



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 119th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 171

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 2025

No. 24

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BOST).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,

February 5, 2025.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MIKE BOST to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

MIKE JOHNSON,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Avery M. Stringer, one of his secretaries.

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.

IMPEACHMENT MOVEMENT

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, and still I rise.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, with a to-whom-it-may-concern message. To whom it may concern: Ethnic cleansing

in Gaza is not a joke, especially when it emanates from the President of the United States, the most powerful person in the world, when he has the ability to perfect what he says.

Ethnic cleansing in Gaza is no joke, and the Prime Minister of Israel should be ashamed, knowing the history of his people to stand there and allow such things to be said. Ethnic cleansing has been a crime against humanity.

I stand here today in the well to denounce what was said, to denounce what the President said, to denounce the complicity of the Prime Minister of Israel, and to remind people that Dr. King was right: Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere. Injustice in Gaza is a threat to justice in the United States of America.

I rise to announce that the movement to impeach the President has begun. I rise to announce that I will bring Articles of Impeachment against the President for dastardly deeds proposed and dastardly deeds done.

I also rise to say that the impeachment movement is going to be a grass-up movement, not a top-down. The people have got to move forward. The people have to demand it, and when the people demand it, it will be done.

I did it before. I laid the foundation for impeachment, and it was done. Nobody knows more about it than I, and I know that it is time for us to lay the foundation again.

On some issues, it is better to stand alone than not stand at all. On this issue, I stand alone, but I stand for justice.

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

CONGRATULATING DAVID PRICE

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

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize my constituent, Mr. David Price of Fishersville, Virginia, who was named the grand champion of the 2024 Virginia Truck Driving Championship.

David has been a professional truck driver for 33 years. He has been employed with FedEx Freight for the last 18. He has logged 3.3 million miles without an accident, making him the perfect candidate to enter the competition.

The contest opened on day one with a written exam and concluded the following day with competitive scoring on a pre-trip inspection and driving course skills test.

David demonstrated his knowledge and expertise in all areas to take home the Virginia Straight Truck title. He also captured the best course score and best pre-trip inspection honors to qualify him for his fourth National Truck Driving Championship.

Truck drivers are the backbone of our economy, delivering essential goods across the United States, but beyond the loads they carry, they carry an enormous responsibility, ensuring the safety of everyone and the commitment to sharing the road. David's grand champion status is a testament to his discipline, focus, and care for his fellow drivers.

HALTING THE FENTANYL CRISIS AND PROTECTING AMERICAN LIVES

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, the communities throughout the Sixth District of Virginia and across this entire Nation turned into border communities under the last administration.

This was the direct result of the failed leadership of President Biden and Secretary Mayorkas, who allowed deadly fentanyl to pour through our open borders for 4 years.

In 2023, over 107,000 Americans tragically died from drug overdoses. Of those, 75,000 were due to synthetic opioids, primarily illicit fentanyl. Fentanyl has become the number one

□ 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.

H463

cause of death for adults aged 18 to 49. Even in my home State of Virginia, drug cartels were caught smuggling rainbow-colored fentanyl, specifically intended to target our children. Enough is enough.

That is why this week the House will vote on the HALT Fentanyl Act to address this crisis head on. Introduced by my colleague, Representative GRIF-FITH, the HALT Fentanyl Act will increase penalties for fentanyl traffickers, support research into the devastating mental health effects of fentanyl, and equip law enforcement with the authority and resources needed to keep the deadly drug off our streets.

Unlike the previous administration, House Republicans are stepping up to protect the American people. We are committed to fighting back against the fentanyl crisis, securing our borders, and saving lives. We must pass this important legislation to protect innocent lives and ensure the safety of our families and our communities.

CONGRATULATING DALE MEYERHOEFFER

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and commend a resident of Verona, Virginia, who cares passionately about preserving the lands and cultures that epitomize our American heritage.

On December 11, 2024, in a ceremony in Washington, D.C., it was announced that Dale Meyerhoeffer received the National Park Service 2023 Director's Award for Excellence in Natural Resource Management.

Mr. Meyerhoeffer is a biological technician whose undaunted efforts to save Shenandoah National Park's remaining eastern hemlock trees preserved an ecologically important resource for the park.

After the death of 95 percent of the park's hemlocks from an invasive insect, Meyerhoeffer, with the help from volunteers and park staff, used insecticide treatment to protect more than 30,000 hemlocks.

To reduce the park's reliance on pesticide treatments, Meyerhoeffer worked with researchers from Virginia Tech to procure and release host-specific, predatory beetles and flies in hopes of controlling the invasive insect.

This effort culminated in major success for Shenandoah National Park and the Sixth District of Virginia. We thank him for his persistence and contribution to our great Nation.

RECOGNIZING THE RESTORATION COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the Restoration Community Development Corporation in Luray, Virginia, and its selfless founder, Pastor Audre King. Pastor King grew up in Page County and has made a difference in the community since he moved back 8 years ago.

Pastor King founded Living Legacy, a community nonprofit that serves as an umbrella organization, focused on underprivileged youth. Its most recent

initiative is the Restoration Community Development Corporation, which aims to restore houses and give unhouseed mothers and their children a place to live.

A house in the heart of Luray was rehabilitated in December and is now home to 4 moms and 11 children who are grateful to live together as a family. The moms attend church service and life skills classes and are offered recovery sessions as needed.

They also pay a portion of the upkeep and save for the future. Pastor King hopes to finish a second house for fathers by the end of February and eventually hopes to expand across the county.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the Restoration Community Development Corporation and Pastor King for their exceptional work in the Sixth District of Virginia.

HONORING ARCHITECT FRIEDRICH ST. FLORIAN

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor and remember architect Friedrich St. Florian.

He was a visionary architect whose profound design of the National War II Memorial on our National Mall has left an indelible, enduring mark honoring our Nation's history along that historic Mall of democracy—our collective memory.

Friedrich's architecture does more than commemorate. It invites reflection, on that area of the Mall, on the sacrifices of the greatest and most unselfish generation this Nation has ever seen, ensuring that their valor, unity, and sacrifice are honored for all time.

Friedrich was born amidst the throes of conflict in Graz, Austria. Friedrich's early experiences of war profoundly shaped his values and vision. His architectural design of the World War II Memorial was not merely a professional task. It stands as his personal tribute to freedom and to democracy and its cost.

He was deeply informed by his own moment of liberation at the end of World War II. How fortunate as an American he could connect that experience to our own. The memorial represents the 20th century's most valued achievement: The victory of liberty over tyranny.

As an Austrian by birth and an American by choice, Friedrich brought grace, dignity, and artistry along with his deeply held belief in the cost of liberty.

The memorial and its design stands as a testament to his commitment to honor the sacrifices of those who fought to save liberty for our generation and those to follow.

As we reflect on his enormous legacy, let us visit the National World War II Memorial as nearly 100 million Americans have done already. Let us share

the stories of those who served and what they fought for and against, and ensure that their sacrifices continue to inspire future generations.

Friedrich St. Florian's work remains a symbol of our gratitude, a beacon of hope for peace where nearly, as I mentioned, visitors from near and far have come. As the designers intended, this memorial sits between the Washington Monument and the Lincoln Memorial and was designed as a plaza where people can come and reflect on the awe-some history of our great country.

I thank Friedrich and his family and all those who assisted him for his monumental gift from the 20th century to our Nation going forward.

He will be dearly missed, but through his outstanding work with every detail, even the type of stone that was used, he will never ever be forgotten.

ARIZONA FIREFIGHTERS ASSIST IN CALIFORNIA

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

Mr. CISCOMANI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the bravery of and share my sincere appreciation to all the firefighters in my district and across Arizona who went above and beyond the call of duty to help our neighbors in southern California during the recent devastating fires.

In particular, I thank all of the firefighters from the Tucson Fire Department, the Northwest Fire Department, the Golder Ranch Fire District, and the Fry Fire District, who took time away from their families and communities to be deployed to California to help.

In this time of crisis, while others run away, our firefighters run toward danger, braving smoke and fire to protect life and property. Their selfless dedication, courage, and commitment to service embody the very best of our communities and reminds us of the unity that binds us all as Americans.

These brave men and women put themselves in harm's way, working tirelessly in grueling conditions to contain the flames and provide relief to those affected.

I thank the firefighters who answer the call. Their heroism does not go unnoticed. Their willingness to put themselves at risk for the safety of others is a testament to their extraordinary character.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my constituents and a grateful Nation, I extend my deepest gratitude. We honor their service today and always.

CELEBRATING PINAL COUNTY'S 150TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. CISCOMANI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate a remarkable milestone in my district's history: the 150th anniversary of Pinal County, which happens to be on February 1.

Since its establishment in 1875, Pinal County has grown from its rich roots in mining and agriculture into a thriving community shaped by the hard work, resilience, and spirit of its people.

Mr. Speaker, as we reflect on this historic occasion, let us give thanks to the men and women, past and present, who built Pinal County into such a wonderful place to live, work, explore, and visit.

Representing the incredible people of Pinal County in Congress has truly been the honor of a lifetime, and I am so honored to continue serving all of them.

Whether it is working with mayors to revitalize historic streets in Eloy, improving operations at the Oracle Fire District, advocating for the expansion of I-10, working to help students and educators in Casa Grande achieve their American Dream, or spending time in the great communities in Saddlebrooke, I will never stop fighting to make Pinal County the best place it can be.

Mr. Speaker, I thank all of my constituents in Pinal County for being part of an incredible journey. The best is yet to come. Here is to another 150 years.

□ 1015

CAUTIONING FEDERAL WORKERS AGAINST TAKING BUYOUTS

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

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to urge Federal workers in Pennsylvania and across the Nation to exercise extreme caution as they consider the bogus buyout plan that the White House is pressuring them to accept.

In a memo to Federal workers last week, Trump's Office of Personnel Management notified Federal workers across the country that they had just over a week, until tomorrow, February 6, to voluntarily quit their jobs in exchange for keeping pay and benefits for 8 months. The memo threatened that if they refused the offer, their jobs might no longer exist.

Tens of thousands of Federal workers in the Philadelphia region received that email and were rightly concerned. The workers impacted by the memo include those who care for our veterans, protect our ports and airports, fight corruption and drug traffickers, and make sure that our food is safe to eat, that our air is clean, and that our water is safe to drink.

The OPM memo is one in a series of directives by the Trump White House aimed at gutting the Federal Government and the critical services it provides to Americans in order to justify massive tax cuts for billionaires and wealthy corporations. We have already seen illegal firings of hundreds of career civil servants and unconstitutional attempts to shutter entire agencies.

Union leaders immediately began raising the alarm that the buyout offer could be a scam. Congress has not au-

thorized or funded these radical cuts to the government workforce and services, and employees could be left without the pay, benefits, and protections to which they are entitled by law.

The proposed workforce reductions would make it impossible for the Federal Government to deliver the services that Congress has authorized and Americans deserve. They would, however, make it easier for large corporations to take advantage of consumers and employees and to pollute the environment.

The unions have filed suit to protect their employees, and yesterday, 12 State attorneys general, including those in New Jersey and Delaware, issued a warning to Federal employees across the country that the buyout offer was misleading and should be viewed with caution.

Amidst the concern about the legality and impact of this unauthorized buyout, our colleagues from across the aisle, at both the State and Federal levels, have gone missing in action. Republicans control both the House and Senate in Washington, and we would welcome their help to stand up for the Constitution, for our constituents, and for Federal workers.

We will continue to raise the alarm and do everything possible to protect Americans and our Constitution from the worst abuses of this administration and its billionaire buddies because construction workers and contractors in our area know that the Trump corporation never kept its promises with respect to pay and meeting its obligations.

Mr. Speaker, the whole world knows that Twitter became a dumpster fire after Elon Musk tried to impact the exact types of reductions that we are seeing here, so I am issuing this warning to our constituents across the Delaware Valley.

TAKING ADVANTAGE OF NUCLEAR POWER

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak a little bit about the amazing asset we have available to us in this country of nuclear power and nuclear generation. We are not taking advantage of that technology as well as we should for how efficient it is and the multiplier effect it has.

Right now, in this country, we do have 93 commercial nuclear reactors, and they generate approximately 20 percent of the Nation's electricity. We are indeed a very large producer of nuclear power in the world scheme of things, but we have some very good partners around the world, such as France, Japan, and some of the other Western countries that are really good at it, as well.

Within the U.S., we have reactors in 28 different States. Illinois leads with

11 reactors. Pennsylvania has nine. California has one. It used to have two. We are lucky we have the one, as they just had a recent 5-year extension on the life of what is called Diablo Canyon. Its usable life is 20, 30, or maybe 40 more years or beyond that with retrofitting.

I hope we can hang on to that because that alone represents in my home State, California, 9 percent of the grid with just one plant. Can we imagine knocking that out and removing 9 percent off the grid? It provides power 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, and 365 days a year. We don't have to wait for the wind to blow. We don't have to wait for the Sun to come up or the clouds to part. It is reliable electricity. Indeed, it has a capacity factor of about 92 percent, which indicates how reliable it is and how efficient it is.

It is also used extensively in our Navy, providing amazing performance for our aircraft carriers and especially our submarines. The old style of submarines used to have to surface to recharge batteries and run diesel at that point. Our nuclear submarines can stay underwater for as long as they strategically need to.

That is a great asset for carriers, as well, because those are very large craft, and the amount of fuel they would need otherwise, except for this really small ball of energy that is within that nuclear reactor, propels those for years and years at a time. It is amazing how much power comes from that concentrated area.

When we talk about nuclear power plants and this conversation about carbon dioxide, the plants we have in this country avoid the production of about 476 million metric tons of carbon dioxide. I am not going to be the guy that stands here and complains about carbon dioxide. I think it is an essential building block. For those who are, why aren't we doing more nuclear if carbon is a big concern? Why aren't we doing more in that department to make carbon-free power, which is nuclear as well as hydroelectric power?

We have a fair amount of that in northern California, in my district, and other Western States, as well, except for the fact they tore down four hydroelectric dams just during this past year because of, ostensibly, a fish issue. We have lost that source of CO₂-free power.

Moving toward the use of uranium, that amazing metal that can generate so much power, we need to do all we can here in Congress to help fund and incentivize more nuclear power for this country because it is going to be a very important part of our grid.

We are right on the cusp of the ability to expand that technology. Some of my colleagues are doing some very good work on that. The United States should move forward on that and take advantage of that, as well as develop the uranium supplies that we need for nuclear generation as well as the amazing uses that there are in medical technology.

Why aren't we producing more of it in this country where we have reserves and can find more reserves? We have that ability to be self-sufficient on energy, and nuclear power can play a big role in that in the coming years if we in Congress will help expedite that process.

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission can look for ways to expedite getting more permits, getting more online, as well as approving new technologies, which are out there, that are even more efficient.

With the concern about the nuclear waste, there are ways that are out there that are being developed that could be so much better for how we would store waste or even reuse it. Why are we not recycling those fuel rods in this country? Why do we have arbitrary laws against the ability to recycle the rods where we are able to reduce the amount of that material by an additional 90 percent and put it back to work for us?

Mr. Speaker, it is because of hangups with the idea of what side effects it might have. It is not a problem. It would be very good.

SUPPORTING MILITARY FAMILIES

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

Mr. VINDMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a bipartisan bill, the Support Military Families Act, that upholds our commitment to both our Federal workforce and the families of those who serve our country in uniform.

As a 25-year Army veteran, I know the professional sacrifice our military spouses make for the Nation. My wife, Cindy, has had a wonderful career alongside mine, but it was a challenge to make it work with what the Army required of me.

Last week, my office heard from a constituent who works remotely for the headquarters of a Federal agency in Washington, D.C. Her husband is an Active-Duty servicemember stationed in Virginia, and they cannot relocate. She has only three options to comply with President Trump's return-to-work executive order: Her husband can leave the military, she can drive 200 miles round trip to D.C. every day, or she can leave her job of more than 18 years.

That is a choice that no military family should have to make. That is why I am introducing this bipartisan bill, my first bill as a Member of Congress, to exempt military spouses from the in-person work mandate. I do so with my good friend, Representative ROBERT WITTMAN, who is a tremendous champion for our military and their families.

This commonsense and simple solution guarantees that those serving our country in uniform can continue their mission, that our Federal agencies retain experienced staff, and that military families remain together.

Supporting military families is not a partisan issue. It is an American issue. This isn't just one family's story. It is a reality for countless military spouses across the country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join in standing up for the military families who sacrifice so much for our country.

CONDITIONS FOR DISASTER AID

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

Mr. FIGURES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay honor and respect to all those who paved the way and had a hand and responsibility for me standing here today as a Member of Congress, a place where I could not stand in this capacity when this building was constructed, both those historical figures as well as those who more presently were actively involved in supporting and praying for and campaigning for us to be here. That includes my wife, Dr. Kalisha Dessources Figures. I certainly would not be here without her support.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to say happy birthday to my mother, who I call Mama. She celebrated a birthday while we were not in session, and I both literally and figuratively would not be here without her. I thank her and love her, and I wish her a happy birthday.

Mr. Speaker, it could not be more fitting for me to be here and to discuss my mother because one of the lessons she repetitively ingrained in us as children was the concept of treating others the way we would want to be treated, treating others how we would like to be treated in the same or similar circumstance.

Unfortunately, we find ourselves in a predicament as it relates to wildfire aid to California, where too many colleagues and our President are not abiding by that baseline principle.

I am just a freshman here. There is the question of what I know about how things work here. I am still learning where the bathrooms are, as they say. I don't have the relationships. I don't understand the dynamics. I don't know how things move here yet.

Here is what I do know. I know about decency. I know about compassion. I know that when someone comes from a community like mine on the Gulf of Mexico, names like Camille, Frederic, Ivan, Danny, and Katrina mean a little something different to us. I know that I come from a community where the average individual median income is just south of \$32,000.

People cannot afford to just rebuild their lives without disaster aid. I know when people come from where I come from, it is not a question of if we will be hit by disaster. It is a matter of when. It is not a matter of if our community will need Federal disaster aid. It is how much we will need and how fast we can get it there.

I stand here today in support of California because I know that by standing

for California, I am standing for Alabama. By standing for Los Angeles, I am standing for cities like Mobile, Leroy, Jackson, Evergreen, Monroeville, Montgomery, Tuskegee, Eufaula, Phenix City, and Union Springs. I know enough, even as a freshman, to know that, one day, the shoe will be on the other foot.

□ 1030

I know that we will not always find ourselves in the dynamic as we are now where Republicans are in control of the House.

One day, Democrats will be in control, a Republican community will be in need of disaster aid, and not a single Republican now that is supporting applying restrictions and conditions onto the aid will then stand up and say that we should apply conditions to that aid.

It is not right, it is unnecessary, and quite frankly, it is un-American. It is not who we are. We pride ourselves on those cornerstones of the religion that most of us claim to abide by in this House. Those cornerstones are grace, mercy, and compassion.

We pride ourselves on being able to say that we live in a country where we have the backs of the people that call themselves Americans as well.

This is not like us. It simply is not.

California pays the most in Federal taxes of any State in this Union. They subsidize most of the States, or many of the States, rather, including the State of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and Alabama.

We need to be there for them. I know that today the L.A. that needs help stands for Los Angeles, but tomorrow that LA could be Louisiana or it could be lower Alabama, as some people call back home. It could be FLA as in Florida. We have to stand up for California now. We have to do better.

As a freshman, I don't know much, but I know what my mama taught me. I know this ain't it, and I know this is not what the mothers of my colleagues taught them.

We have to put aside the partisan nonsense and do right by the American people because one day your community will be in need as well.

HONORING SAMUEL LILLEY

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and the service of Samuel Lilley, a dedicated pilot and proud resident of Richmond Hill, Georgia, in the First Congressional District. His tragic passing in a midair collision near Washington, D.C., is a heartbreaking loss for his family, his community, and for our Nation.

Sam was a graduate of Richmond Hill High School where he was known for his strong work ethic, his leadership, and his kindness. He was driven. He was hardworking and always willing to

lend a hand to those in need. He had a bright future ahead of him filled with dreams and aspirations that he was determined to achieve.

Beyond his many accomplishments, Sam was a charismatic and intelligent young man who loved his fiancée, Lydia Coles; flying; his family; and the Lord. His passing leaves an unimaginable void in the lives of those who have loved him, but his memory will forever remain in their hearts.

The Richmond Hill community has come together to mourn and honor his life, a testament to the impact he had on so many.

We extend our deepest condolences to his family, to his fiancée, and to his loved ones. May they find comfort in the lasting memories of his life and his legacy.

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 10 o'clock and 33 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. DESJARLAIS) at noon.

PRAYER

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

Show us Your unfailing love, O Lord, and grant us Your deliverance. For we find ourselves in times of turmoil and tension, disagreements and dissension. But if we can open our hearts to receive Your life-changing mercy and experience Your soul-penetrating grace, we will be redeemed from our own discord, restored to common purpose and mutual respect.

Let us listen that we will hear what You speak. When You pronounce health in our afflictions, may we receive it. When You promise peace to Your people, may we live it. When we walk to the right or to the left, may our ears hear Your word behind us, saying, "This is the way. Walk in it."

The Word of the Lord is alive and powerful, sharper than any two-edged sword. The voice of the Lord is over the waters. The glory of God is heard in the thunder over many waters. Lord, pierce our soul and spirit, our joints and marrow, and discern our thoughts and the intentions of our hearts. Then may we in this place hear and heed Your Word.

It is on the foundation of this word we stand, and 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 gentleman from California (Mr. WHITESIDES) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WHITESIDES 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.

HONORING THE LIFE OF REPRESENTATIVE MARTIN GRABER

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

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today with a heavy heart to honor the life and legacy of a dear friend, a true servant of our State, and an extraordinary public servant, Representative Martin Graber. His unexpected passing leaves a void that cannot be filled.

For all who knew him, Martin was more than a colleague. He was a friend, mentor, and dedicated leader. A proud veteran with 32 years of service in the Iowa National Guard and a distinguished representative of Iowa House District 100, Martin was a man of integrity, always putting the people of southeast Iowa first. His commitment to faith, community, and service will never be forgotten.

To his beloved wife, Coni, their daughters and granddaughters, his entire family, and the rodeo family, we extend our deepest condolences. Martin's genuine care and unwavering dedication to those he served left an indelible mark on all of us.

Mr. Speaker, may God bless his memory, and may we continue to honor his spirit of service as we move forward.

IMPROVING ACCESS TO LOCAL FOOD IN NORTH CENTRAL MASSACHUSETTS

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, Growing Places, an imaginative nonprofit based in Leominster, Massachusetts, is

leading a new effort in our region to improve access to local fruits and vegetables. They have established a local food processing center that takes raw produce, items like old butternut squash, potatoes, apples, carrots, and cauliflower, and peels, chops, and packages it into an easy-to-consume form.

When I visited, we peeled and cubed local squash for schools and hospitals that could be roasted or easily turned into soup. This processing center helps farmers more easily take the nutritious food that they grow to market. It helps institutions purchase more local food because they often don't have the equipment or resources to prepare the raw produce onsite. It improves access to local produce for families at school, work, and home through their produce delivery program.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the incredible Ayn Yeagle and the entire Growing Places team for their work to improve our local food system, make us all healthier, and end hunger now.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL SCHOOL COUNSELING WEEK

(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 National School Counseling Week.

Since its establishment by the American School Counselor Association, National School Counseling Week has highlighted these professionals' essential role in shaping the future. From helping students navigate academic challenges to providing critical support for their mental well-being, school counselors are instrumental in ensuring that every child has the tools they need to thrive.

We all know that a student's success isn't just measured in grades or test scores. It is also reflected in their confidence, resilience, and ability to handle life's challenges. Additionally, school counselors provide critical information to students on all options available to them for their careers, including successful pathways through career and technical education.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the school counselors who dedicate their lives to this mission. They are a steady source of guidance for students who need it most. Because of their dedication, we are building stronger schools, healthier communities, and a brighter future for the next generation.

Mr. Speaker, let's continue to invest in our students' well-being and ensure that every child has the opportunity to thrive.

PROTECTING AGAINST EXTREME GOVERNMENT OVERREACH

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

Mr. WHITESIDES. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a minute to talk about the events of this week and to rise on behalf of law enforcement in this country.

I know that people across my district and across the country are deeply concerned about the personal data being exposed in an act of extreme government overreach. We are doing everything we can to put a stop to it. We are pursuing legislation that will stop it, and we will also work on legal avenues to prevent this and other unlawful executive actions taken by this administration.

I also want to take a moment to talk about the recent attacks against the FBI and brave law enforcement officials who defended our Capitol on January 6 from a violent insurrection.

In just the past 2 weeks, violent criminals were released from prison and have been making direct threats against public safety officers who helped put them away. These law enforcement officers have now been asked to step away from their actual jobs to take surveys and loyalty tests to the current President.

That is not how we should treat our law enforcement, our FBI, or anyone who has put their own safety at risk to protect all of us. We must all step up in this historic moment to be on the record for law enforcement.

ADDRESSING FENTANYL CRISIS

(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, the issue of fentanyl is not getting any better in this country. We hear more and more stories about yet another big cache of it being found, enough to kill millions of Americans.

Thankfully, President Trump is doing what needs to be done to control our border and make sure that Mexico and Canada are stepping up to do their part.

What we have available to us is the HALT Fentanyl Act, critical legislation to keep fentanyl-related substances permanently classified as schedule I drugs so law enforcement has an extra tool to help stop this poison from flooding into our country.

Right now, fentanyl is the leading cause of deaths for Americans aged 18 to 45. I will say that again: The leading cause of deaths for Americans aged 18 to 45 is the fentanyl coming across our border. It is being disguised as prescription pills. One mistake or one touch can be fatal.

This crisis has been fueled by years of the Biden administration's open-border policies. They are made in Mexico with chemicals from China, and traffickers are bringing them across the border with little resistance, at least until now.

Mr. Speaker, if Congress does not act, the schedule I classification will

expire, making it harder for law enforcement to crack down on traffickers and stop these deadly drugs. The House needs to pass this bill immediately to get it done.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF VERONICA LYNN HORN

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

Ms. McDONALD RIVET. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the life of Veronica Lynn Horn of Frankenmuth, Michigan.

Throughout her life, Veronica fought ferociously to make mid-Michigan a better place to work, start a business, and raise a family.

Veronica's leadership quite literally shaped communities like Saginaw County. She served in two congressional offices, worked for some of the biggest job creators in our district, was the president and CEO of the Saginaw County Chamber of Commerce, and worked with countless nonprofits across the region.

As I entered the State senate, I was lucky to count Veronica and her husband, Ken, as allies in the fight for Saginaw County. Veronica would work with anyone, regardless of political affiliation, to find common ground and attack a problem together.

Mr. Speaker, may Veronica's memory serve as a shining example of commitment to faith, family, and community.

PROMOTING DEMOCRACY IN TUNISIA

(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, Tunisia's inspiring Arab Spring revolution in 2011 made the country a symbol of courageous democratic patriots. Sadly, in 2021, Tunisia's dictator, Kais Saied, sabotaged the successful democracy.

Tunisia has been corrupted into a dictatorship enforced by rule of gun. The Constitution and elected parliament are suspended. In rigged elections last October, dictator Saied fabricated over 90 percent of the votes, jailed opponents and parliament members, including the former Prime Minister and parliament speaker who were illegally sentenced today, and coordinated with war criminal Putin, the Chinese Communist Party, and the terrorist regime in Tehran.

Aid to Tunisia should be suspended and sanctions imposed until democracy is restored. I urge support for the Tunisian Democracy Restoration Act.

In conclusion, God bless our troops as the global war on terrorism continues. Open borders for dictators put all Americans at risk of more imminent 9/11 attacks, as warned by the FBI.

Trump is reinstituting existing laws to protect American families with peace through strength and fighting fentanyl.

Mr. Speaker, we welcome Prime Minister Netanyahu to America. We appreciate his success for Middle East peace and prosperity, deterring a nuclear Iran.

TRUMP ADMINISTRATION IS UNDERMINING FOUNDATION OF OUR COUNTRY

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

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a former prosecutor and a Republican political appointee in the Bush administration's Justice Department. I know the law. All I see is the President and Elon Musk's unelected cabal flagrantly breaking the law.

Last week, the Trump administration recklessly issued and then rescinded a memo freezing taxpayer funds lawfully appropriated by Congress to local agencies, nonprofits, and school districts. This week, Musk agents demanded access to the Bureau of the Fiscal Service, overriding laws and regulations and accessing the most sensitive personal information of every American.

Every promise to lower costs and put the working and middle class first was a lie. The reckless quest to sell out the American people and silence opposition jeopardizes our national security and undermines the very foundation of our country.

Mr. Speaker, Project 2025 is the playbook; fear is the weapon; and greed is the point.

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

HONORING BREVARD COUNTY SHERIFF WAYNE IVEY

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

Mr. HARIDOPOLOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today and extend my gratitude to Brevard County Sheriff Wayne Ivey and the dedicated men and women of the sheriff's department for their unwavering commitment to protecting our community.

Just last week, I had the opportunity to sit down with Sheriff Ivey and actually go on a ride-along and see the challenges they face each and every day. That day, deputies actually arrested a man who was found to be in possession of enough fentanyl to kill 20,000 people.

This dangerous reality that our law enforcement officers confront every day is due to the failures of the prior administration to secure our border. The deadly impact of fentanyl has devastated communities across America,

and strong action must be taken to end this crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Sheriff Ivey and the brave men and women of the Brevard County Sheriff's Office for this opportunity to see firsthand the challenges they face, and I will continue to stand with law enforcement as we fight to keep our communities safe.

□ 1215

HONORING KENNETH LEE PARKER

(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 Kenneth Lee Parker, the former mayor of Momeyer, North Carolina.

Kenneth was a dedicated public servant and a true pillar of the Momeyer community. For over 25 years, he selflessly served as mayor, dedicating his time as assistant fire chief and a volunteer EMT.

Kenneth's commitment to his community didn't stop there. For 52 years, he was actively involved in the Ruritan club where he and his wife, Colleen, provided delicious meals and he gracefully embodied its motto: "fellowship, goodwill, and community service."

We reflect on Kenneth's remarkable life and contributions, and I extend my prayers to his family and all those who were fortunate enough to have known him. His legacy of kindness and service will forever resonate in our hearts. May we all find inspiration in Kenneth's example and strive to make a difference as he did.

ELECTING A MEMBER TO A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Republican Conference, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 107

Resolved, That the following named Member be, and is hereby, elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND WORKFORCE: Mr. Moylan (to rank immediately after Mr. Rulli).

Mr. GRIFFITH (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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTING A MEMBER TO A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE 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. 108

Resolved, That the following named Member be, and is hereby, elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET: Ms. Chu to rank immediately after Ms. Jayapal.

Mr. AGUILAR (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. 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.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE STRATEGIC COMPETITION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE CHINESE COMMUNIST PARTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment pursuant to section 4(a) of House Resolution 5, 119th Congress, and the order of the House of January 3, 2025, of the following Members to the Select Committee on the Strategic Competition Between the United States and the Chinese Communist Party:

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Illinois
Ms. CASTOR, Florida
Mr. CARSON, Indiana
Mr. MOULTON, Massachusetts
Mr. KHANNA, California
Ms. SHERRILL, New Jersey
Ms. STEVENS, Michigan
Mr. TORRES, New York
Ms. BROWN, Ohio
Mr. STANTON, Arizona
Ms. TOKUDA, Hawaii

CONTINUATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO SITUATION IN AND IN RELATION TO BURMA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 119-17)

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:

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 situation in and in relation to Burma declared in Executive Order 14014 of February 10, 2021, is to continue in effect beyond February 10, 2025.

The situation in and in relation to Burma, and in particular the February 1, 2021, coup—in which the military overthrew the democratically elected civilian government of Burma and unjustly arrested and detained government leaders, politicians, human rights defenders, journalists, and religious leaders, thereby rejecting the will of the people of Burma and undermining the country's democratic transition and rule of law—continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 14014 with respect to the situation in and in relation to Burma.

DONALD J. TRUMP,
THE WHITE HOUSE, February 4, 2025.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 27, HALT ALL LETHAL TRAFFICKING OF FENTANYL ACT

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 93 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 93

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 27) to amend the Controlled Substances Act with respect to the scheduling of fentanyl-related substances, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees; (2) the further amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I further ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, last night the Rules Committee met and reported out a rule for one measure, H.R. 27, the HALT Fentanyl Act, under a structured rule.

The rule provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees and provides for one motion to recommit.

As most Members know, unfortunately, we all know somebody who has been affected by the drug overdose epidemic plaguing our country.

According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, in 2023, there were more than 107,000 overdose deaths that occurred in the United States. These staggering numbers are due in large part to the increased presence of fentanyl and fentanyl analogues or fentanyl-related substances, which are approximately 100 times more potent than morphine and 50 times more potent than heroin. The lethal dose of fentanyl is just 2 milligrams, or about 4 grains of sand.

A loophole the cartels use and have tried to use to traffic illicit fentanyl into our country is by changing just one component of fentanyl's chemical structure in order to create a fentanyl analogue or a fentanyl-related substance. The cartels did this in an attempt to evade our criminal laws.

Right now, fentanyl analogues are considered schedule I substances but only because of a series of temporary scheduling orders, which is now set to expire on March 31, 2025.

Along with my colleague, Mr. LATTA from Ohio, we decided to introduce H.R. 27, the HALT Fentanyl Act.

The bill aims to curb overdose deaths by permanently scheduling fentanyl analogues or fentanyl-related substances as schedule I substances. This will strengthen law enforcement's ability to prosecute fentanyl traffickers and act as a deterrent.

The HALT Fentanyl Act also promotes research by improving the registration process to eligible individuals so that they can conduct studies on schedule I substances with appropriate safeguards.

In the Energy and Commerce Committee, we have heard testimony that there may be as many as 4,800 individual analogues or fentanyl-related substances. Our experts at the NIH, the FDA, and others have studied roughly 30 to 40 of those 4,800 analogues or fentanyl-related substances.

By encouraging research of schedule I substances like fentanyl analogues, we can better understand how these substances work and how we can prevent potentially harmful impacts in the future or even find a better use or a better opportunity than the current fentanyl that we use.

Because fentanyl has a proven medical use, it is considered a schedule II narcotic, as the Speaker knows, having practiced medicine for many years.

Illicit derivatives of fentanyl, also called fentanyl analogues, currently have not demonstrated a medical value.

Let me be clear. This bill will have no impact whatsoever on physicians' ability to administer fentanyl in medical settings.

The HALT Fentanyl Act deals specifically with fentanyl analogues or fentanyl-related substances, not medicinal fentanyl.

The Biden administration even released a statement when this bill passed through the House last Congress stating that they supported permanent scheduling and streamlined research for fentanyl and fentanyl-related substances.

We must address this bipartisan issue immediately and not allow this temporary extension to expire.

Once fentanyl analogues are permanently scheduled in schedule I, Congress will continue to build off this work to continue to address the illicit fentanyl crisis.

According to a 2021 GAO report, there was a 90 percent decrease in these fentanyl analogues coming into our country the year they were first placed into schedule I.

This bill is a critical step in combating the opioid crisis in our country because China and Mexico are heavily involved in this business. China is sending the precursors of fentanyl and fentanyl analogues to the cartels in Mexico, who are then bringing it across our border.

By making these analogs permanently schedule I, it removes the incentive for the cartels to traffic these analogues or fentanyl-related substance drugs into our country. China even realized the risk of fentanyl analogues and permanently scheduled those analogues on their strictest schedule. Other countries have followed suit and done the same.

Last Congress, this bill cleared through the Energy and Commerce Committee on a bipartisan basis and then passed on the House floor with 74 Democrats voting in favor.

The bill has the support of many law enforcement agencies and other entities calling for the need to pass the bill as it is.

We must act quickly to make the scheduling order permanent before it expires again at the end of March.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the legislation at hand, the so-called HALT Fentanyl Act, all I can say is folks on the other side must be living on another freaking planet.

□ 1230

Mr. Speaker, Republicans want to come down here and lecture people about fentanyl. Let's talk about fentanyl.

President Donald J. Trump, during his very first week in office, pardoned a drug dealer who helped fentanyl pour into our country. Let me repeat that nice and slowly so it sinks in.

As one of his first acts in office, Donald J. Trump pardoned a drug dealer who was sentenced to life in Federal prison who let fentanyl into America.

I just have a simple question for my friends on the other side: Why? Why? Why isn't this guy still in jail?

Why would Donald Trump let out a drug dealer like this?

The guy is sentenced to life in Federal prison. I wish I had an answer. Maybe they can explain it to us. They like to talk so much about pardons, but they are silent on this one. We hear crickets from the other side. It makes you wonder, Mr. Speaker, what is going on here.

Let me read the ICE press release for when this guy was arrested.

Are you ready for this, Mr. Speaker?

ICE says that the guy Donald Trump pardoned helped "thousands of drug dealers and other unlawful vendors distribute hundreds of kilograms of illegal drugs and other unlawful goods and services to more than 100,000 buyers and to launder hundreds of millions of dollars deriving from these unlawful transactions."

It goes on to explain how he distributed narcotics that were linked to overdose deaths across the country.

People died as a result of this criminality.

This is a guy who made the cartels rich, who made it easier for China to mail fentanyl into our country. This is a guy who let the drugs pour into our communities, tearing families apart, getting people sick, exposing people to danger, and causing numerous deaths.

He was pardoned. He was pardoned by Donald Trump.

It takes a lot of nerve, Mr. Speaker, to let out the fentanyl guy and then come down here with a straight face and tell people that we are all about stopping drugs coming into America.

Let's not get started about the funding freeze that Trump is trying to put into place. Trump wants to block hundreds of billions of dollars in bipartisan

funding for law enforcement, including blocking money going after fentanyl. He wants to block State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance, the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, and the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas program. Republicans are in court right now fighting to get it all.

Why are they doing this?

The answer is very simple, actually. They are stealing. They are stealing taxpayer dollars. Republicans want to steal from you, the American people, to give Elon and Trump more tax breaks and more tax write-offs for their private jets, their mansions, islands, and yachts. It is corruption: good, old-fashioned, plain and simple corruption.

Then they will come down here to the floor and pretend to care about fentanyl while they pardon the drug dealers who profit off of people's pain and gut the programs that keep drugs off our streets.

Do you know what, Mr. Speaker? Let's talk about those tariffs, yes, the tariffs that Trump kept bragging about that he promised he was going to slap on our allies Canada and Mexico. If he was successful, they would have sent domestic costs on food, gas, and household goods spiraling out of control. Then, when people started paying attention, when we stood up for the workers and when the public fought back, Trump folded. He lost. He rescinded his funding freeze. He walked back his tariffs, and he got nothing in exchange.

Trump wants to give us this impression that he has power and strength. He really has none. He backed down on his funding freeze. He backed down on his tariffs. The courts are rejecting his executive orders because guess what, Mr. Speaker? He is not king, and we are fighting back.

I can promise you this, Mr. Speaker: We are going to fight back with every single ounce of strength we have to prevent this President and his billionaire sidekick from undermining the rule of law and stealing from the people we were elected to protect.

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

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I understand there are all kinds of concerns on the other side of the aisle, but we are talking about the HALT Fentanyl Act.

I could stand here and talk about Burma. We heard today that the President has extended the emergency situation with Burma, that undemocratic country where they overthrew the democratically elected government and how Burma, also known as Myanmar, is the largest cultivator of opium products and the producer of heroin globally, second only to Afghanistan. That doesn't have anything to do with the HALT Fentanyl Act. The HALT Fentanyl Act is a good bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to my good friend from New York (Mr. LANGWORTHY), who will talk about the bill some more.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support today of the rule which provides consideration of the HALT Fentanyl Act. For 4 long years, the American people suffered from an administration that time and again refused to take seriously the flood of deadly fentanyl-related substances and analogues flooding into our communities.

Fentanyl-related overdose has remained the leading cause of death for Americans aged 18 to 49 for much of the last several years. Millions of families have been torn apart, and our towns and our cities have suffered from the blight of crime and homelessness that has grown from this epidemic. Not one corner of our country has been left untouched by the fentanyl crisis. Urban, suburban, rural, rich, poor, old, and young lives have been torn apart, and families have been torn apart.

The previous administration could have addressed this tragedy head-on by securing our borders and protecting our communities, but time and again, they refused, and Democrats here in the House of Representatives supported that decision.

The HALT Fentanyl Act before us today permanently schedules fentanyl-related substances on schedule I of the Controlled Substances Act, a crucial step that will ensure that law enforcement and our communities are empowered to address this deadly scourge head-on.

To my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who spent years cheering an administration that allowed the flood of these substances to pour in from our southern border unchecked: Now is your time to support one important step in combating the epidemic that has taken too many lives and destroyed too many homes and communities.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the legislation under this rule today, Mr. Speaker, and I am proud to be a cosponsor of the HALT Fentanyl Act.

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

Mr. Speaker, there has been no response from either of the gentlemen about why it was okay for Trump to pardon the guy who let the fentanyl into this country and who made hundreds of millions of dollars off of fentanyl. He was sentenced to life in prison, and he let him out.

You are okay with that, yet you are coming down here saying that you really care about fighting fentanyl in our country. There has been not a peep from the other side justifying what Trump did.

One of his first acts as President was to pardon this guy who received life in prison for his crime. He received life in prison.

Mr. Speaker, I urge we defeat the previous question. If we do, then I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 4531, the SUPPORT for

Patients and Communities Reauthorization Act.

Mr. Speaker, the SUPPORT Act reauthorization would permanently place xylazine in schedule III of the Controlled Substances Act. However, unlike the bill before us today, it doesn't stop at scheduling.

The bill reauthorizes resources for residential substance use disorder treatment for pregnant and postpartum women. It provides resources for training and education related to fentanyl and other illicit substances for first responders, and it ensures that Medicaid beneficiaries have access to medication-assisted treatment.

Here is the best part, Mr. Speaker. This bill already passed last Congress with 386 votes. One hundred ninety Republicans voted for it, and it was included in the end-of-year spending package.

Guess what happened, Mr. Speaker?

Elon Musk tanked that deal for reasons that no one seems to be able to explain to me, and this good bill was never signed into law.

Mr. Speaker, passing this bill would mean, to quote the chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce who helped lead this bill in the last Congress, that this bill could help save lives by preventing overdoses and providing access to immediate and long-term care recovery services.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment into the RECORD, along with any extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) to introduce that proposal.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member MCGOVERN for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, if the previous question is defeated, Democrats plan to offer a vote on the SUPPORT for Patients and Communities Reauthorization Act.

The SUPPORT Act, which House Republicans unceremoniously abandoned after billionaire-in-chief Elon Musk tanked the end-of-year bipartisan package, would have reauthorized a wide range of prevention, treatment, and recovery programs that included a 2-year extension of scheduling for fentanyl-related substances.

This bipartisan approach, which focused not only on disrupting the drug supply but also investing in the full spectrum of prevention, treatment, and recovery, passed the House overwhelmingly by a vote of 386-37, as was made mention by Representative MCGOVERN, in the 118th Congress.

Passing this vital legislation would have helped continue our progress against the overdose epidemic which finally saw overdose deaths start to decline during the Biden administration

after skyrocketing during the first Trump administration.

It is indeed clear that Republicans just aren't serious about addressing this crisis. They are using cheap sound bites and photo ops to exploit parents' pain and to distract Americans while President Trump, Elon Musk, and their cronies rob us blind and dismantle the very programs that individuals rely on to get treatment and live a life of recovery for their situations.

With last week's Federal funding freeze, Trump and Musk immediately halted over some \$8 billion in programs working to combat the opioid crisis, including: \$6.5 billion for SAMHSA that would support naloxone distribution in our communities, drug-free community programs to keep kids off drugs, and medication-assisted treatment programs. It also authorized \$1.5 billion for addiction research at the National Institutes of Health to help deliver the next generation of lifesaving treatments.

Unfortunately, that is not all.

As we speak, Republicans are cooking up plans to steal over \$2.5 trillion from Medicaid, jeopardizing healthcare for 72 million people and decimating the single biggest payer for substance use care, just so that they can give more tax breaks to Elon Musk and his billionaire buddies.

Cutting lifesaving prevention and treatment services to the bone while trying to restart a failed 1980s war on drugs?

America should just say no.

In closing, I urge my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to defeat the previous question so that we can vote on a real plan to tackle this epidemic that continues to ravage our communities.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I keep thinking I am here to talk about the HALT Fentanyl Act, but they keep talking about all kinds of other things.

My colleagues have acknowledged that the HALT Fentanyl Act passed in the last Congress with a large majority, yet here we are using this as a vehicle to talk about everything else they think is going wrong in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I have a little bill here. It does some good. We ought to pass it. If my colleagues want to talk about lots of other stuff, they are entitled to. That is their right. However, I don't want the focus taken off the HALT Fentanyl Act. It is a good bill. It helps law enforcement. It helps slow down the flood across the southern border. That is what we are here about today.

I know if the motion on the previous question fails, then they are going to introduce a different bill. However, my understanding is their bill completely eliminates and doesn't have anything in their language about halting fentanyl.

This is something a large majority of Congress wants to get done. Let's get it done. Let's stop all the rhetoric. Let's stop trying to point fingers at us and everybody else for other things. Let's just do our job. I think that is what the American people want us to do.

In fact, I hear a lot of times from my constituents back home that they are tired of seeing these gigantic bills. It sounds like what my colleagues on the other side want is some more gigantic bills that people vote on. It is kind of like what the former Speaker said: We have to vote for it so we can find out what is in it.

I would rather vote on bills that I know what is in it. That is why I read all the bills if I plan to vote for it.

I helped write this bill. I am the lead sponsor of this bill. It is an easy bill to read. It is pretty straightforward in what it does, what it is supposed to do, and what we are trying to do. President Biden thought it was okay. He issued a statement in favor of it last term. This term President Trump says that he is in favor of it.

This is a bipartisan approach to solve a problem.

Does it solve all the world's problems, Mr. Speaker?

Of course it does not, but it solves a problem that our law enforcement has that helps the bad guys, the people making the precursors in China, the people in the cartels in Mexico flooding across our southern border with these harmful fentanyl-related substances and analogues. It makes it easier for our law enforcement people to focus on illegal fentanyl.

□ 1245

Mr. Speaker, fentanyl is legal for medicinal purposes, and it will be even after this bill.

There is something else that Democrats haven't mentioned. I mentioned it briefly, but I will talk about it a little bit further, Mr. Speaker. That is the component in this bill that allows for research on the 4,800 other related substances or analogues that we believe are out there. It is a rough number. Nobody knows until they get in and start experimenting, but we heard that testimony in the Energy and Commerce Committee.

There might be some benefit to some other analogue. There might be some benefit, but we don't want it out there on our streets or being used for medicinal reasons until we know for sure that it does something positive for society.

Right now, all the analogues that we have seen are either inert or just as bad as the illegal use of fentanyl, so this bill needs to be passed.

I understand the minority doesn't want to talk about this. My Democratic colleagues want to talk about everything else, but that is not why we are here today.

When I came to Congress, I pledged to read the bills. I pledged to talk about what it is we are talking about

today and not talk about everything else in the world that I think we might be able to fix someday or that we might ought to do someday. There is a process for that.

As my friend Terry Kilgore used to tell me all the time, somebody would come up with an idea, and then they would want to put on some kind of an amendment or change the bill around when we had a nice, little, simple bill. Mr. Kilgore is a member of the Virginia House of Delegates, and he was my seatmate. He came up with a famous phrase when people wanted to rearrange the bill in a way that he didn't think was proper or put an amendment on it that would completely change the bill or, in this case, defeat the motion of the previous question in order to defeat the HALT Fentanyl Act and put forward some other bill. He would say: Well, you might have some points to make. I would say to the gentleman: Get your own bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, what would help end the illegal fentanyl problem here would be Donald Trump not pardoning a drug kingpin, essentially, who brought illegal fentanyl into our country and who was sentenced to life in prison in a Federal court. What would have been a strong signal would have been not to pardon somebody like that.

Mr. Speaker, I get why my friends don't want to talk about that. Republicans don't want to get on the bad side of the President because then Republican Members may get a primary or then Elon Musk might send all kinds of money into their primary. I get all of that.

If we are serious here about dealing with fentanyl, we should at least all be able to say what the President did was wrong.

Maybe the gentleman wasn't listening to the debate on the previous question, but the gentleman from New York (Mr. LANGWORTHY) talked for 3 minutes about an alternative bill that would help deal with this problem.

This was a bill that got 386 votes in this House in the last Congress. The bill received 386 votes. It was in the final package that we were all going to vote on, by the way, that Republican leadership agreed with and our leadership agreed with and the Republicans and Democrats in the Senate agreed with. It was in that bill, but then Elon Musk sabotaged that bill.

Mr. Speaker, I get it. I have been here for a while. Before I was a Member, I worked here as a staffer for George McGovern, no relation, and for Congressman Joe Moakley. Let me tell you, Republicans today do not hold the same values as Republicans from back then.

Republicans used to be for backing the blue. Trump pardoned people who beat police officers. Right now, he is gutting the FBI, which the Republicans

used to believe was the citadel of law and order.

Republicans used to stand for cutting the deficit. Now, the majority is spending night and day planning to jam through a tax cut for the ultrarich without pay-fors, which will blow up the deficit by trillions of dollars. It is what my Republican colleagues did in 2017 for their billionaire tax cuts.

Republicans spent decades claiming my colleagues on the other side of the aisle were the champions of free trade. Just this past week, Trump and the Republican Party started a trade war with our neighbors, not to mention the majority spoke nonstop about inflation for the past 2 years but seem to be fine with slapping this tariff tax on their constituents that is going to make prices across the board in this country go sky high.

Is there any principle today's version of the Republican Party won't abandon? Is there anything Trump could do that Republicans wouldn't support or would even question?

It would be almost comical to see how much my Republican colleagues are willing to bend down and kiss the ring if we didn't currently find ourselves in multiple constitutional crises at the hands of Trump and his cronies.

Mr. Speaker, the fact that we can't even get Republicans to say that it was wrong for the President of the United States to pardon this individual who was serving life in prison for bringing fentanyl into our communities and killing our constituents, the fact that the majority can't even raise the question of whether it was the wrong thing to do, tells you everything you need to know.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, it is kind of interesting. I keep thinking we are talking about the HALT Fentanyl Act, and then I hear all this other stuff.

Earlier, one of my colleagues said that we were cooking up some kind of a plan to cut—I forget what the number was now—\$2.5 trillion or \$2.7 trillion out of Medicaid. I haven't heard of any such plan being cooked up. I think that is just hyperbole, but that is my opinion.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman keeps asking about a pardon or about somebody who was pardoned. Well, I don't know if he has noticed or not, but I am not the President of the United States. I don't have the power to pardon. I don't get the information put on my desk about various individual pardons.

I didn't make any comments about pardons by the previous President when many people were pardoned or were sitting on death row and had sentences commuted. That is not what we are here about today.

We can get down into that trap if we want to, but I am just telling you that we are here today to talk about a rule for a simple bill that the majority of this House supports. I believe it is an overwhelming majority. I don't know if my colleagues admitted it was exactly 74, but they admitted it was a big vote last year. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle admitted it was a part of a package that the minority wanted to see pass on the floor at the end of last year.

I thought we were here to talk about this. I recognize that it is a free-for-all on the floor, but I just hate to get into all those kinds of things and start talking about this or that and, whether crossing the line or not, somehow casting aspersions that Members over here don't have independent wills. We certainly do, and I think my colleagues might recognize that from some of the things I said last night when I was being questioned.

Do I support the President? Well, of course, I do. Do I agree with everything he does? No.

As the old saying goes, I don't agree with my wife all the time. She certainly doesn't agree with me most of the time.

The bottom line is that I think the President is moving us in the right direction. One of those right directions would be to pass the HALT Fentanyl Act. Another is closing down the border, shutting that border down.

If Democrats want to talk about drugs coming across our southern border and want to point to an individual who is thought to be primarily responsible for some of that, how about the hundreds and thousands of people who were used by the cartels to bring illicit substances, whether it be at ports of entry or other places, across our southern border?

The President is cracking down on that, too, but that is not what this bill is about. This bill is about making sure that when our law enforcement officers arrest somebody and their preliminary examination indicates that what they have is significant, or even a small amount but generally significant amounts of a fentanyl-related substance, that when they go to court, they don't have somebody arguing in court that, wait a minute, this is not the fentanyl on schedule II, that this is a fentanyl-related substance but it is a left-handed molecule instead of a right-handed molecule or a right-handed molecule instead of a left-handed molecule.

I can say that, as a former defense attorney, I loved those kinds of arguments. As a Congressman, it is our job to shut those arguments down. The HALT Fentanyl Act stops those arguments from being made in court, which are basically spurious attempts to help drug dealers.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues are not trying to help drug dealers. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle are just here to try to make some

other points today. Let's talk about this bill and the good that this bill can do.

My Democratic colleagues brought up substituting this bill with the SUPPORT Act. I am a cosponsor of the SUPPORT Act, which is carried by the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, BRETT GUTHRIE. That bill has a very good chance of passing this body, so let's let that bill go through its process, and let's let this bill, the HALT Fentanyl Act, finish out this process, get across to the Senate, get signed into law by the President, and start doing good work.

The Speaker might be asking why we have to do this at this moment. The answer is that we have had a rolling series of temporary bills on making the fentanyl-related substances schedule I because we all recognize the danger that these present to the American public.

Let's make it permanent and give our scientists an opportunity to look at some of those other 4,800 analogues or fentanyl-related substances to see if there is anything there that might be beneficial to mankind, that might be a reversal of an overdose, that might be a better and less-addictive pain reliever. Let's let them do that research.

They can't do that research without the HALT Fentanyl Act, and the efforts of the defense attorneys for the cartels can't be crippled by constantly passing temporary bills because any day that it is not in effect is a day that lawyers will take advantage of.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I understand that the gentleman is new to the Rules Committee, and I think this may be his first time on the floor handling a rule.

I will remind the gentleman that this is the rule debate. We are not having general debate on the underlying bill. The rule debates are about the majority's agenda, what Republicans are bringing to the floor and what Republicans are not bringing to the floor.

The majority could have brought to the floor the bill that we want to bring to the floor, that we talked about in the previous question debate, that passed overwhelmingly in a bipartisan vote in the last Congress, and that my Republican friends allowed to get blown up at the last minute.

Basically, I am going to take my time during the rule debate to talk about the Republicans' unpopular, crummy agenda for the American people: raising prices on consumers and ignoring all the concerns that everyday people have.

We are also going to talk about the fact that, when it comes to fentanyl, one of Donald Trump's first acts was to pardon a criminal who brought fentanyl into this country and who was sentenced to life in Federal prison.

Mr. Speaker, I get it that the gentleman doesn't want to have an opinion

on that or voice an opinion on that, but, really, is it that hard? I don't know what is so difficult to condemn there.

Mr. Speaker, speaking of the agenda, I am looking at *The New York Times*: "Trump Proposing Takeover of Gaza as U.S. Territory." Do Republicans' constituents want to have their sons or daughters sent to Gaza to be in the middle of that violence?

This is the guy who also now wants to invade Greenland. He wants to take over Panama. He wants to annex Canada. He wants to now occupy Gaza.

Mr. Speaker, we have 42 million people in this country who are hungry. Whatever happened to America First? Whatever happened to helping people in this country? Whatever happened to lowering prices?

Instead, we get this. This is like a warmonger here. I mean, come on.

Again, we had an agreement on a bipartisan bill that would address the underlying concerns that the gentleman raises here, yet it was blown up at the last minute.

Mr. Speaker, the rule debate is about the Republican agenda. It is about the crappy agenda of this majority in the House of Representatives, which is not fighting for regular people and not fighting for the people who I represent but instead is doing the bidding for billionaires like Elon Musk and others.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ), the distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

□ 1300

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, we are in a moment of constitutional crisis. These days will define what we stand for. They will define who we stand with.

Yet in this time of crisis, Republicans are rearranging deck chairs on the Titanic. Republicans are using the precious floor time we are given to put forth watered-down fentanyl bills like the one in this rule. Let's remember that all of these bills require a Federal agency to enforce it.

Let me remind my Republican colleagues that their President granted Elon Musk the authority to dismantle our Federal agencies. Musk and his DOGE—I like to call it dodgy because they seem to dodge any kind of authority and accountability—are intent on destroying our Federal Government and the essential services it provides.

Mr. Speaker, I remind my colleagues to remember their power and remember their constitutional duty.

Musk didn't take an oath to protect the Constitution. We did. Voters sent us here to protect their interests. Congress alone has the power to fund our agencies. A billionaire who was not elected and has not probably even passed a security clearance cannot destroy our Federal agencies. We will not stand for it, and I hope you stand with us to protect our Federal agencies, including the FBI who would be the ones

who would enforce and investigate and go after fentanyl trafficking.

My phones are ringing off the hook from constituents who are frightened and terrified and angry about what Musk is doing. They don't want billionaire tech titans to dismantle Federal agencies or gain access to their most private data.

We definitely can't address the fentanyl crisis, like the bill in today's rule claims to do, if Trump and Republicans get their way on the Federal funding freeze, if they get their way on a hiring freeze.

Now remember, this intention that we have seen from this administration, that we are not hearing them stand up against, would actually destroy the FBI. It would take away funds from addiction treatment, which would be essential to save lives. It would take away funds from interdiction technology, which is what we need to stop fentanyl from flowing in and killing our neighbors and my friends and my constituents. My constituents want us to fund effective border safety measures, not engage in the chaos and demonization we have seen from this administration.

I have also heard loud and clear from my communities in New Mexico about the chaos that Trump's orders have created. Trump is about chaos and Trump is about corruption.

Yesterday, I went to the Treasury Department to demand answers about Musk's power grab and information heist. They didn't let Members of Congress in that building, which belongs to the American people.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from New Mexico.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. They didn't let us in that building because they don't want Americans to know what they are doing.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and all my Republican colleagues: Would you let Elon Musk and his interns rummage through your savings account, your tax return, your children's personal data?

I just don't understand the point of putting bills like this on the floor if we are not going to have the courage to stand up to Elon Musk and his rip off of Congress' power.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against the rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEWHOUSE). Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

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

Mr. Speaker, darn, I wish I had known 40 minutes ago we could talk about anything we wanted to, that this time was not really to talk about the rule present before us today or the underlying bill, but was to talk about whatever we wanted to, whatever is on our agenda, their agenda.

I have to say, Mr. Speaker, this is why the American people don't have

confidence in Congress, because they can't follow the bouncing ball. We are here to talk about the HALT Fentanyl Act, and we are talking about everything including the kitchen sink.

If I had only known that 40 minutes ago, I could have brought over all my CRAs that I am interested in getting passed, all my bills that I think are fascinating and interesting that I can't seem to get out of committee, at least not in the past. I could have talked about all kinds of things.

I understand that may not be the practice of the Rules Committee. I am new. The gentleman is absolutely right to remind me of that. I have no problem with that. I just didn't know that we could talk about whatever we wanted to when the subject of the day is: Are we going to pass a rule that ultimately we hope will be put in place for the debate and passage of the HALT Fentanyl Act.

Then I heard, amongst a number of things today that I thought were just kind of odd, that my bill, the HALT Fentanyl Act, had been watered down.

Well, that is news to me because the bill, with the exception of changing a couple of paragraph numbers, the lettering on the paragraphs to make sure we were alphabetically correct, is exactly the way I introduced it. I don't think that is a watering down. A watering down is when you take a bill that is 20 or 30 pages long and you make it into a 2-page bill and you have it do half of what it was supposed to do.

What this bill was supposed to do, Mr. Speaker, is exactly what this bill does. It takes and makes a permanent schedule I classification for all of the roughly 4,800 fentanyl-related substances or analogues. It provides for research on those fentanyl-related substances or analogues at our research institutions with certain safeguards to make sure we can continue to do research so that maybe we can find a better path forward, something that may help with our drug addiction issues, something that may be a better, less addictive pain reliever.

We want that research done, but until we have the evidence that one of those 4,800 analogues or fentanyl-related substances actually does good, we need to make them schedule I. They need to be on there so that the cartels can't use this as some trick in the courtroom to get out of trouble, to get a proverbial get-out-of-jail-free card.

My colleagues want to talk about everything else coming down the road, including an individual—and I haven't reviewed his file—who they claim was involved in the drug trade and who was pardoned.

I haven't heard them talk about Lairon Graham of Buffalo, convicted of heading a drug conspiracy and selling fentanyl, crack cocaine, and heroin, who was pardoned by the previous President, Mr. Biden.

I haven't heard them talk about Valentino Shine, convicted of narcotic sales, along with sex trafficking and

distribution of crack cocaine, who was pardoned by the previous President.

Now, I personally don't think any of that is relevant to today's discussion, and I recognize that that is apparently the practice of the Rules Committee. I find it surprising. I think it is a sloppy practice, but if that is the practice, then next time I will be sure to bring my wish list with me and we can talk about everything except the bill we are supposed to be talking about.

It does make you wonder and think that everybody at home watching this, both of them, are confused because we are not talking about the bill that we are supposed to be talking about. I hope Congress some day gets around to talking about the bill that it is supposed to talk about, whether it is my bill or somebody else's bill.

Today, I will try to make my remarks as much as I can about passage of the rule for the HALT Fentanyl Act.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman really think that people dislike Congress because we are debating issues, because we are debating what is on their mind? No. I think people dislike Congress because politicians say one thing and do another.

They are on the floor today talking about the need to combat fentanyl and then are silent when the President of the United States pardons a criminal sentenced to life in prison for flooding our streets with fentanyl.

That is what people get frustrated with. People are frustrated that we had a deal on a bill at the end of last Congress that everybody signed off on. It was fine. At the last minute, Elon Musk comes in and blows it up, and now we can't bring the bill up again. That is what people are frustrated with.

My Republican friends like to talk about America First. Look at the front page of The New York Times today: "Trump Proposing Takeover of Gaza as U.S. Territory."

I have to tell you, people voted for lower egg prices, not for a Middle East Mar-a-Lago. People did not vote to send their sons and daughters into the tunnels of Gaza so that Jared Kushner and Donald Trump can build Trump Tower Gaza. That is not what they voted for.

People want to talk about issues. They want us to deal with issues that will impact everyday life and lower the cost of living. In the first weeks, we have seen nothing from this President or the Republican majority here to deal with that.

Don't tell me that people don't like Congress because we debate issues. I am sorry. We are debating your agenda, even though it is unpopular.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an article from the Associated Press titled: "Elon Musk's DOGE commission gains

access to sensitive Treasury payment systems."

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

There was no objection.

[From AP News, Feb. 1, 2025]

ELON MUSK'S DOGE COMMISSION GAINS ACCESS TO SENSITIVE TREASURY PAYMENT SYSTEMS: AP SOURCES

(By Fatima Hussein)

The Department of Government Efficiency, run by President Donald Trump's billionaire adviser and Tesla CEO Elon Musk, has gained access to sensitive Treasury data including Social Security and Medicare customer payment systems, according to two people familiar with the situation.

The move by DOGE, a Trump administration task force assigned to find ways to fire federal workers, cut programs and slash federal regulations, means it could have wide leeway to access important taxpayer data, among other things.

The New York Times first reported the news of the group's access of the massive federal payment system. The two people who spoke to The Associated Press spoke on condition of anonymity because they were not authorized to speak publicly.

The highest-ranking Democrat on the Senate Finance Committee, Ron Wyden of Oregon, on Friday sent a letter to Trump's Treasury Secretary Scott Bessent expressing concern that "officials associated with Musk may have intended to access these payment systems to illegally withhold payments to any number of programs."

"To put it bluntly, these payment systems simply cannot fail, and any politically motivated meddling in them risks severe damage to our country and the economy," Wyden said.

The news also comes after Treasury's acting Deputy Secretary David Lebryk resigned from his position at Treasury after more than 30 years of service. The Washington Post on Friday reported that Lebryk resigned his position after Musk and his DOGE organization requested access to sensitive Treasury data.

"The Fiscal Service performs some of the most vital functions in government," Lebryk said in a letter to Treasury employees sent out Friday. "Our work may be unknown to most of the public, but that doesn't mean it isn't exceptionally important. I am grateful for having been able to work alongside some of the nation's best and most talented operations staff."

The letter did not mention a DOGE request to access Treasury payments.

Musk on Saturday responded to a post on his social media platform X about the departure of Lebryk: "the @DOGE team discovered, among other things, that payment approval officers at Treasury were instructed always to approve payments, even to known fraudulent or terrorist groups. They literally never denied a payment in their entire career. Not even once."

He did not provide proof of this claim.

DOGE was originally headed by Musk and former Republican presidential candidate Vivek Ramaswamy, who jointly vowed to cut billions from the federal budget and usher in "mass headcount reductions across the federal bureaucracy."

Ramaswamy has since left DOGE as he mulls a run for governor of Ohio.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD an article from The New Republic titled: "25-year-old Elon Musk Crony Has Total Control Over Treasury Payments."

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

There was no objection.

[From the New Republic, Feb. 4, 2025]

25-YEAR-OLD ELON MUSK CRONY HAS TOTAL CONTROL OVER TREASURY PAYMENTS

(By Hafiz Rashid)

One of Elon Musk's handpicked operatives for his fake "Department of Government Efficiency" has been given complete access to critical payment systems at the Department of the Treasury, despite being only 25 years old.

Marko Elez, whose total work experience consists of working for Musk's companies SpaceX and X (formerly Twitter), has administrator privileges on systems that are responsible for 95 percent of payments made by the U.S. government including Social Security checks, tax refunds, and virtually all contract payments, Wired reports. This contradicts earlier reports that Musk's henchmen only had "read-only" access to Treasury data.

Wired, citing two unnamed sources, reports that Elez has the ability to write code on the Payment Automation Manager and Secure Payment System at the Bureau of the Fiscal Service, which control government payments that amount to more than a fifth of the U.S. economy. Elez's level of access could allow him to bypass security measures and possibly cause irreversible damage to these systems. Talking Points Memo further reports that Elez has already used his power to significantly rewrite code for the payment systems.

"You could do anything with these privileges," one source with knowledge of the systems told Wired, adding that they couldn't see a reason that such access was necessary for hunting down fraud or assessing how payments are disbursed, as DOGE claims it is doing.

"Technically I don't see why this couldn't happen," a federal IT worker told the magazine Monday regarding whether a DOGE worker would get such a level of government access. "If you would have asked me a week ago, I'd have told you that this kind of thing would never in a million years happen. But now, who the f*** knows."

Musk and his cronies have already taken control of federal workers' private data by installing an illegal commercial server at the Office of Personnel Management, giving them access to databases containing federal employees' Social Security numbers, home addresses, medical histories, and other sensitive personal information. Senior government officials at OPM have even been locked out of employee databases.

Many, if not most, of Musk's associates that he's used in his government takeover are young and inexperienced young men between the ages of 19 and 26, like Elez. Whether the tech mogul or the people doing his bidding even have proper security clearances is not known, which would definitely make their efforts illegal, if they weren't already. But with Donald Trump taking over federal law enforcement and prosecutors threatening critics of DOGE, who, if anyone, will take action?

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an article from Wired titled: "Federal Workers Sue to Disconnect DOGE Server."

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

There was no objection.

[From Wired, Feb. 4, 2025]

FEDERAL WORKERS SUE TO DISCONNECT DOGE SERVER

(By Dell Cameron)

Federal employees are seeking a temporary restraining order as part of a class action lawsuit accusing a group of Elon Musk's associates of allegedly operating an illegally connected server from the fifth floor of the US Office of Personnel Management's (OPM) headquarters in Washington, DC.

An attorney representing two federal workers—Jane Does 1 and 2—filed a motion this morning arguing that the server's continued operation not only violates federal law but is potentially exposing vast quantities of government staffers' personal information to hostile foreign adversaries through unencrypted email.

A copy of the motion, filed in the DC District Court by National Security Counselors, a Washington-area public-interest law firm, was obtained by WIRED exclusively in advance. WIRED previously reported that Musk had installed several lackeys in OPM's top offices, including individuals with ties to xAI, Neuralink, and other companies he owns.

The initial lawsuit, filed on January 27, cites reports that Musk's associates illegally connected a server to a government network for the purposes of harvesting information, including the names and email accounts of federal employees. The server was installed on the agency's premises, the complaint alleges, without OPM—the government's human resources department—conducting a mandatory privacy impact assessment required under federal law.

Under the 2002 E-Government Act, agencies are required to perform privacy assessments prior to making “substantial changes to existing information technology” when handling information “in identifiable form.” Notably, prior to the installation of the server, OPM did not have the technical capability to email the entire federal workforce from a single email account.

“[A]t some point after 20 January 2025, OPM allowed unknown individuals to simply bypass its existing systems and security protocols,” Tuesday's motion claims, “for the stated purpose of being able to communicate directly with those individuals without involving other agencies. In short, the sole purpose of these new systems was expediency.”

OPM did not immediately respond to a request for comment.

If the motion is granted, OPM would be forced to disconnect the server until the assessment is done. As a consequence, the Trump administration's plans to drastically reduce the size of the federal workforce would likely face delays. The email account linked to the server—HR@opm.gov—is currently being used to gather information from federal workers accepting buyouts under the admin's “deferred resignation program,” which is set to expire on February 6.

“Under the law, a temporary restraining order is an extraordinary remedy,” notes National Security Counselors' executive director, Kel McClanahan. “But this is an extraordinary situation.”

Before issuing a restraining order, courts apply what's known as the “balance of equities” doctrine, weighing the burdens and costs on both parties. In this case, however, McClanahan argues that the injunction would inflict “no hardship” on the government whatsoever. February 6 is an “arbitrary deadline,” he says, and the administration could simply continue to implement the resignation program “through preexisting channels.”

“We can't wait for the normal course of litigation when all that information is just

sitting there in some system nobody knows about with who knows what protections,” McClanahan says. “In a normal case, we might be able to at least count on the inspector general to do something, but Trump fired her, so all bets are off.”

The motion further questions whether OPM violated the Administrative Procedure Act, which prohibits federal agencies from taking actions “not in accordance with the law.” Under the APA, courts may “compel agency action”—such as a private assessment—when it is “unlawfully withheld.”

Employees at various agencies were reportedly notified last month to be on the lookout for messages originating from the HR@opm.gov account. McClanahan's complaint points to a January 23 email from acting Homeland Security secretary Benjamin Huffman instructing DHS employees that the HR@opm.gov account “can be considered trusted.” In the following days, emails were blasted out twice across the executive branch instructing federal workers to reply “Yes” in both cases.

The same account was later used to transmit the “Fork in the Road” missive promoting the Trump administration's legally dubious “deferred resignation program,” which claims to offer federal workers the opportunity to quit but continue receiving paychecks through September. Workers who wished to participate in the program were instructed to reply to the email with “Resign.”

As WIRED has reported, even the new HR chief of DOGE, Musk's task force, was unable to answer basic questions about the offer.

The legal authority underlying the program is unclear, and federal employee union leaders are warning workers not to blindly assume they will actually get paid. In a floor speech last week, Senator Tim Kaine advised workers not to be fooled: “There's no budget line item to pay people who are not showing up for work.” Patty Murray, ranking Democrat on the Senate Appropriations Committee, similarly warned Monday: “There is no funding allocated to agencies to pay staff for this offer.”

McClanahan's lawsuit highlights the government's response to the OPM hack of 2015, which compromised personnel records on more than 22 million people, including some who'd undergone background checks to obtain security clearances. A congressional report authored by House Republicans following the breach pinned the incident on a “breakdown in communications” between OPM's chief information officer and its inspector general: “The future effectiveness of the agency's information technology and security efforts,” it says, “will depend on a strong relationship between these two entities moving forward.”

OPM's inspector general, Krista Boyd, was fired by President Donald Trump in the midst of the “Friday night purge” on January 24—one day after the first HR@opm.gov email was sent.

“We are witnessing an unprecedented exfiltration and seizure of the most sensitive kinds of information by unelected, unvetted people with no experience, responsibility, or right to it,” says Sean Vitka, policy director at the Demand Progress Education Fund, which is supporting the action. “Millions of Americans and the collective interests of the United States desperately need emergency intervention from the courts. The constitutional crisis is already here.”

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD an opinion article from The Washington Post titled: “Elon Musk has your Social Security number. It's as scary as it sounds.”

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

There was no objection.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 5, 2025]

[OPINION] ELON MUSK HAS YOUR SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER. IT'S AS SCARY AS IT SOUNDS

(By Natasha Sarin)

David A. Lebrzyk had a volatile end to his 36 years serving the public at the Treasury Department last week. On Monday, he was the acting treasury secretary. By the end of the week, he had unexpectedly retired.

I worked with Lebrzyk when I was on President Joe Biden's Treasury team, so I am not an unbiased observer. But leaders on both sides of the aisle have positive things to say about him. President Donald Trump's nominee to be deputy treasury secretary, Michael Faulkender, recalled working with Lebrzyk during the first Trump administration and finding him “relaxed and under control” and not a political actor.

It was those traits that made him a natural fit to serve as Treasury's fiscal assistant secretary and oversee what is essentially the federal government's accounts payable department. It is an immensely important job: The Bureau of the Fiscal Service cuts the checks that go to households and businesses and, in recent years, has been at the front of the various debt showdowns, because only they can ascertain the “X” date when the government will, absent congressional action, hit the debt limit.

But it's not a political job. It's mechanical, keeping track of the money coming in and going out. This means the bureau has access to incredibly sensitive information about everyone in the country—all of our Social Security numbers and bank account information—because they need it to get people their tax refunds and Social Security checks.

Late last week, Lebrzyk left the agency after a rift with members of the so-called Department of Government Efficiency, who demanded access to Treasury's payments system. Secretary Scott Bessent then gave them that access, ostensibly because the team, which lacks the experience or background to handle such sensitive information, would be able to sift through government payments to cut fraudulent, wasteful spending.

Let's get some facts straight. It is totally reasonable to be concerned about fraudulent or mistaken payments made by the federal government. The Government Accountability Office recently estimated that somewhere between 3 and 7 percent of what the government pays out each year is fraud. That's nowhere near Elon Musk's pledge to cut \$2 trillion from the federal budget, but it is certainly not couch change.

Having access to Treasury's payments system isn't where Musk would go if he truly wants to make progress on waste, fraud and abuse. Here's why:

First, legally, it isn't the Bureau of the Fiscal Service's mandate to decide who is eligible for tax credits or which Social Security beneficiaries are worthy recipients of payments. The bureau does conduct a systemwide check against a “do not pay” list, to make sure it is not paying out to people who are perhaps deceased or members of known terrorist organizations.

But it is not their role to probe, for example, rampant fraud in the covid-19-era employee retention tax credit, and then decide which businesses look to be worthy recipients of the credit. That is a job for the Internal Revenue Service, which administers the program. The Bureau of the Fiscal Service just cuts the checks.

That's how it should be. The bureau has no way of identifying fraud across every program in the federal government. That's more

than \$5 trillion of payments each year, and more than 1 billion individual payments.

Being able to tell a fraudulent payment from a valid one requires information about the programs and the households and businesses getting the funds, and all of that information sits in the agencies, not in the payments system. That's part of why I am disheartened to see the Trump administration and Musk push to "delete" the IRS or dismantle the Education Department. These changes will lead to more government fraud, not less.

There are likely many ways the systems at the Bureau of the Fiscal Service could be run more efficiently. I spent two years with colleagues at the IRS, in part, working on upgrading its IT infrastructure, which dates in meaningful ways to the 1950s. I learned that government IT is a labyrinth of complexity and often out of date relative to private sector advances. My ardent hope was that Musk would be able to bring his substantial private-sector expertise and recruit skilled professionals who can help make government work better.

In recent days, Bessent has tried to make the case to lawmakers that is what Musk and DOGE teams' access to the payments system will accomplish. He says they have been given something called "read-only" access to make recommendations about improving government operations without the ability to actually stop or redirect particular payments, though some reporting has questioned that claim.

Be wary. Just a week ago, it would have been unimaginable for DOGE—or any Trump political appointees—to have access to this sensitive data and fragile payments infrastructure. It is natural to worry about the potential threats to data privacy, cybersecurity and the stability of the federal government that are ahead. There is no legitimate reason for them to have this access.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, it is being reported that Elon Musk has sent his creepy minions to illegally install a private server that is stealing people's information. They are using it to skirt laws about sensitive and possibly even classified information, giving them access to people's Social Security numbers, home addresses, and more.

What is happening is a crime, plain and simple. It is a crime. It violates the Privacy Act of 1974, the Federal Information Security Management Act of 2002, the Computer Fraud and Abuse Act, as well as provisions of the Internal Revenue Code.

Elon says it is a crime to expose who he has put in charge of the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I say to Elon that it is a crime to hide that from the American people. I, for one, am not going to stand by while he gets his grubby little billionaire hands all over our parents' and grandparents' Social Security checks. He better believe that he is going to be held accountable for all of this.

The truth is coming out. He is stealing from the American people, and we are not going to let him do it.

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

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I offer the gentleman from Massachusetts an opportunity for whatever comments he has remaining.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to close yet, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman brought up some pardons. A few minutes ago, I talked about how Trump pardoned a drug trafficker who let fentanyl pour into our country. Let's not forget he also pardoned over 1,000 people who beat cops and tried to kill them on January 6.

The last time I was on the floor, I went through some of the worst offenders he pardoned. Since then, we have learned even more about these convicted felons, these violent criminals, who are now roaming free in our communities thanks to Donald Trump and the Republicans.

Matthew Huttie is a man with 12 prior criminal convictions, including a shocking case where he pled guilty to brutally hitting his 3-year-old son, leaving bruises all over the child's backside and neck. After he was pardoned by Trump, Huttie went back to Indiana where he was killed during a violent confrontation with law enforcement. Huttie was a child abuser with a history of violence who put law enforcement in danger again after he was pardoned by Donald Trump.

Theodore Middendorf, accused of sexually assaulting a 7-year-old child, pled guilty to this horrific crime in 2024 and was sentenced to 19 years in prison, but that wasn't all. He also pled guilty to destroying government property using a flagpole as a weapon during the Capitol riot, and for that he was pardoned by Donald Trump.

□ 1315

Peter Schwartz is a man with 30 prior criminal convictions, including assaulting his wife, biting her and repeatedly punching her. The same man attacked police officers on January 6 with pepper spray. He is a repeat offender pardoned by Donald Trump.

Andrew Taake was arrested in 2016 for soliciting a minor online for sex, but his criminal history didn't stop there. He assaulted police officers with bear spray and a metal whip on January 6. He is another repeat offender pardoned by Donald Trump.

Kasey Hopkins has a criminal history so disturbing, it is hard to stomach. In 2002, he was convicted of forcible rape, where he choked his victim to the point of impairing her vision. This is the same man who has prior convictions for assaulting law enforcement and possessing controlled substances. He was here on January 6, and he was pardoned by Donald Trump.

David Daniel is facing charges for producing and possessing child pornography, disturbingly involving two young girls in his own family. Police

officers found evidence of child sexual abuse while they searched his home in connection with his arrest for assaulting police officers on January 6. He may have his sexual charges thrown out thanks to the fact that he was pardoned by Donald Trump.

Because of Donald Trump and the Republicans, we have child sex predators, domestic abusers, and violent criminals unleashed back onto our streets. I have to ask, how many American parents are sleeping easier tonight knowing these criminals are out there walking free thanks to Donald Trump? This is stomach churning.

It doesn't even stop there. We also have January 6 perpetrators who have been rearrested—yes, rearrested—on new charges even after being pardoned.

Daniel Ball, a convicted felon because of his involvement in the Capitol insurrection, was pardoned by Donald Trump on January 20 only to be rearrested 2 days later on gun charges.

Now, Trump is going after the law enforcement officers who helped put these criminals away.

America, your President is purging the police of anyone not loyal to him. Think about that. Let that sink in because these are the actions of a fascist.

More than half a dozen senior FBI executives have been ordered to retire or be fired by Monday. The Acting Director of the FBI said that the list of names of those involved in the Capitol riot investigations could number in the thousands.

How many police officers will Trump fire? How does any of this make any of us more safe?

My colleagues need to wake up. I mean, purging the police of anyone who goes after criminals, we know how this ends. We know what the message this sends is. Trump is telling America that violence is fine as long as his people do it.

Republicans are releasing violent child predators, domestic abusers, and sexual offenders back into our communities and, at the same time, investigating and firing the real law enforcement officers, the heroes who are actually upholding the rule of law.

Guess what. I won't be complicit. They are about to run into a massive wall of resistance, and that wall is us.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair and also to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, I have so much more I want to say, but this all really boils down to one question: Whose side are you on, Mr. Speaker? Whose side are you on?

Are you on the side of the American people or the billionaires who are stealing from them?

Are you on the side of law enforcement or the guy who pardoned the drug dealer who let in all the fentanyl?

Are you on the side of workers or the robber barons who want to fleece people out of their paychecks and rob them of their hard-earned benefits?

Are you on the side of the American taxpayers or Elon Musk, a nepo baby who sucks up government subsidies and uses tax money to enrich himself while spreading hate and lies on his broken website?

Democrats know what side we are on. We are on the side of the people. We are going to continue to show up, and we are going to continue to fight back.

Mr. Speaker, I urge everybody to vote “no” on this rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, I just have to say that I am appalled. I understand they get the right to say whatever they want to during this time of debate on the rule for the HALT Fentanyl Act. I understand that, but they say you have to choose what side you are on, then bring up Elon Musk, and then say vote “no.” This bill has nothing to do with Elon Musk. This bill is about fentanyl-related substances and fentanyl analogues. It perplexes me, other than it is an attempt to confuse everybody on what this bill is about.

If they want to make all those statements, they can, but I would think they would be in favor of getting this bill done. If you are going to choose to say whose side you are on with this bill, you are making a choice. You are making a choice. We have an opportunity today, right here and now, to pass a rule and then tomorrow to pass a bill that will make a step forward in stopping the cartels, the Chinese precursors, and the folks who are doing the bad things in our country and in other countries from bringing their substances into this country and trying to use a gimmick, a chemical technique, saying that it is not really fentanyl, that it is a fentanyl analogue, and get around our laws.

That is what this bill is about. Every Member ought to be in favor of that. Why you wouldn't be in favor of at least bringing that bill to the floor and having a vote on it is beyond me. If we are choosing sides, I am going to choose to take a step forward. I am going to take a step forward to try to stop this scourge of fentanyl poisoning, fentanyl analogue poisoning, and fentanyl-related substances coming into our country. That is the side I am going to choose.

I understand they want to talk about all kinds of other things. I think it is a pretty darn good bill, and I think we should pass it.

Now, let me get to my script. I would like to reiterate the importance of the bill to permanently schedule fentanyl analogues as schedule I while still allowing for research into these substances.

This is one small step in fighting the opioid crisis our country faces. If we allow this temporary extension to expire in March—as it will if we take no action, if we choose the wrong side today and tomorrow—it will bring back the incentives for traffickers to bring these fentanyl analogues and fentanyl-related substances into our country.

I truly don't believe my colleagues on the other side want that. I understand they get fired up on the floor sometimes and say things that maybe later, in retrospect, they think maybe they shouldn't have gone that far.

If we are going to choose sides, I urge everybody to pass the rule and choose the side of stopping the fentanyl scourge in our country, the fentanyl analogue scourge in our country, and urge the passage of this rule and for final passage of the underlying bill.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 93 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert the following:

That immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill consisting of the text of H.R. 4531 of the 118th Congress, as passed by the House, to reauthorize certain programs that provide for opioid use disorder prevention, recovery, and treatment, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 4531.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

EMERGENCY WILDFIRE FIGHTING TECHNOLOGY ACT OF 2025

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 836) to require the Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Chief of the Forest Service, and the Secretary of the Interior to conduct an evaluation with respect to the use of the container aerial firefighting system (CAFFS), and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 836

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Emergency Wildfire Fighting Technology Act of 2025”.

SEC. 2. CONTAINER AERIAL FIREFIGHTING SYSTEM (CAFFS).

(a) EVALUATION.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the National Interagency Aviation Committee and the Interagency Airtanker Board, shall jointly conduct an evaluation of the container aerial firefighting system to assess the use of such system to mitigate and suppress wildfires.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the National Interagency Aviation Committee and the Interagency Airtanker Board, shall jointly submit to the appropriate committees a report that includes the results of the evaluation required under subsection (a).

(c) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate committees” means—

(1) the Committees on Agriculture and Natural Resources of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committees on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry and Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 836, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise in strong support of Congressman VALADAO's bill, the Emergency Wildfire Fighting Technology Act of 2025. This timely legislation offers us a chance to equip land managers with another tool in their arsenal to combat the catastrophic wildfire crisis by testing a new and innovative method for wildfire suppression.

Last month, wildfires in southern California took the lives of at least 29 people and changed thousands of lives forever. These fires destroyed more than 16,000 structures and racked up untold fire suppression costs and economic damages.

This tragedy is a wake-up call for millions of Americans and demonstrates just how important it is to proactively address the wildfire crisis. Unfortunately, decades of inadequate forest management have created an unprecedented forest health crisis. Across our country, 1 billion acres are now at risk of wildland fire. In the absence of dramatic change, the future outlook remains bleak.

When it comes to fighting these out-of-control infernos, it is critical that we utilize all available technologies that could improve the cost efficiency and effectiveness of fire suppression. Wildland firefighters on the front lines of these disasters must have all the tools and methods available to fight fires and protect lives and property.

Aircraft and helicopters provide life-saving support to ground crews, often by delivering water or fire retardant. In order to drop water or fire retardant from a plane or helicopter, the aircraft must be designed or retrofitted for such purpose, which limits the number of aircraft available.

Representative VALADAO has worked with various stakeholders who have developed and improved container aerial firefighting systems that drop water or fire retardant from aircraft via disposable containers. This technology could decrease the response time to wildfires by increasing the number of aircraft available, which could, in turn, save lives and critical infrastructure.

This technology is not new and is used successfully in other parts of the world. However, U.S. wildland firefighting agencies have not recently studied the system.

H.R. 836 would require the U.S. Forest Service and the Department of the Interior to evaluate the use of container aerial firefighting systems in response to wildfires. The evaluation will focus on effectiveness, cost, ease of delivery, and safety.

Directing our wildfire firefighting agencies to study new and emerging technologies is a win for the wildland firefighting crews and a win for those who live in vulnerable, fire-prone areas.

I applaud Congressman VALADAO for his leadership on this important topic. His legislation passed the House unanimously last year, and it has also passed the House twice with bipartisan support as part of the Fix Our Forests Act.

Mr. Speaker, I support the bill and reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in support of this legislation introduced by the gentleman from California (Mr. VALADAO).

In a few minutes, I will also have a lot to say about one of the bills that

was abruptly and outrageously pulled from our agenda today, but right now, I am happy to support my friend's bill.

I point out that the text of this bill passed the House as part of Chair WESTERMAN's H.R. 471 less than 2 weeks ago. I recognize that this is the beginning of a new Congress. Things are pretty chaotic, and our friends across the aisle want to appear busy amidst all the unconstitutional chaos and illegal action that is flooding our in-boxes and our newspapers, and we are constantly on the defensive because our democracy is under attack by someone who doesn't want to be a President—he wants to be a king—and has no regard for Article I of the Constitution.

We have silence from our friends across the aisle about all of that, but I guess we have time today to move a bill that we have already passed and that nobody opposes. Congratulations for this particular head-scratcher.

□ 1330

It is a real missed opportunity since we could be using this time to talk about critical issues like the Federal wildland firefighting pay and benefits that are set to expire a few weeks from now.

I think there is bipartisan support to extend those, but I can't get my friends across the aisle to talk about that, let alone come together and move some legislation to get it done.

Of course, fixing firefighter pay wasn't in the recent Republican package. It is not on the agenda today either. I hope we get to it at some point, but we are not doing it today, and that is a shame.

We should also be talking about disaster relief for California, but that is not on the agenda today either. Since we are considering this bill for a second time, Groundhog Day on this bill, instead of all of the other priorities, I will say committee Democrats continue to support this bill.

There is no opposition to this bill. We are going to pass it again and again, maybe, if we run out of other things to do this in this Congress.

The legislation would require relevant Federal agencies to complete an updated evaluation of the Container Aerial Firefighting System to support wildland fire mitigation and suppression efforts across the country. The system involves using a box or a container for aerial drops of water or fire retardant.

Its proponents claim that the utilization of this technology could improve delivery time and make it easier for aircrafts to fight fires. That is fine. That is a good thing.

However, back in 2011, the Forest Service conducted a study and determined that this particular system did not meet existing standards and posed safety risks to our communities and forests. Since that initial report, there have been technological advancements.

This bill aims to take another look at a potentially useful tool while en-

suring the Forest Service retains its authority to decide if the tool is ready to use or not. This is an important safeguard for wildland firefighters and the communities who are impacted by the wildfire crisis.

As we saw in the recent southern California fires, the climate crisis is clearly increasing the severity and duration of wildfire season. Evaluating new technology that can help keep communities safe needs to be a priority.

This bill is one of many examples of the potential for truly bipartisan collaboration on the issue of wildfires. I hope we can keep this work going. I hope we can extend it to actually be a permanent fix for the firefighter pay problem that we need to address.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes," and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friends across the aisle for their overwhelming support of Representative VALADAO's bill. We should have that kind of support for a bill that is addressing a huge issue in our country with wildland fire and the dangers that it imposes.

Mr. Speaker, I believe you and Mr. VALADAO both serve on the Committee on Appropriations where Republicans brought an Interior appropriations bill to the floor with firefighter pay funding in that bill, and it was voted down by our friends across the aisle.

We do need to take care of our firefighters. When we get bills on the floor that increase pay for firefighters, I would hope we could get more bipartisan support on that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. VALADAO), the lead sponsor of the bill.

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the Emergency Wildfire Fighting Technology Act of 2025, which would dramatically increase the number of airlift assets available for wildfire emergencies.

Containerized Aerial Firefighting Systems, or CAFFS, are airdrop-capable disposable containers for water or fire retardant, which can be dropped from much higher altitudes and with less visibility than current aerial firefighting operations.

Current operations depend on single-mission aircraft, but CAFFS can be used by any standard cargo plane. The use of CAFFS provides for more coverage for firefighters on the ground and allows teams to quickly respond to prevent smaller fires from raging out of control.

These systems are used by other countries, but the United States has not utilized them. We have the technology that we can deploy to stop or minimize the devastation these fires cause, and we should be using it.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chair WESTERMAN and his staff at the Committee on Natural Resources for their work on this important bill to combat and contain wildfires in a quicker and more efficient way.

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

Mr. Speaker, I certainly didn't think I was engaging in personalities by talking about a President that wants to be a king. I thought I was just acknowledging the reality of what is happening in this country.

I was also referring to these 19-year-olds in hoodies that have been given read-write access to our most sensitive, personal data who are inside the Treasury Department's payment system right now rummaging through our private information doing who knows what.

We can't even get answers because our friends across the aisle don't want to talk about it. They want to rerun all these bills that we have already passed and that are, frankly, not opposed, and this is a waste of our time here on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" again on this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Again, I would remind Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 836 is a good, commonsense piece of legislation that has passed the House three times on a bipartisan basis.

I commend Representative VALADAO for his proven leadership on bipartisan solutions that meaningfully improve forest health and reduce wildfires. If we could get the Senate to act on some of these bills, we wouldn't have to pass them so many times.

I appreciate Representative VALADAO being so persistent and continuing to work on his good legislation. I encourage adoption of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 836.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE OF PLEASANT VALLEY RANGER DISTRICT ADMINISTRATIVE SITE TO GILA COUNTY, ARIZONA

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 837) to require the Secretary of Agriculture to convey the Pleasant Valley Ranger District Administrative Site to Gila County, Arizona.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 837

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

SECTION 1. CONVEYANCE OF PLEASANT VALLEY RANGER DISTRICT ADMINISTRATIVE SITE TO GILA COUNTY, ARIZONA.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COUNTY.—The term "County" means Gila County, Arizona.

(2) MAP.—The term "map" means the map entitled "Pleasant Valley Admin Site Proposal" and dated September 23, 2021.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Chief of the Forest Service.

(b) CONVEYANCE REQUIRED.—Subject to this section, if the County submits to the Secretary a written request for conveyance of the property described in subsection (c) not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall convey to the County all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the property described in subsection (c).

(c) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The property referred to in subsection (b) is the parcel of real property, including all land and improvements, generally depicted as "Gila County Area" on the map, consisting of approximately 232.9 acres of National Forest System land located in the Tonto National Forest in Arizona.

(2) MAP.—

(A) MINOR ERRORS.—The Secretary may correct minor errors in the map.

(B) AVAILABILITY.—A copy of the map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Forest Service.

(3) SURVEY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the National Forest System land to be conveyed under subsection (b) shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary.

(d) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The conveyance under subsection (b) shall be—

(1) subject to valid existing rights;

(2) made without consideration;

(3) made by quitclaim deed; and

(4) subject to such other terms and conditions as the Secretary considers to be appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(e) COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.—As a condition of the conveyance under subsection (b), the County shall pay all costs associated with the conveyance, including the cost of—

(1) a survey, if necessary, under subsection (c)(3);

(2) any environmental analysis or resource survey required under Federal law; and

(3) any analysis required to comply with division A of subtitle III of title 54, United States Code (commonly referred to as the "National Historic Preservation Act").

(f) ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS.—Notwithstanding section 120(h)(3)(A) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9620(h)(3)(A)), the Secretary shall not be required to provide any covenant or warranty for the land and improvements conveyed to the County under subsection (b).

(g) USE OF LAND.—The land conveyed to the county under subsection (b) shall be used by the County only for the purposes of serving and supporting veterans of the Armed Forces.

(h) REVERSION.—If any land conveyed under subsection (b) is used in a manner that is inconsistent with the requirements of subsection (g), all right, title, and interest in and to the land shall revert to the United States, at the discretion of the Secretary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 837, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 837, which is led by my friend from Arizona, Representative CRANE.

This is a good bill that would transfer land from the Forest Service to create a retreat facility in Gila County, Arizona, for veterans and their families. Over 5,000 veterans call Gila County home, and there are over 500,000 veterans in all of Arizona.

Creating this facility will help the brave men and women who have served our country find healing, reconnect with nature, and ease the transition back to civilian life.

Nearly 60 percent of the land in Gila County is Federally owned, which creates significant limitations on available land for commendable efforts like the veterans' retreat center. The proposed location of this new center is a Forest Service site that is scheduled to be torn down.

This 232-acre site includes 17 buildings, 2 residences, 2 barracks, a historic ranger house and barn, and helipads.

Gila County plans to remodel and renovate many of the buildings to provide an excellent experience for veterans and their families. Repurposing the site is a win-win, as it will be a great resource for Arizona's veterans while freeing the Forest Service from maintaining property it no longer needs.

I commend Representative CRANE for his leadership on this effort on behalf of his constituents. As a veteran himself, I know he understands how important this center will be for his community. His diligent work with Gila County and the Forest Service has led to this important effort, which will make a meaningful difference in the lives of Arizona's veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I support the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation. My Democratic colleagues and I agree that it is a good idea to authorize the conveyance of the Pleasant Valley Ranger District Administrative Site to Gila County in Arizona.

However, I do want to talk about the broader context for this bill because it

was supposed to be considered today alongside a Democratic-led bill, the National Museum of Play Recognition Act. It is about as innocuous as it gets.

This is a bill that has a Republican co-lead. It would merely confer the title of “national” to this museum in Rochester, New York, which is a unique institution dedicated to the exploration of how play serves to promote learning, creativity, discovery, and cultural history.

The bill wouldn’t provide Federal funding or any other benefits that my friends across the aisle could object to. I am talking about conferring an honorary title on a children’s museum. It has areas for kids to play and imagine that they are in Sesame Street or the Berenstain Bears books.

Unfortunately, House Republicans have pulled the bill from today’s agenda at the last minute because we are told that many Republicans think the museum is too woke and too DEI. That is right. That is the explanation we have been given for why the deal is off and the Democratic bill can’t be considered today.

I don’t know the names of who made this decision or what specific complaints are behind it, but I am guessing that some of my Republican colleagues don’t like the fact that the museum currently has a small temporary exhibit called Black Doll Designers that lets visitors “learn about the pivotal role that Black designers have played in diversifying toy aisles.”

In September, the museum also posted on Instagram about Hispanic Ballerina Barbie and how the My First Barbie line of dolls “come in various ethnicities and styles, encouraging inclusivity and diversity. . . .”

That doesn’t strike me as controversial or offensive in any way, but is that why we can’t have a vote on this bill here today? Some unidentified Republicans are triggered by that, by Hispanic Ballerina Barbie, or are our Republican friends just taking their orders from the far-right website Breitbart, which posted yesterday, attacking this museum for its content and for offering what it called diversity and inclusion internships. I guess those are dirty words these days.

That is how it works these days. Shortly after the Breitbart post went up, this bill disappeared from the agenda. It was pulled. That is how it works these days. Breitbart posts something. Congress reacts. Elon Musk tweets. Republicans in Congress walk away from a bipartisan budget deal.

Mr. Speaker, this is disgusting. Are my colleagues now puppets on a string, something that maybe should be an exhibit in the play museum that we are talking about here? It sure would seem so.

There is nothing more I can say. I believe this is disgusting. I will save my comments about the remaining bill on today’s agenda for later, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from

Arizona (Mr. CRANE), the lead sponsor of this bill about a veterans’ retreat center.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of my bill, which passed the House last Congress and was the first piece of legislation I introduced in my first term.

It is a testament to veterans in Arizona. Specifically, my bill would enable Gila County, Arizona, to operate a veterans’ center on 232 acres in Young, Arizona.

As a former Navy Seal, I know the importance of providing this resource cannot be understated. This legislation will serve our State and its heroes well.

The veterans’ center would protect and maintain the rich history of the property while providing family housing, meeting and activity spaces, resource rooms, veteran ceremonial grounds, and outdoor recreation.

It would be the first of its kind in northern Arizona, providing resources and support to primarily rural veterans and their families.

Furthermore, this legislation is an exemplary model of efficient land management. Out West, the Federal Government retains vast amounts of land, limiting States’ ability to maintain, conserve, recreate, and responsibly produce on lands within their own State.

□ 1345

Mr. Speaker, anytime Congress can vote on legislation that returns power to the States is a good thing.

In this case, veterans of northern Arizona will get a space to heal and reconnect with their families after putting their lives on the line for the peace and freedom of all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR), who helped lay the foundation for this effort, as well as Senator KELLY, who is leading this bill in the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that we can get this bill across the finish line, and I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, I will close by saying I support this legislation. As we have already heard, this is a property that is adjacent to the rural town of Young, Arizona, surrounded by the Gila National Forest and formerly a Forest Service office building and administrative site that is no longer used by the agency.

This conveyance will provide Gila County with the opportunity to do something productive and important with the property. It will establish a veterans retreat and community center. That is a worthy goal. It will support and uplift our deserving community of veterans in that location, and the partnership made possible by this bill would provide some new life to deteriorating buildings, barns, barracks, and existing wastewater systems.

This is a bill that passed the House last Congress. It is unfortunate that

the Senate didn’t take it up. Hopefully, this time around, they will, and we can help fulfill Gila County’s goal in creating what they have described as “the ultimate experience for veterans and their families.” We support all of that.

If this bill does become law, I hope our Federal Government will be sufficiently staffed to carry it out. With furloughs, firings, and attempts at encouraging early retirement, including a whole bunch of lawless attempts that I wish my friends across the aisle were a little more concerned about, we are already seeing basic government functions at risk.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues across the aisle to tell their friends in the White House to look before they leap and to stop dismantling the offices that serve our constituents.

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I applaud Representative CRANE for his leadership in this effort. Representative CRANE honorably and bravely served our Nation, and now, he is providing exemplary service to his constituents by championing this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 837.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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 47 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1618

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LALOTA) at 4 o’clock and 18 minutes 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:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 93; and

Adoption of House Resolution 93, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant

to clause 9 of rule XX, the remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 27, HALT ALL LETHAL TRAFFICKING OF FENTANYL ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 93) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 27) to amend the Controlled Substances Act with respect to the scheduling of fentanyl-related substances, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 212, nays 208, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 30]

YEAS—212

Aderholt	Fleischmann	Loudermilk
Alford	Flood	Lucas
Allen	Fong	Luttrell
Amodei (NV)	Fox	Mace
Arrington	Franklin, Scott	Mackenzie
Babin	Fry	Malliotakis
Bacon	Fulcher	Maloy
Baird	Garbarino	Mann
Balderson	Gill (TX)	Massie
Barr	Gimenez	Mast
Barrett	Goldman (TX)	McCaul
Baumgartner	Gonzales, Tony	McClain
Bean (FL)	Gooden	McClintock
Begich	Gosar	McCormick
Bentz	Graves	McDowell
Bergman	Green (TN)	McGuire
Bice	Greene (GA)	Messmer
Biggs (AZ)	Griffith	Meuser
Biggs (SC)	Grothman	Miller (IL)
Bilirakis	Guest	Miller (OH)
Boebert	Guthrie	Miller (WV)
Bost	Hageman	Mills
Brecheen	Hamadeh (AZ)	Moolenaar
Bresnahan	Haridopolos	Moore (AL)
Buchanan	Harrigan	Moore (NC)
Burchett	Harris (MD)	Moore (UT)
Burlison	Harris (NC)	Moore (WV)
Calvert	Harshbarger	Moran
Cammack	Hern (OK)	Murphy
Carey	Higgins (LA)	Nehls
Carter (GA)	Hill (AR)	Newhouse
Carter (TX)	Houchin	Norman
Cline	Hudson	Nunn (IA)
Cloud	Huizenga	Obernolte
Clyde	Hunt	Ogles
Cole	Hurd (CO)	Onder
Collins	Issa	Owens
Comer	Jack	Palmer
Crane	Jackson (TX)	Perry
Crank	James	Pfuger
Crawford	Johnson (LA)	Reschenthaler
Crenshaw	Johnson (SD)	Rogers (AL)
Davidson	Jordan	Rogers (KY)
De La Cruz	Joyce (OH)	Rose
DesJarlais	Joyce (PA)	Rouzer
Diaz-Balart	Kean	Roy
Donalds	Kelly (MS)	Rulli
Downing	Kelly (PA)	Rutherford
Dunn (FL)	Kennedy (UT)	Salazar
Edwards	Kiggans (VA)	Scalise
Ellzey	Kiley (CA)	Schmidt
Emmer	Kim	Schweikert
Estes	Knott	Scott, Austin
Evans (CO)	Kustoff	Self
Ezell	LaHood	Sessions
Fallon	LaLota	Shreve
Fedorchak	LaMalfa	Simpson
Feenstra	Langworthy	Smith (MO)
Finstad	Latta	Smith (NE)
Fischbach	Lawler	Smith (NJ)
Fitzgerald	Lee (FL)	Smucker
Fitzpatrick	Letlow	Stauber

Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Strong
Stutzman
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons

Adams
Aguilar
Amo
Ansari
Auchincloss
Balint
Barragan
Beatty
Bell
Bera
Beyer
Bishop
Bonamici
Boyle (PA)
Brown
Brownley
Budzinski
Bynum
Cabajal
Carson
Carter (LA)
Casar
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cherfilus-
McCormick

Chu
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conaway
Connolly
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crockett
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Davis (NC)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
Dexter
Dingell
Doggett
Elfreth
Escobar
Espallat
Evans (PA)
Fields
Figures
Fletcher
Foster
Foushee
Frankel, Lois
Friedman
Frost
Garamendi
Garcia (CA)
Garcia (IL)

Ciscomani
DeSaulnier
Grijalva
Hinson
Jayapal

Turner (OH)
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Dwyne
Van Orden
Wagner
Walberg
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)

NAYS—208

Garcia (TX)
Gillen
Golden (ME)
Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Gonzalez, V.
Goodlander
Gottheimer
Gray
Green, Al (TX)
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jacobs
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy (NY)
Khanna
Krishnamoorthi
Landsman
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latimer
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Levin
Liccardo
Lieu
Lofgren
Lynch
Magaziner
Mannion
Matsui
McBath
McBride
McClain Delaney
McClellan
McCollum
McDonald Rivet
McGarvey
McGovern
McIver
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Mfume
Min
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Morrison
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Nadler
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Ocasio-Cortez

NOT VOTING—13

Leger Fernandez
Luna
Miller-Meeks
Mullin
Pettersen

□ 1649

Mr. COSTA changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. SIMPSON changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Westerman
Wied
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

Olszewski
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pelosi
Perez
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Pou
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Randall
Raskin
Riley (NY)
Rivas
Ross
Ruiz
Ryan
Salinas
Sanchez
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Simon
Smith (WA)
Sorensen
Soto
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Subramanyam
Suozi
Swalwell
Sykes
Takano
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Tran
Turner (TX)
Underwood
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Velazquez
Vindman
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Whitesides
Williams (GA)

Stated for:

Mrs. HINSON. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 30.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 215, noes 208, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 31]

AYES—215

Aderholt	Gonzales, Tony	Miller (OH)
Alford	Gooden	Miller (WV)
Allen	Gosar	Miller-Meeks
Amodei (NV)	Graves	Mills
Arrington	Green (TN)	Moolenaar
Babin	Greene (GA)	Moore (AL)
Bacon	Griffith	Moore (NC)
Baird	Grothman	Moore (UT)
Balderson	Guest	Moore (WV)
Barr	Guthrie	Moran
Barrett	Hageman	Murphy
Bean (FL)	Hamadeh (AZ)	Nehls
Begich	Haridopolos	Newhouse
Bentz	Harrigan	Norman
Bergman	Harris (MD)	Nunn (IA)
Bice	Harris (NC)	Obernolte
Biggs (AZ)	Harshbarger	Ogles
Biggs (SC)	Hern (OK)	Onder
Bilirakis	Higgins (LA)	Owens
Boebert	Hill (AR)	Palmer
Bost	Hinson	Perry
Brecheen	Houchin	Pfuger
Bresnahan	Hudson	Reschenthaler
Buchanan	Huizenga	Rogers (AL)
Burchett	Hunt	Rogers (KY)
Calvert	Hurd (CO)	Rose
Cammack	Issa	Rouzer
Carey	Jack	Roy
Carter (GA)	Jackson (TX)	Rulli
Carter (TX)	James	Rutherford
Ciscomani	Johnson (LA)	Salazar
Cline	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
Cloud	Jordan	Schmidt
Clyde	Joyce (OH)	Schweikert
Cole	Joyce (PA)	Scott, Austin
Collins	Kean	Self
Comer	Kelly (MS)	Sessions
Crane	Kelly (PA)	Shreve
Crank	Kennedy (UT)	Simpson
Crawford	Kiggans (VA)	Smith (MO)
Crenshaw	Kiley (CA)	Smith (NE)
Davidson	Kim	Smith (NJ)
De La Cruz	Knott	Smucker
DesJarlais	Kustoff	Stauber
Diaz-Balart	LaHood	Stefanik
Donalds	LaHood	Steil
Downing	LaLota	Steube
Dunn (FL)	LaMalfa	Strong
Edwards	Langworthy	Stutzman
Ellzey	Latta	Taylor
Emmer	Lawler	Tenney
Estes	Lee (FL)	Thompson (PA)
Evans (CO)	Letlow	Loudermilk
Ezell	Lucas	Tiffany
Fallon	Luna	Timmons
Fedorchak	Luttrell	Turner (OH)
Feenstra	Mace	Valadao
Finstad	Mackenzie	Van Drew
Fischbach	Malliotakis	Van Dwyne
Fitzgerald	Maloy	Van Orden
Fitzpatrick	Mann	Wagner
Flood	Massie	Walberg
Fong	Mast	Walberg (TX)
Fox	McCaul	Webster (FL)
Franklin, Scott	McClain	Westerman
Fry	McClintock	Wied
Fulcher	McCormick	Williams (TX)
Garbarino	McDowell	Wilson (SC)
Gill (TX)	McGuire	Wittman
Gimenez	Messmer	Womack
Goldman (TX)	Meuser	Yakym
	Miller (IL)	Zinke

NOES—208

Adams	Garcia (TX)	Olszewski
Aguilar	Gillen	Omar
Amo	Golden (ME)	Pallone
Ansari	Goldman (NY)	Panetta
Auchincloss	Gomez	Pappas
Balint	Gonzalez, V.	Pelosi
Barragán	Goodlander	Perez
Beatty	Gottheimer	Peters
Bell	Gray	Pingree
Bera	Green, Al (TX)	Pocan
Beyer	Harder (CA)	Pou
Bishop	Hayes	Pressley
Bonamici	Himes	Quigley
Boyle (PA)	Horsford	Ramirez
Brown	Houlahan	Randall
Brownley	Hoyer	Raskin
Budzinski	Hoyle (OR)	Riley (NY)
Bynum	Huffman	Rivas
Carbajal	Ivey	Ross
Carson	Jackson (IL)	Ruiz
Carter (LA)	Jacobs	Ryan
Casar	Jeffries	Salinas
Case	Johnson (GA)	Sánchez
Casten	Johnson (TX)	Scanlon
Castor (FL)	Kamlager-Dove	Schakowsky
Castro (TX)	Kaptur	Schneider
Cherfilus-	Keating	Scholten
McCormick	Kelly (IL)	Schrier
Chu	Kennedy (NY)	Scott (VA)
Cisneros	Khanna	Scott, David
Clark (MA)	Krishnamoorthi	Sewell
Clarke (NY)	Landsman	Sherman
Cleaver	Larsen (WA)	Sherrill
Clyburn	Larson (CT)	Simon
Cohen	Latimer	Smith (WA)
Conaway	Lee (NV)	Sorensen
Connolly	Lee (PA)	Soto
Correa	Levin	Stansbury
Costa	Liccardo	Stanton
Courtney	Lieu	Stevens
Craig	Lofgren	Strickland
Crockett	Lynch	Subramanyam
Crow	Magaziner	Suozi
Cuellar	Mannion	Swalwell
Davids (KS)	Matsui	Sykes
Davis (IL)	McBath	Takano
Davis (NC)	McBride	Thanedar
Dean (PA)	McClain Delaney	Thompson (CA)
DeGette	McClellan	Thompson (MS)
DeLauro	McCollum	Titus
DeBene	McDonald Rivet	Tlaib
Deluzio	McGarvey	Tokuda
Dexter	McGovern	Tonko
Dingell	McIver	Torres (CA)
Doggett	Meeke	Torres (NY)
Elfreth	Menendez	Trahan
Escobar	Meng	Tran
Espallat	Mfume	Turner (TX)
Evans (PA)	Min	Underwood
Fields	Moore (WI)	Vargas
Figures	Morelle	Vasquez
Fletcher	Morrison	Veasey
Foster	Moskowitz	Velázquez
Foushee	Moulton	Vindman
Frankel, Lois	Mrvan	Wasserman
Friedman	Nadler	Schultz
Frost	Neal	Waters
Garamendi	Neguse	Watson Coleman
Garcia (CA)	Norcross	Whitesides
Garcia (IL)	Ocasio-Cortez	Williams (GA)

NOT VOTING—10

Baumgartner	Jayapal	Spartz
Burlison	Leger Fernandez	Wilson (FL)
DeSaulnier	Mullin	
Grijalva	Pettersen	

□ 1657

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. BAUMGARTNER. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted AYE on Roll Call No. 31.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was unable to vote today, as I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 30, on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 93, and

NO on Roll Call No. 31, H. Res. 93, the Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 27, the HALT Fentanyl Act.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. PETERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I recently gave birth and am unable to travel to DC to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 30 and NO on Roll Call No. 31.

REMEMBERING CAPITOL POLICE RECRUIT OFFICER CHRISTOPHER KATZ

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

Mr. STEIL. Mr. Speaker, on this past Saturday, February 1, 2025, United States Capitol Police Recruit Officer Christopher Katz was tragically killed in a car accident in Glynn County, Georgia. Five other Capitol Police recruits were seriously injured in the crash, as well.

Chris was an ambitious young man who had dreams of serving his country and his community. He had several career options in law enforcement but chose the United States Capitol Police due to their rich history and dedicated service to the United States.

He had tremendous respect for the critical role in protecting the Nation's elected officials and the institutions of democracy. Chris' family and friends remember him for his unwavering dedication to service and his love of life.

He was a young man with a bright future taken far too soon, but he will be forever remembered for his passion, kindness, and commitment to making a difference. We are thankful for his service.

Every single day members of the Capitol Police put themselves in the line of danger to protect this great institution and those of us who work and visit here. Our prayers and sympathies are with the United States Capitol Police community, these officers, and their families.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself, Ranking Member JOE MORELLE, and the House of Representatives, I ask that the United States House of Representatives observe a moment of silence.

HONORING KEVIN JONES

(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 honor Mr. Kevin Jones, who retired as Brunswick police chief after an exceptional 30-year career in law enforcement.

His dedication to service has had a lasting impact on the community. Chief Jones served as Brunswick's police chief since February of 2019, focusing on modernizing policing practices, enhancing officer training, and improving public safety efforts.

His leadership emphasized transparency, accountability, and community trust, earning respect from citizens and city officials alike. Under his guidance, Brunswick experienced a significant reduction in crime, a revitalization of neighborhood watch programs, and improved police-community relations.

His dedication made Brunswick a safer place to live, strengthened ties between the community and law enforcement, and increased confidence in the department. Chief Jones announced his retirement in October of 2024, ensuring a smooth leadership transition for the department.

He has mentored many officers, ensuring the next generation of leaders is ready to step up. Chief Jones leaves behind a legacy of integrity, leadership, and service that will continue to inspire the community for many years to come.

FIGHTING FOR OUR FEDERAL WORKERS

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

Ms. MCCLELLAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak out on behalf of our beleaguered Federal workforce which is currently under attack by the Musk-Trump-Vance administration.

Trump's OMB nominee, Russell Vought, said: "We want the bureaucrats to be traumatically affected. When they wake up in the morning, we want them to not want to go to work because they are increasingly viewed as the villains. . . . We want to put them in trauma." Well, Mr. Speaker, they are in trauma.

Literally, on my way to the floor to vote tonight, I received a text from a Federal employee who said simply: "Help us!" Who exactly is the Musk-Trump-Vance administration terrorizing: the people who make sure your food is safe to eat, your water is clean to drink, and the air is clean to breathe; the people who work tirelessly to keep pregnant women, asthmatic children, and people with cancer from dying; the people who make sure you fly safely; and the people protecting American lives here and around the globe through diplomacy, intelligence gathering, and fighting crime.

Mr. Speaker, I see the Federal workforce. I am doing everything I can to help them. I won't quit. They shouldn't quit either.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MOORE of West Virginia). Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

CELEBRATING ALAN KINDER'S 100TH BIRTHDAY

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

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate an extraordinary milestone: The 100th birthday of Alan Kinder, a man whose life embodies resilience, courage, and a passion for service.

Alan's story is one of bravery, from storming Omaha Beach during the second wave of D-Day to surviving the Battle of the Bulge. After his heroic service in defense of our Nation, he returned home to build a life filled with family, purpose, and more adventure.

Alan has been both a witness to history and a keeper of it, reminding us all of the sacrifices made for our precious freedom. Yet, it is his warmth and compassion that shines the brightest.

Both Alan's kindness and the stories of his remarkable service have left an indelible mark on every person lucky enough to know him. On behalf of the Ninth District, I wish Alan a happy 100th birthday and entire 100th birthday year. I thank him for his service, his stories, and his example.

HOLD THE LINE

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

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to speak directly to the American people and to our Federal workers, not only across the country but especially in New Mexico.

I know that many are feeling frightened, uncertain, and under attack. I want them to know that Democrats have their back and are fighting back using every tool that we have. We are fighting back in the courts, the Congress, and in our communities. We are fighting back against an unqualified, unvetted billionaire who is stealing their data, taking their jobs, dismantling our Federal agencies, and freezing the funds that make our communities run.

Mr. Speaker, they have dedicated their careers to ensuring that this great Nation can serve our people. We say to them: Hold the line, because we have their backs.

REINSTATING OUR SERVICEMEMBERS

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

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, it seems like every day there has been such good news coming out of the White House. It is easy to lose track of some of the executive orders coming from President Trump, but I would like to bring attention to one today.

Once this executive order is in effect, there is nothing Democrats will be able to do to stop it. That is the executive order reinstating servicemembers discharged under the military's COVID-19 vaccination mandate.

It is hard to believe that only 4 years ago we had a President who was de-

manding that all our brave servicemembers had to take an experimental vaccine, and if they didn't take it, they would be removed from the service.

President Trump has reinstated these folks. President Trump is a great man of compassion. He is a man who respects independent thought; unlike a lot of people who feel: One guy who went to college told me this, so I better do it.

I know a lot of other people who didn't get the vaccine. They did a very good job of researching the vaccine and had solid reasons for not getting it. I thank President Trump for reinstating all of our brave servicemen who were unfairly forced from the military.

BLACK HISTORY MONTH

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

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I know that Black History Month is a time to celebrate and recommit to the fight for justice and Black liberation in Michigan's 12th Congressional District and beyond.

I am proud that I was born and raised in the most beautiful, Blackest city in the country, the city of Detroit, where movements are born and where history is made every single day. Time and time again, we see efforts to erase our history.

Systemic racism continues to be codified into our laws and into our budgets. I know the current administration is now attempting to dismantle foundational civil rights protections, diversity, equity, and inclusion, and roll back our hard-won progress here in our country.

No matter how much they want to whitewash it, they cannot erase Black history. Black history is American history. There would be no United States of America without the contributions of our Black neighbors. Black lives matter, and Black history matters.

SUPPORT FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

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

Mr. TURNER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to stand in unwavering support of our Nation's Federal employees, many of whom live and work across the Texas 18th Congressional District.

As a proud member of the Congressional Labor Caucus, I am here to say loud and clear: America needs its Federal workforce, and we will not sit by while their jobs, their rights, and their livelihoods are under attack.

Federal employees ensure the safety and well-being of every American, and these efforts to reduce Federal workers will only bring them harm. Thousands of Federal workers in Texas' 18th Congressional District serve vital roles, in-

cluding healthcare, transportation and safety, Social Security, and much more.

To every dedicated Federal employee, our message is clear. We have their back. We will fight in Congress to protect their rights, their jobs, and their ability to serve the American people. Their work does not go unrecognized.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to stand against this calculated attack on Federal workers and the values of public service.

□ 1715

PROTECTING FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, these are unprecedented and extraordinarily difficult times for our Federal employees. The Trump administration seems intent on dismantling much of the Federal Government in violation of the Constitution, Federal statutes, and Federal regulations.

The administration has relentlessly attacked Federal employees, subjecting them to chaos and fear. The administration has imposed a hiring freeze, offered deferred resignations, fired employees, put employees on leave, effectively reestablished schedule F, and ended telework and remote work.

The administration is not alone in attacking Federal employees. The House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, on which I serve, has held two hearings this Congress, and both were designed to demoralize Federal employees.

As I said at the first hearing, Federal employees deserve praise for their expertise, dedication, and service, not derision.

Let's be clear. What is motivating these actions? They are designed to get experts to quit the workforce.

U.S. GOVERNMENT SERVES AMERICAN PEOPLE, NOT WEALTHY SHAREHOLDERS

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

Mr. THANEDAR. Mr. Speaker, Elon Musk invested \$277 million into Donald Trump's election. I guess that is the price to take over our Federal Government. Elon Musk is worth over \$400 billion, meaning his contribution to Trump is the same as about \$130 for an average American.

Mr. Musk, the government is not a private enterprise. It serves the American people, not the wealthy shareholders.

Thousands will die around the world because USAID won't deliver lifesaving

food and medicine. Millions will lose control of their personal information, such as Social Security numbers, banking information, Social Security checks, and Medicare benefits.

Elon Musk does not care about us because he does not have to and does not want to. Rest assured, Democrats care, I care, and we will use every tool at our disposal to get rid of this unelected, power-hungry, egocentric billionaire.

IN SUPPORT OF FEDERAL WORKERS

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I rise for every American whose life has been made better because of the work of Federal civil servants.

President Donald Trump and his power-crazed posse of billionaire bosses are firing our Federal workers. Our quality of life is degraded and diminished because of that.

They are moving to install their unqualified followers to do the dirty work of a hostile takeover of every facet of our lives, like Medicaid, the National Weather Service, and the Department of Education.

Their deferred resignation plan is a scam. Firefighters, nurses, TSA agents, park rangers, and foreign aid workers are refusing to go quietly in the face of an authoritarian. I commend them.

America is indeed at a fork in the road. Do we want a qualified, respected workforce serving us, or do we want an army of clueless yes-men working to serve the selfish?

I know what I want, what the American people want, and what the American people deserve. It is a government that works for them. I thank our Federal workforce and our civil servants.

SUPPORTING FEDERAL WORKERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. IVEY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. IVEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. IVEY. Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Labor Caucus comes today to oppose the Trump administration's unlawful and unconstitutional attacks on Federal workers.

Our Federal workforce has the experience and expertise that America needs. We must protect the public. The

air that we breathe, the water we drink, the medicine we take, and the food that we eat hangs in the balance.

This fight is too important. We cannot allow the Trump administration to replace a competitive merit system with a political spoils system. That is why we will keep fighting in Congress and the courts. I have my colleagues with me today who have come to express their concerns.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. NORCROSS).

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, as co-chair of the Labor Caucus, I am here today to speak on something I didn't think we would ever have to. We have to talk about the hard work of our Federal workforce, those workers who get up every day to go to work, the ones who keep our food safe, the water safe to drink, and the air safe to breathe.

Federal workers are nurses. They are doctors. They are in the VA, taking care of our vets each and every day. They are civilian DOD workers. That is right. They are working in the Pentagon and around the world to make sure that our military is ready to go. They are the ones who are processing Social Security checks for our seniors. They are the TSA agents, who we see every time we go to the airport.

Trump is making it hard, almost impossible, for them to do their jobs. He wants them to quit. They dedicated their lives for us. Who is the Federal workforce? They are you and me.

They say they have to come back to the office when it is more efficient for a person, agreed upon with management, to work from a different location.

I suggest, if we really want to know where Federal workers are, look at the offices where the Member is supposed to be showing up. Tell me how many times they go to the office. That is what we are dealing with.

Trump is revoking their union contracts, the contracts which they negotiated legally and tried to enforce. It is so important. Trump doesn't have the authority to change these agreements, but he is doing it. It is going to take our courts to turn this around.

America's civil service is a merit system. Trump signed another executive order to remove jobs from the non-partisan civil service. Here we are, back again.

These civil servants wake up every day to help us. I am not seeing any of those civil servants flying their private airplanes like Mr. Musk and Mr. Trump. They are just regular people like us, trying to get by.

As we have this discussion with all the Labor Caucus, I want to take a minute to thank GLENN IVEY, who represents so many Federal workers back in his district, and STEPHEN LYNCH, who has been leading our fight at the Postal Service.

At the end of the day, we have to stick together. Right there, carved into the wood, it says, "Union," and that is what we have to have.

God bless them. I thank every Federal worker for what they do.

Mr. IVEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman IVEY for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, this is so important, yet we should be ashamed of the way the Trump administration has been absolutely attacking our Federal workers, the people who go to work every single day to do important functions.

They don't have any ulterior motive. They are making sure our senior citizens get their medications and that we take care of our veterans who need help. These are the kinds of things they do. They are servants to all of our people. They are doing their best job, yet they are being criticized.

I thank them, and I pledge to all of our Federal workers that I will be here to praise them, to protect them, and to say that they have not only every right but every privilege of serving the American people as they have done day in and day out.

Mr. Speaker, I say hooray to the workers who do so much every single day. They don't ask for any special awards but do the work that the people of the United States need. We have to thank them every single day for their work and not denigrate them as the Trump administration has done.

Mr. IVEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for her remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to Representative SANCHEZ.

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank GLENN IVEY for his wonderful work.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of our Nation's Federal workers. As a member of the Labor Caucus, I stand with the essential workers who provide critical services to the American public.

Make no mistake, we are seeing a direct attack on our democracy right now. Efforts to shut down Federal agencies are designed to erode our Nation's foundation. No one, not the President, not an unelected billionaire, has the right to singlehandedly dismantle Federal agencies created and funded by the Congress, yet that is exactly what is happening.

President Trump has surrendered control over to Elon Musk, allowing him to dismantle our institutions without any oversight. This is a blatant abuse of power, and it is happening on this Congress' watch.

They have attacked Federal workers, replacing skilled civil servants with political loyalists. They have targeted and smeared public employees who have served this country honorably, many for decades. They are even rejecting union contracts that were lawfully negotiated between the government and workers. This is union-busting, plain and simple.

As a former union member, I won't stand for that. These contracts are protected by law and cannot be changed

on a whim or, more likely, on a tantrum.

It gets worse. Elon Musk's DOGE has even infiltrated the Treasury Department. He and a bunch of twentysomethings now have access to the Federal payment system and the confidential data of almost every American.

Why on Earth do a bunch of kids who are not even legally old enough to rent a car need access to Americans' personal information and data? Why should they have their hands on our Social Security or Medicare payment or see whether we or a loved one has a disability or whether or not we received a tax refund?

This isn't just a violation of privacy. It is a breach of the trust of the American people who they put in government.

DOGE needs to be held accountable for its unlawful actions, and Democrats are and will continue to fight back. We are demanding hearings, investigations, and supporting lawsuits that seek to protect our constituents' very personal information.

We need the few Republicans in this body who care about the rule of law to join us in this fight. We need to defend Congress' constitutional authorities, the power of the purse, and oversight of the executive branch. We need Republicans to stand up for all Americans.

We want all Federal workers to please know that they are essential. America values them, needs them, and has their backs. When they are attacked, every American who depends on them is also attacked.

Mr. Speaker, I once again thank my colleague, Mr. GLENN IVEY, for yielding.

Mr. IVEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN).

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. IVEY for convening this Special Order hour and for his hard work on behalf of the Federal employees and all workers in his district. As a co-chair of the Congressional Labor Caucus, I am proud to stand with our essential workers who keep the government running every day.

Since day one of this administration, President Trump has relentlessly attacked Federal employees as he and Elon Musk seek to eliminate non-partisan, career public servant jobs across the country. These attacks on Federal workers are straight out of the Project 2025 playbook.

Unelected billionaire Elon Musk has been bulldozing through the Federal workforce, demanding the firing of hundreds of thousands of employees whose only fireable offense is trying to serve the American people.

□ 1730

Federal workers are nurses and doctors at veterans hospitals. They process Social Security checks for seniors. They are TSA agents and air traffic controllers who keep us safe when we fly.

More than 85 percent of the Federal workforce operates outside of Washington, D.C. In my home State of Wisconsin, there are 18,000 Federal civilian employees, including over 5,800 Federal workers in my district alone.

In the last 2 days, my office has gotten over 1,000 constituent calls with people angry, hurt, and terrified that the services they use every day will vanish along with the workers who make these programs run. An attack on Federal workers is an attack on the services that Americans rely on every day.

Elon Musk and Trump will continue to put lives at risk as they seek to cut \$4 trillion over the next 10 years to pay for tax cuts for Elon Musk, Donald Trump, and the wealthiest.

To all the selfless civil servants, our message is clear: America needs you, and we have your back. We are fighting in Congress to oppose Donald Trump and Elon Musk's baseless attacks on you and your important work. We urge you to stand strong.

Mr. IVEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his remarks.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ).

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank my incredible colleague GLENN IVEY for convening us here today and for the opportunity to speak.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in solidarity with our Nation's Federal workers, including the more than 22,000 who live and work in the great State of New Jersey.

Our Federal workforce is a vital cornerstone of our work to protect the most vulnerable amongst us, grow our economy, protect our national security, and to keep us safe.

In Newark, our air traffic controllers and TSA agents devote their careers to keeping our skies safe and getting us to where we need to go safely.

Social Security employees in the Hoboken field office assist our seniors and those with disabilities in receiving the benefits they have earned and depend on.

USCIS officials in Newark assist immigrant families with processing their visas, green cards, and applications for naturalization.

Our Nation runs because of Federal workers, and an attack on them is an attack on the services that Americans rely on every day.

Along with my Democratic colleagues, I want to make our message to Federal employees clear. We have your back, and we will not back down. We will continue to oppose this administration's baseless and lawless attempts to diminish the important work you do every day.

Our civil service is a merit system protected by the right to due process, and attempts to implement Schedule F, union bust, and undermine our collective bargaining process will be met with swift and unyielding resistance from me, the Congressional Labor Caucus, and my colleagues on this side of the aisle.

The decision to enter public service is an honorable one, and millions of Federal workers and retirees who have made that decision deserve our support.

Mr. IVEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MCCLAIN DELANEY).

Mrs. MCCLAIN DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, as a proud member of the Labor Caucus, I rise today to stand up against the administration's actions against our 2.2 million Federal workers, including 35,000 of them in the Sixth District of Maryland.

America's greatest asset is its people, and our dedicated civil servants are no exception.

I am so deeply troubled by the administration and Elon Musk's efforts and actions to access every Americans' data and to more importantly access the U.S. Treasury Department's Federal payment system, including U.S. taxpayers' confidential financial information to slash critical Federal programs and to threaten the termination of thousands of Federal workers.

I am even greater alarmed by the Trump administration's flagrant efforts to seek political retribution against Federal agents for past investigations, including investigating the violence that occurred on January 6.

Many Members feared for their lives that day, and insurrectionists violently assaulted officers tasked with protecting the people here in this building. Now, these agents are at risk for losing their livelihoods for following the law and doing their jobs.

All of this follows the Trump administration's OMB directive to illegally freeze congressionally approved Federal funding and its letter to more than 2 million Federal employees offering a buyout from service. I implore you, do not take that buyout. It is not to be trusted.

As the buyout letter says, we are truly at a fork in the road. Do we defend American workers and our institutions or gut the Federal agencies of the knowledge that fuels American innovation and strengthens our national security?

These attacks strike at the bedrock of our American values and represent an unprecedented power grab that undermines our democracy's checks and balances.

Many of these actions have not been authorized by Congress and rightfully belong under its purview.

While I have long believed in seeking common ground when governing, I must now stand my ground for the 35,000 government employees in my district and countless more across the country looking now for Congress to take action.

Yesterday, I joined a briefing with several colleagues from Virginia, Maryland, and other places along with members of AFGE, AFSCME, Democracy Forward, NTEU, IFPTE, NARFE,

NFFE, and AFL-CIO in conjunction to develop an action plan to better defend our workers at USAID, at DOL, at the Department of Education, at NOAA, and so many other agencies under imminent threat of mandated leave, termination, or closure.

In closing, from NIST to Fort Detrick to our National Fire Academy in the Sixth District, Federal workers in Maryland are counting on us, the people in this Chamber and in our communities, to stand up and speak up for them.

Mr. IVEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of our public servants as they face an unprecedented, illegal attack by the Trump administration.

Our Federal employees are part of every single community in America. They keep us safe. They sustain us, and they support us. Now, they are under attack.

Donald Trump and Elon Musk's attack on the Federal workforce is an illegal purge. Don't let anyone call it anything else. This is a purge. It is an unlawful attempt by a reality show wannabe king to install cronies and bootlickers.

Our public servants represent the best of us. They are selfless, determined, disciplined, and professional. They are everything that Donald Trump and his MAGA flunkies are not.

To our public servants I say this: Do not be afraid. Do not be intimidated. The law is on your side. We are still with you. A grateful Nation is still with you. You have dedicated your lives to the American people. You have made our country strong. Have faith that our country is strong enough to withstand the petty tantrums of a small, self-obsessed man who disgraces the very idea of public service with his every breath.

Now is the time for courage. I am grateful for your service. I believe in you.

Mr. IVEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LANDSMAN).

Mr. LANDSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support our Federal workers. These are public servants who live and work all over the country. The vast majority of our Federal workers do not live in the Washington, D.C., area. It is a big misconception. People think, well, these are Federal workers. They are just here in D.C.

They are in our districts. Each one of us has probably tens of thousands of Federal employees in our congressional districts, meaning that we serve them. It just so happens that they serve us.

Trump and Elon Musk have been setting these fires all over the Federal Government. They have launched this reckless trade war with China. They tried to stop Federal funding from going into our communities. These are our tax dollars. Trump gave an

unelected tech billionaire access to our Social Security data, to all of our data, to our Federal payment system, and empowered him to purge as many public servants from our Federal agencies as he possibly could.

One of those public servants is a constituent of mine in southwest Ohio. She lost her job. For 20 years, she worked at USAID leading the agency's famine early detection efforts. Her work ensured food reached children, families, and communities in crisis. She saved lives.

It is not just about food. Hunger fuels instability. When people are desperate, terrorism thrives. When the U.S. pulls back, it creates a vacuum for China to step in. This administration's actions are just cruel, and they are making our country and our world less safe.

Why are they purging our Federal workforce? They have got to find \$4 trillion—\$4 trillion that won't go to you or me or our communities. They are planning to use these dollars to pay for tax giveaways for the uberwealthy, for the Elon Musks of the world. They are stealing from our workers, our country, and our allies all so the uberwealthy can get wealthier. It has to be stopped. This Congress can stop it, but the majority has to step up.

Mr. IVEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CASTEN).

Mr. CASTEN. Mr. Speaker, last week I spent an afternoon at the National Air Traffic Control Center in Aurora, Illinois. I had been invited to discuss some work our office has been doing to make sure these folks are not penalized for seeking mental health care. None of us could have anticipated that our visit would be after the crash of American flight 5342 in Washington, but it is safe to say that that office was shook. Then we started talking about mental health.

One employee said that their staff still remembers the arson attack on the facility back in 2014 and that they were nervous that recent budget cuts have limited their ability to maintain security levels at the facility.

Another employee asked how should they interpret announcements from the Trump White House that Federal employees were going to get laid off. Would they have a job? If they got laid off, who was going to do their work? How would they continue to support their families?

A female air traffic controller asked why Donald Trump immediately blamed the crash on DEI hiring practices. It wasn't lost on any of us that our air traffic controllers, like our society, are not exclusively straight, White men. She was wondering if she was about to get fired solely on account of her gender.

Now, let that all sink in. These are hardworking Federal employees who have dedicated their lives to keeping our skies safe. They are overworked, underpaid, and now they are wondering

whether the President of the United States, his Republican enablers, and his IT goons are about to fire them, curtail their pay, and blame them for airline tragedies because of the way they look, who they love, and how they pray.

What possible good comes to the American people by having a bunch of stressed-out air traffic controllers?

The United States Government can't function without these nonpartisan civil servants: our air traffic controllers, our TSA agents, our VA hospital workers, and the people who make sure your Social Security payments get through.

Why would we want to break that? Maybe you want to break it because you are carrying out Russia's foreign policy. Maybe you want to break it because you are just a grifter who has figured out that you are going to short the stock market after you tank it. Maybe you are just a coward. Maybe you are an idiot. Maybe you think it is better to be proximate to power than to stand up for whatever is right. Whatever it is, it ain't patriotism, and it scares the dickens out of me that standing up for America in 2025 is a partisan endeavor.

Mr. IVEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for hosting this Special Order. I thank my colleague for his service.

In full disclosure, my colleague and I probably represent between us about 150,000 Federal employees. I rise not only for those Federal employees, who I care a lot about, as does Mr. IVEY, but I rise for the Federal employees throughout America. I rise not just for them. I rise because they serve America every day in critical places for veterans, for homeowners, for moms, for dads, for teachers, for doctors, and for nurses, all of whom rely on the Federal Government so that they can give services needed by the American people.

□ 1745

Why are we doing this?

I just said upstairs that I have been here for 44 years. This is an unprecedented move taken by the Trump administration and the Musk administration in the first 15 days. There has been no thought, no planning, and no consultation. It is a blitzkrieg on the American Government.

Mr. Speaker, let me just give you the words of Russell Vought who is going to be heading up, apparently, the OMB, the Office of Management and Budget.

This is what he said not so long ago: "We want the bureaucrats to be traumatically affected. When they wake up in the morning, we want them to not want to go to work because they are increasingly viewed as the villains. We want their funding to be shut down."

He is referring to the EPA, but he has aimed his objective at all of the agencies of government.

Mr. Speaker, I rise not only on behalf of Federal workers, as I said, who every day perform the services we, the Congress representing the American people, have asked them to do. They didn't create any of these agencies, we did. They did not give them the objectives, we did. They are performing the services for the American people that the American people need and, yes, want.

The initial notice went out to 2 million people, approximately all of the civilian employees of the Federal service. I want everybody to think for just one second what if all 2 million of Americans' civil servants said: Okay, we are gone. Then having been promised to be paid for 7 months for doing no work, the government shut down. Business, commerce, education, healthcare, and public safety would all be shut down. That is not what the American people voted for.

Mr. Speaker, are the people who help feed our seniors and our children, who provide medical care to our veterans, who keep our communities clean and safe, who help Americans recover from disasters, and who defend our national security and provide countless other services to American people villains? Hell, no. They are heroes and absolutely essential for America to be great.

When you treat Federal workers as villains, then you turn the American people into victims. That is what this administration is doing.

They have offered Federal workers a buyout with a deadline just hours away without any consultation to determine the adverse or, frankly, positive impact of such an action. That is not what the American people expect us to do.

I, and the Members who speak here, hope all the Members of this House, will do what the Founding Fathers thought we should do: Be an independent branch of government to set policy and not allow the Federal workers or the Federal Government to be run over by somebody who likes firing people.

Mr. IVEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Congressman for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. BROWN.)

Ms. BROWN. I thank Congressman IVEY for organizing this Special Order hour.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of more than 9,000 Federal workers in my district and their dedicated colleagues across the country.

Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker. President Trump and unelected billionaire Elon Musk are waging an all-out assault on Federal workers. In just 2 weeks, they have engaged in unlawful union busting, budget freezes, and civil servant layoffs all designed to intimidate, weaken, and dismantle our Federal workforce.

This isn't just an attack on Federal employees. It is an attack on all of us. In northeast Ohio, Federal workers process Social Security checks for seniors. They are doctors and nurses car-

ing for veterans. They are TSA agents and air traffic controllers who keep us safe when we fly. They are researchers developing new technologies at NASA Glenn. These are hardworking, honorable public servants who deserve our respect, not threats and not pink slips.

Let's be clear. This reckless effort to push Federal workers out isn't about rightsizing government; it is about gutting it. It is about dismantling the very services that millions of Americans depend on. This is part of a coordinated effort to erode trust in government because the President and his billionaire buddies want it to fail. They don't want experienced workers loyal to the country. They want political lackeys loyal to only one man. They push the lie that government is inherently wasteful and that Federal employees are part of some so-called deep state.

It is nonsense, and it is dangerous. Here is why they are really doing it: To strip away labor, consumer, and environmental protections. Most notably, it is to hand billionaires and their corporations massive tax breaks while sticking it to working Americans.

We have to ask: Is this a government of the people, by the people, and for the people? Or is it a government of the billionaires, by the billionaires, and for the billionaires?

Federal workers don't serve a President or his billionaire buddy. Let me say that again: Federal workers don't serve a President or his billionaire buddy. They serve the American people, and we stand with them.

Mr. IVEY. May I inquire how much time is remaining, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 27 minutes remaining.

Mr. IVEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOYLE).

Ms. HOYLE of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of our Nation's Federal workers.

As a member of the Labor Caucus, I am proud to stand with these public servants who have dedicated their careers to delivering for the American people.

This administration has relentlessly attacked these nonpartisan expert workers who make sure our food is safe to eat, our water is safe to drink, and our air is safe to breathe.

As a third-generation union member, I am particularly outraged by the obvious intimidation and union-busting tactics that this administration has used on these essential workers. However, these actions are not just an attack on Federal workers. They are an attack on the services that these hardworking people of my district and this country rely on every day.

Let's be clear. Firing Federal workers means delays in receiving Social Security checks and fewer law enforcement officers keeping our communities safe.

If the Department of Labor doesn't have sufficient personnel, it will be

easier for employers to commit wage theft and workplace safety and rights violations.

Whom does that benefit?

It is not the American people and not working people. In my district, we know Federal workers are not lazy or ineffective. They are our friends, our family, and our neighbors who support us every day. They get up and they go to work to work for the people of this country and not for a political party.

Federal workers have had our backs, and I assure them that we have theirs.

Mr. IVEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I first thank Congressman IVEY for putting this together here today and for his leadership.

I rise today to stand in unwavering solidarity with the hardworking men and women of our Federal workforce.

As a member of the Labor Caucus, I am proud to support the public servants who dedicate their lives to keeping our country running, including the 8,500 Federal employees who call my district home.

These workers are not faceless bureaucrats. They are the backbone of our communities. They are our neighbors, and they are our friends. They process veterans' benefits, ensure Social Security checks go out on time, make Medicare payments to our seniors' physicians, ensure our air and water are clean, keep our Nation safe, and much, much more.

Yet, right now, they are under attack from a President who has outsourced his own power to a billionaire hell-bent on dismantling our government to serve his own greed.

The administration and so-called Department of Government Efficiency are purging career professionals, politicizing civil service, and handing over even more power to the ultrawealthy.

I have been hearing from constituents all week, and this is not what people in my community and across America want.

They do not want an unelected billionaire who, I might add, has made billions off taxpayer-funded contracts to actively weaken our government.

They do not want an unelected billionaire to create a system where the rules don't apply to him and democracy takes a back seat to his own profits.

They do not want an unelected billionaire to attack our Federal workers whose love for our country keeps our communities safe and our society functioning.

We will not stand by while they buck the rule of law to dismantle the very institutions that protect hardworking families, seniors, veterans, and our democracy.

Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker. This is an attack on Federal workers that will allow those at the highest levels of our government and their billionaire buddies to exploit the concerns of our

constituents, take power away from the people, and enrich themselves at the expense of hardworking families in America.

America's civil service is a pillar of our society, and we will defend it.

I say to the Federal workforce: Thank you for your service. We have your back. We will fight for your jobs, your dignity, and the services that millions of Americans rely on.

Mr. IVEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Vermont (Ms. BALINT).

Ms. BALINT. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to stand with our Federal workers and civil servants and to tell them that we will fight these illegal actions.

The Trump administration is treating our Federal workforce as if they are the enemy. These are regular Americans who work important jobs all over the country, not just in D.C., but in all of our districts.

In fact, 85 percent of the nonpartisan civil servants are spread around the country. Vermont is home to 8,000 of these Federal workers. They are part of the 2 million Federal workers who operate our national parks. They are scientists at the FDA. They work at hospitals, at NASA, and they protect our national security. In fact, 70 percent work on behalf of our national security and defense.

I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned that the illegal purge of our civil servants at the Department of Justice and at the FBI will lead to another 9/11 terrorist attack.

I ask Americans: Do we really want to put our Nation at risk so that billionaires can get a massive tax cut?

Follow the money. What this is about is firing our Federal workforce to fund tax cuts for billionaires. Don't be fooled by what is happening here. It is about the money. Follow the money.

Our Federal workers are civil servants because they are here to serve the people. They are hired on a nonpartisan basis because they keep our country running, and they keep us safe.

What is happening is an illegal takeover of our government. By locking them out of their jobs, firing them illegally, and bullying them out of a job, Trump and Musk are trying to create chaos and confusion. It will harm Americans, not just the people who are being fired illegally, but it will harm all of those Americans in our districts who seek services from these workers.

None of this is about making our government work better for Americans. It is a well-worn tactic used by authoritarians and dictators like Orbán in Hungary and Bolsonaro in Brazil. They do it to destroy government services so that they create chaos and they create confusion, and then we turn against each other.

This administration is using chaos and cruelty to amass power and wealth, not for us and not for Americans, but only for them.

□ 1800

Mr. IVEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland for yielding. I am here on behalf of the House Labor Caucus, and I thank the gentleman for convening us today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of our Nation's Federal workers, who are under a brutal and heartless assault by Elon Musk and his co-President, Donald Trump.

A week ago, they sent the now-infamous fork-in-the-road email to 2 million Federal employees, trying to trick them into a quick decision to retire immediately and receive 8 months of severance pay, which is false, while threatening that if they refused to retire, their jobs might be eliminated.

My brothers and sisters, don't fall for the okey doke. Don't retire. Stay on the job.

Federal workers have rights that protect their jobs. Federal workers should not be intimidated into retirement. This country needs them to continue their work. They are professional and highly skilled people, and we know they work long hours, often under difficult circumstances. They do so because they believe in the importance of public service.

We will not allow Elon Musk and Donald Trump to replace Federal workers with people who are willing to kiss Trump's ring rather than serve their country. Federal workers should stay the course and keep their eyes on the prize, and House Democrats have their backs.

I thank the Federal workers for their service.

Mr. Speaker, I point out that Elon Musk and President Trump are doing this with House and Senate Republicans letting it happen. Don't fall for the okey doke.

Mr. IVEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO).

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the actions coming out of the White House are shocking, alarming, and unconstitutional. We have seen an unelected billionaire attempt to lay off, fire, and purge Federal employees from across the executive branch. No agency or department is safe, not even the department taking care of veterans.

As the ranking member of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I have been quick to warn employees at the VA not to fall for the recent attempt from Musk to buy out employees. I have warned VA employees and providers. Elon Musk thinks they are stupid and won't see through his deceptive and fraudulent buyout offer.

VA employees should ignore his email and send it to the trash bin. The Trump administration is playing a dangerous game with their livelihoods and veterans' lives.

The Department of Veterans Affairs has a mandate to ensure that veterans with visual, hearing, mobility, and cognitive impairments can still apply and receive care. The Trump administration put an end to that mission to reach out to veterans with visual, hearing, mobility, and cognitive impairments. He put an end to that mission in the fervor to get rid of diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts in Federal agencies.

Yes, diversity, equity, and inclusion include veterans with visual, hearing, mobility, and cognitive impairments. So far, 60 employees with the mission of reaching out to these very veterans with unique challenges, to encourage them to apply for VA benefits, have been put on leave. They have been put on leave. We are talking about veterans with visual, hearing, mobility, and cognitive impairments.

The Federal hiring freeze initiated on President Trump's first day in office has left approximately 700 open positions that cannot be filled. These are 700 opportunities to increase veterans' access to care that will instead stay unfilled.

What is even more shocking is that my Republican colleagues have stayed silent while veterans' care is being impacted by DOGE.

Mr. Speaker, I challenge my Republican colleagues who sit idly by to stand up to the richest man in the world. Stand up to this would-be autocrat. Stand up to this bloodless coup. Stand up for Federal workers and your constituents.

Mr. IVEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his words.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of our Nation's Federal workers. As a proud member of the Labor Caucus, I stand with these professionals who keep our government running. Their work is vital to the health, safety, and security of the American people.

Since taking office, President Trump has attacked Federal employees, seeking to replace nonpartisan civil servants with unqualified political loyalists. These workers ensure our food is safe, our air and water are clean, and our veterans are cared for. They process Social Security benefits, safeguard our airports, and protect our communities.

More than 85 percent of Federal workers serve outside of the National Capital region, meaning these attacks impact every single congressional district in our Nation, including mine in New Orleans and the River Parishes.

Firing Federal workers leads to delays in Social Security payments, longer VA wait times, and fewer law enforcement officers on the street. We cannot allow reckless policies to dismantle these vital services.

Trump's administration recently issued a deferred resignation offer, claiming employees could resign by February 6 and still receive pay benefits until September 30, 2025. There is no evidence that this is legal or even real.

Federal employees who accept this offer may face retaliation, unemployment, and no recourse. This is a calculated effort to weaken agencies and cut services. Simply put, it is a sham.

We must also oppose Schedule F, which would strip civil service protections, making employees at will and vulnerable to political purges. Our government should be staffed by professionals based on merit, not political loyalty. The American people deserve a government that works for them and not for some partisan politician.

Finally, Trump's union-busting tactics, including rejecting legally bargained contracts, cannot stand. The right to collective bargaining is a fundamental right, and these agreements must be honored.

To all Federal workers: America needs you. The Labor Caucus has your back, and we will fight for your rights, your jobs, your dignity, and your livelihood. Stand strong. We are with you. Don't fall for the okey doke. Know this: We stand with you, and we have your backs.

Mr. IVEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his words.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Ms. ELFRETH).

Ms. ELFRETH. Mr. Speaker, 44,000 civil servants—hardworking, qualified, passionate public servants—call Maryland's Third Congressional District home. In the last week, thousands have reached out to my office. They were concerned, anxious, and wondering if their government actually values the work they do on behalf of the American people.

It is clear that, through the fork-in-the-road email that 2.2 million Federal employees received in attempts to expand Schedule F, President Trump and Elon Musk are trying to remove civil servants from the civil service.

Instead, they want to fill our Federal workforce and put lifesaving services for the American people in the hands of unqualified political cronies in a modern-day spoils system.

The irony, of course, is that the civil service was created to avoid this situation. The Congress recognized that cronyism and corruption did not serve the American people, and Congress did something in 1883 to create a merit-based civil service system.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my constituents, as the proud daughter of two civil servants, and as a proud member of the Labor Caucus, I stand here appalled by this administration's changing of the rules on these workers.

Everyone in my district and every Federal worker in this Nation should know that House Democrats have their backs.

Mr. IVEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. MAGAZINER).

Mr. MAGAZINER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, Mr. IVEY, for yielding, and I rise today as a proud vice chair of the Congressional Labor Caucus to stand with the hardworking men and women who keep our government running.

Federal workers show up every day to serve their neighbors and our country. These are the workers who make sure that Social Security checks go out to your parents and grandparents. These are the men and women who deliver our mail, no matter the weather, and the doctors and nurses at the VA who provide care to our Nation's bravest.

When Donald Trump and Elon Musk attack these public servants, it means fewer law enforcement officers working to keep us safe, slower disaster response for families hit by severe storms, and longer wait times for Social Security and Medicare.

Attacking these workers is exactly what Donald Trump and his co-president, Elon Musk, have set out to do. They are attacking air traffic controllers, postal workers, food inspectors, and people who keep us safe. Why? To find money to pay for tax cuts for billionaires.

That is right. Their goal here is to line the pockets of the wealthy off of the backs of working people and the services that all Americans rely on. These attacks on Federal workers are an attack on all working people across this country.

I want to tell the Federal workers in Rhode Island and across the United States that House Democrats stand with you. We see your dedication. We know the positive impact that you deliver every day. The best resistance is to keep showing up and to keep doing what you do best. This country runs because of you.

Here in Congress, we are going to fight to oppose Donald Trump and Elon Musk's baseless and cruel attacks against those who have devoted their lives to service.

Mr. IVEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii (Ms. TOKUDA).

Ms. TOKUDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in solidarity and with much aloha for our Nation's Federal workers. As a member of the Labor Caucus, I am proud to stand with these essential employees who keep our government running every single day.

Federal workers care for our veterans, keep us safe when we travel, and make sure our seniors get the Social Security payments that they need to put food on the table and to survive.

Our Federal workers were also the ones who were first on the scene when fires ravaged Maui. They saved lives. They provided food and shelter and replaced documents. They gave our people hope.

Day in and day out, Federal workers are the unseen hands and hearts that guide our Nation through complex challenges and maintain the infra-

structure and services that underpin daily life. They give our people hope and help.

When we attack Federal workers, we not only discredit their work, Mr. Speaker, but we cut off the very hands that are holding us up.

Since taking office, President Trump has made it his number one priority to undermine and dismantle our Federal workforce. Over the past 2 weeks, the Trump administration has been bullying Federal workers to resign while making a hollow promise of paying benefits through the end of the year. Now, President Trump is threatening mass layoffs to those who refuse to accept this bogus and deceptive offer.

We have 43,000 hardworking Federal employees in Hawaii. Many of these civil servants have contacted me to express their anger, frustration, and fear.

One constituent who spent his entire career with the Department of Health and Human Services said he had experienced several Presidential transitions but none as demeaning and demoralizing as this one. Once committed to a full career in public service, he now wakes up daily dreading the new abuses and attacks he and his colleagues will face.

Let us be clear: Federal workers are not the problem. They are part of the solution. They don't make decisions based on political whim. They don't serve a single master and his billionaire friends. They serve the people of this country.

The American people deserve a government that works for them, not against them.

To all the Federal employees in Hawaii and across this country: We see you. We hear you. We will fight to protect you. Thank you for your dedication and for your service. You are the quiet force that keeps our Nation strong. You have always had our backs. Now it is time we have yours.

□ 1815

Mr. IVEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Ms. DEXTER).

Ms. DEXTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Congressman from Maryland for this opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I rise as a proud member of the Congressional Labor Caucus in support of our Federal workers today.

I introduced new legislation earlier today to protect Federal workers who stand up against Elon Musk's grotesque seizure of critical government agencies.

My bill, the Stop Musk Act, would prevent retaliation against any Federal employee who resists illegal or unconstitutional efforts led by Elon Musk.

In the last week alone, Musk has seized control of the U.S. Department of the Treasury's payment system, exposing Oregonians' personal financial information; has shuttered the U.S. Agency for International Development, USAID, putting the lives of millions of

people at risk; and threatened the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, otherwise known as NOAA, undermining our work to combat the climate crisis.

This is just the beginning.

Under this legislation, Federal employees who resist, circumvent, or prevent Musk's illegal and unconstitutional takeover would be protected against retaliation for their efforts to fight back.

The world's richest man should not have the power to unilaterally dismantle the Federal Government and the critical services it provides Oregonians.

Federal employees are at the forefront of fighting Elon Musk's power grab, and we must protect them. All week, I, like all my colleagues, have been hearing from constituents who are demanding action.

Let me be clear: We will use every legislative, judicial, and public pressure tactic to stop Musk's takeover and protect our workers. This multifront battle will be fought in the courts, the Halls of Congress, and in the public sphere. We must stay loud. We must stand tight. We must press on.

Mr. IVEY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. IVEY. Mr. Speaker, a few hours ago, I stood with members of unions, employees at the Department of Labor, and people walking down the street who saw what we were doing and wanted to join in and support the cause.

As I stood out there and spoke in favor of the efforts they were making to be heard, to protect their jobs and protect their ability to work for the American people, it reminded me of my father who had worked in that same building four decades ago until he was forced out during the Reagan administration.

To my colleagues who were there today, I thank them for joining. To the employees who were out there, I say this: I lived through what you are going through right now and I understand. For that reason, I recommit myself to working hard to protect your rights, to make sure that you don't get forced out of government, even though you haven't done anything wrong.

You have the experience and the expertise to do the work that the American people need, and we want to make sure that you have a chance to continue to do that.

I thank the Congressional Labor Caucus as well for standing up and making sure that we continue to fight here in Congress to protect their rights.

Lastly, I thank all of those people out there, whether they are union members or attorneys or employees, who are fighting every day to get their point across and make sure that we are heard by the Trump administration. Thank you for what you are doing. I

urge you to continue to do the work that you are doing because it is making a difference.

The Trump administration has made many moves. Many of them have been, in my view, unlawful and unconstitutional, especially the ones that are impacting the employee rights that these government employees have earned over the decades, like my father who joined the Department of Labor after his service in the Air Force. They deserve to be treated fairly, with respect, and with recognition of the legal rights that they deserve to have.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President and to direct their remarks to the Chair.

ISSUES RELATING TO REBUILDING THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time and the opportunity to shed light on several subjects that we will cover here tonight. Indeed, there is much going on and much to be excited about, as well.

In my home State of California, we have several issues I will touch upon that have to deal with water, water supply, fire and forestry, and some rebuilding that will need to be done around our State.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN), my colleague and good friend, who is also here tonight. He has been a strong leader on immigration and, more specifically, controlling our border. He has also been sticking up for our families in this country and the values it is going to take to have strong families and maintain the founding values that will make our country strong. I appreciate his work and articulation on that.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, there has been so much in the news in the last 2 weeks, it is hard to know where to start.

I will cover a couple issues that the mainstream media has picked up on, though not done the best job uncovering, and one issue that made a huge difference in the lives of the most vulnerable of us that Donald Trump weighed in on not by doing something but by allowing an administrative rule to die.

The first great victory for Donald Trump, which hasn't been reported out there, concerns the effort by the Biden administration, which ran out of time, to get rid of what they call 14(c) certificates.

Everybody may be familiar with light manufacturing or packaging done

in their district by people who are handicapped. Maybe they have spina bifida, maybe they have Down syndrome. In any event, for this reason, they are not able to be profitably employed for above minimum wage or minimum wage dollars.

Each State does it a little bit differently, but the States make an estimate of what that employee is worth, and maybe they are paid \$5 an hour for, like I said, light manufacturing or packaging.

If you tour these facilities—and I think every Congressman ought to tour them at least once—it is one of the most enjoyable things you can do, because you will find the people who have been dealt a difficult lot on life so happy to see you, so happy to see what they are doing with you, so happy to make friends with the other employees there who have different abilities and other employees who are usually in a supervisory capacity.

These are also a godsend to the parents or guardians of these folks. Under normal circumstances, they have to worry when the guardians or parents die off what type of friends and what type of social life they will have, but because they frequently stay in these facilities or work in these facilities for 20 or 30 or 40 years, they develop lifelong friendships which are so important for these folks to have.

Now, had Donald Trump not won the election, it would have continued to work through the administrative rule process, and it is entirely possible that these sort of facilities would have been shut down by a Biden or Harris administration. They were working toward that. You might say, why would anybody take away the right for these people to have these jobs.

The reason is, they will say, because if we are paying somebody \$5 an hour, we are taking advantage of them. We can't take advantage of them, so we would rather have them shut down.

How horrible is that? To the most vulnerable members of our society, Joe Biden was prepared to say, if you want to work here for \$5 an hour, tough. We are going to close that facility, or we will leave the facility open, but you will no longer be able to work. You will no longer have the pride of being able to get a paycheck and spend it on clothes for yourself or gifts for your parents, what have you.

Mr. Speaker, I thank President Trump for not continuing with that administrative rule. At least, probably for the next 4 years, we know the jobs of these folks, which mean so much to them—more to them than I would say the average citizen in our society—I thank President Trump for allowing the most vulnerable members of our society to have the choice to continue to work for, in some cases, subminimum wage, but have the enjoyment of that independence.

I should point out that almost all the people I am talking about have some SSI payment in addition to that, so it

is not like they are expected to pay a mortgage with their \$5-an-hour job. They get other governmental assistance, as well.

I know there are a lot of other things we have been grateful to President Trump for these last couple weeks, but keeping the 14(c) certificates is a tremendous victory for the most vulnerable of us. I don't think it would have happened if President Trump didn't get elected.

Now, the next thing to look at. We have heard people talk about Elon Musk and what he wants to do to USAID.

First of all, I will point out that the reason people are mad at Elon Musk, who can't do anything on his own—all he can do is advise the President. The reason they are mad at him is, horror of horrors, he thought there was a government program that wasn't necessary. That is not the way things work here.

Nobody believes that if Elon Musk had Donald Trump's ear and came out for more preschool, if he came out for more mental health funding, if he came out for expanded government daycare, the folks on the other side of this aisle would be praising Elon Musk for being a forward-looking person and for doing what people on that side of the aisle want to do, which is either expand old programs or come up with new government programs.

Quite frankly, as long as I have been here, I am sure there must be some government program that ended, but I can't think of any.

Elon Musk is under attack for actually suggesting a government program is unnecessary. I praise him for that. There is nothing wrong with him advising President Trump. I don't know if folks would feel better if they gave him a position and \$100,000-a-year salary. I don't know, but it is refreshing that some of the most successful people in America can use their mind, their brains to advise President Trump on how to be a good President.

It is particularly good to have somebody outside this building who is not used to the swamp-type mentality of we never under any circumstances get rid of a program; the only question is whether we are going to expand it 2 percent or 8 percent. It is great to have a friend who can look at some programs and say, hey, maybe this program sounded good when we first created it in 1963 or whatever, but it hasn't worked up to snuff.

Of course, I agree with Elon Musk that some of the money spent on these programs is even a moral stain on the United States of America, particularly a moral stain because we are spending money in other countries.

When we talk about gender-affirming care, that is where they give puberty blockers to young children. I think it is horrific that we would give puberty blockers to a 12 or 13 year old in America, but America is supposed to be the light unto the world.

Can you imagine the United States weighing in and giving gender-affirming care to the poor little children in Guatemala?

□ 1830

I mean, how bad can we be? How embarrassing can we be? That is what we do with the incredible amount of wealth that this country has been given? We take our wealth and try to screw up—what I would say is “screw up”—the poor little children in Guatemala?

I am glad Elon Musk came across this program, and upon people pointing out what is in the program, I am glad that Donald Trump, when he heard about it, full bore put his foot on the brake and said if the people running this program are spending the money that way, we have to stop spending money right away and look a little bit further into the program.

In any event, what I am going to do is, I am going to ask people on that side of the aisle to take an honest look at themselves. If Elon Musk announced that we needed more preschool, if Elon Musk announced we were going to need more mental health, with where the mental health professions are today in favor of these puberty blockers and that sort of thing, would they really be concerned that he is advising President Trump, or would they be praising him? Would The Washington Post and The New York Times be praising Elon Musk for being openminded and ignoring the hidebound conservative members of the Republican Party? Of course, they would be praising him.

The only reason they question whether or not he can advise President Trump is because they don't like, for almost the first time, the first time that I have been here, that we genuinely are seeing a government program begin to end, hopefully.

The third thing I will point out is that President Trump signed a bill today dealing with men in women's sports. It was a good bill. There are not a whole lot of men participating in women's sports around the country, but it is certainly a little weird that when one sets up a swimming tournament, a track meet, or something where it is very clear we have the men's event and the women's event, that under any circumstances we take a man and say, well, just because you feel like a woman today, we are going to pretend you are a woman. I think that is unusual enough.

I am going to hope—and President Trump has had executive orders on this topic, as well—that we are able to do something statutorily about getting rid of government funding for programs that do things like give surgeries on minors, give puberty blockers on minors. There is no shortage of intelligent people who will say this is damaging, not to mention there are a huge number of people with just plain common sense who realize that you don't try to engage in irrevocable medical procedures with 14- or 15-year-olds.

In fact, I would say it is medically inexcusable to engage in these procedures when people are 24- or 25-years-old. After all, in this country, you know, you can't buy a beer until you are 21 years old, can't buy a cigarette until you are 21 years old. I wouldn't think any medical professional with any morality—I realize they are making money on this—would harm these young people.

Now that we took care of the ridiculous idea that men should be able to pick whether they are men or women, depending upon, I guess, whether there is a track meet that day, I hope our leadership team begins to go after these so-called medical professionals who are doing irrevocable damage, either with drugs or surgeries, on people under 18.

Quite frankly, they ought to be barred for people under age 21. Quite frankly, the medical society ought to, on their own, make it clear that it is medical malpractice to do this sort of thing even on a 25- or 26-year-old because we all know very well that the way we feel about things when we are 20 or 24 or 25 is frequently very different from the way we feel about things when we are 30 years old.

I thank the gentleman from California for allowing me to address these issues. Remember, folks out there, if you have a ward or a child who worked for what used to be called a sheltered workshop, President Trump kept your ward or child employed the way they want to.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) on that, for sticking up for families, and in other conversations on sensible border policy, which is going to keep our country safe and strong and our employees of this country more likely to be employed. It is appreciated.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LAMALFA. 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 (Mr. ONDER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, picking up on a little bit of what Mr. GROTHMAN was saying here a moment ago, I would like to point out as well that I think a real national heroine, a young woman who has really stepped up, out of necessity, but also out of a strong desire to do the right thing and have the right thing, is Riley Gaines, a collegiate swimmer who swam so successfully and did much winning at the University of Kentucky.

She is the one who also had to face off in competition against a basically 6'4" male and was denied opportunities, denied recognition, because of the unfairness and imbalance of girls and

women in their sports having to face boys and men in their sports as well as all the discomfort from shared changing areas and the unfairness of losing out on the ability to win competitions that might put them in a position to win medals that might ultimately win them a scholarship from high school into college or put them in a national competition or an international competition if you are at the collegiate level or at the Olympic level.

We saw some horrific things, in my view, in this last Olympics, where the young woman who was a female boxer, I believe she was from Italy, how humiliated she was when she had to face basically a male boxer with a clear physical advantage and just get the heck beat out of her in the process.

One of the saddest things I have seen in a long time was her collapsing on her knees just in tears at that Olympic event afterward because of the unfairness of it all and how hard she trained for years and years to be in that position only to have, in this case, the Olympic committee say that we will let anybody compete against the women in this case.

I know Riley Gaines personally and just find her to be a dynamic young woman who will stand up for the right things. She didn't ask for this position. She was a competitor and doing her thing. She was thrust into this position because she saw what needed to be done, what needed to be made right on this, and stuck up for other women and girls in their sports and in their other domains.

Riley has gotten a lot of good work done, including, today, the Presidential declaration that this would no longer go on in this country, especially things that the Federal Government might have involvement in or sanction. I congratulate President Trump for straightening things back out a little bit and putting some common sense back into that area.

Mr. Speaker, I also heard the debate here tonight on Federal workers and the opportunity that has been put in place here, if they seek and so choose—and there is the word “choose,” “choice”—to take advantage of an opportunity if the job they are in is not meeting where they want to be, or you might see reduction in some of these government programs, in some of these government agencies.

It is a pretty generous exit of 8 months of pay and such to retire from that job or move on from that one and go seek other opportunities. We heard a lot of caterwauling about that tonight, about, I guess, the essentialness of every single government agency and every single worker.

Now, there are plenty of really good workers willing to work hard and do a good job in so many of our Federal agencies, but there are also quite a few who aren't as motivated. We see this battle over them returning to work, as is being mandated.

We saw President Biden, just before leaving office, trying to give out super-

generous contracts and extend the term of not having to be at the workplace based still upon, basically, the COVID era and getting used to that concept, to that way of doing things.

It is proper for people to show up to work. It is essential. Around here, we had proxy voting, and our committees were not meeting in person. Doggone it, it is essential in this place that we sit across from each other, that we sit next to each other and have these real debates in front of the American public to allow true public debate on the things that are going to affect over 300 million Americans through the decisions made here.

I am certainly glad we got rid of proxy voting here and got back to work doing things after the COVID era finally ended and a lot of manipulation that happened in that era. Still, we haven't completely recovered in our workforce and the attitudes, I think, of certain people who feel like they are entitled to just have the government send them checks, and the attitude of not having to show up to work.

We found that certain people can do a certain amount of work from home, but the battle here in town, where some really high percentage—I have heard a number as high as 92; I don't know if it is accurate or not—92 percent aren't showing up here. Some of these buildings are almost ghost towns from the workforce not coming in there. This needs to be looked at.

What is being looked at by the Department of Government Efficiency, DOGE, and Elon Musk is basically saying, hey, American taxpayers, we know you work hard for what you earn and what government takes from you.

These aren't contributions. We heard talk about these contributions. They aren't contributions. They are compelled payments of taxes here. You don't have a choice. They come start taking things away from you, auctioning off your home or your car or your farm or whatever, if you don't pay your taxes. It is not voluntary. It is not contributions, as these guys talk about. It is not an investment. They take it from you.

I think any taxpayer, any working person, has the right to demand that government is looking at things and is being efficient with what it is using.

The stones they are flipping over and what they are uncovering so far with USAID, and many other aspects I can't list here tonight, confirms what I think normal people know, that there is a lot of money being wasted in government by many entities.

Look at the situation in Ukraine. Now Zelenskyy is claiming that of about \$177 billion that has been transferred over there, he thinks only \$75 billion of it actually got to him or the causes they were working on over there in Ukraine. Where has \$102 billion gone? Are these real numbers? Let's investigate. Let's find out.

That is what we need to do, respectfully, with tax dollars that are taken

from people not voluntarily. Every aspect of government needs to have that accountability. It is okay to audit. It is okay to ask these questions. It is not against something or against a certain group of people. When we are talking about, in this case, the opportunity for employees to find other opportunities, then what would be wrong with that if they so choose and if agencies are going to be downsized?

Everybody is mad at Elon Musk now, at least on that side of the aisle. When he took over Twitter, now known as X, he cleared out about 85 percent of the employees there. A lot of them were just hanging on and going for the party there. He seems to be able to run that entity a lot more efficiently. That should be an example for government instead of the scourge that we are hearing that it is awful, terrible.

We appreciate those who do the things that we as Americans ask the government agencies to do, and they do them efficiently and with cheerfulness and remembering that the customers are the taxpayers, the people who come to the counter and say, hey, I need a permit to do this, or I need this or that service. These are the customers.

Getting a passport has been a problem. We have had horrific stories coming out of my own office during the height of COVID and such that you could hardly get anybody to process a passport for you, at least very timely.

□ 1845

In my home State of California, just a simple thing like a personalized license plate at the State level from the DMV takes 9 months now. It takes 9 months to get a personalized plate. Supposedly that is a revenue generator for the State.

We have got to really check and see what the attitudes of the people are who work and serve in government at any level, whether you are elected, whether you are hired, whether you are an agency head, what have you. These are good conversations to have, not the cattle rolling we are hearing about: Oh, my gosh, they might be displacing somebody. Well, maybe we need to have a little downsizing. I believe we do. That is what I have to say on that debate.

I am going to return back to issues going on in the West. I am privileged to chair the Western Caucus in the House here, and the important issues that it has addressed over the years, and a lot of that revolves around energy.

I will tell you what: The issue with energy in this country when we see skyrocketing prices of all types of fuel, that has been a major inflation driver. Really, two aspects of why we are suffering from inflation is government overspending beyond anywhere close to what revenue was and the trillions we have seen being spent by the government during the COVID era and beyond and the end of the Biden administration.

We are going to have to take some medicine on that and how about get

back to a concept of pre-COVID level of spending, maybe even adjusted for inflation, old inflation, not just massive inflation.

We have the right and the obligation to be looking at it this way. Inflation driven by massive government spending, eating up the pool of available currency and credit, as well as the cost of doing business driven by issues such as energy.

In farming, for example, on my own farm, a couple years ago we saw that our price on fertilizer tripled and our price of fuel doubled in that season. What does that mean for a farmer like me or any other farmer growing a crop?

They still have to be in the black at the end of the year. They still have to make profit. Those costs are going to be passed on somewhere, aren't they? It always comes back to the consumer. It always comes back to the taxpayer having to pay for these things. On one hand, government massive overspending here at the Federal level, and things that drive inflation, such as the cost of fuel and all of the things that are related. There is so much that depends on energy. Any type of production that depends on energy is going to have an impact on price. As an example, take diesel fuel, take a food product.

As a farmer, when you start out in the spring, you need fuel to start tilling the land and getting it ready for preparing the seedbed to plant that crop. Someone has to bring you the diesel to run your equipment. Soon after, someone delivers that fertilizer, likely with the diesel vehicle, someone delivers that seed.

At that point you planted, and you have irrigation of one type or another depending on your crop. In some cases, it is going to be fuel that is required to run the pumps or electricity to run wells, fuel for lift pumps. In some cases, you are fortunate, you have gravity-fed water much like we do in northern California. We do the storage of water.

What is our energy policy? I guarantee you, under President Trump it is going to improve. With that, we are going to see improved prices on energy. That will help us to tame inflation.

On the other side of the coin here with the work of Elon Musk and others on the Department of Government Efficiency, prices can go down if we are not doing so much massive spending and sucking up all the credit and all the currency out there by government action. It is a pretty good recipe.

Why don't we allow success to happen. The American people are clamoring for that as they have had their eyes opened on what is going on and where their tax dollars are going. I say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, you might just slow down a little bit and look and see what is really happening here and how people are feeling about that. How they are thinking about it. How they felt it for sev-

eral years in their wallets with inflation and wondering: Why do I no longer have money left over to do some of the things I want?

At the same time, where there are these mandates coming down the pike in my home State of California and affecting things nationally here. You can't buy a gas-powered vehicle anymore or a diesel-powered pickup in just a few years because we want to ban them because of CO₂.

That is taking choices away from people. That is giving them unaffordable alternatives, especially the more they ban and the more they drive up the cost of fuel in my home State. They keep adding on new taxes for climate taxes or CO₂ taxes. They have auctions for the privilege of making CO₂. Where did that come from?

It is like they devised a new currency, CO₂. I can remind you—you have probably seen me on TV doing this several times—but let me remind you. The composition of our atmosphere is those main components. Right there in yellow, that is nitrogen, 78 percent.

Now, I ask people: How much CO₂ do you think there is in the atmosphere? Most folks, you know, are going about their lives and not worried about all this stuff. They guess somewhere between 20 and 50 percent.

Nitrogen is at 78. Here in the blue is oxygen at 21. That adds up to 99. Third place, here in the green, argon is .93 percent. We are already at 99.93 percent that is not CO₂. Look over here. Here are some other trace gases that have to do with water vapor. There is even krypton gas up in the atmosphere. That is .03.

You come down here to this little purple stripe right here. CO₂ is .04 percent. It is practically a rounding error when you look at it on this chart. You would think it is an existential crisis the way John Kerry and all the others are taking their private jets over to Davos and talking about how we need to change our life. That people with the Paris accord and the World Economic Forum and others all want to make sure the United States is paying a heavy price for this.

Meanwhile, China builds more and more coal-fired power plants and does what they wish. They are not part of the Paris accord. Again, a little reminder of CO₂ and what that is actually going to be costing us.

Let's get back to other forms of energy here. I am showing you a picture of the Shasta Dam. It is actually starting to fill up right now. We are getting massive rains in northern California. On the Shasta Dam, they are actually not dumping the water at a higher rate. That makes hydroelectric power.

You see, it actually comes from the bottom of the dam is where the hydro-power plant is. That is a different form of spilling there that comes out of the spillway when they feel like they have an excess.

Hydroelectric power, if you want to play the CO₂ game for a moment, is

CO₂-free power. It is available 24/7. As long as you have water behind the dam, you can generate that CO₂-free power. It is reliable. You don't have to wait for the sun to come up to heat your solar panels or the clouds to go away or the rain to go away or the wind to come up to blow your windmill.

What is happening in northern California? Recently they decided after many years to tear down—this is kind of related to that subject—four dams on the Klamath River. You see some of the Klamath system here that helps transfer water to agriculture and other needs and wildlife, as well.

They tore them down. They took down four dams that produce hydroelectric power. The CO₂-free power everybody thinks they want. They tore them down. Guess what is happening now? Because they are getting a lot of rain in the area, we are actually getting flooding in certain areas. We will get more flooding with even a greater amount of rain because we don't have the dams anymore as a tool. This is all ostensibly to help a fish population go up and down the Klamath River.

The flaw in that thinking is that the Klamath Lake is actually a system that is based on a very shallow, rather warm lake up here that feeds the rest of the system here that is not really the best for the salmon that they are talking about. We gloss over that because we want to tear the dams out and score a win.

They got their way. They scored them. The whole basin here is being affected. The whole river system is being affected by where there used to be water and now you are getting sloughing. The people that live along the area there, their properties are now worth a lot less all because of, I think, fraudulent environmental claims that really have never been proven.

What are some of the other effects of watching those dams be torn out? The initial happening was dead fish, essentially four fish. When they removed those dams, there was a great concentration of silt that had built up behind them over 50, 60, 100 years, depending on the age of which of the four dams. We had this massive till of this and a whole bunch of other wildlife up and down the river as that silt is now being pushed 170 miles or so out to the ocean.

The salmon live on a 3-year cycle. If the silt doesn't wash all the way out to the sea in that 3-year period, what does that mean long-term for salmon populations? Will they die off as all the different cycles of salmon will be gone? Here is a dead fish. You had dead deer getting trapped in the silt. All sorts of wildlife, turtles, you name it.

In the name of the environment, pinning their ears back and just going, they tore the dams out anyway, and they have their sights on more. One is called Lake Pillsbury in Mendocino County, which a lot of people rely on

for drinking water as well as agricultural water. It used to be a power generator in that area, as well. The utilities decided it is not worth the fight anymore, so they abandoned it. If they get their way, it will be torn out soon, too. It is just one losing combination after another, all in the name of the environment, and another loser for the people.

The tear out of the Klamath dams cost the people \$450 million to remove those. Mr. Speaker, \$250 million of it came from a State water bond. The rest of the bond is supposed to be actually building water supply, including the Sites Reservoir. I will talk to you about that in a little bit.

Another \$200 million came from the rate-payers of PacifiCorp where they charge a surcharge to put money aside for the dam removal so the company can skate out of there without any real liability on the dams they own. That was the honey deal that was put together for that.

I will come back to this picture of the Shasta Dam here. When the water is not being run through the turbines at the bottom of the dam or like the one at Lake Oroville, then you miss out on the opportunity of generating low cost, highly reliable CO₂-free power.

The Shasta Dam isn't currently doing that right now, but Lake Oroville nearby, also in my district of northern California, is dumping water. I understand the Army Corps of Engineers has a goal of making sure there is enough storage to make up for massive amounts of rain. Indeed, we have gotten a lot of rain lately.

The Shasta Dam had a peak inflow of 120,000 cubic feet per second. I think it was yesterday. In Oroville, I think it peaked at about 107,000 cubic feet per second. Guess what? Both of those dams have still a massive amount of space behind them.

Oroville, I think it is 400,000 more acre-feet of space, maybe 450. The Shasta Dam is still about 500,000 acre-feet of space. This storm is going to end mostly, I think, tomorrow. At that point, they have already tailed off from those peaks I said in the hundred thousands. Each of them are down now about 50 to 60,000 CFS coming in. Those numbers continue to tail off as the rain stops.

We will have a situation where, yeah, we have got a good influx of water that is going to help fill the lakes. As I said, they are each still far from their goal of being full. If you recall, we went nearly zero for January on rain fall in northern California. We got some on the very last day. We are going to expect that we can count on filling these lakes in February or March.

April 1 is kind of the magic date where they relieve the flood control mandate on that. They allow the lakes to fill up more than their action level, which those numbers are being caught up to now and maybe have slightly exceeded their levels.

The thing is, they are quick to want to dump water. Yes, they are scared of this big storm right now, but it has just kind of brought it up to par. It is going to put us in a good position to be able to get the lakes full by the time May and June rolls around. There is nothing to say that they can't let water out a little at a time if it looks like it will get too full.

□ 1900

Mr. Speaker, but the haste, in my view, and it is my opinion, to let the water out—I think they want to bump Oroville up to 50,000. I think currently it is 33,000 CFS going out. They want to bump it up to 50,000, which isn't the greatest for people downriver at that level.

They could keep it at a steady 20,000 or 30,000 for a little while. Then, when the storm ends and they see the inflow has stopped, maybe they can take a timeout and forecast with the weather. We can watch the news and have a pretty good read on what the weather is going to be.

The Army Corps of Engineers is still using 50-year-old manuals from the seventies on how they want to plan the flood control aspects of the storage of these lakes. They say they are updating them. When will they be updated so we can use dynamic scoring, so to speak, on how weather is going to be predicted? Can we manage the lake in a way like, well, we don't see much weather happening in the next 2 weeks, so we don't need to let water out in February or March or what have you. Let's let it build up.

They are not allowing themselves to use that. They are still studying. They are still in the back room, studying and working on updating the manuals. They say we have 2 or 3 more years. Well, that is frustrating. Watch what happens when people don't get the water they need in the San Joaquin Valley to grow the amazing crops that we have in this State.

I showed this poster quite a bit in these floor talks of what California grows. When we don't have the water to do this stuff, you don't get this stuff from California. When we see that over 90 percent, even 100 percent, of some of these products are grown in California, are we going to import them from somewhere else? At what quality, price, and continuity? Can we have them come from the State because we actually do have the water supply in the north to supply the whole State?

Some of my northern California neighbors sometimes ask if I am going to send all the water south. They ask what is wrong with me. We have plenty of water if we would store it and if we would add to the Shasta Dam. We have the opportunity to raise Shasta Dam 18 feet, 600,000 more acre-feet of storage, and also the ability to not release water quite as quickly if they get to that point.

We see the water chugging down the Sacramento River without the re-

leases. There is a lot of water coming in. We get that, but that is what these structures are for, to take that ebb and flow, so to speak, and to be that rubber band. That is what dams are good for. That is why they are seeing flooding on the Klamath in areas, because they took the dams out and lost the hydroelectric power in the process.

We talk about how much water is getting away from us that could be generating power and growing crops in northern and central California—indeed, the breadbasket I just showed you.

Here is a more updated poster I have now of what has been happening. The water year, they score it from October 1 until the following September 30. This is starting from October of '23, the water year, up to, so far, a little earlier in January when we had this information. It is about a year and a quarter of flow.

What makes me crazy is we are not taking advantage right now of the water that is flowing out of Lake Oroville or coming out south of Lake Shasta and flooding the delta. During this year-and-a-quarter period that is almost current right now, we have a number of 29 million acre-feet that came into the delta.

Lake Oroville and Lake Shasta combined hold 8 million acre-feet. San Luis Reservoir holds about 2 million acre-feet. Nearby, New Melones is about 2 million. I think Trinity Lake is 2.2 million. I think Folsom Lake is a number of 800,000, if I remember correctly. We fill all those lakes one time with this year and a quarter's worth of flow that comes into the delta. That is what comes in.

Certainly, we are using some of that water and moving it to other places because we are smart and can design things. We have the engineers for that. We had the vision for that when we built the Central Valley Project in the thirties and the State Water Project in the sixties.

Their vision did put away a lot of water. They had a vision for even more, but they quit building it because the population didn't demand it at that time in the thirties or the sixties or whatever. It can't be built now because of all the environmental nonsense.

How much did we save? Twenty-nine million went in. Twenty-two million went out to the Pacific Ocean and turned into saltwater.

Some people say we should build some desal plants along the coast. Yes, we could do that. Certain areas might be strategically smart.

Guess what happened? I think a project called Poseidon in Huntington Beach, one of the beach towns in southern California, fought over it for 20 years. They tried to meet every mandate, every hoop to jump through on what it would take to get a permit from the California Coastal Commission and others. They spent millions of dollars to build that desal plant down there. They jumped through every hoop

and answered every question. They were told after 20 years they were not going to be permitted. There we are on our desal.

Where do we want the water to come from for anybody, for any purpose? It could come from right here, this 22 million we are wasting. What is happening right now? The mass inflow is coming down the Sacramento River, Feather River, and all these other areas. I would like to see what these delta inflows are today. They are probably pretty amazing.

There are two sets of pumps at the south end of the delta, a Federal set and a State set. President Trump has seen to it through the Bureau of Reclamation that the Federal pumps are running pretty strong. Some are around 90 to 91 percent capacity. State pumps are running at a much lower level, somewhere around 20 or 25 percent. It oscillates between that.

Why don't they run it at 100 percent and take advantage of the opportunity to fill the San Luis Reservoir, which is only three-quarters full right now, put water in the aqueduct, or put even more into the areas that water could be pooling in the Central Valley and doing groundwater recharge?

I was just told today that we saw some groundwater recharge last year due to some of those positive efforts. That is a tough deal for those folks down there because they have had overdrafts due to agriculture and due to having their surface water taken away from them on these projects because it is going out to the ocean on a fish deal. They had to run their wells. Maybe they ran them too much. We have had subsidence where the land goes down. It depresses somewhat. We even see that on the canals going through there.

We could be doing recharge right now, and the Governor has moved in a direction of allowing more recharge. For some reason, they have to get a permit every year. I talked to his team about that. I asked why we don't have the permits ready to go every year so we don't have to wait and lose time on that. Maybe that will be a precedent going forward.

We have groundwater recharge, filling the aqueducts in the southern California reservoirs that aren't full. For example, this one, which was empty when the fire broke out in the Pacific Palisades, is the Santa Ynez Reservoir. My understanding of it is that, done correctly, the aqueducts could supply some of the higher lakes—I think Lake Cachuma. Someone could straighten me out if I am wrong on this. Through the domino effect, surface water, I believe, could make it here. I know they fill this with well water also, but the lake was empty because they had to fix the cover over it.

They emptied it last February and haven't gotten around to doing the repair or finishing the job. It sat empty, 117 million gallons of water, which is about 40 acre-feet, which would have

helped keep the hydrants full instead of just a few hours as they are relying on three 1-million gallon tanks instead of 117 million. It lasted a few hours down there as they were valiantly trying to fight fires in the Palisades and other areas.

They could have had several days' worth of water had that been full. Was it bad planning? I don't know. Maybe it was bureaucracy. The crazy thing was the L.A. Fire Department didn't even know. They didn't have the knowledge that it was empty. Instead, there is a burned-out community because they didn't have everything they needed to be able to fight that fire the way they could.

Could they have beat it all? I am not sure. They had a lot of wind to beat. The firefighters fought valiantly, and people did what they could. Certainly, having that extra water supply could not have hurt.

I know I have seen plenty of that in my own northern California area, with communities just disappearing due to fire.

This falls more to forest management and land management. Down in southern California, they had a brush removal program in the areas adjacent and above those communities that burned. They suspended it. The brush is the fuel that allowed the fire, driven by high winds, to come all the way to the edge of town and burn through the town.

Maybe brush removal wouldn't be the be-all and end-all on that, but it sure would have helped. It would have given them more of a fighting chance. That is what it is. We are doing forest management, especially folks have seen around our cities, to thin the product, thin the trees and such to a point where a fire coming at a high speed from a distance hit that because the trees are thin enough and spread out enough that it hits the ground and slows down, so we have a chance to save whatever town it is.

We lost the town of Paradise partly because of that. We lost a town called Greenville in Plumas County. We lost another one next door called Canyon Dam above my hometown of Oroville, California. We lost the town of Berry Creek and other adjacent areas there due to fire after fire because of lack of management.

The one above Oroville, Berry Creek, had funding lined up to do some forest thinning around there. They had a grant. The local folks were going to do it. There was an 18-month process or longer to get the permits to do something. This is not something new, either. This isn't new under the Sun of thinning forests and managing them. They didn't get it done. Those areas burned. They burned out. These towns burned out.

I talked to a cattle rancher there about what that looked like for him. His family had been farming and ranching or grazing up in those forested areas for many generations and dec-

ades. Look it up on the Internet. Read his column. He is a man named David Daley, D-a-l-e-y. Look at his column. Look at the emotion. Look at what it meant to him on that. He wrote a really good column on that 2 or 3 years ago, on what that means. If we want to talk about a real human story on that and a real thing that affects the community, I ask my colleagues to look up David Daley. Search that and look at his column and the burned-out carcass of the cattle that he and his family run there, as well as all the other wildlife, the cougars, the raccoons, you name it. This happens to everybody.

The next effect of that after the fire is that when the rain does come, it is going to wash all this ash and all this mud down into the brooks, creeks, rivers, and streams and eventually into this area, Lake Oroville. Being a key part of the State Water Project, it supplies water to 20 million Californians.

It isn't just, well, the guys way up there in the sticks don't matter, whatever. No, that has an effect on pretty much the whole State that draws that water supply because we aren't doing a simple thing like something that is not new under the Sun of managing forests properly.

Well, they are going to clearcut everything. That is what they want to do. That is what the big timber and big lumber companies want. No, it isn't. That is nonsense.

Pay attention. Dig in on this. These folks that do it on their private land have an 80-year, 100-year plan of how they harvest, manage, and plant it back. That is what we need to have similarly on Federal lands or other government-owned lands, which I am reminded aren't government-owned. They are owned by the people. The government is supposed to be the steward of them. It is not being the steward.

The Forest Service is way behind the eight ball. They have 193 million acres under their purview. If they are managing 2 million of that per year, that is only 1 percent, which means it will take 100 years to get over all of it. Hopefully, they are accelerating the process. That is what we are trying to cause them to do here.

When they count burned-out land sometimes as treated acres, we can burn everything, I guess, and check the box that says it is treated. That is nonsense. That is terrible for everybody. The asset that timber is doesn't always get accounted for, for its value. We talk about what the cost of the firefighting was or the cost of the buildings and towns that were burned out. Do we ever get to see what the value is of the actual timber itself?

What we have isn't working. It is not all that successful with the management of these forested lands, the management of the water supply, and the ability we have to do so much better. It doesn't cause environmental harm. We have excess water for much of the year going out the delta and other areas that could be captured and put to good people use.

People still need the food. They still need these products. We can grow them in California, or we can try to import them from South America or somewhere else and become dependent on a foreign food supply. That is a really great idea. Then, we don't have the employment of our people. We don't have employment of the lumberjacks in small towns I represent in northern California and others like it in other States.

So, we have unemployment. We have small communities that are boarded up. We have all the things that go with the social aspect of the people who don't have the self-worth that comes from good, honest work. What does that get into? We know what that gets into. It ends up being alcoholism, drug abuse, domestic violence, all the things that would be restored with a strong local economy, giving products that people need anyway.

They need wood and paper products. They need food products. They need electricity generated, whether it is by a hydroelectric power plant or any other manner of energy that can do it.

Uranium, why aren't we doing much more with nuclear power? It is CO₂-free, for all the CO₂ scorers out there, so why aren't we doing that?

□ 1915

Environmentalists sue and stop over everything. We have to reform the Endangered Species Act; NEPA; and on the California State level, CEQA, to work for us once again. These are laws that the Fed level passed 50 years ago or longer, and they have been manipulated and they have been weaponized by courts, by judges, and by environmental groups to turn into everything else, even something as nice as a national park.

I would like to point out that the folks in Marin County, these farmers and ranchers there on an area called the Point Reyes National Seashore park, those folks came in in the early sixties and demanded they were going to bully these people off their land by eminent domain, so they struck a deal. They said, well, we will sell the land to the National Park Service as long as we have the ability to lease it back in perpetuity. That was the deal that was struck. As long as it is the same family that is in the operation there, the deal was it was supposed to be in perpetuity. They struck that deal, and they thought they could live with that.

Well, not too many years later after the weaponization of environmental laws and what is known as NEPA, a permit process, that got weaponized by environmental groups to sue the heck out of these people every time they tried to get an extension of their grazing permit. They were trying to get them for 20 years, then they said, well, we have to settle for 5 or 2.

For doing some of the environmental mitigation that they would be demanded of with only a 2-year lease, it is pretty tough to say, well, I can't put

half a million dollars into my sheds or my equipment or the drainage to control whatever might be coming off the dairy or the ranch, so they can't make the investment because they can't be assured they will be there long enough to do that. Basically they are screwed by the government and by environmental organizations. These are good, honorable people. They are very compatible with the land.

They say the tule elk are being affected by these cattle. The elk and the cattle get along beautifully together. There are many acres for them. They graze to a level that the land can sustain, and then they move them out. They move them to a different grazing area.

Grazing is a good thing, whether you are talking forested areas or as fire breaks or in this case at Point Reyes Seashore. These families have been disrespected and basically had a gun held to their head to sign an agreement only recently to say you are going to have to leave the land. These are good, hardworking people, and there doesn't seem to be much reward in California and some aspects of the Federal Government for being good, hardworking people, honest people, the ones that will pull over on the edge of the road and help you with your flat tire and make sure you are okay like that, you know?

What do they get? They get litigated to death. Some of them are very elderly now and they say that I just can't fight the fight anymore, I don't have enough money, I don't have enough will.

So what happens? The government wins. Extreme environmental organizations win. Somebody comes in and says they will save the day telling you, hey, we are going buy you out. You will get 15 months to be eased out of this. When all the employees are gone, and the cattle is gone, the dairies are going to go somewhere else.

It is hard enough to run a dairy in California anymore. They regulated that out of business. There are people who do not like dairy products. They don't like that. They don't like that it comes from animals.

You know, a lot of wrong people are in charge, and it has been pretty refreshing to see what the Trump administration has done to put things back in a direction here that rewards hard work, honesty, and the right way of doing things.

It can be kind of discouraging, very discouraging, and for the families, the farmers, the ranchers in this Point Reyes situation right now. My heart goes out to them. I hope we can find a solution for them because they shouldn't be getting kicked off that land. They, in good faith, when they were bullied off that land and had to sell to the parks or otherwise lose it to eminent domain, have now been bullied off by regulations, by NEPA, by endless lawsuits. That ain't right. That ain't America. They are still making a prod-

uct that people want and people need. They would like to continue to do that as good stewards of the land.

Instead, they have designs, like, well, we are going to have more tourism on there. Is that as good? I would suggest it probably isn't as good for that land, but they power ahead. I hope maybe something can be done to rectify that and rectify a lot of other things that have affected rural America so much so.

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

CHAOS, CONFUSION, AND MANUFACTURED CRISES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER) for 30 minutes.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I was listening to my colleague on the other side of the aisle as he was talking about how families want to be able to go to the grocery store and afford food for their kids; that they want to be able to put not just food on the table but put their kids in clothes and shoes and pay for their healthcare and for housing.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to share much of the frustration and anger of our constituents watching as the new administration has come in and done a whole host of things, announced a whole litany of actions but failed to deliver on the key promise of working to lower costs for American families. Costs are going up.

In fact, you may have seen the news today. Waffle House just announced that they are putting on a 50 cent surcharge per egg because the price of eggs have gone up so much. In fact, in my community in Highland Park, Illinois, a dozen eggs costs \$5.

A generation ago, President Clinton ran on a campaign built on a very simple axiom: It is the economy, stupid. What was true in 1992 is just as true in 2024 in the last election and is true today. The American people want their Representatives working and focused on the economy. They want us to be trying to create quality, well-paying jobs, provide more opportunities for themselves and a better future for their children. They want us to lower costs and raise the standard of living for all Americans.

Beyond economic growth and opportunity, they want us to make sure that we are helping to keep our communities healthy and safe and that we are focused on a strong national security and a strong national defense.

That is the charge voters gave us here in Congress and gave to the new President. It is hard to believe that we are only 2 weeks into the second Trump administration and already the early onslaught of chaos, confusion, and manufactured crises has been stunning. It is easy to feel overwhelmed. In fact, folks at home are telling me how

they feel because this onslaught is non-stop, which I guess is the point of what the administration is trying to do.

We are going to focus tonight on a couple of issues. I am joined by a couple of my colleagues. We are a part of the New Democratic Coalition. The new Democrats are the moderate Democrats, 110 strong, who are focused on serving our people an economy that is lifting up their lives. We are focused on lowering costs. We are focused on making life better for all Americans.

Look at the last couple of weeks, just three things. I can't touch on everything, but I will touch on three specific things.

A little more than a week ago, the administration issued a memo threatening to freeze \$3 trillion of spending across the board. It was confusing. It had no clarity of what specifically or how specifically anything would be frozen, who would be included, who would be excluded. Our phones started ringing off the hooks. Preschools providing early education to our children, giving them that head start to get ahead in life, were saying they might have to close. Programs like Meals on Wheels for seniors were struggling. Infrastructure projects such as in my district, a project that was decades in the making and received a \$19 million grant from the Department of Transportation, was threatened. Healthcare providers didn't know what they were going to continue to do. First responders were concerned.

There was an extraordinary outcry from across the country. On Monday, the administration started backtracking. By Tuesday, they had pulled the memo back altogether.

There is chaos, confusion, and manufactured crises.

Just this past weekend, President Trump announced 25 percent tariffs on our two most important trading partners, Mexico and Canada, as well as 10 percent tariffs on China. This is across the board.

The Wall Street Journal issued an op-ed titled: "The Dumbest Trade War in History." This is not a Democratic rag. This is The Wall Street Journal calling it the dumbest trade war in history. Evidently, the President got the message because within just a couple of days he paused the threat against our trading partners in Canada and Mexico.

For the past week, our phones have been ringing off the hooks again, this time talking about the fact that an individual who didn't receive a single vote, a billionaire who controls one of the largest social media platforms who would benefit from having access to data, classified, confidential personal data of Americans, was, in fact, given unfettered access to that confidential personal information of Americans. He was given access to their pay information, their Social Security numbers, healthcare information. All of this is now in the hands of Elon Musk, who no one in this country voted for. No one empowered him to try to control our government. A man who is positioned

to reap billions of dollars off the personal information of the American people and gain his own personal power is now having access to that information. We need to make sure that this stops.

Those are just three examples of the chaos, crisis, and confusion sown by this administration in just 2 weeks. Yet none of this has focused on bringing down the cost of eggs or the cost of living for the American people.

That is why we are here tonight calling on this administration, calling on our colleagues in Congress to work together with the Democrats to focus on the economy, to make life easier for all American families, and to help families get ahead and lift their children up for a better future.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CARBAJAL).

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I am proud to stand here as vice chair of the New Democrat Coalition to make it clear that we are here, 5 weeks into this new Congress, fighting to end the chaos of this new administration and get us back to what the American people elected us to do: lowering costs, promoting safer communities, and actually governing.

The American people elected us to tackle the cost of living, not cut public education. The American people elected us to lower the price of groceries, not declare trade wars with allies that will raise those prices for Americans even further.

Mr. Speaker, the American people elected us to ensure their communities are protected, not give billionaires back doors into their personal data. I want the American people to see this, this room. This room is empty. The majority has gone home for the night. We have not even tackled one bill this whole week to deal with the high costs.

This is a coequal branch of government, but my colleagues seem content to give up our congressional power of the purse. Where is the so-called party of law and order? That party is willing to look the other way on enforcing the law, like the laws that protect funding approved by Congress into law.

□ 1930

The self-proclaimed party of law and order is willing to let chaos reign, and thousands of Americans see the funding they rely on to get frozen, their benefits put on the chopping block, and even their jobs eliminated by an unelected billionaire.

My constituents are crying out for us to do something, and I want to ensure them that we are doing something. We are here even as they get ready to turn off the lights. We are working to craft legislation that will block rightwing activists and the use of our power in this Chamber to halt all the efforts to deny the law and promote chaos over order.

New Dems are the tip of the spear. We will fight ill-conceived tariffs and plots to raise taxes to pay for tax cuts

for the richest people in our country. We will fight invasions of our privacy. Of course, we will fight to deliver what we hear every single day: Lower the costs of living, make our communities safer, and stop the chaos and gridlock.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Again, Mr. Speaker, I thank SALUD CARBAJAL from California. He touched on that critical thing. Republicans are literally trying to take money from hardworking families to pay for tax cuts for those who need it the least, for billionaires like Elon Musk and Mark Zuckerberg or for the President's family.

The President threatened to put tariffs on our trading partners, Canada and Mexico. That is a tax on American families. We are not going to let it stand. That is why the outcry is important, and that is why it is important we are here tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO).

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my dear friend from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER) for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, you may have heard this, but inflation was one of the biggest issues in this last election.

Let me take you a little way back here. We saw during the height of the pandemic that it caused global inflation. Supply chains broke down, production broke down, and every country felt it, even the U.S. Inflation at one point rose as high as 9 percent. Over many months and many years and through efforts to boost productions, improve supply chains, and improve our infrastructure to get back to normal, we saw it go down to as low as 2.4 percent in September of 2024. Groceries and housing specifically have been a challenge.

When President Trump took office, inflation was still under 3 percent. It was still under 3 percent. Hundreds of executive orders have been signed. Some divisive and some illegal, but few, if any, address lowering costs for the American people. Many may have even increased costs.

First, the tariffs caused chaos against our own allies. President Trump admitted that this may cause some pain for Americans. Don't we remember he ran on lowering costs?

Maybe that was just a joke to get elected, because now suddenly we are going to have to accept some pain because of tariffs that he is trying to impose on the American people. Tariffs equal inflation. Tariffs equal taxes on American consumers.

Regarding immigration, we had a workforce shortage for many years, and then over time through legal programs like temporary protected status and parole in other areas, booming States like Florida, and particularly central Florida, south Florida, and Tampa Bay, benefited by these legal programs.

Mr. Speaker, when you look at housing, of which there is a huge shortage, 34 percent of the industry relies on immigrant labor. That is after trying to

get every American we can to work to help build housing. Also with commercial real estate it is the same thing.

So what do we see? Food prices already are starting to creep back up. With housing prices it is the same deal. Eggs, gosh, remember: I can't afford eggs, bro.

That was like a huge deal during the election. We saw eggs down to about \$2 only a couple of months ago. Now they are \$7 and almost \$8. Back in the day it was: Oh, it is President Biden. Now we have MAGA supporters going into intimate detail on the bird flu. That is funny. The last time that happened that wasn't the explanation at all. It was: Oh, Biden this and that. Now it is science and thoughtful answers to explain inflation that is happening under President Trump.

This was the craziest thing, Mr. Speaker. Apparently, it is dishonoring folks for us to even talk about how these policies will raise costs right up again that went down to as low as 2.4 percent a few months ago, still under 3 percent when President Trump was sworn in. However, it could get worse if the Trump tax scam 2.0 gets passed.

The Inflation Reduction Act allowed for a cap of \$2,000 a year for prescription drug savings for all seniors under Medicare. Mr. Speaker, \$3,500 was the cap last year. There was no cap before that, and most seniors were paying 3, 4, \$5,000 or more in out-of-pocket expenses.

Now seniors won't pay more than \$2,000 a year for their prescription drugs. However, if we see the majority take a sledgehammer to the IRA, then that savings goes away for seniors across the Nation just when they got it. That savings lowering costs for our seniors could go away.

Regarding the ObamaCare subsidies, oh, my gosh, have we not seen the majority learn, have Republicans not learned from now?

First of all, there is no plan, and there is no alternative. It has been over 10 years. By the way, since then, we have seen States like Florida have the largest ObamaCare exchange in the Nation. Mr. Speaker, 4.6 million Floridians from President Trump's home State, more than any other State in the Union, get their healthcare through the ACA exchange.

Do you know what happens if the ObamaCare subsidies go away, Mr. Speaker?

A family of four will see their healthcare increase by 8 to \$10,000 a year. That is a lot of eggs. That is a lot of costs that people are going to have to shoulder. That will cripple families.

Do you know what is also going to happen, Mr. Speaker? We will have more people without health insurance, and then it is going to cost taxpayers in the emergency room. This is not how you make America healthy again, Mr. Speaker. It is how you make America sicker.

Why would anybody want to eliminate these healthcare savings? What

could possibly be so important? Mr. Speaker, can you believe it is to cut taxes for billionaires? My constituents will see an \$8,000 to \$10,000 increase in their health insurance. Seniors across the Nation who have a \$2,000 cap on prescription drugs—little old ladies who are trying to pay out of their pockets for prescription drugs, our seniors, our men and our women—are going to have to forgo those savings because the top 1 percent and the top 0.1 percent need more tax cuts.

Are they serious? Is this what people voted for? Heck no.

The last time we saw that happen, we saw this Chamber flip quicker than you could possibly imagine. It was sad. It didn't have to be that way.

The record is clear: President Trump inherited a strong economy from President Biden. I am going to repeat that. President Trump inherited a strong economy from President Biden: High growth, big job numbers, and inflation below 3 percent, 2.9 percent to be exact as of the end of January.

Here is a simple measure we will see over the next couple of months: Will costs go up or will they go down? Will grocery prices go up or will they go down? Will housing prices go up or will they go down?

Democrats stand ready to work in a bipartisan manner to keep our economy running strong. This is the second closest House in the history of the Nation. There are three votes separating Democrats from Republicans in this Chamber. Actually one vote right now because of the folks who had to go on to the Trump administration. So we can easily work together to resolve these things or my friends will go it alone in some big reconciliation package for billionaires and then we will see what happens in these very easily tracked measures.

Most of all, people will see it when they want to buy a home, when they want to go to the grocery store, and when they want to go on vacation down to Orlando, which we welcome everyone to come to, or when they want to buy a new car.

All these things Americans are going to be watching. We need to work together.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from the great State of Virginia (Ms. MCCLELLAN), who is also a member of the leadership team for the New Democrat Coalition.

Ms. MCCLELLAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chair of the New Democrat Coalition, BRAD SCHNEIDER, for organizing this Special Order hour so that we can talk about the Trump-Vance-Musk administration's erratic and senseless attacks on the Federal Government, their Federal hiring freeze, their ill-conceived and shortsighted actions in the first 2 weeks, and how they are actually going to raise costs for the American people and not lower costs for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, you have heard about the tariffs that were on, then off, then

paused, except against China. Before the tariffs were announced, I was meeting with local leaders across my district from the rural southern end to the urban northern end. My farmers were worried about the trade war that the tariffs would unleash and how it would decimate the largest industry in Virginia which is agriculture.

The seniors across the district were worried about the impact that rescinding efforts to reduce prescription drug costs would have on their healthcare bills. Other seniors were worried about how attacks on energy efficiency programs that they use to weatherize their homes and reduce their electric bills would lead to higher utility bills.

We have seen whole flocks of the chickens on poultry farms having to be put down which will impact the cost of eggs that so many people supposedly voted this election because of their worry about.

We have seen hardworking Federal employees whose jobs are at risk who fear whether or not they will receive their pension if they take this illegal offer to buy them out. If they read the fine print of the documents that just now are starting to be given to them, they will find that they just might.

I don't think any of that lowers costs. What it does is throw the American Government, which so many people rely on, into chaos and grinding it to a halt, and that was the point. However, what we are going to find is that that does not lower costs. It hurts the American people, and the New Democrat Coalition will fight it every step of the way.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, we heard in the last half hour or so people talking about the rising cost of eggs. They talked about the fact that there is a bird flu epidemic that is devastating our flocks. The Centers for Disease Control is being cut by the Trump administration at a time when we need their work more than ever to try to make sure that this horrible epidemic comes to an end and that costs come down for American families.

The thing is that Trump and the House Republicans are plotting cuts to a whole host of programs across our government, programs providing services to seniors and veterans with healthcare, programs feeding hungry families and their children and more. All of these cuts are simply to pay for tax cuts for their billionaire friends like Elon Musk and others.

The New Dems will continue fighting on behalf of the American people to cut inflation, to improve the lives of hardworking families, and to make our communities safer and our national security stronger.

If Trump's tax on American consumers with his tariffs goes through on Canada and Mexico, then American consumers are going to see a 25 percent increase on many essentials, as well as things like cars and appliances and just taking a trip to the grocery.

While Trump is waging war on Americans' savings and bank accounts, the

New Dems will continue to fight to lower inflation and cut costs for hard-working families. By giving Elon Musk and his minions unfettered access to American citizens' personal information, he is putting at risk Medicare, Social Security, Medicaid, Head Start, and so much other information. The New Dems will continue to work with our colleagues in the Democratic Caucus on legislation to prevent unlawful access to this information.

We are prepared to stand strong on behalf of the American people. We are prepared to stay focused on the economy and do everything we can to make peoples' lives easier, to make their future and their children's future better, and to preserve our dear country.

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

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 6, 2025, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

EC-291. A letter from the OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Commissary Credit and Debit Card User Fee [Docket ID: DoD-2019-OS-0131] (RIN: 0790-AK92) received February 3, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-292. A letter from the Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, USD(A&S)(A)/DPCAP, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Update of Challenge Period for Validation of Asserted Restrictions on Technical Data and Computer Software (DFARS Case 2022-D016) [Docket: DARS-2022-0030] (RIN: 0750-AL67) received February 3, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-293. A letter from the Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, USD(A&S)(A)/DPCAP, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Technical Amendments [Docket: DARS-2024-0001] received February 3, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-294. A letter from the Director, Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Financial Crimes Enforcement Network; Inflation Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalties received February 3, 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-295. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, Division of Regulatory Services, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final regulations — Indian Education Discretionary Grant Programs; Professional Development Program [Docket ID ED-2024-OESE-0008] (RIN: 1810-AB70) received February 3, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

EC-296. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, Division of Regulatory Services, Office of Postsecondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Income-Contingent Repayment Plan Options [Docket ID ED-2024-OPE-0135] (RIN: 1840-AD97) received February 3, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

EC-297. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — International Traffic in Arms Regulations: U.S. Munitions List Targeted Revisions [Public Notice: 12441] (RIN: 1400-AF42) received February 3, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-298. A letter from the Director, GSA Regulatory Secretariat Division, Office of Governmentwide Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — GSAR Case 2024-G502, Update to OMB Approval Table (RIN: 3090-AK81) received February 3, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

EC-299. A letter from the Biologist, NMFS, Office of Protected Resources, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Taking and Importing Marine Mammals; Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to the U.S. Navy Training and Testing Activities in the Hawaii-Southern California Training and Testing Study Area [Docket No.: 241220-0334] (RIN: 0648-BL72) received February 3, 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-300. A letter from the Management Analyst, OS Federal Register Liaison, Office of the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's direct final rule — Joint Policies of the Departments of the Interior and of the Army Relative to Reservoir Project Lands [Docket No.: DOI-2024-0017; 256D0102DM, DS6CS00000, DLSN00000.000000, DX6CS25] (RIN: 1093-AA29) received February 3, 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-301. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, Division of Regulatory Services, Office of General Counsel, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final regulations — Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalties for Inflation (RIN: 1801-AA25) received February 3, 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.

EC-302. A letter from the Agency Representative, United States Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Setting and Adjusting Patent Fees During Fiscal Year 2025 [Docket No.: PTO-P-2022-0033] (RIN: 0651-AD64) received February 3, 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.

EC-303. A letter from the Legal Yeoman, United States Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establish Anchorage Ground; Port Westward Anchorage; Columbia River, Oregon and Washington [USCG-2023-0749] (RIN: 1625-AA01) received February 3, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-304. A letter from the Legal Yeoman, United States Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Security Zone; Corpus Christi Ship Channel, Corpus Christi, TX [Docket Number USCG-2024-1002] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received February 3, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-305. A letter from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's Temporary final rule — Safety Zone, Lower Mississippi River, Natchez, MS [Docket Number: USCG-2024-1055] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 3, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-306. A letter from the Legal Yeoman, United States Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Updated Document Submission Process for Compliance with Electronic Records Mandate [Docket No.: USCG-2023-0584] (RIN: 1625-AC93) received February 3, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-307. A letter from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Special Local Regulation; San Diego Bay, San Diego, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2024-0877] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received February 3, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-308. A letter from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Special Local Regulation; American River, Sacramento, CA [Docket Number: USCG-2024-0909] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received February 3, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-309. A letter from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Santa Barbara Harbor, Santa Barbara, CA [Docket Number: USCG-2024-1004] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 3, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-310. A letter from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; San Pedro Bay, Los Angeles, CA [Docket Number: USCG-2024-1019] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 3, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-311. A letter from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Queensway Bay, Long Beach, CA [Docket

Number: USCG-2024-1025] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 3, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-312. A letter from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Security Zone; Corpus Christi Ship Channel, Corpus Christi, TX [Docket Number: USCG-2024-1078] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received February 3, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-313. A letter from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone, Port Arthur Canal, Sabine, Pass, TX [Docket No.: USCG-2022-0988] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 3, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-314. A letter from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's Temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Cypress Passage overhead powerline demolition and removal, Atchafalaya River, LA [Docket Number: USCG-2024-1095] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 3, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-315. A letter from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulated Navigation Area; Port of Miami, Miami, FL [Docket Number: USCG-2024-0205] (RIN: 1625-AA11) received February 3, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-316. A letter from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's Temporary final rule — Special Local Regulation; Lake Havasu, Lake Havasu City, AZ [Docket Number: USCG-2024-0869] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received February 3, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-317. A letter from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — Regulated Navigation Area; Cuyahoga River, Cleveland, OH [Docket Number: USCG-2024-0393] (RIN: 1625-AA11) received February 3, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-318. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Section, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Automatic Consent for Revocation of Section 831(b) Elections (Rev. Proc. 2025-13) received February 3, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. VINDMAN (for himself and Mr. WITTMAN):

H.R. 977. A bill to permit Federal employees who are spouses of members of the armed

forces to engage in telework and remote work, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. STAUBER (for himself, Mr. FINSTAD, Mrs. FISCHBACH, Mr. FULCHER, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. HUNT, Ms. MALOY, Ms. HAGEMAN, and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 978. A bill to rescind Public Land Order 7917, to reinstate mineral leases and permits in the Superior National Forest, to ensure timely review of Mine Plans of Operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself and Mr. PALLONE):

H.R. 979. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to issue a rule requiring access to AM broadcast stations in motor vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Homeland Security, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. VAN ORDEN:

H.R. 980. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements to the provision of on-campus educational and vocational counseling by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VAN ORDEN:

H.R. 981. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the processes to approve programs of education for purposes of the educational assistance programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VAN ORDEN:

H.R. 982. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the amount of educational assistance paid by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to an eligible individual during the first year of a full-time program of apprenticeship or other on-job training; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VAN ORDEN:

H.R. 983. A bill to Amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to disapprove courses of education offered by a public institution of higher learning that does not charge the in-State tuition rate to a veteran using certain educational assistance under title 10 of such Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. VAN ORDEN:

H.R. 984. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide timely equitable relief to an individual who suffers a loss based on an administrative error by the Secretary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VAN ORDEN (for himself and Mr. CARBAJAL):

H.R. 985. A bill to amend the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018 to reauthorize the dairy business innovation initiatives; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. BALINT:

H.R. 986. A bill to amend the Marsh-Billings-Rockefeller National Historical Park Establishment Act to expand the boundary of the Marsh-Billings-Rockefeller National Historical Park in the State of Vermont, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BARR (for himself, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mr. CLYDE, and Mr. HARRIGAN):

H.R. 987. A bill to amend certain banking laws to prohibit certain financial service providers who deny fair access to financial services from using taxpayer funded discount window lending programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BOST (for himself, Mr. CISCOMANI, Mr. BALDERSON, and Mr. KEAN):

H.R. 988. A bill to amend title 36, United States Code, to move the place of incorporation and domicile of the National Woman's Relief Corps to Illinois, to move the principal office of such Corps to Murphysboro, Illinois, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. BROWN (for herself and Mr. RASKIN):

H.R. 989. A bill to codify Executive Order 11246 titled "Equal Employment Opportunity"; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Ms. CHU (for herself and Mr. CAREY):

H.R. 990. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals to avoid a penalty for failure to pay income tax by timely paying 125 percent of the income tax liability for the prior year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLOUD (for himself, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. CASE, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. GOLDEN of Maine, Ms. PEREZ, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. MCCORMICK, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. OBERNOLTE, Mr. EDWARDS, and Mr. COLLINS):

H.R. 991. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to provide that any estimate prepared by the Congressional Budget Office or the Joint Committee on Taxation shall include costs relating to servicing the public debt, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules, 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. CLOUD (for himself, Mr. BABIN, Mr. BIGGS of Arizona, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. EVANS of Colorado, Ms. FOXX, Mr. GOSAR, Ms. MACE, Mr. NEHLS, Mr. ROUZER, Ms. VAN DUYN, Mr. SCHMIDT, and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida):

H.R. 992. A bill to prohibit the Department of Justice from bringing a civil action against a State under section 9 or 10 of the Act of March 3, 1899, for certain border security measures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. CORREA (for himself and Mr. LUTTRELL):

H.R. 993. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to develop a plan to identify, integrate, and deploy new, innovative, disruptive, or other emerging or advanced technologies to enhance, or address capability gaps in, border security operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. DEXTER:

H.R. 994. A bill to prohibit retaliation against any Federal employee who stops, or attempts to stop, unlawful or unconstitutional actions by Elon Musk against Federal

agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. ANSARI, Ms. BALINT, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BISHOP, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWN, Ms. BROWNLEY, Ms. BUDZINSKI, Mr. CARSON, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. CASAR, Mr. CASE, Ms. CHU, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONAWAY, Ms. CROCKETT, Mr. CROW, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Mrs. MCCLAIN DELANEY, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DELUZIO, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. DEXTER, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. EVANS of Pennsylvania, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Mr. FOSTER, Mrs. FOUSHEE, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. FROST, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. GARCIA of California, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GOLDEN of Maine, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. HOYLE of Oregon, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. IVEY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. LANDSMAN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Mr. LIEU, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MAGAZINER, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. MCBRIDE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGARVEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. MENG, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. MRVAN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. OMAR, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. PEREZ, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. RILEY of New York, Ms. ROSS, Mr. RYAN, Ms. SALINAS, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SOTO, Ms. STANSBURY, Ms. STEVENS, Mrs. SYKES, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THANEDAR, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. TITUS, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. TURNER of Texas, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WATERS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 995. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for current year inclusion of net CFC tested income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FEENSTRA (for himself, Mrs. BICE, and Ms. PEREZ):

H.R. 996. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to enhance the paid family and medical leave credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FEENSTRA (for himself and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 997. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to conform to the intent of the Internal Revenue Service Restructuring and Reform Act of 1998, as set forth in the joint explanatory statement of the committee of conference accompanying Conference Report 105-599, that the National Taxpayer Advocate be able to hire and consult counsel as appropriate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FEENSTRA (for himself and Mr. SCHNEIDER):

H.R. 998. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require additional information on math and clerical error notices; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. FLETCHER (for herself, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Ms. CRAIG, Ms. JACOBS, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. AMO, Ms. ANSARI, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Ms. BALINT, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BELL, Mr. BERA, Mr. BEYER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWN, Ms. BROWNLEY, Ms. BUDZINSKI, Ms. BYNUM, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CARSON, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. CASAR, Mr. CASE, Mr. CASTEN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Ms. CHU, Mr. CISNEROS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CORREA, Mr. COSTA, Ms. CROCKETT, Mr. CROW, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DELUZIO, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. DEXTER, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. ELFRETH, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. EVANS of Pennsylvania, Mr. FOSTER, Mrs. FOUSHEE, Mr. FIGURES, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. FRIEDMAN, Mr. FROST, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GARCIA of California, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. GILLEN, Ms. PEREZ, Mr. GOLDEN of Maine, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. GOODLANDER, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. HOYER, Ms. HOYLE of Oregon, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. IVEY, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. LANDSMAN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LATIMER, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Ms. LEE of Nevada, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LICCARDO, Mr. LIEU, Mr. MAGAZINER, Mr. MANNION, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. MCBRIDE, Ms. MCCLAIN DELANEY, Ms. MCCLELLAN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. McDONALD RIVET, Mr. MCGARVEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. MCIVER, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. MENG, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MIN, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MORELLE, Ms. MORRISON, Mr. MOSKOWITZ, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. MRVAN, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. OLSZEWSKI, Ms. OMAR, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PETTERSEN, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. POCAN, Ms. POU, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Ms. RANDALL, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. RIVAS, Ms. ROSS, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RYAN, Ms. SALINAS, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. SCHOLTEN, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SHERRILL, Ms. SIMON, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SORENSON, Mr. SOTO, Ms. STANSBURY, Mr. STANTON, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. SUBRAMANYAM, Mr. SWALWELL, Mrs. SYKES, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THANEDAR, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. TITUS, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. TOKUDA,

Mr. TONKO, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. TRAN, Mr. TURNER of Texas, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VASQUEZ, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. VINDMAN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WATERS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, and Ms. LOFGREN):

H.R. 999. A bill to protect an individual's ability to access contraceptives and to engage in contraception and to protect a health care provider's ability to provide contraceptives, contraception, and information related to contraception; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GREEN of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. GUEST, Mr. GIMENEZ, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. STRONG, Mr. EZELL, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mrs. BIGGS of South Carolina, Mr. EVANS of Colorado, Mr. MOOLENAAR, and Mr. GARBARINO):

H.R. 1000. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for education and training programs and resources of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, 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 Ms. HAGEMAN:

H.R. 1001. A bill to provide for a memorandum of understanding to address the impacts of a certain record of decision on the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. HAYES (for herself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BEYER, Ms. STANSBURY, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. CASTEN, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. FROST, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MAGAZINER, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. DELUZIO, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. CARSON, Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. EVANS of Pennsylvania, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. OLSZEWSKI, Ms. MCBRIDE, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. MCIVER, Mr. MCGARVEY, and Ms. OMAR):

H.R. 1002. A bill to amend the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 and title 5, United States Code, to permit leave to care for a domestic partner, parent-in-law, or adult child, or another related individual, who has a serious health condition, and to allow employees to take, as additional leave, parental involvement and family wellness leave to participate in or attend their children's and grandchildren's educational and extracurricular activities or meet family care needs; to the Committee on Education and Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, and House Administration, 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. HERN of Oklahoma:

H.R. 1003. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the carbon oxide sequestration credit to ensure parity for different uses and utilizations of qualified carbon oxide; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUDSON (for himself, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. VAN ORDEN, Ms. MORRISON, Mr. LUTTRELL, and Mr. KHANNA):

H.R. 1004. A bill to amend titles 10 and 38, United States Code, to improve benefits and services for surviving spouses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JOYCE of Ohio (for himself and Mr. RULLI):

H.R. 1005. A bill to prohibit elementary and secondary schools from accepting funds from or entering into contracts with the Government of the People's Republic of China and the Chinese Communist Party, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Mr. JOYCE of Ohio (for himself and Ms. MALLIOTAKIS):

H.R. 1006. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the excise tax on investment income of private colleges and universities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAWLER (for himself, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. MOSKOWITZ, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. LALOTA, Mr. KUSTOFF, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. BACON, Ms. FOX, Ms. GILLEN, Mr. OWENS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. KILEY of California, Mr. RYAN, Mr. KEAN, Mr. EDWARDS, Ms. BROWN, Mr. SCHMIDT, Mrs. BICE, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mrs. KIM, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. ALFORD, Mr. MOORE of North Carolina, Mr. OBERNOLTE, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. CAREY, Mr. MANN, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. MESSMER, Mr. CISCOMANI, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mr. GOLDMAN of Texas, Mr. FEENSTRA, Mrs. HINSON, Mr. JAMES, Mr. LANDSMAN, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. CRANK, Ms. MENG, Mr. ESTES, Mr. LANGWORTHY, Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. MALOY, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. WITTMAN, and Ms. STEVENS):

H.R. 1007. A bill to provide for the consideration of a definition of antisemitism set forth by the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance for the enforcement of Federal antidiscrimination laws concerning education programs or activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAWLER (for himself, Mr. GARBARINO, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. MORELLE, Ms. MENG, Mr. RYAN, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. TONKO, Mr. TORRES of New York, and Mr. LATIMER):

H.R. 1008. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 298 Route 292 in Holmes, New York, as the "Sheriff Adrian 'Butch' Anderson Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LAWLER (for himself, Mr. GARBARINO, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Ms. MENG, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. RYAN, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. TONKO, Mr. TORRES of New York, and Mr. LATIMER):

H.R. 1009. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 86 Main Street in Haverstraw, New York, as the "Paul Piperato Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ (for herself, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas):

H.R. 1010. A bill to require Federal law enforcement agencies to report on cases of missing or murdered Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Natural Resources, 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 Ms. LETLOW:

H.R. 1011. A bill to amend the Agricultural Credit Act of 1978 to remove barriers to agricultural producers in accessing funds to carry out emergency measures under the emergency conservation program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. ISSA, Mrs. KIM, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. LAWLER, and Mr. PETERS):

H.R. 1012. A bill to amend the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 to prioritize the acceptance of high-level radioactive waste or spent nuclear fuel from certain civilian nuclear power reactors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LUCAS (for himself, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. FOSTER, and Mr. BARR):

H.R. 1013. A bill to amend the Federal securities laws to enhance 403(b) plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LUTTRELL:

H.R. 1014. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Defense to include certain tests as part of the periodic health assessments provided to members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. MACE (for herself, Mr. NEHLS, Mr. DONALDS, and Ms. BOEBERT):

H.R. 1015. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for certain rules for housing or transportation based on gender and to provide for a limitation on gender-related medical treatment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MACE (for herself, Mr. OGLES, Mr. RULLI, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. GILL of Texas, Ms. BOEBERT, and Mr. MOORE of West Virginia):

H.R. 1016. A bill to prohibit individuals from accessing or using single-sex facilities on Federal property other than those corresponding to their biological sex, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. MACE:

H.R. 1017. A bill to prohibit an entity from receiving Federal funds if such entity permits an individual to access or use a single-sex facility on the property of such entity that does not correspond to the biological sex of such person, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MESSMER:

H.R. 1018. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require additional information in disclosures of foreign gifts and contracts from foreign sources; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS (for herself and Mrs. DINGELL):

H.R. 1019. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to ensure the reliability of address information provided under the Medicaid program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MOOLENAAR (for himself, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. HUIZENGA, and Mr. PANETTA):

H.R. 1020. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a refundable credit against tax for the purchase of communications signal boosters in areas with inadequate broadband internet access service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NEGUSE (for himself and Mr. OBERNOLTE):

H.R. 1021. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to increase the minimum disaster loan amount for which the Small Business Administration may require collateral, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 1022. A bill to amend title 11, District of Columbia Official Code, to revise references in such title to individuals with intellectual disabilities; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. OWENS (for himself and Mr. HARRIS of North Carolina):

H.R. 1023. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require disclosure of certain foreign investments within endowments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Mr. PANETTA (for himself, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. BERA, Ms. TITUS, Mr. SUOZZI, Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Ms. TENNEY, and Ms. VAN DUYNE):

H.R. 1024. A bill to authorize the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (normal trade relations treatment) to the products of Kazakhstan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SELF (for himself, Mr. JACKSON of Texas, and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 1025. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2600 Wesley Street in Greenville, Texas, as the "Cooper Dawson Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SMUCKER (for himself, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Ms. SCHRIER):

H.R. 1026. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals with direct primary care service arrangements to remain eligible individuals for purposes of health savings accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SORENSON (for himself and Mr. CISCOMANI):

H.R. 1027. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require disclosures with respect to robocalls using artificial intelligence and to provide for enhanced penalties for certain violations involving artificial intelligence voice or text message impersonation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STEUBE (for himself, Mr. CLYDE, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. HARIDOPOLIS, Ms. MACE, Mr. BURCHETT, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. NEHLS, Mr. OWENS, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Ms. HAGEMAN, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. EDWARDS, Ms. DE LA CRUZ, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. FULCHER, Mr. BABIN, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. KUSTOFF, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BIGGS of Arizona, Mr. MESSMER, Mr. BOST, Mr. VAN ORDEN, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. TIMMONS, and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 1028. A bill to modify eligibility requirements for amateur sports governing organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 1029. A bill to abolish the United States Agency for International Development; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. STRICKLAND:

H.R. 1030. A bill to develop a database of members of the Armed Forces who died in non-combat military plane crashes and to provide support to the families of such members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. TENNEY (for herself and Mr. SUOZZI):

H.R. 1031. A bill to establish the Fort Ontario National Monument in the State of New York as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. TENNEY:

H.R. 1032. A bill to prohibit Federal spending on funding research in China, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. TORRES of New York (for himself and Mr. LAWLER):

H.R. 1033. A bill to require the Secretary of Education to establish a program to provide for antisemitism monitors at institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Mr. TURNER of Texas (for himself and Mr. LUTTRELL):

H.R. 1034. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish a DHS Cybersecurity On-the-Job Training Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. UNDERWOOD (for herself, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. CHU, Ms. MENG, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. MAGAZINER, Mr. BEYER, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. MCBRIDE, Mr. DELUZIO, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Ms. TITUS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. NADLER, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. SANCHEZ, Ms. TOKUDA, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Mr. CLEAVER, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. STANSBURY, Mr. CASAR, Mr. CASTEN, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. FROST, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. MCGARVEY, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. STRICKLAND, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. CARSON, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. ANSARI, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Mr. THANEDAR, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. BROWN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Ms. OMAR):

H.R. 1035. A bill to amend the Family and Medical Leave Act to expand employees eligible for leave and employers subject to leave requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, 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. VALADAO (for himself, Mr. TURNER of Ohio, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, and Mr. MAGAZINER):

H.R. 1036. A bill to provide for modifications to ending trafficking in government contracting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. VAN DUYNE (for herself, Mr. NEHLS, Mr. SELF, Mr. CLINE, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. VAN ORDEN, Mr. TIFFANY, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. PERRY, Mr. EDWARDS, and Mr. BIGGS of Arizona):

H.R. 1037. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to promptly comply with State requests for information regarding the citizenship status of an individual; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VASQUEZ (for himself and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 1038. A bill to direct the Bureau of Labor Statistics to prepare and publish a Consumer Price Index for Rural Consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Ms. MALOY (for herself, Mr. OWENS, Ms. HAGEMAN, Mr. MOYLAN, Mr. FULCHER, Mr. KENNEDY of Utah, and Mr. MOORE of Utah):

H.J. Res. 36. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture relating to "Law Enforcement; Criminal Prohibitions"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H. Res. 107. A resolution electing a Member to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. AGUILAR:

H. Res. 108. A resolution electing a Member to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SMITH of Missouri (for himself and Mr. NEAL):

H. Res. 109. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Ways and Means in the One Hundred Nineteenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HAMADEH of Arizona (for himself, Mr. OWENS, Mr. GILL of Texas, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. NEHLS, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. BURLISON, Mr. HARIDOPOLOS, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. GOODEN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. ISSA, and Mr. SCHMIDT):

H. Res. 110. A resolution prohibiting the distribution of Chinese Communist Party-controlled publications within House facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota (for himself, Mr. STEIL, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, and Mr. TORRES of New York):

H. Res. 111. A resolution expressing support for blockchain technology and digital assets; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PANETTA (for himself, Mr. BACON, Mr. NEGUSE, and Mr. BAIRD):

H. Res. 112. A resolution expressing support for the designation of February 5, 2025, as "National Prosecutors Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H. Res. 113. A resolution directing the Secretary of Homeland Security to transmit to the House of Representatives certain documents relating to Department of Homeland Security policies and activities related to

the security of Department information and data and the recruitment and retention of its workforce; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H. Res. 114. A resolution directing the Secretary of Homeland Security to transmit to the House of Representatives certain documents relating to Department of Homeland Security policies and activities related to domestic preparedness and collective response to terrorism and the Department's cybersecurity activities; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania

(for himself, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. COSTA, Mr. MAGAZINER, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. BEAN of Florida, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. WITTMAN, Ms. BUDZINSKI, Ms. PEREZ, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. STEIL, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. OWENS, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. FINSTAD, Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. SORENSEN, Mr. LAWLER, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. TONKO, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mrs. HINSON, Mr. FRY, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MRVAN, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. BOST, Mr. CISCOMANI, and Ms. LETLOW):

H. Res. 115. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of "Career and Technical Education Month"; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN (for herself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi,

Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. NEAL, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BEYER, Mr. MULLIN, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. CROCKETT, Ms. NORTON, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. OLSZEWSKI, Mr. THANEDAR, Ms. SIMON, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. PETERS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. TONKO, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. TURNER of Texas, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. TORRES of New York, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. CASTEN, Mr. CORREA, Mrs. MCIVER, Mr. MIN, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. CARSON, Mr. DELUZIO, Ms. SALINAS, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. POCAN, Ms. BUDZINSKI, Mr. IVEY, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. MCBRIDE, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. TRAHAN, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. ANSARI, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. MENG, Mr. LANDSMAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. HOYLE of Oregon, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. SUBRAMANYAM, Mr. KEATING, Ms. BALINT, Mr. AMO, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MAGAZINER, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. TITUS, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. DEXTER, Mrs. MCCLAIN DELANEY, Ms. LEE of Nevada, Ms. POU, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. STANTON, Mr. HOYER, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. LIEU, Mr. MANNION, Mr. MFUME, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. ROSS, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. GARCIA of California, Ms. OMAR, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. FIGURES, Ms. DELBENE, Ms.

ESCOBAR, Ms. GOODLANDER, and Mr. MRVAN):

H. Res. 116. A resolution condemning the pardons for individuals who were found guilty of assaulting Capitol Police Officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

ML-1. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Ohio, relative to House Concurrent Resolution Number 8, urging the federal government to select Ohio for the permanent headquarters of the United States Space Command; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ML-2. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Ohio, relative to House Concurrent Resolution Number 14, urging the United States Congress to enact the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative Act of 2024; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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. VINDMAN:

H.R. 977.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, “[The Congress shall have 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 Officer thereof.”

By Mr. STAUBER:

H.R. 978.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 18

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 979.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. VAN ORDEN:

H.R. 980.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3

By Mr. VAN ORDEN:

H.R. 981.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, Sec 8, Clause 18

By Mr. VAN ORDEN:

H.R. 982.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3

By Mr. VAN ORDEN:

H.R. 983.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3

Article I, Section 8, clause 14

By Mr. VAN ORDEN:

H.R. 984.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3

By Mr. VAN ORDEN:

H.R. 985.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. BALINT:

H.R. 986.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 987.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BOST:

H.R. 988.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. BROWN:

H.R. 989.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section VIII

By Ms. CHU:

H.R. 990.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article 1

By Mr. CLOUD:

H.R. 991.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. CLOUD:

H.R. 992.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, 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. CORREA:

H.R. 993.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. DEXTER:

H.R. 994.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. DOGGETT:

H.R. 995.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FEENSTRA:

H.R. 996.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 1 (Taxing and Spending Clause)

By Mr. FEENSTRA:

H.R. 997.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 1 (Taxing and Spending Clause)

By Mr. FEENSTRA:

H.R. 998.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 1 (Taxing and Spending Clause)

By Mrs. FLETCHER:

H.R. 999.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GREEN of Tennessee:

H.R. 1000.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One, Section Eight, Clause One

By Ms. HAGEMAN:

H.R. 1001.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, clause 2 (Property Clause)

By Mrs. HAYES:

H.R. 1002.

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. HERN of Oklahoma:

H.R. 1003.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. HUDSON:

H.R. 1004.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 1

By Mr. JOYCE of Ohio:

H.R. 1005.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. JOYCE of Ohio:

H.R. 1006.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. LAWLER:

H.R. 1007.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. LAWLER:

H.R. 1008.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 7

By Mr. LAWLER:

H.R. 1009.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7

By Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ:

H.R. 1010.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: “[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 Officer thereof.”

By Ms. LETLOW:

H.R. 1011.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. LEVIN:

H.R. 1012.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. LUCAS:

H.R. 1013.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. LUTTRELL:

H.R. 1014.

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 in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Ms. MACE:

H.R. 1015.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Ms. MACE:

H.R. 1016.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Ms. MACE:

H.R. 1017.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. MESSMER:

H.R. 1018.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8.

By Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS:

H.R. 1019.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8 of the Constitution. "The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

By Mr. MOOLENAAR:

H.R. 1020.

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; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. NEGUSE:

H.R. 1021.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 1022.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 17 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 1023.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. PANETTA:

H.R. 1024.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 3

By Mr. SELF:

H.R. 1025.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. SMUCKER:

H.R. 1026.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section VIII of Article I of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. SORENSEN:

H.R. 1027.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 1028.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 1029.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. STRICKLAND:

H.R. 1030.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. TENNEY:

H.R. 1031.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article one

By Ms. TENNEY:

H.R. 1032.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article one

By Mr. TORRES of New York:

H.R. 1033.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. TURNER of Texas:

H.R. 1034.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Ms. UNDERWOOD:

H.R. 1035.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. VALADAO:

H.R. 1036.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. VAN DUYNE:

H.R. 1037.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Sec. 8

By Mr. VASQUEZ:

H.R. 1038.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United State Constitution, to provide for the general welfare and make all laws necessary and proper to carry out the powers of the Congress.

By Ms. MALOY:

H.J. Res. 36.

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. 22: Mr. MILLS.

H.R. 26: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. MCGUIRE, and Mr. BEGICH.

H.R. 27: Mr. KILEY of California, Mr. MCGUIRE, and Mr. BEGICH.

H.R. 35: Mr. MILLS.

H.R. 36: Mr. MOYLAN.

H.R. 38: Mr. MILLS.

H.R. 51: Ms. ELFRETH.

H.R. 54: Mr. MILLS.

H.R. 136: Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 139: Mr. MCCORMICK and Mr. RUTHERFORD.

H.R. 151: Mr. GILL of Texas and Mr. MILLS.

H.R. 162: Mr. TIFFANY.

H.R. 163: Mr. MILLS.

H.R. 175: Mr. SCHMIDT.

H.R. 205: Mr. DONALDS.

H.R. 224: Mr. NUNN of Iowa.

H.R. 236: Mr. HARRIGAN.

H.R. 247: Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 262: Mr. COLLINS.

H.R. 273: Mr. MOORE of North Carolina and Mr. RUTHERFORD.

H.R. 309: Mr. RUTHERFORD.

H.R. 323: Mr. MANNION, Ms. GILLEN, Mr. SUOZZI, and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 329: Mr. OLSZEWSKI.

H.R. 345: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 347: Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. MACE, Mr. MAGAZINER, and Mr. GARBARINO.

H.R. 369: Mr. EDWARDS.

H.R. 396: Mr. MCGARVEY, Ms. TLAIB, Mrs. RAMIREZ, and Mr. MANNION.

H.R. 397: Mr. TORRES of New York, Mr. MANNION, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 407: Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Ms. PLASKETT, and Ms. OMAR.

H.R. 425: Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS and Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia.

H.R. 429: Mr. HARDER of California.

H.R. 433: Ms. ANSARI, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. THANEDAR.

H.R. 445: Mr. GOLDMAN of Texas.

H.R. 452: Ms. VAN DUYNE, Mr. ESTES, Mr. NUNN of Iowa, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. DUNN of Florida, Mr. FLOOD, and Mr. GOLDMAN of Texas.

H.R. 465: Mr. GILL of Texas, Mr. BARR, and Mr. DOWNING.

H.R. 474: Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 475: Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 478: Mr. ROSE, Mr. McDOWELL, and Mr. ALFORD.

H.R. 479: Mr. KENNEDY of Utah.

H.R. 492: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 500: Ms. McDONALD RIVET.

H.R. 504: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 507: Ms. MALLIOTAKIS.

H.R. 516: Mr. ALLEN, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. YAKYM, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. LAHOOD, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Mr. NEHLS, and Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas.

H.R. 522: Mr. YAKYM.

H.R. 530: Mr. STANTON, Mr. SWALWELL, and Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 539: Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. BOST, Mr. DAVIDSON, and Mr. MASSIE.

H.R. 587: Mr. YAKYM.

H.R. 599: Mr. GILL of Texas.

H.R. 623: Mr. BOST.

H.R. 624: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.

H.R. 627: Mr. BIGGS of Arizona and Mr. HARRIS of Maryland.

H.R. 638: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 648: Mr. LUTTRELL, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. FITZGERALD, and Ms. TENNEY.

H.R. 649: Mr. WEBER of Texas and Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 662: Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 668: Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 670: Mr. GARCIA of Illinois.

H.R. 682: Mr. RUTHERFORD.

H.R. 696: Mr. YAKYM.

H.R. 719: Mr. HARRIS of North Carolina.

H.R. 720: Mr. HARRIS of North Carolina.

H.R. 723: Mr. LOUDERMILK.

H.R. 724: Mr. CRANK.

H.R. 728: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Ms. SANCHEZ.

H.R. 736: Mrs. FISCHBACH.

H.R. 740: Mr. SCOTT Franklin of Florida.

H.R. 749: Mr. DONALDS and Mr. BOST.

H.R. 756: Mr. RUTHERFORD.

H.R. 759: Mr. LIEU.

H.R. 760: Ms. ROSS.

H.R. 764: Ms. DELBENE, Mr. TURNER of Texas, and Mr. GOLDMAN of New York.
H.R. 777: Mrs. DINGELL.
H.R. 786: Mr. CRENSHAW.
H.R. 801: Mr. LAWLER.
H.R. 830: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 833: Mr. KUSTOFF, Mr. FINSTAD, and Mr. MACKENZIE.
H.R. 842: Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Mr. TURNER of Texas, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. MCGARVEY, Mr. CAREY, Mr. MOSKOWITZ, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. COHEN, Mr. BALDERSON, and Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 846: Mr. CASTEN.
H.R. 863: Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 879: Mr. BARR, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. JACKSON of Texas.

H.R. 882: Mr. GOLDMAN of Texas.
H.R. 884: Mr. LAMALFA and Mr. GOLDMAN of Texas.
H.R. 925: Mr. JACKSON of Texas, Mr. MCDOWELL, and Mr. GOODEN.
H.R. 929: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 943: Mr. VAN ORDEN and Mr. YAKYM.
H.R. 944: Mr. CARSON, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, and Ms. OMAR.
H.R. 945: Mr. POCAN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. OMAR, Mr. VAN ORDEN, and Ms. JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 959: Mr. CARSON.
H.R. 964: Mr. CARSON and Mr. MFUME.
H.J. Res. 20: Mr. SCHMIDT.
H.J. Res. 31: Mr. GOLDMAN of Texas.
H. Res. 23: Ms. BROWN and Mrs. SYKES.
H. Res. 57: Mr. HARRIGAN.

H. Res. 61: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. STANSBURY, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mrs. DINGELL, and Mr. MULLIN.
H. Res. 70: Ms. HOYLE of Oregon, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. SUBRAMANYAM, Mrs. TRAHAN, Ms. CRAIG, Ms. SALINAS, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. VINDMAN, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. PETERS, and Ms. OMAR.
H. Res. 94: Ms. OMAR, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. FRIEDMAN, Ms. PETERSEN, Mr. TORRES of New York, Ms. DELBENE, and Ms. BROWNLEY.
H. Res. 100: Ms. OMAR.
H. Res. 106: Ms. OMAR.