000 shall be for additional Homeland Security Investigations special agents;

(ii) \$80,000,000 shall be for the implementation of Homeland Security Investigations' Strategy for Combating Illicit Opioids; and

(iii) \$30,000,000 shall be for joint surge operations along the land borders of the United States by Homeland Security Investigations and U.S. Customs and Border Protection;

(B) \$68,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2028, to the Drug Enforcement Administration, which shall be used for salaries and expenses relating to increased law

enforcement activities along the land borders of the United States;

(C) \$60,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2028, to the White House Office of National Drug Control Policy for the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Program;

(D) \$110,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2028, to the Department of Justice for the Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Forces; and

(E) \$50,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2028, to the U.S. Marshals Service for salaries and expenses relating to increased law enforcement activities along the land borders of the United States.

(c) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) REPORT ON U.S. BORDER PATROL PROCESSING COORDINATORS.—Not later than March 31, 2028, the Commissioner for U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall submit a report to Congress that—

(A) details the impacts of Border Patrol Processing Coordinator positions; and

(B) describes how such positions are supporting the mission of U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

(2) REPORT ON NEW OUTBOUND INSPECTIONS PROGRAM.—Not later than March 31, 2028, the Executive Assistant Commissioner of the Office of Field Operations of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall submit a report to Congress that details the equipment that would be needed to establish a permanent outbound inspections program to increase the rate of scanning of motor vehicles departing the United States.

(3) REPORT ON EXISTING AND PLANNED SCANNING TECHNOLOGY.—Not later than March 31, 2028, the Executive Assistant Commissioner of the Office of Field Operations of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall submit a report to Congress that details, for each United States land port of entry—

(A) a summary of the non-intrusive inspection technology that is in use or is being built out; and

(B) the major factors to consider regarding the future procurement and deployment of large-scale, non-intrusive inspection machines at the port of entry, including—

(i) existing limitations, including—

(I) the footprint of the port of entry;

(II) land that is available for use by U.S. Customs and Border Protection at the port of entry; and

(III) any geological or environmental factors that would affect construction timelines or costs;

(ii) the volume and modes of traffic at the port of entry, and an estimate of the potential impacts of additional large-scale, non-intrusive inspection systems being deployed, in terms of additional seizures and impacts on transit times; and

(iii) an analysis of the cost-effectiveness of deploying additional large-scale non-intrusive inspection systems at the port of entry.

(d) PENALTIES FOR HINDERING IMMIGRATION, BORDER, AND CUSTOMS CONTROLS.—

(1) PERSONNEL AND STRUCTURES.—Chapter 8 of title II of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1321 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 274D the following:

“SEC. 274E. DESTROYING OR EVADING BORDER CONTROLS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—It shall be unlawful to knowingly and without lawful authorization—

“(1)(A) destroy or significantly damage any fence, barrier, sensor, camera, or other physical or electronic device deployed by the Federal Government to control an international border of, or a port of entry to, the United States; or

“(B) otherwise construct, excavate, or make any structure intended to defeat, circumvent or evade such a fence, barrier, sensor camera, or other physical or electronic

device deployed by the Federal Government to control an international border of, or a port of entry to, the United States; and

“(2) in carrying out an act described in paragraph (1), have the intent to knowingly and willfully—

“(A) secure a financial gain;

“(B) further the objectives of a criminal organization; and

“(C) violate—

“(i) section 274(a)(1)(A)(i);

“(ii) the customs and trade laws of the United States (as defined in section 2(4) of the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015 (19 U.S.C. 4301(4)));

“(iii) any other Federal law relating to transporting controlled substances, agriculture, or monetary instruments into the United States; or

“(iv) any Federal law relating to border control measures of the United States.

“(b) PENALTY.—Any person who violates subsection (a) shall be fined under title 18, United States Code, imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both.”

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 274D the following:

“Sec. 274E. Destroying or evading border controls.”

SA 65. Mr. CASSIDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 5, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to take into custody aliens who have been charged in the United States with theft, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 4. EXPANSION OF REIMBURSEMENTS UNDER STATE CRIMINAL ALIEN ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) REIMBURSEMENTS UNDER IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 241(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1231(i)) is amended—

(A) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), compensation under paragraph (1)(A) shall be the average cost of incarceration of a prisoner in the relevant State as determined by the Attorney General.

“(B) Compensation under paragraph (1)(A) with respect to an undocumented criminal alien described under paragraph (3)(A) shall—

“(i) be provided for each day such undocumented criminal alien is detained by a State or a political subdivision of a State; and

“(ii) be equal to the average daily cost of incarceration of a prisoner at facilities in the same level of security as such undocumented criminal alien for the relevant State, as determined by the Attorney General.”; and

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in subparagraph (B), by redesignating clauses (ii) and (iii) as subclauses (II) and (III), respectively;

(ii) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B)(i) as subparagraph (B)(i) and clause (ii)(I), respectively; and

(iii) by inserting after the matter preceding subparagraph (B)(i), as so redesignated, the following:

“(A) is described in section 236(c)(E); or”.

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary such sums as are necessary to carry out the amendments made by this subsection.

(b) REIMBURSEMENTS UNDER IMMIGRATION REFORM AND CONTROL ACT OF 1986.—Section 501(a) of the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 (8 U.S.C. 1365(a)) is amended by inserting “or any alien described in section 236(c)(E) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1226(c)(E))” after “by such State”.

SA 66. Mr. MURPHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 5, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to take into custody aliens who have been charged in the United States with theft, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 8, strike the end quote and final period and insert the following:

“(4) EXEMPTION FOR YOUNG CHILDREN.—The mandatory detention requirement set forth in paragraph (1)(E) shall not apply to children who are younger than 14 years of age.”.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—Nothing in this Act, or the amendments made by this Act, may be construed to supersede or modify the Stipulated Settlement Agreement filed in Reno v. Flores in the United States District Court for the Central District of California on January 17, 1997 (CV 85-4544-RJK) (commonly known as the “Flores Settlement Agreement”), or subsequent court decisions related to such agreement.

SA 67. Mr. MURPHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 5, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to take into custody aliens who have been charged in the United States with theft, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 9, strike “SEC. 3” and insert the following:

SEC. 3. PROTECTION OF CHILDREN.

(a) EXEMPTION FOR YOUNG CHILDREN.—Section 236(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended by section 2, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5) EXEMPTION FOR YOUNG CHILDREN.—The mandatory detention requirement set forth in paragraph (1)(E) shall not apply to children who are younger than 14 years of age.”.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—Nothing in this Act, or the amendments made by this Act, may be construed to supersede or modify the Stipulated Settlement Agreement filed in Reno v. Flores in the United States District Court for the Central District of California on January 17, 1997 (CV 85-4544-RJK) (commonly known as the “Flores Settlement Agreement”), or subsequent court decisions related to such agreement.

SEC. 4.

SA 68. Mr. MURPHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 5, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to take into custody aliens who have been charged in the United States with theft, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 2, line 5, strike “Section” and insert the following:

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section

On page 2, beginning on line 14, strike “and” and all that follows through “(ii)” on line 15, and insert the following:

“(ii) is 14 years of age or older; and

“(iii)

On page 3, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—Nothing in this Act, or the amendments made by this Act, may be construed to supersede or modify the Stipulated Settlement Agreement filed in *Reno v. Flores* in the United States District Court for the Central District of California on January 17, 1997 (CV 85-4544-RJK) (commonly known as the “Flores Settlement Agreement”), or subsequent court decisions related to such agreement.

SA 69. Mr. MARSHALL (for himself and Mr. GRAHAM) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 8 proposed by Mr. THUNE (for Ms. ERNST (for herself and Mr. GRASSLEY)) to the bill S. 5, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to take into custody aliens who have been charged in the United States with theft, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

“(i) is charged with, is arrested for, is convicted of, admits having committed, or admits committing acts which constitute the essential elements of any burglary, theft, larceny, or shoplifting offense, a crime of domestic violence, or any crime that results in death or serious bodily injury to another person,”;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (4); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of paragraph (1)(E)—

“(A) the terms ‘burglary’, ‘theft’, ‘larceny’, ‘shoplifting’, and ‘serious bodily injury’ have the meanings given such terms in the jurisdiction in which the acts occurred; and

“(B) the term ‘crime of domestic violence’ has the meaning given such term in section 237(a)(2)(E)(i).

SA 70. Mr. MARSHALL (for himself and Mr. GRAHAM) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 8 proposed by Mr. THUNE (for Ms. ERNST (for herself and Mr. GRASSLEY)) to the bill S. 5, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to take into custody aliens who have been charged in the United States with theft, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

“(i) is charged with, is arrested for, is convicted of, admits having committed, or admits committing acts which constitute the essential elements of any burglary, theft, larceny, shoplifting, or assault of a law enforcement officer offense, a crime of domestic violence, or any crime that results in death or serious bodily injury to another person,”;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (4); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of paragraph (1)(E)—

“(A) the terms ‘burglary’, ‘theft’, ‘larceny’, ‘shoplifting’, ‘assault of a law enforcement officer’, and ‘serious bodily injury’ have the meanings given such terms in the jurisdiction in which the acts occurred; and

“(B) the term ‘crime of domestic violence’ has the meaning given such term in section 237(a)(2)(E)(i).

SA 71. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 5, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to take into custody aliens who have been charged in the United States with theft, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 8, strike the end quote and final period and insert the following:

“(4) CHILD CUSTODY DETERMINATION HEARING.—If any noncitizen who is 18 years of age or older and is the parent or guardian of a child who is younger than 17 years of age remains in custody pursuant to paragraph (1)(E) for 30 consecutive days, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide a custody determination hearing to determine whether it is in the best interests of such child for such noncitizen to be released in order to care for such child. The Secretary shall determine bond or other conditions for release only after determining that the noncitizen does not pose a flight risk or a danger to the community.”.

SA 72. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 5, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to take into custody aliens who have been charged in the United States with theft, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 4. BEST INTEREST OF THE CHILD STANDARD.

Notwithstanding any other provision of the Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall detain noncitizen children younger than 18 years of age in a manner that—

(1) is consistent with the best interest of such noncitizen children; and

(2) does not abrogate, modify, or replace protections for children in applicable Federal law, Federal regulations, court orders, or consent decrees.

SA 73. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 5, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to take into custody aliens who have been charged in the United States with theft, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 2, beginning on line 14, strike “and” and all that follows through “(ii)” on line 15, and insert the following:

“(ii) is 18 years of age or older; and

“(iii)

SA 74. Mr. VAN HOLLEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 5, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to take into custody aliens who have been charged in the United States with theft, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 2, line 5, strike “Section” and insert the following:

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section

On page 3, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:

(b) WAIVER.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary of Homeland Security or the Attorney General shall waive the mandatory detention requirement set forth in section 236(c)(1)(E) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by subsection (a)(1), upon determining that the implementation of such requirement would require the diversion of resources away from the apprehension, detention, and removal of aliens convicted of violent crimes.

(2) QUARTERLY ASSESSMENTS.—Not less frequently than quarterly, the Secretary of Homeland Security or the Attorney General shall conduct an assessment to determine whether resources are being diverted from the apprehension, detention, and removal of violent criminals due to the implementation of the mandatory detention requirement under such section 236(c)(1)(E).

(3) REPORT REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 90 days after the first date on which resources are diverted from the deportation of violent criminals due to the implementation of the mandatory detention requirement under such section 236(c)(1)(E), the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Attorney General, shall submit a report to Congress that identifies which resources were so diverted.

SA 75. Mr. SCHMITT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 5, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to take into custody aliens who have been charged in the United States with theft, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 4. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance, is held by a Federal court to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this Act, and the application of such provisions to any other person or circumstance shall not be affected.

SA 76. Mr. SCHMITT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 5, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to take into custody aliens who have been charged in the United States with theft, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 4. JUDICIAL AUTHORIZATION.

Any Federal district court or immigration court is authorized to enter appropriate orders related to this Act, or the amendments made by this Act, requiring Federal law enforcement authorities to arrest and prosecute aliens violating Federal law.

SA 77. Mr. SCHMITT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 5, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to take into custody aliens who have been charged in the United States with theft, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 3, strike line 9 and all that follows through page 8, line 10, and insert the following:

SEC. 3. ENFORCEMENT BY ATTORNEY GENERAL OF A STATE.

(a) INSPECTION OF APPLICANTS FOR ADMISSION.—Section 235(b) of the Immigration and

Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1225(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) **ENFORCEMENT BY ATTORNEY GENERAL OF A STATE.**—The attorney general of a State, or other authorized State officer, alleging a violation of the detention and removal requirements under paragraph (1) or (2) that will harm such State or its residents shall have standing to bring an action against the Secretary of Homeland Security on behalf of such State or the residents of such State in an appropriate district court of the United States to obtain appropriate injunctive relief. The court shall advance on the docket and expedite the disposition of a civil action filed under this paragraph to the greatest extent practicable. For purposes of this paragraph, the attorney general of a State, or other authorized State officer, shall have standing if the State or its residents are experiencing harm or will experience harm that is fairly traceable to a violation of any such detention or removal requirement or an intent to commit such violation, including—

“(A) financial harm in excess of \$1; or

“(B) an increased probability of future harm, including future encounters or interactions with aliens who are unlawfully present in the United States.”.

(b) **APPREHENSION AND DETENTION OF ALIENS.**—Section 236 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1226), as amended by this Act, is further amended—

(1) in subsection (e)—

(A) by striking “or release”; and

(B) by striking “grant, revocation, or denial” and insert “revocation or denial”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(f) **ENFORCEMENT BY ATTORNEY GENERAL OF A STATE.**—The attorney general of a State, or other authorized State officer, alleging an action or decision by the Attorney General or Secretary of Homeland Security under this section to release any alien or grant bond or parole to any alien that will harm such State or its residents shall have standing to bring an action against the Attorney General or Secretary of Homeland Security on behalf of such State or the residents of such State in an appropriate district court of the United States to obtain appropriate injunctive relief. The court shall advance on the docket and expedite the disposition of a civil action filed under this subsection to the greatest extent practicable. For purposes of this subsection, the attorney general of a State, or other authorized State officer, shall have standing if the State or its residents are experiencing harm or will experience harm that is fairly traceable to such action or decision to release or grant bond or parole to an alien or an intent to take such action or make such decision, including—

“(1) financial harm in excess of \$1; or

“(2) an increased probability of future harm, including future encounters or interactions with aliens who are unlawfully present in the United States.”.

(c) **PENALTIES.**—Section 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1253) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) **ENFORCEMENT BY ATTORNEY GENERAL OF A STATE.**—The attorney general of a State, or other authorized State officer, alleging a violation of the requirement to discontinue granting visas to citizens, subjects, nationals, and residents as described in subsection (d) that will harm such State or its residents shall have standing to bring an action against the Secretary of State on behalf of such State or the residents of such State in an appropriate district court of the United States to obtain appropriate injunctive re-

lief. The court shall advance on the docket and expedite the disposition of a civil action filed under this subsection to the greatest extent practicable. For purposes of this subsection, the attorney general of a State or other authorized State officer shall have standing if the State or its residents are experiencing harm or will experience harm that is fairly traceable to a violation of the requirement to discontinue granting visas to aliens described in subsection (d) or an intent to commit such violation, including—

“(1) financial harm in excess of \$1; or

“(2) an increased probability of future harm, including future encounters or interactions with aliens who are unlawfully present in the United States.”.

(d) **CERTAIN CLASSES OF ALIENS.**—Section 212(d)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(d)(5)) is amended—

(1) by striking “Attorney General” each place such term appears and inserting “Secretary of Homeland Security”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) The attorney general of a State, or other authorized State officer, alleging a violation of the limitation under subparagraph (A) that parole solely be granted on a case-by-case basis and solely for urgent humanitarian reasons or a significant public benefit, that will harm such State or its residents shall have standing to bring an action against the Secretary of Homeland Security on behalf of such State or the residents of such State in an appropriate district court of the United States to obtain appropriate injunctive relief. The court shall advance on the docket and expedite the disposition of a civil action filed under this subparagraph to the greatest extent practicable. For purposes of this subparagraph, the attorney general of a State, or other authorized State officer, shall have standing if the State or its residents are experiencing harm or will experience harm that is fairly traceable to a violation of the limitation under subparagraph (A) or an intent to commit such violation, including—

“(i) financial harm in excess of \$1; or

“(ii) an increased probability of future harm, including future encounters or interactions with aliens who are unlawfully present in the United States.”.

(e) **DETENTION.**—Section 241(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1231(a)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking “During the removal period,” and inserting the following:

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—During the removal period,”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) **ENFORCEMENT BY ATTORNEY GENERAL OF A STATE.**—The attorney general of a State, or other authorized State officer, alleging a violation of the detention requirement under subparagraph (A) that will harm such State or its residents shall have standing to bring an action against the Secretary of Homeland Security on behalf of such State or the residents of such State in an appropriate district court of the United States to obtain appropriate injunctive relief. The court shall advance on the docket and expedite the disposition of a civil action filed under this subparagraph to the greatest extent practicable. For purposes of this subparagraph, the attorney general of a State, or other authorized State officer, shall have standing if the State or its residents are experiencing harm or will experience harm that is fairly traceable to a violation of the detention requirement under subparagraph (A) or an intent to commit such violation, including—

“(i) financial harm in excess of \$1; or

“(ii) an increased probability of future harm, including future encounters or interactions with aliens who are unlawfully present in the United States.”.

(f) **LIMIT ON INJUNCTIVE RELIEF.**—Section 242(f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1252(f)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) **CERTAIN ACTIONS.**—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to an action brought pursuant to section 235(b)(3), subsections (e) or (f) of section 236, or section 241(a)(2)(B).”.

SA 78. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 5, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to take into custody aliens who have been charged in the United States with theft, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 4. DETENTION PRIORITIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—If available Federal detention facilities or Federal detention resources are insufficient to house all of the aliens required to be detained under sections 236(c)(1) and 236A of the Immigration and Naturalization Act (8 U.S.C. 1226(c)(1) and 1226a), U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement shall place a higher priority on the detention of aliens described in subparagraphs (A) through (D) of section 236(c)(1) and section 236A of such Act.

(b) **PERMISSIVE DETENTIONS.**—U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement may detain aliens described in section 236(c)(1)(E) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by section 2, if sufficient detention space and personnel resources are available for such detentions.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I have seven requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority Leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, January 15, 2025, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on a nomination.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, January 15, 2025, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on a nomination.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, January 15, 2025, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on a nomination.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, January 15, 2025, at 1 p.m., to conduct a hearing on a nomination.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, January 15, 2025, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing on a nomination.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

The Special Committee on Aging is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, January 15, 2025, at 3:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, January 15, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on a nomination.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 6

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I understand that there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 6) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I now ask for a second reading, and in order to place the bill on the calendar under

the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will receive its second reading on the next legislative day.

CONGRATULATING THE NORTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY BISON FOOTBALL TEAM FOR WINNING THE 2024 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION DIVISION I FOOTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP SUBDIVISION TITLE

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, this one causes me great pain, but I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 27, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 27) congratulating the North Dakota State University Bison football team for winning the 2024 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Football Championship Subdivision title.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. THUNE. Go Jacks.

I ask unanimous consent, Madam President, that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 27) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JANUARY 16, 2025

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 12 noon on Thursday, January 16; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate resume consideration of Calendar No. 1, S. 5.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:09 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, January 16, 2025, at 12 noon.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BRITTANY PETTERSEN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 15, 2025

Ms. PETTERSEN. Mr. Speaker, due to travel restrictions related to my pregnancy, I was unable to travel to D.C. to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 8 and YEA on Roll Call No. 9.

CALIFORNIA CONDITIONING AIDE

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 15, 2025

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, there is a great tragedy occurring in California.

As we speak, tens of thousands of people have been displaced as the fires in Los Angeles have raged on and have yet to be contained.

Members of the California Delegation have been speaking out about the devastating damage, loss of life, and the lives that have been disrupted.

I was shocked to watch on television the elected leader of this House suggesting that federal assistance to respond to this tragedy be conditioned.

He didn't specify on what, but I would remind Speaker MIKE JOHNSON that \$120 billion dollars has gone to Louisiana just for Hurricane Katrina and Rita.

It would be unconscionable for this House to place any condition on the necessary assistance that the United States should give to Angelenos, Californians, and, most importantly, Americans who have lost everything.

I would ask that the elected leader of the most powerful legislative body in the world to search his conscience and for all of us who are privileged enough to serve in this body to do the right thing and support your fellow Americans in need.

RECOGNIZING THE 35TH ANNIVERSARY OF BLACK JANUARY

HON. ROBERT B. ADERHOLT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 15, 2025

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, this month, our friend and partner, the Republic of Azerbaijan marks the 35th anniversary of "Black January."

This period symbolizes the beginning of the end of Soviet rule over Azerbaijan, an occupation that lasted for much of the 20th Century. This was a time of oppression and horror. But uncowed by the evil of communism, the people of Azerbaijan yearned for freedom.

On January 19, 1990, violence erupted in Azerbaijan's capital city of Baku where Soviet troops killed over 100 Azeri demonstrators and wounded another 700. Undeterred, the people of Azerbaijan continued their peaceful protests until declaring independence from the U.S.S.R. on October 18, 1991.

I ask my colleagues to join me in observing the events of Black January in Azerbaijan and honoring those who lost their lives in pursuit of freedom. The United States continues to stand with the people of Azerbaijan and their right to live free.

HONORING HAROLD GROSS ON HIS 100TH BIRTHDAY

HON. DARREN SOTO

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 15, 2025

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, born in Berlin, Germany, Harold Gross' childhood was marked by resilience and adaptability. His family left Germany when he was 15 years old and resettled in the Dominican Republic, where he began learning English. He later spent time in Haiti, where he picked up French before moving to the United States and settling in Detroit, Michigan as a teenager.

Gross was drafted into the Army at age 18 in April of 1943 and gained his U.S. citizenship. Trained as an interpreter and interrogator, his skills as a German-to-English interpreter proved pivotal during World War II, particularly in interrogations of German prisoners.

Gross served heroically while assigned to the Military Intelligence Service during D-Day, Normandy Beach (1944), France and Germany (1945–1946), and the Nuremberg Trials (1945–1946).

After his service, Gross returned to the United States and immersed himself in the world of breeding horses and horse racing. His lifelong connection to horses was inspired by his grandfather in Germany, who was also in the horse business. Gross bred and trained racehorses in Michigan, Florida, and Kentucky, achieving significant success.

Gross and his wife Elaine turned their mutual love of horses into a very successful business called Boot and Saddle, which sold horse supplies and medicines for racehorses. They were married for 44 years until she passed away in 2002. One of his proudest accomplishments was naming a racehorse, Jeffrey's Gyro, in honor of their late son Jeffrey, who passed away at an early age.

Harold Gross' 100 years are a testament to resilience, love, and the enduring spirit of a veteran who has lived life to the fullest. His story inspires those around him, a beacon of wisdom and joy.

HONORING DR. AMARJIT SINGH MARWAH

HON. JUDY CHU

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 15, 2025

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and commemorate the life of Dr. Amarjit Singh Marwah, who passed away on January 7, 2025, at the age of 98, just weeks shy of his 99th birthday. Dr. Marwah was a philanthropist, activist, and beloved leader in the Sikh-American community.

Born in Lahore in 1926, Dr. Marwah came to the United States on a Fulbright scholarship in 1950. He earned a Master of Science from the University of Illinois and a Doctor of Dental Surgery at Howard University. At the time, he was the only foreign dentistry student at Howard. Dr. Marwah became the first dentist of Indian origin in America, establishing himself as a "dentist to the stars" in Malibu, California. His patients included Elizabeth Taylor, Sidney Poitier, and Muhammad Ali.

In 1956, Dr. Marwah served as the Campaign Manager for Dalip Singh Saund when he ran for the U.S. House of Representatives. Dr. Marwah worked behind the scenes, out of public view, explaining: "If I showed my turban, he wouldn't get one vote." Their history-making campaign was won by only 300 votes, making Dalip Singh Saund the first Sikh, Indian, and Asian American elected to the U.S. Congress. Dr. Marwah's work was instrumental in opening the doors for future Indian Americans and Asian Americans in public service.

As a philanthropist, Dr. Marwah was dedicated to supporting young people and his Sikh community. His work included establishing the first Sikh temple in the U.S. after India's Independence from the British, establishing a new state-of-art dentistry clinic at Howard University, and funding scholarships for over 100 Indian American students. He also founded KK Marwah Girls College in Faridkot, India, which was named in honor of his late wife, Kuljit K. Marwah whose contributions were equally significant.

Throughout his life, Dr. Marwah was recognized as a leader, activist, and beacon of cultural pride. The City of Los Angeles honored him by renaming an intersection on Hollywood Boulevard as Amarjit Singh Marwah Square. In describing his work, Dr. Marwah remained characteristically humble, stating it is "a service to both my motherland and my adopted country."

Dr. Marwah is survived by his children and a community that mourns his loss and celebrates his legacy of perseverance, selflessness, and civic engagement. May his memory inspire others to follow in his footsteps and lead a life of generosity and kindness.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF BROTHER RONALD GALLAGHER

HON. MARK DESAULNIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 15, 2025

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and service of Brother Ronald Gallagher. Ronald was born in Oakland, California and grew up in Santa Cruz and Central California. He later moved to Napa, California where he attended the Christian Brothers Juniorate at Mont La Salle. Ronald entered the Novitiate in 1964 then took his final vows in 1972.

He received his B.A. from Saint Mary's College, his M.A. from San Francisco State University, and his PhD in Comparative Literature from the University of Washington. Shortly after earning his Masters, Brother Ron became a teacher, going on to shape generations of students. He was a devoted educator and encouraged students to grow both academically and spiritually. He taught at Saint Mary's College High School in Berkeley, Justin-Siena in Napa, and joined Saint Mary's College faculty as a professor of English in the early 1980s.

Brother Ron was a monumental figure at Saint Mary's College and his authenticity and commitment to faith were evident to all who knew him. He served as Residence Hall Director and Assistant to the President before serving as the 28th President of Saint Mary's College from 2005 through 2013. During his tenure as President, Ronald spearheaded the construction of the Kalmanovitz School of Education building, improvements to Oliver Hall, and the creation of the Athletics and Recreation Corridor. He returned to the college in 2018 as President Emeritus where he remained involved in campus activities and continued supporting the college's mission. In 2023, the college's newly renovated baseball facility was named Brother Ronald Gallagher Stadium in recognition of his outstanding service.

Further, Ronald served as Vice Chancellor of Bethlehem University in Palestine and as Secretary General of the global Lasallian Institute. He was a regular attendee at Collegiate Seminar retreats at the Russian River and Huntington Lake and started a class at Saint Mary's to share his love of Irish literature and culture with students. Additionally, Brother Ron was known for his sense of humor, love of sports, and passion for literature.

Sadly, Ronald passed away on January 4, 2025. He will be remembered for his unwavering commitment to service, education, and his faith. Please join me in recognizing Brother Ronald Gallagher for his indelible impact on our community.

TRIBUTE TO LOUISVILLE METRO COUNCILMAN JECOREY ARTHUR

HON. MORGAN MCGARVEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 15, 2025

Mr. MCGARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Louisville Metro Councilman Jecorey Arthur, whose historic election in 2020 led to him becoming the youngest city legislator in Louisville, Kentucky's history, and to honor his unwavering dedication to the citizens of Louisville Metro Council District 4.

Representing neighborhoods including Butchertown, California, Clifton Heights, Downtown, Old Louisville, Parkland, Phoenix Hill, Portland, Russell, and Smoketown, Councilman Arthur worked tirelessly to uplift his district. His investments in youth, arts, financial literacy, mental health, violence prevention, and mentoring programs provided essential resources and opportunities for our community.

Councilman Arthur's leadership has brought significant improvements to public amenities such as libraries, community centers, parks, and affordable housing, while also enhancing infrastructure through street and alley repaving, sidewalk repairs, lighting, and beautification efforts. His commitment to community pride is evident through the annual district events he has funded, which celebrate the rich history and culture of his district.

As councilman, he championed innovative and impactful policies that reflect a deep commitment to equity and justice. From sponsoring the country's first anti-displacement law to proactive rental inspections, protections against concentrated short-term rentals, and language access policies, his efforts have created a more inclusive and equitable Louisville.

Councilman Arthur's leadership has also extended to addressing systemic challenges, including supporting federal reparations for descendants of slavery, funding a community grocery store, and requiring city government and vendors to accept job applications from unhoused individuals. These efforts, along with community benefits agreements and protections for vulnerable populations, have left a lasting legacy of progress and opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, Councilman Arthur's service has uplifted communities, inspired change, and strengthened the bonds between government and the people it serves. I express my profound gratitude for his dedication, vision, and tireless efforts to build a brighter future for all Kentuckians, and I wish him well in his future endeavors. These efforts, along with community benefits agreements and protections for vulnerable populations, have left a lasting legacy of progress and opportunity.

HONORING JOSEPH DINGMAN UPON HIS FAREWELL

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 15, 2025

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize the distinguished career and dedicated service of Mr. Joseph M. Dingman, who has honorably served as the Executive Director of Travis Air Force Base in California. Mr. Dingman has meritoriously served our country and community for over three decades.

Mr. Dingman has been a vital leader and served as the senior civilian advisor to the commander on both civic and military matters, overseeing 24 wing agencies that play an essential role in the mission readiness and operational success of the largest base in Air Mobility Command.

Mr. Dingman graduated from the United States Air Force Academy in 1995 and has since devoted his career to excellence in service, both in uniform and as a civilian leader. His military career, which culminated in his retirement in 2015, included key leadership roles such as Military Assistant to the Department of

Defense Executive Secretary and a member of the Secretary of Defense's Immediate Office. Over the course of two decades, Mr. Dingman demonstrated exemplary skill, dedication, and leadership in positions spanning levels in the squadron, group, wing, Air Staff and Department of Defense.

Mr. Dingman's achievements include his role as the Chief of Mobility Operations in the Air Force Executive Action Group. His service as the Deputy Chief of the Corporate Liaison Branch was responsible for managing a \$119 billion budget. Mr. Dingman also holds distinction as a McCourt Scholar at Georgetown University's Public Policy Institute. With over 2,900 hours as a senior pilot in airlift and tanker mobility aircraft, he exemplified the highest standards of professionalism and commitment to mission success.

In his civilian career, Mr. Dingman has continued to embody service, leadership, and innovation. Over the past five years, he has excelled in various executive positions, fostering collaboration and advancing organizational excellence. Mr. Dingman has demonstrated a passion for entrepreneurship and community service as a business owner, a founding member of the Avalon Institute Leadership Development firm, and a dedicated contributor to numerous community boards and foundations.

As Mr. Dingman transitions from his role at Travis Air Force Base, we reflect on his extraordinary contributions to our Nation and the enduring legacy of leadership he leaves behind. His service has been marked by unwavering commitment, exceptional expertise, and a deep dedication to the mission and people he served. On behalf of the constituents of California's 8th Congressional District, I wish to extend my sincere gratitude for his many years of steadfast dedication and tireless service to the community and best wishes in all his new endeavors.

COMMEMORATING AZERBAIJAN'S "BLACK JANUARY"

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 15, 2025

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 35th anniversary of the "Black January" killings, one of the most tragic events in Azerbaijan's history.

On the night of January 20, 1990, approximately 26,000 Soviet troops stormed Azerbaijan's capital city of Baku in tanks and armored vehicles. The Soviet military bulldozed innocent Azerbaijanis and opened fire indiscriminately on peaceful demonstrators, including women and children. As a result of these merciless acts, 147 people were killed, about 800 were injured, 841 were arrested, and five went missing.

The Human Rights Watch report "Black January in Azerbaijan" states that "among the most heinous violations of human rights during the Baku incursion were the numerous attacks on medical personnel, ambulances, and even hospitals." I offer my thoughts and prayers to the families of the victims and to those who gave their lives to help their fellow citizens.

The United States was one of the first countries to recognize independence and fully established diplomatic relations on February 28, 1992. Today, the United States and Azerbaijan are still strategic allies and share common interests in the region and globally.

As the co-chairman of the Congressional Azerbaijan Caucus, I urge my colleagues to recognize the sacrifices of the Azerbaijani people in their steps towards independence and encourage a recommitment to the democratic values for which many Azerbaijanis sacrificed their lives.

RECOGNIZING LOWER MAKEFIELD CHIEF OF POLICE AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT COORDINATOR KENNETH D. COLUZZI'S RETIREMENT

HON. BRIAN K. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 15, 2025

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding constituent of my district, Lower Makefield Chief of Police and Emergency Management Coordinator Kenneth D. Coluzzi who retired on December 31, 2024, after a distinguished 48-year career in law enforcement, including 24 years of dedicated and faithful service to the citizens of Lower Makefield, Pennsylvania.

Prior to becoming Chief of Police, Chief Coluzzi began his career as a police officer in Philadelphia. Starting out as an officer in the Transit Unit and moving to the 14th district of Germantown, he quickly rose through the ranks as corporal, detective, and then detective sergeant. Around this time, Chief Coluzzi was assigned to work with the elite Homicide Unit showing his dedication to his community and commitment to justice. Chief Coluzzi transferred to the Special Investigative Unit and Fugitive Squad and prior to leaving the Philadelphia Police Department, he went back to the Homicide Unit as their Commander. Throughout his 22 years serving the Philadelphia community, he was a well-known presence in the media, drawing attention to various high-profile investigations.

Chief Coluzzi has had extensive police training including attending the Northwestern University School of Staff and Command and the Pennsylvania State University Police Executive Management Program. The Chief has a bachelor's degree in business communications from Chestnut Hill College and holds a master's degree in business administration with a public administration concentration.

In 2000, Chief Coluzzi became the Chief of Police for the Lower Makefield Police Department in Bucks County, Pennsylvania. Under his leadership, the Lower Makefield Police Department was transformed. Chief Coluzzi brought new initiatives to the community including introducing the use of Narcan to police officers and advocating for all police agencies in Bucks County to use Naloxone.

After a dedicated career to law enforcement, Chief Coluzzi plans to spend time with his wife Karen, eight children and his thirteen grandchildren. Retirement for Chief Coluzzi means traveling and spending time fishing at the Jersey Shore.

I wish to congratulate Kenneth on his almost five decades of service to the citizens of

Bucks and Philadelphia Counties and on his well-deserved retirement from the Lower Makefield Police Department.

RECOGNIZING THE TENTH ANNIVERSARY GALA HELD IN HONOR OF THE EPISCOPAL ORDINATION OF HIS EMINENCE METROPOLITAN APOSTOLOS OF NEW JERSEY

HON. FRANK PALLONE, Jr.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 15, 2025

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize His Eminence Metropolitan Apostolos of New Jersey as he is honored for his profound devotion to the Greek Orthodox Church and to the Greek American Community. I join the Greek Orthodox Metropolis of New Jersey as they commemorate the ordination of His Eminence Metropolitan Apostolos to the Holy Episcopacy. It is my privilege to join in celebration during the Metropolitan 10th Anniversary Gala, His Eminence Metropolitan Apostolos of New Jersey is truly deserving of this body's recognition.

Metropolitan Apostolos began his service to the Greek Orthodox church on July 28, 1996, when he was ordained to the Holy Priesthood and received the Offikion of Archimandrite by Metropolitan Apostolos of Rhodes. In March of 2000, he continued his theological education at the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, where he was granted the degree of Master of Divinity. To expand his studies and service globally, he attended Boston University School of Theology. His Eminence Metropolitan Methodios of Boston assigned Archimandrite Apostolos as the visiting priest at the Annunciation Church in Brockton, Massachusetts.

Archimandrite Apostolos went on to serve many others throughout the country, including the historic parish of St. George in Southbridge, Massachusetts, the Saints Anargyroi parish of Marlborough, Massachusetts, Metropolis of San Francisco and more. Notably, Archimandrite Apostolos Koufallakis was granted the title of honorary president during his service as the Dean of the historic Cathedral of St. Demetrios in Astoria by the president and members of Society of Patmos. Metropolitan Apostolos was also recognized for his devotion to the community during the 2008 Greek Independence Day Celebrations by the President of the Borough of Queens, New York. His Eminence Archbishop Demetrios of America appointed Archimandrite Apostolos Koufallakis as the director of the Archdiocesan Hellenic Cultural Center.

On July 24, 2023, His Eminence Metropolitan Apostolos upon the recommendation of His All Holiness, Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew was unanimously elected by the members of the Holy and Sacred Synod of the Ecumenical Patriarchate as the New Metropolitan of the Greek Orthodox Metropolis of New Jersey. His leadership is currently responsible for parishes in New Jersey, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia and Delaware.

Mr. Speaker, once again, please join me in congratulating Metropolitan Apostolos on another honorable year of his enthronement. The continued efforts to honor the Hellenic heritage are truly admirable.

ILLEGITIMATE COURT COUNTERACTION ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. LATEEFAH SIMON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 9, 2025

Ms. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, Congress should support an impartial international criminal justice system to promote accountability and justice around the world. Imposing mandatory sanctions and visa restrictions on foreign individuals interacting with International Criminal Court prosecutors is a broad, dangerous approach, which is why I oppose this bill.

International law is effective only when it applies to actors and states regardless of who they are. Weakening and discrediting investigations into allegations of war crimes and human rights violations undermines peaceful tools of resolving and preventing conflicts.

Taking a blanket approach as proposed in this bill could implicate any foreign individual who interacts with the ICC and may even punish people like cafeteria workers and janitors for simply doing their jobs. Undermining the rule of law and freedom of speech as this bill proposes will threaten international justice and accountability. For those reasons, I oppose the bill.

HONORING DR. ROZZANA VERDER-ALIGA UPON HER RETIREMENT

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 15, 2025

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Rozzana Verder-Aliga, EDD, LMFT, on the occasion of her retirement. Dr. Verder-Aliga's unwavering commitment to our community and her remarkable contributions to Vallejo, Solano County, and beyond have been invaluable to our community.

For nearly three decades, Dr. Verder-Aliga has served with distinction as a community organizer, educator, mental health professional, and public servant. A role model for aspiring leaders, especially young women and girls, she has exemplified the values of representation, diversity, inclusion, and equity. Her dedication to serving children, seniors, veterans, and families in need has been the cornerstone of her work.

Dr. Verder-Aliga made history as the first Filipino American woman elected to public office in Vallejo and Solano County. She began her public service career on the Vallejo School Board in 1993, where she served three terms as Board President during her 12-year tenure. She later served on the Solano County Board of Education Area 7, for six years, including a term as Board President. In 2013, she was elected to the Vallejo City Council, where she served for 11 years, earning the distinction of being the longest-serving Vice Mayor in Vallejo's history.

Born in Manila, Philippines, Dr. Verder-Aliga immigrated to the United States in 1981, bringing with her a passion for service and a vision for a better future. She and her husband, Nestor Aliga, a retired U.S. Marine Corps and Army Colonel, raised three sons,

all of whom graduated from California public universities. The Aligas recently welcomed their first grandchild, Nestor III.

As a mental health professional, Dr. Verder-Aliga dedicated 28 years to Solano County Behavioral Health, providing critical services to children, seniors, veterans, and families. It is a pleasure to celebrate Dr. Rozzana Verder-Aliga as a trailblazing leader, dedicated public servant, and champion of equity and empowerment. On behalf of the constituents of California's 8th Congressional District, I wish Dr. Verder-Aliga best wishes in her well-earned retirement and extend my sincere gratitude for her many years of service to the community.

TRIBUTE TO JUDGE GINA KAY
CALVERT

HON. MORGAN MCGARVEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 15, 2025

Mr. MCGARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Judge Gina Kay Calvert in recognition of her outstanding career in law and her significant contributions to the legal system of Kentucky.

Judge Calvert's impressive career began with twenty years of practice, where she gained experience as a prosecutor, defense attorney, civil litigator, and family court attorney. Her extensive background in the legal field, coupled with her unwavering dedication to justice, paved the way for her election to the Jefferson District Court Bench in 2010, where she was re-elected in 2014. As Juvenile Court Judge, Judge Calvert served with distinction, also stepping in as a substitute judge for Family Court, Circuit Court, and Circuit Drug Court.

As an Assistant Commonwealth's Attorney, Judge Calvert prosecuted some of the most sensitive and important cases, including physical and sexual crimes against children and felony domestic violence. Her 17 years of experience in Family Court, where she represented abused and neglected children, indigent parents, and handled divorce, custody, paternity, and adoption cases, has made her a respected voice in family law. Judge Calvert's role as a certified Family Court Mediator and Parenting Coordinator has further solidified her reputation as a compassionate and highly skilled legal professional.

In addition to her service on the bench, Judge Calvert is actively involved in organizations such as the Kosair Charities Advisory Council, the FACE IT movement to end child abuse, and the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges. Her commitment to advancing the welfare of children and families is evident in both her professional and personal endeavors.

Judge Calvert has earned the highest praise and endorsement from her peers, with more than 90 percent of attorneys rating her as highly qualified or qualified in the 2016 Louisville Bar Association candidate poll.

Mr. Speaker, Judge Calvert's lifelong dedication to justice, children's advocacy, and the families of Kentucky has made a lasting impact. I express my deepest appreciation for her exemplary service and tireless commitment to ensuring justice for all.

ILLICIT NICOTINE POUCHES FROM
CHINA

HON. DON BACON

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 15, 2025

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss an increasingly alarming problem facing America's public health, which is the flow of unregulated illicit nicotine pouch products. These illicit products, most of which are coming from China, avoid FDA regulation, confusing adult consumers seeking safer alternatives and retailers, and muddying the waters for manufacturers that are following the rules.

While enforcement action has largely focused on e-cigarettes, the Food and Drug Administration has paid little attention to illicit Chinese nicotine pouches and enforcing the rules—especially when the foreign manufacturer failed to apply for FDA authorization.

Congress established the FDA's Center for Tobacco Products to regulate the tobacco and nicotine market. But the FDA has failed to determine which nicotine pouch products should remain available or be removed, making it difficult for retailers and consumers to know what to do.

The FDA must follow the science. By doing so, the FDA will authorize nicotine pouch products that are appropriate for the protection of public health and stem the flow of illicit products coming in from China.

HONORING STAFF SERGEANT
YUVAL SHOHAM

HON. RITCHIE TORRES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 15, 2025

Mr. TORRES of New York. Mr. Speaker, we remember Staff Sergeant Yuval Shoham who was tragically killed while defending his beloved Israel. Yuval, a brave member of the 9th Battalion of the 401st Brigade of the Israeli Defense Forces was only 22 years old.

Yuval was the beloved son of Oshrat and Effie Shoham, former members of Riverdale's SAR Academy community, where Yuval was part of the third-grade class during the 2010–2011 school year.

Yuval will be remembered not only as a soldier who made the ultimate sacrifice but also as the child who so eagerly learned and grew.

He will be sorely missed, and may we honor his courage by continuing to stand in support of community and the values that he held dear.

IN MEMORY OF CHUCK LARSEN

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 15, 2025

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the Midlands of South Carolina is humbled to remember President Chuck Larsen of the

Greater Irmo Chamber of Commerce. With his leadership, the Chamber has been so effective promoting small businesses for creating jobs and opportunities, now led by President Kerry Powers.

I especially appreciate his achievements as a member of the Chamber evolving from the Irmo Business and Professional Association. In 2001, I was grateful to be selected as the first Irmo Chamber Ambassador of the Year with my predecessor Armed Services Committee Chairman Floyd Spence attending.

Celebrating the life of Chuck Larsen, services were conducted by Reverend Andrew Davis of the St. Andrews Presbyterian Church at Dunbar Funeral Home of Irmo with a thoughtful eulogy by Don Gilbert of Chapin and a musical remembrance of "Danny Boy" by Ted Lightle.

The program of the services featured an inspiring obituary,

"Charles "Chuck" Larsen, Sr., 96, passed away January 5, 2024. Chuck was born in 1928 in Pensacola, Florida to Karl and Alma Bishop Larsen.

At an early age, Chuck had a radio show where he performed, sang, and tap danced. This was the start of his lifetime love of music and dance. In Chuck's early twenties, in the big band era, he started the Chuck Larsen Band in Pensacola, Florida which toured in the west Florida area.

Chuck attended Pensacola Junior College and Furman University before serving in the Navy and was an Air Force veteran of the Korean War.

Chuck had a varied career in business and politics working for Monsanto in South Carolina and various politicians including South Carolina senators and governors. He received numerous awards and commendations from the South Carolina Senate and House of Representatives for his service to the state including the South Carolina Order of the Palmetto.

Chuck was instrumental in the formation of the Greater Irmo Chamber of Commerce and worked with the Chamber for over 20 years. Chuck served as the President and Executive Director of the Greater Irmo Chamber of Commerce and retired at the age of 80. Chuck was well known in Irmo through his work with the Greater Irmo Chamber of Commerce, Okra Strut Festival, and Miss Irmo pageants. Chuck was commonly known as "Mr. Irmo." He picked this up due to his active support of the Chamber as well as all the activities in Irmo.

Chuck was preceded in death by his wife of 46 years Merlyne "Mert" Thornton Larsen; daughter-in-law Sharon Renee Baker Larsen; and great-grandson Kage Archer Larsen. He is survived by sons Charles Lars Larsen, Jr. (Jamie) and James Karl Larsen; grandchildren Karl (Heather), Kevin (Kristin), Jessica Mitchum (Chase), Kyle (Courtney) and Justin (Maggie); and great-grandchildren June Mitchum and Rheese Larsen.

A viewing will be held from 5:00 p.m. until 8:00 pm on Thursday, January 9 at Dunbar Funeral Home in Irmo, South Carolina. A funeral service will be held Friday, January 10, 2025 at 2 p.m. at the Dunbar Funeral Home Dutch Fork Chapel in Imo, South Carolina, 7600 Woodrow Street.

In lieu of flowers, the family requests donations to Tunnel to Towers Foundation or the local Irmo based charity of your choice."

RECOGNIZING 15 YEARS OF SELF-LESS SERVICE OF THE NATIONAL CEMETERY HONOR GUARD

HON. BRIAN K. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 15, 2025

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Guardians of the National Cemetery Honor Guard, an extraordinary group comprised solely of volunteer veterans who have dedicated themselves to honoring our nation's heroes. Since 2010, these selfless individuals have conducted over 23,000 military honors at Washington Crossing National Cemetery, ensuring that every veteran laid to rest receives the dignity, respect, and recognition they so rightfully deserve for their service to our country.

The Guardians' commitment extends far beyond their daily military honors. They have played an integral role in outreach efforts, working tirelessly to inform the public about the mission of Washington Crossing National Cemetery and the essential services available to veterans and their families. Through their generosity, they have funded promotional videos highlighting the cemetery's importance. These videos, aired on public access networks, have helped foster community awareness and engagement, furthering support for this sacred space.

Their dedication goes beyond Washington Crossing National Cemetery. The Guardians provide military honors for veterans interred in private cemeteries upon request, demonstrating their profound respect for all veterans, regardless of where they are laid to rest. This unwavering commitment is a testament to their honor, compassion, and belief in the sacredness of military service.

In addition to their ceremonial duties, the Guardians have left a lasting legacy through their contributions to Washington Crossing National Cemetery. They were instrumental in securing donations for significant monuments, including the Gold Star Monument—the first of its kind dedicated to a national cemetery—and the General George Washington in Prayer Monument. Their efforts also brought forth a commemorative garden honoring the 100th anniversary of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier and a United States Flag Rock Garden. Moreover, their dedication to the maintenance of the Avenue of Flags ensures that the cemetery remains a place of reverence and pride for generations to come.

Beyond their contributions to the cemetery, the Guardians serve as a vital bridge connecting the Veterans Administration, veterans,

their families, and the broader community. They offer critical support to veterans in need, cultivating a network of compassion and care throughout Southeastern Pennsylvania. Their unwavering efforts underscore the profound importance of service, community, and solidarity, leaving an enduring impact that cannot be overstated.

For their tireless dedication, extraordinary service, and contributions to preserving the memory and honoring the legacy of our Nation's veterans. I am proud to recognize and honor the Guardians of the National Cemetery Honor Guard. These volunteer veterans embody the highest ideals of service, bringing great honor not only to themselves but also to the veterans they serve and the country they so proudly defended.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, January 16, 2025 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JANUARY 17

9 a.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the expected nomination of Kristi Noem, to be Secretary of Homeland Security.

SD-342

JANUARY 20

Time to be announced

Select Committee on Intelligence

Closed business meeting to consider pending intelligence matters.

TBA

3:15 p.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Business meeting to consider the expected nomination of Marco A. Rubio, of Florida, to be Secretary of State.

S-116

JANUARY 21

Time to be announced

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the expected nomination of Douglas A. Collins, to be Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

SR-418

10 a.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Elise M. Stefanik, of New York, to be the Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations, with the rank and status of Ambassador, and the Representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations and the Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations, during her tenure of service as Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations.

SD-419

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

Organizational business meeting to consider committee rules for the 119th Congress, and other pending calendar business.

SD-562

JANUARY 22

10 a.m.

Committee on the Budget

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Russell T. Vought, of Virginia, to be Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

SD-608

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Business meeting to consider the nomination of Sean Patrick Duffy, of Wisconsin, to be Secretary of Transportation.

SR-253

JANUARY 23

10 a.m.

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Brooke Rollins, of Texas, to be Secretary of Agriculture.

SD-106

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S159–S196

Measures Introduced: Thirteen bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 6, 94–105, S. Res. 27, and S. Con. Res. 5. **Pages S185–86**

Measures Passed:

Congratulating the North Dakota State University Bison Football Team: Senate agreed to S. Res. 27, congratulating the North Dakota State University Bison football team for winning the 2024 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Football Championship Subdivision title. **Page S196**

Measures Considered:

Laken Riley Act—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of S. 5, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to take into custody aliens who have been charged in the United States with theft, taking action on the following amendments and motion proposed thereto: **Pages S161–82**

Adopted:

By 70 yeas to 25 nays (Vote No. 3), Cornyn/Budd Amendment No. 14 (to Amendment No. 8), to expand the list of criminal offenses that subject inadmissible aliens to mandatory detention. **Page S181**

Rejected:

By 46 yeas to 49 nays (Vote No. 4), Coons Amendment No. 23, to strike the section that authorizes State attorneys general to sue Federal immigration authorities for alleged violations relating to the detention of aliens. **Page S182**

Pending:

Thune (for Ernst/Grassley) Amendment No. 8, to include crimes resulting in death or serious bodily injury to the list of offenses that, if committed by an inadmissible alien, require mandatory detention. **Page S161**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the bill, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur on Friday, January 17, 2025. **Page S182**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill at ap-

proximately 12 noon, on Thursday, January 16, 2025. **Page S196**

Message from the President: Senate received the following messages from the President of the United States:

Transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the issuance of an Executive Order in order to take additional steps with respect to the national emergency with respect to the situation in and in relation to Syria declared in Executive Order 13894 of October 14, 2019; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. (PM–6) **Page S184**

Transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the continuation of the national emergency that was originally declared in Executive Order 14064 of February 11, 2022, with respect to the widespread humanitarian crisis in Afghanistan; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. (PM–7) **Page S184**

Messages from the House: **Page S184**

Measures Referred: **Page S184**

Measures Read the First Time: **Pages S184, S196**

Executive Communications: **Pages S184–85**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page S186**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S186–87**

Additional Statements: **Pages S183–84**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S187–95**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Pages S195–96**

Record Votes: Two record votes were taken today. (Total—4) **Pages S181–82**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 12 noon and adjourned at 7:09 p.m., until 12 noon on Thursday, January 16, 2025. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S196.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

NOMINATION

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the expected nomination of Sean Duffy, of Wisconsin, to be Secretary of Transportation, after the nominee, who was introduced by Senators Johnson and Baldwin, testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

NOMINATION

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the expected nomination of Chris Wright, to be Secretary of Energy, after the nominee, who was introduced by Senators Hickenlooper and Hoeven, testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

NOMINATION

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the expected nomination of Marco A. Rubio, of Florida, to be Secretary of State, after the nominee, who was introduced by Senator Scott (FL), testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

NOMINATION

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the expected nomination of Russell Vought, to be Director, Office of Management and Budget, after the

nominee testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

NOMINATION

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee began hearings to examine the expected nomination of Pamela Jo Bondi, to be Attorney General, Department of Justice. The nominee, who was introduced by Senators Scott (FL) and Schmitt, testified and answered questions in her own behalf, but the Committee did not complete action thereon. Hearing recessed subject to the call and will meet again at 10:15 a.m., on Thursday, January 16, 2025.

NOMINATION

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee concluded open and closed hearings to examine the expected nomination of John L. Ratcliffe, to be the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, after the nominee, who was introduced by former Senator Ashcroft, testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

IMPROVING WELLNESS AMONG SENIORS

Special Committee on Aging: Committee concluded a hearing to examine improving wellness among seniors, focusing on setting a standard for the American Dream, after receiving testimony from Bill Prummell, Florida Sheriffs Association, Punta Gorda, Florida; Maria Alvarez, New York StateWide Senior Action Council, Inc., Long Island City, New York; Dawn Carr, Florida State University Claude Pepper Center, Tallahassee; and Susan L. Hughes, University of Illinois Center for Research on Health and Aging, Chicago.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 66 public bills, H.R. 404–469; and 8 resolutions, H.J. Res. 19–20; and H. Res. 42–47, were introduced.

Pages H182–86

Additional Cosponsors:

Page H187

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative De La Cruz to act as Speaker pro tempore for today.

Page H151

Recess: The House recessed at 11:03 a.m. and reconvened at 12 p.m.

Page H158

Recess: The House recessed at 12:20 p.m. and reconvened at 1 p.m.

Page H160

United States-Taiwan Expedited Double-Tax Relief: The House passed H.R. 33, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide special rules for the taxation of certain residents of Taiwan with income from sources within the United States, by a yeas-and-nays vote of 423 yeas to 1 nay, Roll No. 15.

Pages H160–68, H170

H. Res. 5, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 33), was agreed to on Friday, January 3, 2025.

Recess: The House recessed at 1:39 p.m. and reconvened at 4 p.m.

Page H168

Suspensions—Proceedings Resumed: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures. Consideration began Monday, January 13th:

Promoting Opportunities to Widen Electrical Resilience: H.R. 164, to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to authorize Federal agencies to provide certain essential assistance for hazard mitigation for electric utilities, by a 2/3 yea-and-nay vote of 419 yeas to 2 nays, Roll No. 13 and **Pages H168–69**

Tennessee Valley Authority Salary Transparency: H.R. 144, to provide that the Federal Reports Elimination and Sunset Act of 1995 does not apply to certain reports required to be submitted by the Tennessee Valley Authority, by a 2/3 yea-and-nay vote of 423 yeas with none voting “nay”, Roll No. 14. **Pages H169–70**

Committee Elections: The House agreed to H. Res. 42, electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives. **Pages H170–71**

Providing for the Attendance of the House at the Inaugural Ceremonies: The House agreed to H. Res. 43, providing for the attendance of the House at the Inaugural Ceremonies of the President and Vice President of the United States. **Page H171**

Committee Elections: The House agreed to H. Res. 44, electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives. **Page H171**

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. on Thursday, January 16th. **Page H171**

Presidential Message: Read a message from the President wherein he notified Congress that the national emergency declared with respect to the widespread humanitarian crisis in Afghanistan and the potential for a deepening economic collapse in Afghanistan is to continue in effect beyond February 11, 2025—referred to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Financial Services and ordered to be printed (H. Doc. 119–11). **Page H171**

Presidential Message: Read a message from the President wherein he notified Congress of an Executive Order taking additional steps with respect to the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13894 of October 14, 2019 (Blocking Property and Suspending Entry of Certain Persons Contributing to the Situation in Syria)—referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed (H. Doc. 119–12). **Pages H171–72**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H168–69, H169, and H170.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:23 p.m.

Committee Meetings

ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee held an organizational meeting. The Committee adopted its Rules, Procedures, Authorization and Oversight Plan, and Staff Roster for the 119th Congress.

ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING

Committee on Education and Workforce: Full Committee held an organizational meeting. The Committee adopted its Rules and Oversight Plan for the 119th Congress.

ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Full Committee held an organizational meeting. The Committee adopted its Rules and Subcommittee Jurisdictions for the 119th Congress.

ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held an organizational meeting. The Committee adopted its Rules and Subcommittee Assignments for the 119th Congress.

ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “The Stay-at-Home Federal Workforce: Another Biden-Harris Legacy”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Full Committee held an organizational meeting. The Committee adopted its Rules for the 119th Congress.

AMERICA BUILDS: THE STATE OF THE NATION’S TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “America Builds: the State of the Nation’s Transportation System”. Testimony was heard from Jeff Landry, Governor, Louisiana; and public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

**COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY,
JANUARY 16, 2025**

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: to hold hearings to examine the expected nomination of Eric Scott Turner, to be Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, 10 a.m., SD-538.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: to hold hearings to examine the expected nomination of Doug Burgum, to be Secretary of the Interior, 10 a.m., SD-366.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: to hold hearings to examine the expected nomination of Lee M. Zeldin, to be Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, 10 a.m., SD-406.

Committee on Finance: to hold hearings to examine the expected nomination of Scott Bessent, to be Secretary of the Treasury, 10:30 a.m., SD-215.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: to hold hearings to examine Remain in Mexico; to be immediately followed by a business meeting to consider an original resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the President of the United States possesses the authority under current law to take immediate and necessary action to secure the southwest border of the United States, and committee rules of procedure, 9 a.m., SD-342.

Committee on the Judiciary: to continue hearings to examine the expected nomination of Pamela Jo Bondi, to be Attorney General, Department of Justice, 10:15 a.m., SH-216.

House

Committee on Rules, Full Committee, organizational meeting, 10 a.m., H-313 Capitol.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Full Committee, organizational meeting, 9 a.m., 360 Cannon.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

12 noon, Thursday, January 16

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Thursday, January 16

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will continue consideration of S. 5, Laken Riley Act. The filing deadline for first degree amendments is at 1 p.m.

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Consideration of H.R. 30—Preventing Violence Against Women by Illegal Aliens Act.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Aderholt, Robert B., Ala., E33
Bacon, Don, Nebr., E36
Chu, Judy, Calif., E33
Cohen, Steve, Tenn., E34

DeSaulnier, Mark, Calif., E34
Fitzpatrick, Brian K., Pa., E35, E37
Garamendi, John, Calif., E33, E34, E35
McGarvey, Morgan, Ky., E34, E36
Pallone, Frank, Jr., N.J., E35
Pettersen, Brittany, Colo., E33

Simon, Lateefah, Calif., E35
Soto, Darren, Fla., E33
Torres, Ritchie, N.Y., E36
Wilson, Joe, S.C., E36



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at www.govinfo.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.