



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 119th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 171

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 5, 2025

No. 42

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Illinois).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 5, 2025.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MARY E. MILLER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

MIKE JOHNSON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

VIRGIN ISLANDS HISTORY MONTH

(Ms. PLASKETT of the Virgin Islands was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Ms. PLASKETT. Madam Speaker, today I rise to recognize the history of my home, the Virgin Islands of the United States.

March is Virgin Islands History Month, and I thought I would take this time to enlighten you as to the significance and the unique history, Madam Speaker, that informs my work here in Congress every day representing my ancestral home, the home of my family

for over 300 years, the U.S. Virgin Islands.

Officially, the Virgin Islands has flown seven flags over 500 years. Since 1917, the American Stars and Stripes have been proudly flown over our islands.

Previously, the Virgin Islands were a Danish possession, a hub of the slave-powered sugar industry. We were owned by Denmark, what is now considered to be home to the happiest people on Earth. Much of that happiness is based off the purchase by the United States of what was then the Danish West Indies in 1917 for \$25 million in gold bullion, which was able to move Denmark from a recession and depression into what we see now.

Those same people, those happiest people, still have not been able to say that the chattel slavery they were involved in, the great sugar-powered industry that they had on our islands, was based on something nefarious.

Before the Danes, the Spanish came for gold, the Dutch came to trade, the English came to raid, and the Knights of Malta came to control. Oh, and the French came, as well. They built a colony with extractive expectations only to watch the population die off from disease.

I have introduced legislation over 10 years as the Virgin Islands Delegate to Congress to directly reflect this history in an attempt to secure the place of the Virgin Islands history in the American consciousness and to enshrine the legacy's intangible articles of remembrances, which will allow the next generation of Americans raised in the Virgin Islands to know the history of their people and their Nation.

We enacted legislation to commemorate the 1733 slave rebellion on St. John, the first rebellion in the Western Hemisphere, and the mass suicide sacrifice which took place on the cliffs of Ram Head on St. John.

We passed legislation into law to designate St. Croix, the island of my par-

ents' birth, as a National Heritage Area. I championed legislation to recognize the historic significance of the self-emancipation of enslaved people of the Danish West Indies and to remember our 175th anniversary which just passed.

The territorial tax bills I have introduced are critical and will address longstanding issues and compensate for historic disadvantages, as well as to create jobs and middle-class incomes.

I came home in 2004 because there was a need for more lawyers, accountants, and architects because of the influx of other businesses in the Virgin Islands. We want to ensure that the worst thing that is happening to us now, our brain drain, is reversed.

To remedy the unintended results of historically inequitable provisions, since the 117th Congress, I have introduced legislation to place the territories on par with other States, which is not intended to favor the issue of status in any of the U.S. territories.

Every single power whose flag flew over our lands knew, no matter what the century, that the fertile lands of the Virgin Islands were in a geographic place of incredible strategic importance.

Since 1917, the Virgin Islands has been the most southern and most eastern point of the sovereign United States. From pirates, privateers, traders, and now drug dealers, gunrunners, oil refiners, transshipments, armadas, and naval submarines, all understood that the Virgin Islands had a strategic value, and this was deeply understood by the American military.

Lincoln's William Seward, who was the Secretary of State, wanted to purchase the Virgin Islands even back during the Civil War. He recognized its strategic importance to the United States, and our purchase in 1917, of course, was because of World War I and the fear of German submarines in the area.

□ 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.

H979

There is so much more to discuss and that I want to share with Members about DiasporaLink and the National Defense Authorization Acts. Let's remember that everyone has a history, we should not forget that history, and let us celebrate it as we move forward.

YOSEMITE BELONGS TO THE PEOPLE

(Mr. MCCLINTOCK of California was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, a well-known bureaucratic response to any attempt to reduce government spending is called the Washington Monument strategy. If anybody suggests cutting the budget, then just shut down the Washington Monument until enough tourists complain to their Congressman.

We saw this strategy implemented with a vengeance during the government shutdown under Obama. All reservations at the national parks were canceled. Vendors were ordered to close, perishable deliveries were turned back, The National Mall was cordoned off, gates to the national parks were chained, and even highway turnouts with a view of Yosemite Valley were barricaded.

Now, compare that to the government shutdown in the first Trump administration. Vendors remained in business, the public lands remained fully open to the public, no monuments were obstructed, no barricades were erected, and the gates to the national parks remained fully accessible.

Today, opponents of President Trump's war on government waste have revived the Washington Monument strategy to maintain a bloated Federal workforce that is crushing American taxpayers. Every dollar of discretionary spending, which fully or partially funds every department within the Federal Government, is now borrowed. Instead of long-overdue streamlining, the Democrats are pushing for a tax increase that will amount to about \$1,500 on a family earning just \$75,000.

At Yosemite National Park, in my district, disgruntled employees hung a giant American flag upside-down on El Capitan the other day, ruining the view for tourists who came to enjoy Yosemite's famous firefall. Remote cameras at the park are now blocked by protest signs. A Yosemite biologist told glib reporters that the staff cuts would doom the Sierra Nevada red fox to extinction. Others warned that layoffs would result in visitors stuck in restrooms and fires raging out of control.

This is human sacrifice, dogs and cats living together, mass hysteria, as a "Ghostbusters" character once put it.

What is the actual number of layoffs at Yosemite National Park that will bring the beautiful valley to rack and ruin?

Mr. Speaker, 10, the number is 10 probationary employees, 10 out of nearly

500 full-time winter employees, 25 if you include early retirements and no firefighters.

This begs some important questions: Is the park so poorly managed that only one employee has keys to the restrooms serving the 748,000-acre national park?

Apparently.

□ 1015

How will the Sierra Nevada red fox survive with only eight remaining biologists at Yosemite looking out for it rather than nine? I guess we will just have to find out.

How many of Yosemite's employees are working from home? We don't know because the park management won't tell us. We do know that 34 percent of National Park Service employees across the country were still working from home in 2023. Need to find the nearest unlocked restroom? Just email them.

Indeed, the employees who provide most of the visitor amenities, such as the hotels, shops, and restaurants, don't even work for the Park Service. They work for the park's private concessionaire.

It is true that hiring seasonal employees was delayed for a few weeks when the administration put a temporary hold on new hires, but that hold was soon lifted. These positions will actually increase by about 50.

More than a decade ago, when I first met with park management, I noticed a placard in the conference room. It read: Is it good for the park?

I suggested that was the wrong question. The right question is: Is it good for the park's visitors?

It is a matter of attitude.

The Yosemite Grant Act of 1864 was the first time that land was set aside for the use, resort, and recreation of the American people. It says nothing about the park's employees. They work for the people, who, in turn, have selected Donald Trump to exercise the executive powers of the government and charged him to take care that the laws be faithfully executed. He can't do that if he can't open the books, look at where the money is spent, and determine whether it is being spent efficiently and in accordance with the law or stop it when it isn't.

The antics of some of Yosemite's employees dishonor the silent majority at the park, who are genuinely devoted to public service.

As Hamilton said: "Here, sir, the people govern."

All 2.4 million employees in the Federal workforce exercise powers delegated by the President through our Constitution by virtue of his election. Any Federal employee who doesn't respect the authority of the people and the President they elected has no business working for them.

HONORING KEVIN G. BANES

(Mr. KENNEDY of New York was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart to honor the life and legacy of my friend, Kevin G. Banes, a man whose kindness, passion, and unwavering dedication to others made this world a better place.

A cherished member of communities in both Buffalo and Albany, Kevin's journey began in South Buffalo, a tight-knit neighborhood where he would learn the value of hard work and the importance of giving back to his community.

Kevin would go on to attend Bishop Timon-St. Jude High School, where he built friendships that lasted a lifetime. He later earned his B.A. in communications from the University at Buffalo and a master's in public relations from the University at Albany.

Kevin had a unique ability to make everyone feel valued. Whether family, friends, colleagues, or strangers, he greeted each person with kindness, respect, and a genuine heart. His presence had a way of bringing people together, forging bonds that transcended time and circumstance.

Kevin didn't just build relationships. He built bridges. He connected with people, not just on a personal level but in a way that inspired action and change. He wasn't content in simply understanding the struggles of others. He made them his own, fighting tirelessly on their behalf at the State capitol.

Kevin was a steadfast champion for those who needed a voice. He knew that real advocacy wasn't just about policy, but it was about people and about making sure that every individual, no matter their circumstances, had the support and opportunity that they deserved.

Kevin's legacy is one of action, impact, and an unwavering belief in the power of community. His advocacy wasn't simply his job, but it was his calling.

Kevin poured his heart into the causes closest to him, championing the Special Olympics, Wildwood Programs, and Deaf Adult Services, not just with words but with relentless effort, strategic thinking, and an unshakable determination to deliver results. He knew how to navigate the complexities of government, how to bring people together, and how to turn passion into progress.

Kevin's work was never about personal recognition, but it was always about lifting others up.

The impact he made will continue to be felt in the countless lives he touched, the coalitions he built, and the relationships he nurtured with such dedication and compassion. His work set a standard for what advocacy looks like, one rooted in empathy, persistence, and commitment to making the world a better, fairer place for everyone.

Kevin is survived by his mother, Kathleen Banes; brother Jeffrey and

his wife, Leeann Baner; brother Matthew and his wife, Jessie English; and his niece, Leah Baner.

They would be the first to tell my colleagues that his laughter was contagious, his compassion boundless, and that those fortunate enough to know him were better off for it.

We honor Kevin's legacy today knowing that his spirit will live on in the lives he touched and the causes that he fought for.

May Kevin Baner rest in peace.

HONORING EDWARD "MACHO" COLON

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Edward "Macho" Colon, a beloved coach, mentor, and community leader.

For more than 28 years, Coach Macho dedicated himself to the Westside Little League Football and Cheer, shaping the lives of countless youth athletes.

Even in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic, he refused to let obstacles stand in the way of opportunity, growing the program from one team to five and adding three cheerleading squads. However, his impact went beyond the field. He wasn't just a coach. He was a role model, a guiding force, and a source of strength for so many in our community.

Beyond sports, Macho was a proud local businessowner. His restaurant, Sandwich'on By Macho, wasn't just a place to grab a meal. It was an extension of his lifetime commitment to giving back, spreading joy, and bringing people together.

Macho is survived by his loving wife of 33 years, Catherine Rivera; his children, Monica Roman, Elliott Roman, Kayla Colon, and Rhace Colon; and his 10 cherished grandchildren.

Macho's unwavering dedication to lifting up young Buffalonians is a legacy that will live on for generations. He made our community stronger, and Buffalo is a better place because of him.

May Edward "Macho" Colon rest in peace.

REGULATORY RELIEF, ENERGY INDEPENDENCE, AND LOWER PRICES

(Mr. LAMALFA of California was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, when my colleagues contemplate inflation, Members can really boil it down to two main drivers of inflation.

One would be profligate government spending. We have a \$2 trillion deficit the last couple of years, post-COVID. We need to get back, of course, to pre-COVID levels of government spending and get back on a better track.

Importantly, the other driver is the cost of energy because energy affects everything from the production side. Whether you are in the farm fields, in a mine, in a manufacturing plant, anything that is being made requires energy.

When you mine those products, take those raw materials, and turn them into something, there is energy consumed at every step of the chain.

Finally, delivery from factory or mill or whatever to the store shelf requires energy. Whether it is by a truck, train, or ship, what have you, they are all brought here because of energy.

The electricity in the plants that are producing things, sawing up timber, milling grain, whatever it is, all requires energy.

When those costs go up, I would say unnecessarily the last few years, then, of course, the price of everything has to go up. It would not be just at the store shelf, but at every step of the chain to when it finally reaches the store shelf. When people get in their vehicles and go get those items or order in when they have a grocery delivery, it still takes energy to get there.

With these prices driving everything, it really isn't just some abstract, where inflation comes from. These are the real-life consequences of policies that make it harder and more expensive to produce, transport, and buy these things that everyday families need.

The Biden administration's regulatory agenda imposed these costly mandates on energy production, and I am seeing it in my home State of California, which seems to be anti-energy, as well. Governor Newsom and the new State legislature are making it more and more impossible to locate and have fueling stations, as well as California's oil-rich holds it has underground, especially in that Kern County area.

Mr. Speaker, the Biden agenda has caused these things to go up. These rules don't just squeeze businesses or big, evil corporations and things like that. They hurt every American family and every American's bank account.

This week, we are taking action to reverse some of the most damaging regulations and restore some common-sense policies that actually work for Americans, that will lower costs for families, farmers, miners, timber people, manufacturers, and small businesses.

H. Res. 42 aims to stop the Department of Energy's overreach on household appliances and commercial equipment. The Biden administration imposed stricter efficiency standards for making everything from dishwashers to industrial equipment. It just drives up the cost and makes it more difficult for families when they want to replace something.

These regulations limit choices and drive up prices. If people want a new gas water heater, they are going to have to get one that doesn't fit in the same spot as the old one because it is going to be a lot thicker from more insulation and stuff in the idea of efficiency. The regulations make it more difficult to do that.

If Democrats take away the gas water heaters and gas stoves and make

them electric, people will have a whole other set of problems.

Outside in people's yards, my Democratic colleagues want to ban their gas lawnmowers and their gas leaf blowers. My favorite is when my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to ban, like in California, gas- or diesel-powered generators.

Mr. Speaker, when the power goes out, tell me what people are going to power a generator with if they don't have these fuels available and generators that use those fuels.

How do people turn a generator on if they don't have fuel to do it? Are they going to plug it into a battery or something like that? What fueled the battery? What if it is several days, like sometimes when we are having these ice storms in the mountainous areas like what happened in my district?

These mandates don't make a lick of sense, so we want to have, with H. Res. 42, the ability for families and businesses to purchase reliable and affordable products without bureaucratic interference and whatever the whim of the day is by a stroke of a pen.

H. Res. 61 seeks to reverse EPA's excessive emissions rule targeting rubber tire manufacturers. Mr. Speaker, can you believe that? The mandate drove up the cost of manufacturing tires, making essential goods more expensive because a lot of things we get come on a vehicle with tires, as well as the cost of tires on the vehicle itself.

Whether it is higher prices for tires or increased costs for transportation, this rule added a burden on families and businesses already struggling with inflation. Reversing this regulation protects manufacturers, safeguards jobs, and keeps products affordable for manufacturers, small businesses, and families.

S.J. Res. 11 aims to eliminate an unnecessary rule from the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management that slowed down oil and gas development. The Biden administration required excessive archeological reports that make more energy production almost impossible.

PEOPLE, NOT STATISTICS

(Mr. FIGURES of Alabama was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. FIGURES. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege last night of sitting in this Chamber yet again, and I witnessed a lot of my colleagues cheering as the President rattled off the numbers, the statistics, and the data of how many people he has terminated and has laid off or fired. Whatever my colleagues want to call it, people are out of a job.

As I sat here, I sat in a little bit of amazement because these aren't just statistics that we are talking about. These are people. These are real people. These are real lives. These are not just data points in a spreadsheet.

These are real families that we are talking about. These aren't just numbers in some speech or in some press

release that my colleagues put out expressing joy over the misfortune of hundreds of thousands of people. These are real people, some of whom I know, some of whom I have met, and some of whom my colleagues know. These are people.

These are people, yet last night, many people in here cheered as the President took pride in announcing his terminations of them.

The Bible says: "Do not gloat over your brother's day, the day of his misfortune." Gloating is what we saw. Gloating is what we have seen. Gloating is what we continue to see. Cheering is what we continue to see.

We have seen hand clapping and high fives over people losing their jobs, people losing their livelihoods.

We have seen cheering at the downfall of people, cheering as if these people are somehow just invisible numbers and invisible things, cheering as if these are not people who are paying mortgages, cheering as if these are not people who are paying student loans, and cheering as if these are people who are not paying car notes or putting their kids through school or taking care of their elderly parents or paying for a wedding or are new parents. These are people.

□ 1030

These are people. These are real people. These are real lives that we are impacting, and yet we sit in here and we cheer. We cheer the downfall.

The sad part about it is that regardless of how you feel about the Federal Government, regardless if you feel that these jobs were unnecessary or unneeded, even if you feel that way, I think we can all agree that there is a better way to treat somebody than sending a 20-year worker, a 15-year worker, a 10-year worker an email on a Saturday night saying you are out of a job on Monday morning.

There are better ways to run a country. There are better ways to run a business. It is not necessary to mistreat people that way. You can incentivize people who are close to retirement to retire early. You can freeze hiring. You can give people a 6-month, a 9-month, a 12-month heads-up that we are phasing out your job, but to get rid of people in the manner in which this administration has done it is simply indecent.

It is, as my 5-year-old son would say, just not nice. It is not how you treat people. It is not how we should be treating people in America. We should not be cheering and gloating over the downfall of people who did nothing wrong but show up to work. It is not right.

Meanwhile, all of this is done allegedly to save money. Yet, if we were serious about saving money, the President would lead by example and not by exception. We know that practically every other weekend the President is traveling down to Mar-a-Lago on trips that cost the American taxpayer, on

average, about \$3.5 million per trip. That is not even including the money that Members of this body spend in going to join him down there for meetings that they could have here in Washington, D.C., for free, but we are allegedly saving money.

That is the goal. We are not achieving it because my colleagues are pushing a budget that is going to add trillions of dollars to the national deficit while firing hardworking men and women while we continue to spend \$3.5 million per trip for the President to go gallivanting to Mar-a-Lago. That is something that DOGE should look into.

Mr. Speaker, if we are serious about saving money, they should look into that. That is something that they should seriously look at. We spend \$3.5 million per trip. Tell Mr. Musk to go and "DOGE" that because that is something that is real. That is something that is within the President's power to be able to stop. Yet, we come in this Chamber and take pride in firing and announcing the terminations of hardworking men and women.

PRESIDENT TRUMP IS GETTING IT DONE FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

(Mrs. MILLER of Illinois was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is a great day in America. We heard from President Trump last night. Clearly, he loves our country. He is amped up to fulfill his promises and get things done that matter to Americans.

Thank God for a landslide victory. We can only imagine the dreadful consequences if Kamala would have been our President. I am afraid that Barack Obama's dream of fundamentally transforming our country would have been complete.

President Trump is getting it done for the American people, America first as every President should have been. Americans have been abused by a bloated, unaccountable government. We all knew that taxpayers were being abused, but the level of abuse to use the hard-earned money that taxpayers have had to cough up to promote evil in our country and to fund terrorists around the world, it is unbelievable.

Thank God for Elon Musk and for DOGE to uncover all the waste, fraud, and abuse. I thank President Trump for securing our border and deporting the murderers, rapists, terrorists, and gang members. I thank him for going after terrorists. I thank him that we are not going to be taken advantage of anymore by unfair tariffs, trade agreements, and funding wars around the world.

Instead of driving our manufacturing overseas, I thank President Trump for incentivizing companies to come back and create jobs and leave the money here in our country. I thank him for incentivizing production, for deregulating so Americans can be creative

and productive like they want to be. I thank him for getting our economic machine going.

Finally, I thank President Trump for standing up for women, for declaring that there are two sexes, that we were created by God, and that we need God's help.

Mr. Speaker, I urge our country, as it says in 1 Timothy, to pray for those who are in authority. To every child in America, we agree with President Trump. They are perfect exactly the way God created them.

CONGRESS HAS NOT ENHANCED SOCIAL SECURITY IN MORE THAN 50 YEARS

(Mr. LARSON of Connecticut was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the Nation's number one antipoverty program for the elderly and the number one antipoverty program for children. That is, of course, Social Security.

Last night, in his state of the Union and over the weekend, the President and Elon Musk referred to Social Security as a scam and a Ponzi scheme. I don't believe the people who receive those benefits believe that Social Security is a scam. It is the Nation's number one antipoverty program for the elderly. Since its inception in 1935, it has never missed a payment.

It is, for capitalism and entrepreneurialism, our safety net. Yet, Mr. Speaker, as you know, Congress has not acted on enhancing Social Security in more than 50 years. Richard Nixon was the President of the United States the last time Congress, whose responsibility it is, did anything to extend benefits. That includes a COLA that is out of place, as AARP indicates, as well as tax cuts for people who continue to have to work after they retire and then have their Social Security double taxed. It also applies for an across-the-board increase for all of our citizens who haven't seen that since 1971.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, there are 10,000 baby boomers a day that become eligible for Social Security, and that is why it is so important.

In your district in Illinois, Mr. Speaker, there are 173,000 Social Security recipients: 135,000 of them are retired; 14,900 are disabled; 9,855 are widows; 4,438 spouses; and more than 8,000 children, but that is not the most important thing, even though all these details are important, but the Sixth District in Illinois receives \$323 million monthly.

Where does that money go? That money goes to the recipients that I just listed.

Where do they spend that money? They spend that money right back in Illinois' Sixth District. Yet Congress hasn't done anything to enhance or extend the program in over 50 years.

Mr. Speaker, we are long overdue for a vote. We have got a plan that both expands Social Security across the board, makes sure that people who continue to work don't pay taxes on their Social Security, and make sure that we have a COLA that works.

Don't you think, Mr. Speaker, it is long overdue for us to have a vote?

If you have a better idea and plan, by all means, bring it to the floor in this great democracy and see it work. Instead, we see the President and Elon Musk with their eyes on the Social Security trust fund because he has been ordered to come up with \$2 trillion in cuts.

What a coincidence that there happens to be just over \$2 trillion in the Social Security trust fund. What a coincidence that President Trump is calling for tax cuts for Social Security recipients, but doesn't pay for them, further weakening the trust fund that is already under stress.

If Congress does not act by 2033, there will be a 20 percent cut across the board for everyone. If Trump continues down his path of not paying for benefits, it will be over a 36 percent cut. There are over 5 million Americans, fellow citizens, who have paid in all their life and got nothing back from the government because Congress has not acted.

DEMANDING TRANSPARENCY, EFFICIENCY, AND ACCOUNTABILITY FROM OUR GOVERNMENT IS NOT EXTREME

(Mr. HARIDOPOLOS of Florida was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. HARIDOPOLOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight some good points made by our opinion editor at Florida Today, John Torres.

He writes: "The pushback over DOGE's cuts and the doomsdayers on social media have me perplexed.

"Don't we want our tax dollars to bring back the biggest bang for the buck? Don't we get angry when we buy something that in the end isn't worth what we paid for it?

"This shouldn't be a red or a blue issue. Everyone, on both sides of the aisle, should want our government to operate as effectively and efficiently as possible."

He adds: "Outrage over Elon Musk's email surprised me.

"I couldn't believe the outrage on social media and broadcast news because DOGE asked government employees to write down five things they did at work the previous week."

He adds, "Here's a news flash: Anyone working in the real world has to constantly justify what they are doing. From the baseball slugger mired in a hitting slump to the journalist not writing enough stories to traffic cops not writing enough tickets, we all have to prove our worth. It's real life.

"I've had friends and colleagues over the years," he adds, "working in the

private sector, who actually had to re-apply for their own jobs and then get interviewed by outside human resource professionals in order to try and keep their positions. Many didn't."

You can read the rest of that article on the Florida Today website.

I will continue by saying, we are at a turning point, a moment when we must ask ourselves: Do we want a government to serve the people efficiently, or do we want a bureaucracy for the sake of bureaucracy?

That is the question that DOGE is forcing Washington to confront, and from where I stand, it is about time.

For decades, we have watched government agencies balloon in size and cost, with little accountability and even less justification. We have seen waste. Some of it egregious, some of it so routine that people barely blink an eye.

Let me be clear: Demanding transparency, efficiency, and accountability from our government is not extreme. It is common sense. It is what every hard-working American does when they balance their budget, scrutinize their receipts, or shop around for the best deal.

Consider the recent controversy over DOGE's request that Federal Government employees account for what they did that week, as I mentioned earlier. That is it. Simple thing: What five tasks did you accomplish?

Tell me, as Mr. TORRES said, who among us doesn't have to justify our work? Why should government be any different?

DOGE understands something fundamental: Washington should work for the people, not the other way around. That means questioning contracts, finding and cutting waste, and making sure that when the government spends a dollar of your money, it delivers value.

Critics argue that some government contracts canceled by DOGE haven't led to immediate savings. Isn't canceling wasteful government spending before it can be renewed a step in the right direction?

Shouldn't we be cleaning house rather than just accepting bad deals because they are already in motion?

Let's put it in terms we can all understand: If you saw a suspicious charge on your credit card, would you just shrug it off and pay for it? I think not. You would demand answers. You would challenge it. That is exactly what DOGE is doing with your tax dollars.

□ 1045

Let me remind you of something else. In November, the American people voted for change. They chose a different direction because the status quo simply wasn't working. Now, because DOGE is doing what it promised, delivering transparency and charting a better course for America's fiscal future, some people are alarmed.

The American people deserve a government that works for them, not

against them, a government that values every dollar that it spends, a government that for once is accountable to the people who actually fund it. That is what DOGE is delivering, and that is why I proudly support this effort for transparency and making sure that every dollar sent to Washington, D.C., is spent in a manner that makes us proud.

AMERICA IS BACK

(Mr. MANN of Kansas was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, on November 5, 2024, America endorsed the greatest political comeback in modern history by electing President Trump the 47th President of the United States. The country rejected the chaos sowed by the Biden-Harris administration for the past 4 years and voted for the candidate that could lead our country and make America strong again. On day one, President Trump, alongside the Republican majorities in the House and Senate, moved full steam ahead to deliver on the country's mandate, and we are committed to upholding the promises made to America.

Last night, I joined Members of this body to hear President Trump's first joint address in this very room to the Nation since he was sworn in for a second term. President Trump's vision and direction for the country could not be more clear, and I applaud him for keeping the promises that he made to the American people.

President Trump has worked to make America secure and competitive again. We are leading on the world stage and actually establishing peace through strength. Our border is secure again, and President Trump is making it clear to the drug cartels and bad actors that if they enter the United States illegally, they will be deported. During his first full month in office, there were only 8,326 apprehensions at our Nation's borders. Compare that to President Biden's failed leadership where 8,000 illegal immigrants were apprehended in one day. It is amazing. Deploying common sense and actually enforcing the law goes a long way.

House Republicans passed legislation like the Laken Riley Act and the Violence Against Women by Illegal Aliens Act that protect American citizens. That is what Americans overwhelmingly voted for in this past election, and the work has only just begun.

Last week, House Republicans took a crucial first step to unlock the process to advance President Trump's full legislative agenda. This Republican majority will not stop fighting until the President's agenda is in place. That means rooting out wasteful, fraudulent, and abusive spending. That means responsibly stewarding the American tax dollar and putting those dollars in places that they can see a return. That means investing in our national security and protecting the safety of our fellow Americans. It means extending

the 2017 Tax Cuts and Jobs Act and preventing American families from seeing a 22 percent tax hike next year.

As the President stated last night and in his inauguration address, the golden age of America is just beginning. I have never been more thankful to have a President who isn't afraid to keep his promises to the American people and to fight tooth and nail to put American Families first. I thank President Trump for his leadership. I look forward to working with him and his administration to deliver policies that deliver for American families and usher in a new era of American greatness.

FAREWELL TO RILEY PAGETT

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the Big First District of Kansas is the third largest ag-producing district in the country. Agriculture is the key component of our DNA, and it is in our blood. It is a lifeline for many of the communities I represent. When I was elected to Congress, I knew that I needed a team who understood Kansas agriculture and who would fight relentlessly for the farmers, ranchers, and ag producers in my district.

The Lord provided abundantly by introducing me and my chief of staff to Riley Pagett. Riley grew up in Woodward, Oklahoma, but he was born in the Big First District in Liberal, Kansas. Growing up on his family's farm and ranch, Riley's leadership skills developed early on. He was involved in FFA, serving as a State officer for Oklahoma and eventually as the national president of the organization.

After graduating from Oklahoma State, Riley moved to Washington, D.C., to work for then-Chairman LUCAS on the House Agriculture Committee. There he was part of the 2014 farm bill and later spent a few months with Senator LANKFORD before serving as the director of advocacy and government relations for the national FFA organization.

He would go on to serve in the first Trump administration as the chief of staff of USDA's Office of Partnerships and Public Engagement for almost 2 years before joining my team as my agriculture staffer, legislative director, and deputy chief of staff.

Riley has excelled in these roles and has been a key player in helping me establish the Congressional FFA Caucus, craft sound food and farm policy, and fight for Kansas priorities in the next farm bill. Those who know Riley know that that just scratches the surface of who he is.

Riley is an incredible friend, a loyal advocate and mentor for his teammates and colleagues, a proud son, a champion for agriculture, a caring father to his kids, Blakely and Ford, a loving husband to his wife, Lauren, and most importantly a man with a deep love for the Lord.

Next week, Riley will start a new endeavor in the second Trump administration at USDA. There are few words to describe how much he will be missed

at 344 Cannon and the Big First, but Audrey and I cannot be more proud of him or grateful for his service to our district and to the team.

Team Mann will be praying over this next chapter for him and Lauren and cheering him on every step of the way. I thank Riley for his service. Godspeed.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF SCOTT KRAUSE

(Mr. CISCOMANI of Arizona was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. CISCOMANI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Tucson Fire Department Battalion Chief Scott Krause, who dedicated over three decades of his career in service to our community.

Chief Krause joined the fire department in June of 1982, answering the call to serve with courage, commitment, and a genuine passion. Over the years, Chief Krause rose through the ranks, earning the respect of his colleagues through his leadership and the gratitude of his community.

From the moment he answered the call of duty, Chief Krause had a deep commitment to helping and protecting those who are in need. Whether he was battling a fire or mentoring the next generation of first responders, Chief Krause exemplified the very best the fire service has to offer. His dedication never wavered, and his impact extended far beyond the firehouse, uplifting the lives of countless people in the community he so faithfully served.

After 33 years of service, he retired in October of 2015, leaving behind a legacy of servant leadership that continues to echo and inspire. Sadly, on February 23 this year, Chief Krause passed away while doing something he loved—hunting.

Today, let us remember not just his service, but the incredible person he was: a leader, mentor, friend, father, and husband. His legacy lives on in the countless lives he saved and the lasting impact he had on his community. May Chief Krause rest in peace. We are all grateful for his service.

HONORING INVALUABLE CONTRIBUTIONS OF MRS. ONITA DAVIS

Mr. CISCOMANI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize the sustained patriotism, service, and invaluable contributions Mrs. Onita Davis has made to enrich the veteran community in Oro Valley, Arizona.

Mrs. Davis has freely given her time, effort, and resources to tirelessly represent critical organizations in our district, like Wreaths Across America, the Military Officers Association, Friday Pilots, and countless other civic and veteran-focused organizations.

Earlier this year, my family and I had the privilege of participating in Wreaths Across America at the Arizona Veterans' Memorial Cemetery at Marana, a deeply moving and beautiful tribute to those who committed the ultimate sacrifice in service for their fel-

low citizens. It was a touching event, made great by volunteers like Mrs. Davis. This is only one of the many, many events and programs that she focuses on and events that she has led in the community.

Mrs. Davis and her husband, Ed, have also served as past officers in The American Legion Post 132, which has received multiple State and national awards for services to veterans during her tenure. Her unwavering dedication to our Nation's heroes has left an enduring impact, ensuring that veterans in our community receive the recognition, respect, and support that they deserve for their service to our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mrs. Davis for her steadfast devotion to our veterans and to our community.

CONGRATULATING SALPOINTE'S WOMEN'S SOCCER TEAM

Mr. CISNEROS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Salpointe women's soccer team for an amazing feat—sweeping the 4A soccer State championship.

For a school to win this many championships is impressive, but in this case we are very, very proud specifically of our women's soccer team at Salpointe.

The number two ranked women's team beat top seed Prescott 1-0 in a thrilling game to claim their fourth State title in the last 5 years. Seniors Gianna Estavillo and Emma Veliz combined for the Lancers' lone goal at the 71-minute mark, which proved to be enough for the win.

The victory is Kelly Pierce's sixth State championship as a coach, building on the impressive two titles she won as a player. The program now has 11 State championships, a truly remarkable achievement.

CONGRATULATING THE SALPOINTE MEN'S SOCCER TEAM

Mr. CISCOMANI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the men's Salpointe soccer team for their impressive season and also their State championship.

In this game, there was no shortage of goals. At half time, the game was tied at 2-2, but in the second half, the Lancers jumped into action, scoring five second-half goals to secure the win. The Lancers dominated Saguaro by seven goals to two, earning their fifth title in a row and 12th State title overall, all under the legendary Coach Wolfgang Weber.

The school and community are extremely proud of the coaches, student athletes, and everyone who played a part in this special season. They should enjoy their victory. I offer my congratulations on their achievements.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 55 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 (Ms. MALOY) at noon.

PRAYER

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

Holy and merciful God, You desire that we return to You with our whole hearts. May we set aside all that draws us away from You and bow before Your throne of grace.

You call us to fast, to deny ourselves the very things that overwhelm our appetites and satiate our desires. May we instead strive to quench our need for You and find satisfaction in Your provision.

You ask us to humble ourselves, even to the point that we grieve what we have become and regret what we have done. May we repent of our prideful attitudes, confess our transgressions, and discover what You want us to be and how You call us to serve.

You, O Lord, are gracious and compassionate, slow to anger, and abounding in steadfast love. Relent, O God, from the judgment we are due. Accept our contrition. We rend our hearts. Spare Your people and take pity on us, and restore us to the joy of Your salvation.

In Your benevolent name, we offer our prayers.

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 South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina 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. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the passing of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER), the whole number of the House is 432.

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.

CONGRATULATING PRESIDENT DONALD J. TRUMP

(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. Madam Speaker, I congratulate President Donald Trump for an inspiring speech to the Nation last night.

WELCOMING MARY BLYTHE THOMAS

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, last Wednesday, on February 26, Lexington County, South Carolina, grew by one as Byron and Rebecca Thomas joyfully welcomed their beautiful daughter, Mary Blythe Thomas, into the world.

Born at 5:07 p.m., weighing 7 pounds, 14 ounces, and measuring 21 inches long, Mary Blythe entered a loving and nurturing home and community.

I am grateful for her father, Byron, a dedicated, long-term staff member of the Second Congressional District's Midlands office, serving as director of outreach. He simultaneously serves as a city of Cayce councilmember.

Mary Blythe is blessed to be born into a home that will foster and guide her to a bright and fulfilling future, including her five wonderful grandparents, Jeff and Vickey Thomas, Lana Thomas, and Bruce and Nancy Pope.

On behalf of my wife, Roxanne, and our entire family and staff, best wishes and warmest regards to Byron, Rebecca, and Mary Blythe. May the years ahead be filled with joy, love, and blessings.

HONORING LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I rise to offer sympathy to the family of Congressman Lincoln Diaz-Balart. America has been blessed with the service of the extended Diaz-Balart family to the people of the United States.

HONORING DAVID DePETRILLO

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

Mr. MAGAZINER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of David DePetrillo, a tireless champion for Rhode Island.

For over three decades as our State's tourism director, David made it his mission to showcase the best of Rhode Island, including our historic landmarks, small businesses, and stunning coastlines.

To him, this work wasn't just a job. It was his way of life. He helped people across the country and the world see what Rhode Islanders have always known, that there is no place like the Ocean State.

Under his leadership, tourism became a major economic driver, creating

thousands of jobs and boosting local businesses. He is perhaps best remembered for the iconic "Biggest Little State in the Union" campaign, which cemented Rhode Island's place on the map.

David's vision lives on in the bustling streets of Providence and the well-coming small businesses of South County.

My heart goes out to his wife, Jean, all of his brothers and sisters, and all who were lucky enough to know and love him.

May his legacy endure, and may he rest in peace.

WILSON STUDENTS VISIT

(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. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize the students who are participating in the incredible Gentleman's Agreement program in Wilson County Schools of North Carolina.

Through the program, they engage in mentorship and leadership development.

During a visit to the U.S. Capitol on a tour with former Congressman G. K. Butterfield, I had an opportunity to speak with the group in the rotunda about what we are doing here and the possibilities of their future.

It is moments like these that subtly remind us of how we can help shape the future by inspiring and motivating our young people.

Investing in the next generation of leaders is critical to building a stronger future in eastern North Carolina and across America. I really enjoyed speaking with this group.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of rule IX, I rise to give notice of my intention to raise a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of the resolution is as follows:

Resolution Censuring Representative AL GREEN of Texas.

Whereas, on March 4, 2025, during the joint session of Congress convened pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 11, the President of the United States, speaking at the invitation of the House and Senate, had his remarks interrupted by the Representative from Texas, Mr. GREEN;

Whereas, the conduct of the Representative from Texas disrupted the proceedings of the joint address and was a breach of proper conduct; and

Whereas, after numerous disruptions, the Representative from Texas had to be removed from the Chamber by the Sergeant at Arms:

Now, therefore, be it resolved that Representative AL GREEN be censured; Representative AL GREEN forthwith present himself in the well of the House of Representatives for the pronouncement of censure; and Representative AL GREEN be censured with the public reading of this resolution by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from Washington will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY RELATING TO "NATIONAL EMISSION STANDARDS FOR HAZARDOUS AIR POLLUTANTS: RUBBER TIRE MANUFACTURING"

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 177, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 61) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Rubber Tire Manufacturing", and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 177, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 61

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Rubber Tire Manufacturing" (89 Fed. Reg. 94886 (November 29, 2024)), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The joint resolution shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.J. Res. 61.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of my bill, H.J. Res. 61, a resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Rubber Tire Manufacturing."

My resolution will repeal this suspect rule that the Biden administration pushed out after the election but before President Trump's inauguration.

This rule was flawed to begin with. It was published on November 29, 2024, after the election of Mr. Trump but before his administration could take office.

Further, as required by the Clean Air Act, EPA performed a risk and technology review specifically on rubber tire plant emissions as recently as 2020. After the risk and technology review, the EPA concluded that the pollutant thresholds and emission regulations already in place were sufficient and protected public health with an "ample margin of safety."

Madam Speaker, under the Clean Air Act, this should have been the end of it, as the EPA is only required to review and revise the standards on emissions every 8 years. To make matters worse, the EPA basically said the only way to comply with the new regulation is to buy regenerative thermal oxidizers, which are essentially flares that burn off the smokestack exhaust at the specific tire plants.

These devices are expensive and likely will not be able to be installed within the 3-year Clean Air Act deadline. It is my understanding that the tire industry estimates that it will cost about \$100 million to get the regenerative thermal oxidizers ordered, fabricated, and installed and then about \$20 million more per year to operate the devices.

While this cost is across several affected plants, these figures are certainly much higher than the EPA's estimates.

I also note that this rule does not affect most of my constituents. I am sure some of my constituents drive from eastern Henry County to work at the Danville Goodyear plant located in the district of my neighbor, Congressman JOHN MCGUIRE, and that facility would be affected.

In the Rules Committee, I was erroneously under the assumption that this

might affect my Yokohama Tire plant today. I still submit, Madam Speaker, that it could affect them because what happens at the EPA, if they do it now on the larger producers of tires, et cetera, at some point, they are going to look at doing it at the medium-sized producers.

□ 1215

The Yokohama plant that employs a lot of people in my district, in my hometown of Salem, Virginia, could be affected long term, but currently it affects Danville. Now, that is about 16 miles from the edge of my district. In my area, because it is a rural area, lots of people drive more than 16 or 17 or 18 miles, whatever the number is, to get to a good-paying job like these facilities have that make tires for the American market.

This rule wouldn't be the first time my constituents have seen an environmental rule from the government inflicting economic pain on our rural part of Virginia. Several years ago, an EPA rule ended up closing down a plant in a small town.

In the end, the Supreme Court struck down the rule just a few weeks after the coal-fired plant closed. It was in Glen Lyn, Virginia. A few weeks after the plant was closed by Appalachian Power, the Supreme Court ruled that the EPA hadn't done it right. The rule was improper and it was invalidated by the Supreme Court, but they are not going to come back in and reopen the plant.

Those jobs are lost. The jobs of the people who worked there, who then ate lunch at the local lunch facilities, or who might have bought a car, or might have bought something else there in the very small town of Glen Lyn, no longer did so. As a result, the people there lost their livelihood, their economic resilience because of an erroneous EPA regulation.

The EPA's callous disregard for my peoples' jobs is not forgotten. What happened in Glen Lyn took about a decade. The population dropped, and last year, they turned in their charter to be a town. They are now an unincorporated census area inside of Giles County, and it all started with an EPA regulation that was misguided and improperly done.

I submit, Madam Speaker, that this regulation is probably not properly done, but that is for the courts to decide. We can fix it, though, here in Congress with this Congressional Review Act.

Some on the other side may say, if we repeal this regulation, we are letting tire manufacturers get away with unchecked pollution.

Madam Speaker, I say not so. That is not so. The EPA's National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants would still exist. All major sources would still have to abide by their Clean Air Act Title V permits and various other Federal and local controls and regulations.

Regardless, if Congress were to pass this joint resolution, rubber tire manufacturers will still be subjected to pollution regulations. The EPA can always come back with an updated hazardous air pollutant standard if they can ever get actual data indicating specific and significant pollution. They don't have that now.

Madam Speaker, I urge all Members to join me in voting in favor of H.J. Res. 61 because it is important for peoples' jobs and for the principle of not doing willy-nilly regulations at the end of an administration in order to pursue something that does not have verifiable data indicating specific and significant pollution.

Mr. Speaker, further, as alluded to in this New York Post article, titled, "Jen Psaki mocks reporter when asked about Keystone pipeline job losses," so-called "green jobs" are not plentiful enough to make up for jobs lost because of EPA regulations.

[From the New York Post, Feb. 8, 2021]

WASHINGTON—White House press secretary Jen Psaki on Monday mocked a reporter who asked when workers on the canceled Keystone XL pipeline would get "green jobs" promised by President Biden.

It's expected that up to 11,000 jobs will be lost following Biden's day-one decision to immediately shut down construction of the pipeline that was supposed to carry oil from Canada to Texas—leaving South Dakotans reeling and 1,000 people immediately out of work.

"Where is it that they can go for their green job?" Fox News reporter Peter Doocy asked Psaki at her Monday afternoon press briefing, referring to Biden's promise to create good-paying union jobs in the green energy sector as his administration attempts to end the nation's reliance on fossil fuels.

"That is something the administration has promised and there is now a gap so I'm just curious when that happens, when those people can count on that?" Doocy added.

"Well, I'd certainly welcome you to present your data of all the thousands and thousands of people who won't be getting a green job," Psaki snarked. "Maybe next time you're here you can present that."

"But you said they will be getting green jobs. I'm just asking when that happens?" Doocy responded, noting a report by the Laborers' International Union of North America that found 1,000 union jobs on the Keystone project would "immediately vanish."

Another 10,000 construction jobs expected to be created by the project have also been nixed by Biden's decision.

A prominent union leader and Biden ally, AFL-CIO president Richard Trumka, lashed the decision in Axios on HBO interview Sunday, saying Biden should have also announced where he would replace those lost jobs.

"I wish he hadn't done that on the first day, because the Laborers International was right. It did and will cost us jobs in the process," Trumka told Jonathan Swan.

"I wish he had paired that more carefully with the thing that he did second by saying, 'Here's where we're creating jobs,'" he went on, saying he believed Biden knows his announcement was a "mistake."

Trumka, a former coal miner, also signaled his skepticism at Biden's plan to transition coal, gas and oil workers to clean energy jobs, saying he was subject to a similar failed policy.

"You know, when they laid off at the mines back in Pennsylvania, they told us

they were going to train us to be computer programmers," Trumka said.

"And I said, 'Where are the computer programmer job at?' 'Uh, they're in, Oklahoma and they're in Vegas and they're here.' And I said, 'So, in other words, what we're going to be is unemployed miners and unemployed computer programmers as well,'" he recounted.

But Psaki swatted away the criticism and made a vague promise that Biden would put a jobs plan forward in the coming weeks.

"He has every plan to share more details on that plan in the weeks ahead," she said when asked how Biden would support workers left jobless by the decision.

Biden's climate czar John Kerry was also condemned by Republicans last month as "out of touch" when he suggested that energy and coal workers impacted by climate change efforts could "go to work to make the solar panels."

Last month, the Biden administration unveiled its \$2 trillion Green New Deal-fueled environmental plan, which includes eliminating coal, oil and natural gas as electricity sources by 2035.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I say it is good to see the gentlewoman from Utah in the chair.

Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 61, another attempt by House Republicans to ensure workers and communities continue to breathe toxic air pollution. This harmful Republican resolution puts the profits of billionaire corporate polluters over the health and welfare of the American people, and it makes a mockery of Republican promises to make America healthy again.

I really believe, Madam Speaker, that this resolution is a distraction. I listened to the President's speech last night, and it is clear to me that neither he, nor the Republicans in the House, have found a way to lower grocery prices. They haven't found a way to lower energy prices. They haven't found a way to fund the government. Now they are on the cusp of stripping millions of people of their healthcare, all so they can shower these giant tax breaks on billionaires and big corporations.

Using the Congressional Review Act hatchet to carve away critical protections from an agency that has already been decimated by DOGE's indiscriminate firing demonstrates how unserious Republicans are about keeping Americans safe from dangerous pollution, and another week of nonsense CRAs, in my opinion, shows how unserious House Republicans are about governing.

Madam Speaker, I will directly address what the gentleman said. Under the Clean Air Act, the Environmental Protection Agency is required to reduce hazardous air pollutants from large industrial sources like rubber tire manufacturers to protect Americans across the country from harm.

They have to do this. They are obligated in the EPA to look at the things that might be hazardous under the

Clean Air Act. To be clear, hazardous air pollutants are air toxics that are known or suspected of causing cancer and other serious health impacts like heart attacks, worsening asthma, reproductive and birth defects, as well as severe impacts on the environment.

EPA is obligated under the law to set pollution limits based on what is already being achieved at similar facilities using readily available technologies.

Basically, under the Clean Air Act, the EPA has to say what is harming the public and is there a technology out there in this industry that is innovative and does not achieve that level of harm?

The bottom line is, there are industries that are already retrofitting and meeting these standards, otherwise, the EPA couldn't establish the standards. I have had this discussion before with my colleague. There are good actors and bad actors. The good actors want innovation, want to retrofit their manufacturing companies to do the right thing and cause less pollution. By repealing this, all the Republicans are doing is basically helping the bad actors, in this case, mostly foreign manufacturers or foreign-based companies that just want to save money by not eliminating this harm.

I don't want to get into the specifics of whether the rubber tire manufacturers will address this, but it is cost-effective, protects public health, and ensures the industry stays competitive. It is long overdue.

In fact, the Court ruling required the EPA to finalize this rule to close the loophole that allowed rubber processing facilities to spew unlimited hazardous air pollution. When fully implemented, the rule will cut these harmful emissions by 171 tons per year. That includes over 100 tons of toxic organic chemicals and over 60 tons of particulate matter that will be removed from the air of the workers and the communities near the impacted facilities.

However, H.J. Res. 61 will throw all of these benefits away. This resolution would hamstring EPA's ability to fulfill its obligation to protect the health and welfare of Americans from air pollution. Unfortunately for everyone with lungs, Republicans can't leave commonsense environmental protections in place.

As the House Republicans move to strip healthcare from millions of Americans to fund tax breaks for billionaires and big corporations, they also want to make people sicker by rolling back regulations meant to keep people safe from cancer-causing air pollution. It is outrageous. I don't know what else to say.

Contrary to what my colleagues on the other side claim, EPA's rule was developed in close consultation with industry, using industry data. It also proposes emissions reduction technology that the best performers in the industry are already using.

Overall, it is estimated to cost less than a fraction of 1 percent of the company's annual revenue and facilities have years to comply.

This should be a no-brainer, a win-win scenario of reducing cancer-causing emissions and promoting innovative technologies to modernize industry and provide regulatory certainty. I really don't understand why House Republicans are so fixated on trying to repeal and block the work of the EPA.

Madam Speaker, for the health of workers and the surrounding communities and for the sake of clean air, I urge all of my colleagues to vote "no" on this resolution that puts the whims of billionaires and corporate polluters before the American people.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, let me assure you that those of us on this side of the aisle have no desire to make people sick.

The number one test in a community as to whether or not there is a likelihood of being sick or healthy is whether or not the people have a good, strong economy and have a job. What this regulation would do is to take that away.

As I talked about with Glen Lyn, if you start shutting down factories, you shut down towns, and people don't have jobs. Then you will have people who are clearly going to have more issues with their health than they currently have.

Further, in regard to the various things that my colleague said, I have seen it before where the EPA goes out and they create a maximum achievable control technology and they claim, oh, it is out there or it will be soon, and industry tells me it doesn't exist.

Now, in this case, it does exist. It is just very expensive and it would take longer than the Clean Air Act gives them in order to install it. This is where I think we should take care of it instead of letting the executive branch do all of our work for us. They used proxy data and used total hydrocarbons instead of looking at what the EPA is charged with doing, which is the actual hazardous air pollutant. They don't have that data, and when they last checked for that data, they said there was an ample margin of safety.

November 29, they suddenly throw this regulation on the books as a final rule without referencing how the ample margin of safety that was found in 2020 somehow disappeared in a 4-year time period, how it went away. They don't have any data to show actual hazardous air pollutants. They used proxy data. That is not good enough for regulations that could cause the curtailment of tire manufacturing in the United States.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROUZER), my colleague.

Mr. ROUZER. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend, the Chairman, for yielding me the time.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.J. Res. 61, which would repeal the Biden-Harris EPA's rule amending National Emission Standards on the domestic rubber tire manufacturing industry.

This rule would impact 11 facilities in nine States, including 1 in my district in Fayetteville, North Carolina, which has been manufacturing tires since the 1960s, produces 20,000 tires a day for passenger vehicles and light-duty trucks, and employs 2,300 of my constituents.

Fayetteville plays a major role in the State's industrial economy, and its manufacturing sector provides significant economic opportunities for my constituents, including our area's veterans from Fort Bragg. These 11 facilities have supported the American worker for decades while complying with all environmental regulations.

In 2020, the EPA ruled that these facilities were already operating under the accepted threshold and had established a margin of safety to protect public health. This rule, issued by the previous administration, would do just the opposite, actually. It would increase CO₂ emissions by requiring facilities to install additional costly technologies that will increase energy consumption.

Beyond that economic harm, the rule would prove costly to manufacturers, affecting workers' wages and the expansion of the domestic tire manufacturing industry.

The per-company cost to comply with this rule would be four times what EPA has suggested: 100 million in capital costs and \$20 million in other annual costs.

Madam Speaker, this regulation must be rescinded. We must reinstate common sense. Rubber tire manufacturing facilities have complied with the existing standards, and keeping this rule in place would bring economic harm and no benefit for anyone, including my constituents.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO), who is the ranking member of our Environment Subcommittee.

□ 1230

Mr. TONKO. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding.

I rise in strong opposition to this resolution. I am honestly having a hard time understanding why we are considering this resolution today.

In the first 9 weeks of 2025, the House majority has made no progress on funding the government for the remainder of the fiscal year, and they have made no attempt to hold the Trump administration accountable for its actions, whether it is ignoring court orders to stop withholding congressionally directed funding or dismissing hard-

working Federal employees or upending our closest trade and national security partnerships.

Instead, today, we are taking time on the House floor to consider a minor rule that EPA was legally obligated to develop. The rule in question—to limit hazardous air pollutants from rubber tire manufacturers—was finalized in November of last year.

At no time, as far as I can remember, did the Energy and Commerce Committee conduct any oversight of that rules development during the years EPA took to collect data and then propose and finalize the rule. It was certainly never the subject of a hearing. Why would it be? This rule only affects 12 facilities across our country and does not even meet the Congressional Review Act's definition of economically significant.

Hazardous air pollutant emission limits have existed for most parts of rubber tire manufacturing since 2002. However, a 2020 court ruling required EPA to address all unregulated hazardous air pollutant emissions from a major source category. When EPA carried out a required technology review, it was obligated to propose limits for the unregulated rubber processing subcategory of rubber tire manufacturing.

I understand this is getting into the weeds of the Clean Air Act, so let me be as clear as possible for our Members. This rule requires a very small number of rubber processing manufacturers to take reasonable steps to reduce hazardous air pollutants. It is not overly burdensome to manufacturers. It is achievable, based on cost-effective, existing pollution control technologies, and it does fulfill EPA's legal obligation to regulate harmful air pollutants from all segments of the rubber tire manufacturing process.

While the economic impacts on these firms are small, the rule will reduce air pollution, resulting in greater public health protections for the communities near those 12 facilities.

This resolution is just the latest on a long and growing list of legislation to give a free pass to polluters. I urge Members to oppose it.

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

Obviously, when, in 2020, the EPA found there was an ample margin of safety, there was no reason for the Energy and Commerce Oversight Committee, which at the time I chaired, to do an oversight hearing on something that appeared to be a matter which on its face would not require new regulation.

The EPA, of course, does things that sometimes are perplexing to many of us. I would submit as well that one would have anticipated they would have used, as they are supposed to, an actual hazardous air pollutant study or standard. Instead, they used a proxy study of total hydrocarbons.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. KELLY), my friend.

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman GRIFFITH for the opportunity to speak in support of this resolution.

It is death by a thousand cuts with the EPA. Each one only costs a little bit. It is kind of like when we have DOGE right now. It only costs a little bit to have two or three extra people on each job. It only costs a little bit to add another regulation that does not make sense and that does not accomplish anything.

These businesses are dying because, one regulation at a time, for no reason other than to create jobs for some bureaucracy, we continue to have those.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.J. Res. 61 to repeal yet another burdensome regulation from the Biden administration that threatens American jobs and manufacturing, some of those in my district. Although it may only be a few that are recognized, one of those is in my district.

This rule imposes costly, unnecessary mandates that do little to improve the environment but will drive up costs, hurt businesses, and put hard-working Americans at risk or out of work.

In my district and across the country, the manufacturers provide good-paying jobs that support families and strengthen our economy, but under this rule, companies will be forced to take on massive new costs, costs that will either be passed on to consumers or result in lost jobs and closed facilities. We cannot afford to let Washington bureaucrats dictate policies that weaken American industries and send our opportunities overseas.

I urge my colleagues to support H.J. Res. 61 and to push back against reckless regulatory overreach. American workers and businesses are better.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Reclaiming my time, I would like to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. KELLY).

Is the gentleman trying to tell the American people that it is only a minor rule, as one of our colleagues said, it is only a minor rule if it doesn't apply to you?

I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. KELLY) for a response.

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. If it doesn't apply to you.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Also, if it doesn't take your job?

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Also, thousands of those minor rules add up over time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. DEXTER.)

Ms. DEXTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 61.

As the government hurtles toward a shutdown and millions of Oregonians fear being stripped of their healthcare, House Republicans are wasting time on ridiculous resolutions that do nothing to lower costs for working families and, instead, threaten our public health.

Before coming to Congress, I spent over two decades as a pulmonary and critical care physician. Every day, I saw firsthand how climate change impacts people and how poor air quality leads to people's morbidity and, yes, mortality. It is undeniable, the air we breathe is making us sick, and we cannot afford to ignore this any longer.

As Democrats fight tooth and nail to protect public health and center our families, Republicans are pushing harmful resolutions that threaten the well-being of our constituents and the future of our planet. If it weren't so cruel, it would be laughable.

H.J. Res. 61, the one before us today, would cripple the EPA's ability to protect our communities from hazardous air pollutants, the worst cancer-causing air toxins, at a time when Republicans are also on the cusp of taking away healthcare from millions of Americans.

This resolution is part of a larger, more dangerous trend to gut our public health agencies, silence our scientists, and roll back critical environmental protections. It proves just how out of touch they are with the American people.

Mr. Speaker, my message to the Oregonians watching is simple: I will stand on this floor time and again to raise their voices and make sure they are heard because, as a doctor, when my patient's health is threatened, I do what it takes to protect them.

Clean air is not a luxury. It is a right, and I will not stop fighting for it. I encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on this reckless and irresponsible policy.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CRENSHAW).

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 61 because it is common sense. The Biden administration decided to put these additional regulations on tire manufacturers. The inevitable consequence of that, of course, is increasing the cost of tires for the American people.

The American people might be okay with such a regulation if it was to have a meaningful, positive effect. Everybody wants to protect the environment. I can't name a single Member who doesn't. As policymakers, we have to ensure that regulations are pragmatic and balance the inherent trade-offs. That is what policymaking is about. That is what regulation is about, trade-offs.

The Biden-era regulation on tire manufacturers is a perfect example of when regulators fail to do a proper cost-benefit analysis.

Let's talk specifics. This EPA rule piles on huge costs for our domestic tire makers. It is going to hit close to 100 rubber-mixers across the country. That jeopardizes jobs, increases prices, and makes American manufacturers less competitive globally.

Worse, there is not really a benefit to this. These regulations don't do much

of anything to actually improve the environment. Under the final rule, tire manufacturers have to install expensive new devices like regenerative thermal oxidizers, which require incredible amounts of energy to operate. Therefore, you offset the so-called benefit by burning a lot more energy, meaning you are burning a lot more carbon dioxide, by the way. In other words, you are left with a policy that is pretty much all cost and no clear upside to it.

If you look at the justification, the Biden EPA claimed they implemented this rule to address hazardous air pollutants from tire manufacturers. Here is the thing: The agency's own data found that our existing standards already kept those emissions in check and protect public health. Why did they do it anyway? It is simple. It was because the political appointees at Biden's EPA are beholden to a bunch of radical environmental groups.

They went for the optics. They want headlines like "Tough on Pollution" instead of trusting the data that says actually we are in a good place here. They want the headlines. They believe in this crazy philosophy that if 1 regulation is good, then 10 more must be better. You can never do enough.

Of course, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have started with the scare tactics claiming the sky is falling, the air quality is plummeting, and people are dying and they are not going to have healthcare. There is no evidence for that, of course.

The evidence actually shows the opposite. The EPA's own website shows criteria pollutants have dropped by nearly 80 percent over the last several decades. We have already made a huge amount of progress. The data backs that up, not doom-and-gloom talking points.

Mr. Speaker, I say to anyone watching at home, don't buy into the fear-mongering that the Democrats are selling. This resolution is about protecting American jobs and keeping an eye on costs for everyone. It won't hurt the environment at all. It just reverses a burdensome rule that does more harm than good.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand with Chairman GRIFFITH in support of this resolution. I urge all my colleagues on both sides to do the same.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. SYKES).

Mrs. SYKES. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in opposition of H.J. Res. 61, which would nullify an Environmental Protection Agency rule to significantly reduce the unregulated toxic chemicals from tire manufacturing facilities, facilities that my community is all too familiar with.

In 1839, Charles Goodyear invented vulcanized rubber, revolutionizing the way that the world travels. Decades later, the Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company was founded and headquartered in Akron, Ohio, my hometown, in Ohio's 13th Congressional District.

For many years, the city of Akron, which I proudly represent, has been nicknamed the Rubber Capital of the World due to its long history of rubber and tire manufacturing. This industry has provided decades of local jobs, economic development, and financial stability to countless families in Akron and the surrounding area.

Without rubber manufacturing, Akron would not be what it is today. In fact, Mr. Speaker, my family fled the segregated South to find jobs in these rubber factories, in the Firestone plant, and I stand here before you a proud graduate of the Harvey S. Firestone High School, the founder of the Firestone Tire and Rubber Company.

Yes, we are proud in the city of Akron to honor the legacy of rubber workers in my district. As the centerpiece of downtown Akron's Main Street corridor, you can find a statue of a rubber factory worker standing tall in commemoration of their contributions to our community that is 200 years old this year. Unfortunately, a generation later, we know now that the stories of far too many rubber workers and families included cancer, asthma, and other respiratory illnesses. Decades without adequate regulation of toxic emissions from these plants have taken a serious toll on the Akron community. Studies from the 1980s found increased risk of leukemia among rubber plant workers in Akron and respiratory illnesses in children nearby rubber plants. Good-year's St. Marys, Ohio, rubber plant vented carcinogenic vinyl chloride into the environment in close proximity to a Boy Scout camp, and an Akron plant vented dust contaminated with asbestos into surrounding neighborhoods.

It should be no surprise that asthma and cancer remain challenges for my community. In 2019, the Asthma and Allergy Foundation of America designated Akron as an asthma capital alongside it being the rubber capital, and ranked the city 14th in the list of the top 100 most challenging places in America to live with asthma.

Thankfully, in 2024, Akron moved further down the list to 52, but we would obviously prefer not to be on that list at all. Studies have also shown that neighborhoods in southern Akron, like Summit Lake and Kenmore, continue to pose lifetime cancer risk from industrial pollution that is nearly twice the EPA's acceptable levels.

Unfortunately, everyone in Akron has a friend or a family member with a cancer story. Too often, these stories involve working in rubber or being too close to a plant.

The EPA rule that is the subject of this joint resolution estimates that compliance with the rule will cost these multimillion dollar corporations no greater than 1 percent of their annual revenue. Yes, I know that can still be a lot of money, but to argue that these costs are too great when the alternative is communities plagued with years of increased cancer and asthma,

as they are in my community, is just plain insulting.

To be clear, I know the importance of the rubber industry to my community. It is the reason why I stand here today. It is, quite literally, why I get the opportunity to stand here today. I appreciate rubber workers in Akron who helped make our city the rubber capital and revolutionized the way in which we travel.

□ 1245

Mr. Speaker, we also built the best middle class that this country has ever seen, but we cannot repeat history and continue to expose our communities and our rubber workers to these toxic chemicals. This resolution poses a danger to the public health of our communities across the country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WIED). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. SYKES. Mr. Speaker, with Americans looking at a reduction in critical healthcare services from the recently passed Republican budget, including cuts to the Medicaid program that children with asthma will need to access, this resolution could not come at a worse time.

This is not hyperbole, and I hear my colleagues when they say on the other side of the aisle that this may be problematic. I ask them to hear me, standing on behalf of 786,000 people from the city of Akron, representing northeast Ohio, a great-granddaughter of a rubber factory worker, who knows what it is like to lose a friend because of cancer due to some of these toxic chemicals: I don't want the same for my colleagues' communities.

Mr. Speaker, I ask them to learn from our mistakes, and I ask my colleagues in Congress to join me in opposition to this resolution.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE), the chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, Chairman GRIFFITH, for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, this rule is an example of unsubstantiated bureaucratic overreach that does not have any added impact to public health benefits and actually goes so far as to have a negative environmental impact.

The Biden-Harris EPA finalized a rule targeting American tire manufacturers that runs the risk of destroying domestic tire production and eliminating thousands of good-paying American jobs.

When finalizing the rule, the EPA stated the goal was to reduce emissions from hazardous air pollutants. However, the rule also adds emissions limitations for total hydrocarbons. These two pollutants are not correlated.

In short, limiting hydrocarbons does not reduce emissions from hazardous air pollutants.

Additionally, implementation of this rule requires facilities to use regenerative thermal oxidizers. Use of RTOs will result in higher carbon dioxide emissions, as they require significant energy inputs to operate and maintain.

American tire manufacturers already comply with National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants, known as NESHAP, and are operating well under the acceptable limitations. The manufacturers' compliance has ensured that our communities are safe. On the other hand, this rule all but ensures their demise.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle are concerned about why we are bringing these issues up now. Due to the number of Biden-Harris administration midnight regulations, we have no choice in Congress but to address the onslaught of these policies before they destroy businesses and make life more expensive for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, let us be pragmatic and use common sense in our policymaking, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.J. Res. 61.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has 15 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Virginia has 11½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MORRISON).

Ms. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, today I rise, as a doctor of more than 20 years, in opposition to H.J. Res. 61, an egregious and completely unnecessary assault on our public health.

This resolution put forward by congressional Republicans would rip away protections that keep Americans safe from some of the most dangerous and cancer-causing air toxins in the world, such as arsenic and lead.

As an OB/GYN, I am extremely concerned because these toxins are known to cause reproductive harm and birth defects.

Just last night, in this Chamber, President Trump claimed: "Our goal is to get toxins out of our environment." President Trump also highlighted the concerning increase in rates of childhood cancer and claimed: "Reversing this trend is one of the top priorities."

Yet, less than 24 hours later, the Republican majority is choosing to increase toxins in our environment, expose more Americans to some of the most dangerous pollutants, and likely increase the rates of cancer.

Let's be clear: This cost-effective rule presents minimal cost to industry in order to protect public health.

What are we doing here? Why are we selling out the health of Americans? The consequences of this would be devastating to our children, moms and new babies, and families across the country. It is completely preventable.

To my Republican colleagues who hold the majority rule in this Chamber,

please, for the sake of the health and well-being of the American people, vote “no” on this resolution.

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

Mr. Speaker, I recognize none of us wants the world polluted. The gentlewoman indicated that somehow this was going to affect arsenic and lead. I suppose, in a theoretical world, perhaps it could, but there are other regulations on tire manufacturing that may deal with that.

That is not what this Congressional Review Act is about. It is about a regulation that was put into effect because, instead of looking for things like arsenic and lead or actual hazardous air pollutants, the EPA used a proxy measurement and measured carbon dioxide. They didn't use a test to come up with this rule based on arsenic or lead. It was a proxy using carbon.

Further, somebody said earlier, Mr. Speaker, that we were stripping away critical regulations. I would say, Mr. Speaker, if it was so critical, why did the Biden administration wait until November 29 with less than 2 months left in their term? If it was so critical, why did the EPA in 2020 find that there was an ample margin of safety in the regulations that already existed?

Mr. Speaker, this is not about stripping away all regulations on tire manufacturing. It is one specific ill-advised, ill-timed, expensive regulation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I can't stress enough that the EPA's rule, which the Republicans are trying to repeal, would remove 171 tons of hazardous air pollution per year, including some of the worst air toxins.

This critical rule is, first and foremost, a public health rule, seeking to help both the workers and the communities surrounding these facilities.

We heard a very impassioned speech by the gentlewoman from Akron, Ohio, who talked about how much, in Akron, they depend on this industry and want it to thrive. They have suffered over the years, not only the people who work in the factory but the people of Akron and the surrounding areas, from hazardous air pollution. Essentially, that is why she is opposed to the repeal of this rule that helps people breathe.

Again, this is not only something that the EPA is required to do under the Clean Air Act, which is to look at whether or not particular industries are causing health problems for the American public, but in addition to that, the EPA was compelled to regulate these specific air toxins by a 2020 court case that required the agency to close loopholes for unregulated hazardous air pollution that they are legally required to manage under the Clean Air Act.

My colleagues on the other side suggested that somehow this is a Biden administration midnight rule and that it

was rushed at the last minute. The reality is that the EPA has been regulating the process involved in tire manufacturing since 2002. That is over 20 years ago.

Rubber processing, which is really what we are talking about here, had gotten a free pass, as I said, for over 20 years. This rule that the EPA promulgated seeks to ensure that the workers and communities like those in Akron near these facilities aren't put in harm's way any longer.

I think House Republicans are really minimizing these critical public health protections decades in the making by using the CRA to repeal this title and block the EPA from further action.

Instead of funding our government, lowering prices, or finding ways to help everyday Americans, House Republicans are wasting Congress' time by rescinding a long-awaited rule that will reduce 171 tons of harmful, cancer-causing emissions a year.

While this rule was finalized in November, the 11 rubber processing facilities have 3 years to make the necessary technology upgrades. Any doomsday claims about the EPA rule simply ignore the very real experiences of people who have been forced to breathe toxic pollution while coming into work or walking out of their front door for far too long.

Mr. Speaker, for all of these reasons, I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, the EPA was under no obligation to do this regulation. They may have been under an obligation to look at unregulated hazardous air pollutants, but nowhere in the statute does it allow for proxy carbon studies.

Hydrocarbons are not listed as a hazardous air pollutant. The plain language, I repeat, does not authorize proxy or surrogate studies to say: Well, we looked at it, and there is a lot of carbon. Therefore, we are going to make specific regulations that cost hundreds of millions of dollars and may or may not cost jobs.

That is not their job. That is the purpose of the Congressional Review Act. It is to rein in unreasonable, improper, or irrational regulations done at the last minute by an outgoing administration or by an incoming team.

This is not something that needs to be on the books to protect health. They did a proxy study. They don't have actual data that shows that this would do any good at all. It will perhaps cause significant curtailment in production at certain facilities of tires made in the United States. It is our job as Members of Congress to prevent this travesty.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the arguments that we have made have now worn out. We have used up the mileage on these arguments. Now, we get to vote “yes,” and voting “yes” is where the rubber meets the road and gives us

a more sound regulatory scheme related to tire manufacturing.

Mr. Speaker, I ask everyone to vote “yes,” and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LOUDERMILK). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 177, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the joint resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1300

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY RELATING TO “ENERGY CONSERVATION PROGRAM FOR APPLIANCE STANDARDS: CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS, LABELING REQUIREMENTS, AND ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS FOR CERTAIN CONSUMER PRODUCTS AND COMMERCIAL EQUIPMENT”

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 177, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 42) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Energy relating to “Energy Conservation Program for Appliance Standards: Certification Requirements, Labeling Requirements, and Enforcement Provisions for Certain Consumer Products and Commercial Equipment”, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 177, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 42

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the Department of Energy relating to “Energy Conservation Program for Appliance Standards: Certification Requirements, Labeling Requirements, and Enforcement Provisions for Certain Consumer Products and Commercial Equipment” (89 Fed. Reg. 81994 (October 9, 2024)), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The joint resolution shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the legislation and to insert extraneous material on H.J. Res. 42.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CLYDE).

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of my Congressional Review Act joint resolution of disapproval which seeks to overturn the Department of Energy's final rule on the Energy Conservation Program for Appliance Standards: Certification Requirements, Labeling Provisions, and Enforcement Provisions.

Over the past 4 years, the Biden-Harris administration has flooded our economy with burdensome regulations, stifling growth and restricting Americans' freedoms. In total, these regulations have imposed a staggering \$1.7 trillion in costs on the American people. Fortunately, House Republicans and President Trump are committed to rolling back these unnecessary and costly mandates.

The latest example of overreach came in October of 2024, when the Department of Energy finalized new certification, labeling, and enforcement requirements affecting 20 different consumer and commercial products, including dishwashers, central air conditioners, heat pumps, washing machines, battery chargers, and light bulbs. These new mandates add unnecessary red tape, disrupt supply chains, limit consumer choice, and drive up prices. It is time to get the Washington bureaucracy out of Americans' everyday lives.

My legislation seeks to rescind this final rule which places excessive costs and bureaucratic obstacles on appliance manufacturers, costs that will inevitably be passed down to consumers. In its broader push against fossil fuels, the Biden administration has imposed at least 31 appliance regulations at an estimated cost of over \$60 billion. This resolution would eliminate Biden-era energy conservation certification and labeling regulations, ensuring that American consumers, not Washington bureaucrats, decide which appliances best fit their needs.

Even the Biden-Harris Department of Energy acknowledges that this rule

will increase annual costs for individual manufacturers by \$213,000 and require an additional 2,905 hours of compliance paperwork, just paperwork, a major burden, particularly for small businesses. As a small business owner myself, I understand how crushing regulations like these harm the small businesses that drive our economy, especially in rural communities like northeast Georgia.

Last November, the American people soundly rejected the Biden-Harris administration's disastrous policies. Now, as President Trump moves swiftly to get our country back on track, Congress must act to roll back these costly misguided regulations, starting with the Department of Energy's appliance rule.

I thank Chairman GUTHRIE, Chairman GRIFFITH, and House leadership for prioritizing this commonsense legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support its final passage to protect consumer choice, reduce costs, and eliminate unnecessary regulatory burdens.

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

I rise in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 42. This resolution is a deliberate distraction from the fact that Republicans cannot govern and have no ideas for lowering costs or helping everyday Americans. Rather than debating things that actually impact our constituents, it appears as if House Republicans opened the Federal Register, searched for what fell within the Congressional Review Act window, and then randomly selected an obscure, noncontroversial rule, one that is, by the way, supported by American manufacturers.

That is why we are here today. We are not here to talk about Republican cuts to Medicare or DOGE's raid of the Federal Government or Trump's tariffs that are tanking the stock market and threatening a recession. We are not even here to consider a government funding bill when government funding runs out in less than 10 days. No, we are here to talk about appliance labels.

Let me talk about them. Let me start with the fact that the recently finalized Department of Energy rule that Republicans want to strike from the books isn't even an efficiency standard. It is a set of technical updates to certification requirements and labels for select products that fall under the appliance standards program.

Now, you might say: Congressman PALLONE, what does this mean? It means that Republicans are simply out of ideas.

The Republican majority seems to be under the impression that by removing this rule from the books, they are somehow alleviating a major burden for manufacturers and consumers. The problem is that manufacturers have been submitting certification information to the Department of Energy for decades, and none of this is new.

This Republican resolution will only create regulatory confusion for American manufacturers because they will still have to make products that meet efficiency standards, but they won't have updated guidance from the Department of Energy on how to prove that they are compliant. As a result, these companies will likely have to waste valuable time and resources on communications with lawyers and the Department of Energy as everyone tries to figure out how to move forward.

My colleagues on the other side are suggesting they are cutting red tape, but it seems to me they are creating more red tape with this resolution. Absolutely no one opposed the Department of Energy's final rule on this topic, no one.

In fact, manufacturers are on record saying that consistent and clear certification guidance is helpful and necessary to them. Today's resolution is the opposite of consistent and clear. They are asking for this, the manufacturers are, and you are saying no. You don't even know what you are talking about, frankly.

I refuse to believe that—I can't believe that they think on the other side that this is a pressing issue facing Americans. In case they have forgotten, Republicans are right now moving forward with a budget that includes devastating cuts to Medicaid, all so they can give tax breaks to their billionaire buddies.

Every day for the last 6 weeks, we have heard horror stories of mass firings across the Federal Government, funding freezes, and Elon Musk and his minions having access to every American's private, personal financial and healthcare information. This is what I hear about when I go home. The list goes on. Now, there is a looming government shutdown next week.

Rather than tackling these real issues that are impacting the lives of everyday Americans, Republicans are wasting time with this resolution.

As far as I can tell, the only beneficiaries of today's resolution are foreign manufacturers. If Republicans create chaos and uncertainty by revoking this Department of Energy rule, they will create an opportunity for cheap foreign imports, with misleading claims about performance, to flood our appliance market. That would hurt consumers and American manufacturers alike.

The Republicans have made their choice. They have sided once again with the foreign manufacturers. They have chosen to push through a resolution that doesn't reduce regulatory burdens, doesn't lower costs, and doesn't improve consumer choices. The only thing it does is create chaos and confusion, from what I can see.

For all these reasons, I oppose the resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE), the chairman of

the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in the subcommittee this morning, it was brought to my attention that our colleague SYLVESTER TURNER had passed away. He was new here, so I didn't really know him that well. Actually, the first time was either Monday or—the days run together. It would have been yesterday during votes, right before we adjourned to get ready for the special session, he was sitting right there on the aisle on the corner, and I shook his hand and talked to him for the first time.

Today, in Energy and Commerce, there were two Members, our colleagues from Texas, Mr. WEBER and Mr. GOLDMAN, who served with him in the Texas Legislature. If you listened to what they said about SYLVESTER TURNER, only knowing him for a day or so, I missed a lot. He seemed to be a wonderful man, a wonderful person, and my thoughts and prayers and the thoughts of the Energy and Commerce Committee, and I know the whole House, are with his family. He is going to be missed.

I will get down to the business in front of us. I know that has moved all of us—that is why I wanted to bring it up—to lose such a great colleague.

I rise today in support of H.J. Res. 42 to repeal the Biden administration's burdensome and unnecessary certification, labeling, and enforcement provisions for 20 different products that American families and businesses rely on day in and day out.

Over the last 4 years, the Biden Department of Energy proposed and finalized new and amended standards for 30 appliance classes, regulating virtually every appliance in our houses and much of the equipment in businesses. All of these regulations led to over \$60 billion in added costs.

Implementing these certification, labeling, and enforcement provisions will further solidify the disastrous standards promulgated under the last administration.

This rule alone will increase costs annually by \$213,000 while doing nothing to improve appliance efficiency, extend product lifetimes, or lower costs.

While consumers struggle to keep up with the ever-increasing cost of appliances and dwindling product optionality, the Biden administration consistently hampered innovation by imposing unnecessary and duplicative regulation on manufacturers.

Fortunately, H.J. Res. 42 will roll back this red tape and enable Congress and the Trump administration to safeguard consumer choice and lower costs for American households.

I thank the gentleman from the Ninth District of Georgia (Mr. CLYDE), my good friend, for leading this legislation. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting H.J. Res. 42.

We will miss our good friend from Texas, as I said, who I really got to

know in the last 24 hours. I missed a lot by not knowing him longer.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this resolution.

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

I just want to clarify some of the comments that we are hearing today from the other side. My colleagues across the aisle said at one point it costs the Department of Energy a little over \$200,000 to implement this rule, and they have described what sounds like onerous associated paperwork and a big administrative burden.

Now, understand, that is \$200,000 total, across all manufacturers throughout the country. I mean, we are not talking about a huge amount of money here. The thing is that the Department of Energy already has certification requirements for manufacturers, and this resolution doesn't remove those requirements. It just includes technical updates that bring those requirements up to date.

The manufacturers, as I said before, have been submitting this information to the Department of Energy for decades. There is nothing new here.

In fact, if this resolution passes, the Department of Energy and manufacturers will be left with a new administrative burden to navigate. They will have to figure out how to use old testing requirements for new standards even when technically these things don't go together.

The manufacturers, who, as I said, support the rule, will have to work with their lawyers to figure out if they are compliant with standards and will have to identify ways to prove they are compliant. The Department of Energy will have to wade through confused outreach from stakeholders. This is what happens if the resolution passes. The rule is not a problem for any of the manufacturers, the underlying rule they are trying to repeal.

Since the Department of Energy will be barred from issuing substantially similar rules, they won't be able to officially update these requirements ever again.

I know this sounds very bureaucratic. I don't know where they came up with this resolution, so I have to explain how they are creating more bureaucracy for the manufacturers who actually like the underlying rule they want to repeal.

□ 1315

In what world is removing clear and consistent guidance, creating regulatory uncertainty, and reducing costs and administrative burdens a bad thing? It doesn't make any sense. Why are we creating a scenario where manufacturers must report outdated information and risk penalties for non-compliance?

If my colleagues across the aisle are worried about administrative burdens at the Department of Energy, perhaps they should speak up for the employees that Musk and President Trump have

fired at the Department of Energy, or maybe they should speak out against all the administrative confusion of turning funding on and off again—you know, freeze one day, thaw the next day, freeze again.

I just think that this resolution is a distraction, Mr. Speaker. It doesn't accomplish what my colleagues across the aisle want to accomplish. In fact, it creates so much confusion that it accomplishes exactly what we should be trying to avoid, and that is increased costs and delays.

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

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 42, which will roll back another burdensome Biden-Harris rule on the Department of Energy efficiency standards for appliances and equipment.

Let's be clear: People elected us to make the laws, and these agencies are making rules. I think Congress is entitled to speak on this issue.

Alongside President Trump, House Republicans are on a mission to reclaim American energy dominance, and that means continuing to eliminate President Biden's burdensome energy regulations that have limited consumer choice. Again, we represent the people, and the people are telling us that these things have to stop.

This final rule that we will overturn today imposes unnecessary and duplicative labeling, certifying, and reporting requirements for various appliances and commercial equipment. This is part of a broken system that needs major reforms. The American people are done paying for it with higher costs, created by government bureaucrats, for at-home appliances.

Under the Biden administration alone, the DOE implemented more than 30 appliance and equipment efficiency rules, at a cost of \$60 billion, many of which negatively impact consumers and manufacturers in my district.

Amazingly, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle were stuck in their seats last night as President Trump spoke about unleashing American energy and lowering costs. Regardless, House Republicans will deliver.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. CLYDE for his leadership, and I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR), the ranking member of our Energy Subcommittee.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 42.

This is the latest Republican bill to raise costs on American families. In fact, Republicans in Congress have failed to bring any bill over the past couple of months since this new Congress started to help reduce the cost of living for our neighbors back home.

Meanwhile, the Trump administration's illegal shutdown of grants, loans,

and partnership funds to our local communities and nonprofits; the firing of public servants, like the inspector general at the Department of Energy, whose job it is to root out waste, fraud, and abuse; the firing of experts that oversee the nuclear enterprise and our nuclear weapons; and tariffs, which are, in essence, new taxes on American families and businesses, is really socking it to the pocketbooks of American families and business owners, except for billionaires like Elon Musk, who stand to win big from the tax breaks for billionaires that Republicans are moving through the House.

Let's talk about what is going on right now with all of this chaos and confusion. The unemployment rate is up. Prices are up. If you haven't checked your 401(k), that is down. All of this has a real-world impact, and I really want to beseech my Republican colleagues to help us end the madness. Find your spines to stand up to the chaos and confusion that all of these illegal actions are having on our folks back home. I mean, right now laying people off, public servants who provide essential services, the illegal pause in funding—thank goodness the United States Supreme Court just announced this morning that they were turning back one of the illegal actions to, in essence, rob money that has been congressionally mandated to fund essential services.

It really is weighing on the entire economy. More importantly, people back home want to know what the Congress is going to do about it, and it is just silence from my friends on the other side of the aisle.

Let's talk about how ridiculous this is to target labeling on energy-efficient appliances, just plain information that you need to have when you go shopping. Energy efficiency is very important to Americans. It has been, as a matter of fact, for about 50 years. When the Congress passed the Energy Policy and Conservation Act, we said to the Department of Energy: Work with manufacturers and advocates and do everything you can to help with innovation to help consumers save more money.

That is really smart policy. One of the innocuous things that goes along with it is the labeling so that customers understand what they are buying. They need to know about how energy efficient an appliance is and be able to comparison shop when they buy a dishwasher or some other appliance.

Republicans, I just don't understand why you want to keep families and businesses in the dark on this. It is a real head-scratcher until you understand that polluters and big oil and gas companies have all too much influence here on Capitol Hill.

Republicans keep sending these love letters to big oil and gas companies. In fact, it was on Valentine's Day, February 14, when the Trump administration announced it would halt cost savings for consumers through energy-effi-

cient coolers and freezers, clothes washers, and air-conditioners. This labeling fiasco, I just don't understand why you think it is important for families to have less information just when they are trying to figure out what appliance to buy.

In contrast, the Democrats, over the past few years, have really been focused on lowering the cost of living and passed very significant cost savings for consumers. I am not talking about prescription drugs and the cap on insulin. I am talking about energy-efficient appliances, home energy tax credits, and rebates so that you can buy those energy-efficient appliances.

Right now, Floridians are waiting for about \$350 million, which has now been put on hold because of the illegal shutdown of a lot of funds that are supposed to flow back home to the benefit of my neighbors.

I know that Republicans and polluters don't like energy efficiency, but today's resolution does nothing to even get at energy efficiency. In fact, it just creates more confusion. They are just talking about the labels.

It creates confusion for businesses. It is confusing for manufacturers. So many of them are grappling now with the twists and turns of new taxes through tariffs on their products. This is going to cost everyone money.

Americans are rightly asking why Republicans are wasting time repealing this until this week. Until this week, I would hazard to guess that most Members of Congress didn't even know that this was a rule.

American families are also asking why Republicans are turning a blind eye to their responsibility to look out for the pocketbooks of our families and small business owners back home.

I think it is because the Republicans are scared. They are scared of Elon Musk. They are scared to talk about the real problems facing working families across the country: affordability, the escalating costs of the overheating climate, what that is doing, higher insurance costs, and higher electric bills because their summers are longer and more intense. Back in the Tampa Bay area, we are trying to rebuild from the most devastating hurricane season that we have ever experienced.

The changing climate isn't just about the weather. It is about your wallets, and folks really need help. They need Republicans, in addition to Democrats, looking out for them, not just lip-service about lowering costs.

That is why it has been so disheartening to watch Elon Musk and the new administration. They have no plan, no interest in addressing the problems. Instead, they continue to double down on chaos and confusion.

Last night, we heard from the President. He continued his crusade of endless lies. It was difficult to listen to. It was very long because the President campaigned on reducing costs and making government more efficient, and instead, all he has proposed is a

major tax giveaway to billionaires like Elon Musk, paid for by hardworking folks, children who rely on Medicaid, our neighbors with disabilities, and our older neighbors in skilled nursing, saying to Social Security recipients it is going to be harder for you to get your payment because we are going to slash the people who ensure that that happens, repealing affordable healthcare, repealing these initiatives that lower your electric bills, and other actions that make us less safe.

Congressional Republicans have a lot to say about today's resolution and their war against energy-efficient appliances. As Elon Musk and his lackeys really take a hammer—a chain saw, I guess—to what really matters in this country, it is very difficult to try to work together to say we are going to solve problems for the American people when one side has no spine and no answer and instead brings these ridiculous resolutions to the floor rather than working on really helping the American people.

The only labels we should be talking about today are the lies stickered across Trump's empty campaign promises. He continues these misleading claims and lies to the American people, and Democrats are not going to stand idly by while he loots the U.S. Government for his own benefit. There has to be an end to the chaos and corruption, and it needs to start right now.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as I said before, but I think it bears repeating, Republicans have cited about \$200,000 in costs for manufacturers associated with this rule that they seek to repeal, but understand that is the total cost of the rule for all affected manufacturers combined. If you break that down, the Department of Energy estimates the costs per manufacturer at about \$2,555.

That is a ridiculous amount to even discuss at this point. We actually heard from one manufacturer that they have already redone their certification reports to comply with the rule. If this resolution is enacted, they will have to redo their certifications to the old, out-of-date rules, and that will cost them more money.

□ 1330

The details of these certification rules are obscure, but they are important for establishing a level playing field and ensuring the products meet U.S. standards, whether they are imported or made here in the U.S.

Repealing the certification would increase costs for the manufacturers that play by the rules and can make it harder on the DOE to enforce standards against those that don't. The good guys

all like the rule and don't want it repealed. Only the bad foreign manufacturers might like to get rid of the rules.

I just find it, Mr. Speaker, deeply ironic that my Republican colleagues are hell-bent on attacking anything even remotely related to energy efficiency standards or bringing up things like administrative burdens on the Department of Energy during a time when they have been praising Elon Musk's destructive government efficiency efforts through DOGE.

I guess my Republican colleagues only care about efficiency improvements, if we can even call it that, when it means indiscriminately slashing our Federal workforce. If Republicans cared about government efficiency, then they wouldn't be rescinding rules that provide clear and consistent guidance for American companies. They wouldn't look the other way when the DOE workforce is slashed without evaluating the impacts.

I don't think Republicans care about reducing costs for American families or helping government work better for our families and industries. Mr. Speaker, just look at their budget that they adopted last week. The only thing they care about is cozying up to greedy billionaires.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I would ask my colleagues to vote against this resolution, it absolutely makes no sense for anyone, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I find this debate fascinating and interesting. That may come as a shock, because it is really pretty boring. However, I find it interesting because my colleagues have just said: Why are we spending time worrying about this little regulation from the Department of Energy when employees are losing their jobs?

Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that if this is such a small, little regulation, I mean it is merely a labeling thing that doesn't cost very much according to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, then what in the world were we doing having DOE employees?

We have got so many DOE employees that they have time to spend all day, weeks, and months creating a new regulation that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle claim doesn't really have much value to it, it is just a little label.

I would submit, Mr. Speaker, it costs more than what DOE has estimated, because even though they spent countless hours coming up with this new regulation, I would submit that in my opinion it looks like they only counted the cost of the new labels. That is because somebody has to send it to legal, and we have to determine if the new certification has any legal consequences.

Does it say something on the new appliance or on the appliance that is already out there but is in the produc-

tion process that might cause a legal issue?

I would submit it costs our manufacturers not only the money to print the label but an employee to come up with the new label before it goes to legal to be looked at. Somebody has to pay those people.

While the cost of the labels might only be \$200,000, there is a cost to each company. That is because this is broad. It doesn't apply to one or two little items. It applies to all kinds of stuff.

I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that that is where your real cost is, and instead of being concerned about coming up with some kind of a new certificate that has to have a new label, maybe we shouldn't have been doing that at the DOE. Maybe we should have been focusing on making small nuclear reactors available for communities and working on ways to provide a stronger electric grid; but no, no, by golly, we are going to have the best labels in the world. That is what we need.

Mr. Speaker, I submit to you this regulation needs to go away, but my colleagues have told me that it is insignificant. If they don't think it is significant, I think we should get rid of it, particularly when it is going to cost businesses.

It may not cost every business, maybe one manufacturer out of dozens and dozens, or maybe hundreds. I haven't done a study, Mr. Speaker. I will just tell you that it has been interesting to listen to all of this discussion.

I will remind you, Mr. Speaker, that over the last 4 years, the Biden administration finalized more than 30 new or updated energy efficiency standards that ended up totaling over \$60 billion in costs. This is just one of many cuts to our manufacturing base in the United States and our producers as well as across the world.

The Biden administration was out to regulate or restrict nearly every appliance or piece of equipment relied upon by every single American household and business.

Today, the House will vote on H.J. Res. 42 to repeal yet another Biden-Harris administration rule that only serves to increase red tape and costs to manufacturers. We know what happens when the costs to manufacturers go up; the American consumer pays the price.

In October 2024, the Department of Energy finalized new and amended certification, labeling, and enforcement provisions for about 20 different products, including dishwashers, central AC, heat pumps, and more.

I am going to get to the "and more" in a minute.

Today, an American homeowner spends about 34 percent more money on appliances than they did just 15 years ago. From 1995 to 2005, the average homeowner replaced their appliances about every 12 or 13 years. These days families get new appliances about every 8 or 9 years. Maybe it is because they are not as efficient as they used to be. I don't know.

However, I do know on one washer-dryer standard, according to the data—I believe this was DOE data—there was a 46-year payback on a device that was expected to last or be expected to be used by the homeowner 8 to 9 years. We are going to make it more efficient, but, by golly, it is going to cost you, Mr. Speaker. It is going to cost you, and it is going to take 46 years to pay back on an item you will only use for about 10.

Consumers are buying more frequently in part because some energy standards make the appliance wear down more quickly. That is what my suspicion was all along.

Consumers don't see the savings. These appliances just don't last as long because they have got to run their washing machine three times.

I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, one time I had a constituent contact me, and she said: Morgan, look at this picture. I take a hose from my backyard to fill up my washing machine because under the new guidelines there is not enough water in there to actually get my clothes clean on one time, so I supplement it with the backyard hose and add more water to my washing machine.

Yeah, that is really, really good policy.

I remember an old DOE energy standard from a few years ago that one of my constituents told me about related to the washing machine. I just told you that story, Mr. Speaker, and I think it is instructive.

This final rule will only expand already broken efficiency standards, increase costs, and slow the development of reliable, efficient products.

On a previous DOE standard for electric combination washer-dryers, DOE said in plain black and white in Federal regulations: payback period 46 years.

DOE itself estimates this final rule might only cost \$213,000, but that is \$213,000 we don't have to spend. As I said, I don't think it is that cheap. I think by the time you get finished with the lawyers and everybody who has to review it and all the time that is spent by your employees, Mr. Speaker, it is a lot more than that in reality.

DOE assumes manufacturers will incur these additional costs, but we know better than that. They will send that on to the consumer, and it will cost us more money.

It also has a DOE expansion in data collection. In one example regarding the data collection, Mr. Speaker, you have to collect the data for dedicated purpose swimming pool pump motors.

Historically, DOE only collected data demonstrating compliance with efficiency standards. However, in this final rule, DOE aims to expand reporting requirements to store data for potential future conservation standards.

If you are trying to run a pool, whether at your house or a commercial operation, I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that is an additional cost. You are

having to collect all this data, Mr. Speaker, or if it is built into your machine, then that is going to cost more, and it is unnecessary. We are making everything more complicated.

Mr. Speaker, you will be surprised to know that at one time in my life I was a Virginia certified pool operator. That is why I brought this over. I keep this on my desk. When the baby pool pump—that would qualify as one of these dedicated purpose swimming pool pump motors—when it broke down, and it would have been in 1980, I found that when we had to get it replaced, this was the gadget that had worn out.

It reminded me that we were moving from brass, in this case, to plastic, and so I have kept it on my desk all these years.

Who knew it would become important today because probably some kind of a label should have been on here if we had today's standards in place. I don't know. All I do know is that when you are trying to get something replaced, Mr. Speaker, particularly in the case of a swimming pool, when the pump breaks, it means you are going to have to shut your facility down, and you are not looking at the label on the new pump motor. You are just getting it in there as fast as you can. You are driving over to the swimming pool supply place, Mr. Speaker, or you are calling them up and saying: Get over here now.

That came out of the Hunting Hills Country Club baby swimming pool where I was the manager that summer and was a certified pool operator to have that job.

Now we are going to be collecting data on all this stuff. Mr. Speaker, you would think we were TikTok in the way we are collecting data on swimming pool motors and other devices.

This overcollection jeopardizes confidential business information. It might not have mattered to the swimming pools I worked with, but it complicates the matter. It is an inappropriate use of the certification process.

Additionally, many of the provisions in this final rule are also duplicative of existing reporting requirements by certain States, EPA, and Energy Star. This increase in red tape will do nothing to lower appliance prices, and it will do nothing to lengthen product lifetimes or to bring real energy savings to the American homeowner.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Georgia (Mr. CLYDE) for his leadership on bringing this to our attention. I urge all Members to join me in voting in favor of H.J. Res. 42, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 177, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

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

□ 1600

AFTER RECESS

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

EXPRESSING THE PROFOUND SORROW OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON THE DEATH OF THE HONORABLE SYLVESTER TURNER

Ms. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Texas delegation, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 191

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable SYLVESTER TURNER, a Representative from the State of Texas.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That when the House adjourns today, it adjourn as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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:

Passage of H.J. Res. 61; and

Passage of H.J. Res. 42.

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 CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY RELATING TO "NATIONAL EMISSION STANDARDS FOR HAZARDOUS AIR POLLUTANTS: RUBBER TIRE MANUFACTURING"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on passage of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 61) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Rubber Tire Manufacturing" on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 216, nays 202, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 58]

YEAS—216

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

Self
Sessions
Shreve
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil

Steube
Strong
Stutzman
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner (OH)
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne

Van Orden
Wagner
Walberg
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westerman
Wied
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NAYS—202

Adams
Aguilar
Amo
Ansari
Auchincloss
Balint
Barragán
Beatty
Bell
Bera
Beyer
Bishop
Bonamici
Boyle (PA)
Brown
Brownley
Budzinski
Bynum
Carbajal
Carson
Carter (LA)
Casar
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cherfilus-
McCormick
Chu
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Conaway
Connolly
Correa
Courtney
Craig
Crockett
Crow
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Dexter
Dingell
Doggett
Elfreth
Escobar
Espallat
Evans (PA)
Fields
Figures
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Foster
Foushee
Frankel, Lois
Friedman
Frost
Garamendi
Garcia (CA)

NOT VOTING—14

Biggs (AZ)
Davidson
Diaz-Balart
Gonzales, Tony
Gosar

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

□ 1627

Messrs. VEASEY, CLEAVER, Mses. PINGREE, SCANLON, WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 58.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I missed the first roll call vote in today's vote series due to an important meeting with constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 58.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I was in my office for a meeting and the roll was closed sooner than normal and I didn't get to cast my vote. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 58.

□ 1630

MOMENT OF SILENCE HONORING AND REMEMBERING CONGRESSMAN SYLVESTER TURNER

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, it is a shocking blow to lose the strong voice of Congressman SYLVESTER TURNER. I have known him for over 40 years.

As an attorney, he worked to represent the most vulnerable. He served 27 years in the Texas House of Representatives. As a lifelong Houstonian, mayor for 8 years, he always put Houston and Houston concerns about education and opportunity at the forefront.

EMANUEL CLEAVER, who is right behind me here, and I represented the House just a few weeks ago, the night before we were all sworn in, at a celebration that SYLVESTER organized for Houstonians who were here for this event.

It was really a joyous celebration. There were so many Houstonians there who were proud of his service as mayor. He had much of the same staff who worked with him as mayor who had signed on to work with him either here or in Houston. It was clear that he was prepared to hit the ground running as a new Member of Congress.

He brought an immense amount of personal experience and experience working with people of all political affiliations and none.

His life has been cut abruptly short. He demonstrated a tenacity and courage that we can all emulate.

Only last night, he was sitting just a few rows back here, yet today he is gone. It is a reminder of all the uncertainties that each of us face in life.

For me, it is a reminder of an oft spoken prayer by John Wesley, the founder of the Methodist Church, who said:

“Do all the good you can,
By all the means you can,
In all the ways you can,
In all the places you can,
At all the times you can,
To all the people you can,
As long as ever you can.”

SYLVESTER lived that prayer.

We send our prayers and condolences to his staff, who I know are shocked by

this; to his family; and to the countless lives that he touched in Houston and elsewhere.

Mr. SPEAKER, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Mrs. FLETCHER), one of his best friends.

Mrs. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, SYLVESTER TURNER personified what it means to be a Houstonian, to believe in possibility, to work for it, and to share it with others.

In his presence, you could always feel the love for the city that we call home and for all of the people who live there.

We were lucky to have his service to our community for decades as a representative in the Texas Legislature, as our mayor, and now representing the 18th Congressional District of Texas.

We were lucky to have his example to learn from, and I was lucky to have him as my friend.

As our hometown paper said today: “Sylvester Turner's life embodied the American Dream and Houston's history like no other.”

May his memory be a blessing and his remarkable life an inspiration to us all.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mrs. FLETCHER for her words.

It is great to have all the members of our delegation here.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), the dean of the Republican members of the Texas delegation.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, you see gathered together Texans but friends, friends of not only a man who was with us last night but we were shocked to hear of his demise today.

We bring not only the presence of love and care for Sylvester but also for the things that he stood for, most of all.

He came to Washington to represent people with his views, ideas, and spirit. He will be missed.

We join with this entire body to say today that we will not only miss him, but we wish his family the very best and Godspeed.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I would ask for a moment of silence to honor Congressman SYLVESTER TURNER and to ask that when the House adjourns today, that it adjourn in his memory.

The SPEAKER. The Chair asks all of those in the Chamber as well as the staff in the Capitol to rise for a moment of silence in remembrance of the Honorable SYLVESTER TURNER.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY RELATING TO “ENERGY CONSERVATION PROGRAM FOR APPLIANCE STANDARDS: CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS, LABELING REQUIREMENTS, AND ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS FOR CERTAIN CONSUMER PRODUCTS AND COMMERCIAL EQUIPMENT”

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is

the vote on passage of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 42) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Energy relating to “Energy Conservation Program for Appliance Standards: Certification Requirements, Labeling Requirements, and Enforcement Provisions for Certain Consumer Products and Commercial Equipment”, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 203, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 59]

YEAS—222

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

Wagner
Walberg
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)

Westerman
Wied
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)

Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NAYS—203

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

NOT VOTING—7

Diaz-Balart
Gonzales, Tony
Grijalva

Mullin
Pettersen
Rose

Sherrill

□ 1642

So the joint resolution was passed.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House and offer the resolution that was previously noticed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURPHY). The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 189

Whereas on March 4, 2025, during the joint session of Congress convened pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 11, the President of the United States, speaking at the invitation of the House and Senate, had his remarks interrupted by the Representative from Texas, Mr. Green;

Whereas the conduct of the Representative from Texas disrupted the proceedings of the joint address and was a breach of proper conduct; and

Whereas after numerous disruptions, the Representative from Texas had to be removed from the chamber by the Sergeant at Arms: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

- (1) Representative Al Green be censured;
- (2) Representative Al Green forthwith present himself in the well of the House of Representatives for the pronouncement of censure; and
- (3) Representative Al Green be censured with the public reading of this resolution by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution qualifies.

MOTION TO TABLE

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read the motion as follows:

Ms. Clark of Massachusetts moves to lay the resolution on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

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

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 209, nays 211, answered “present” 1, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 60]

YEAS—209

Adams	Cisneros	Espallat
Aguiar	Clark (MA)	Evans (PA)
Amo	Clarke (NY)	Fields
Ansari	Cleaver	Figures
Auchincloss	Clyburn	Fletcher
Balint	Cohen	Foster
Barragán	Conaway	Foushee
Beatty	Connolly	Frankel, Lois
Bell	Correa	Friedman
Bera	Costa	Frost
Beyer	Courtney	Garamendi
Bishop	Craig	Garcia (CA)
Bonamici	Crockett	Garcia (IL)
Boyle (PA)	Crow	Garcia (TX)
Brown	Cuellar	Gillen
Brownley	Davids (KS)	Golden (ME)
Budzinski	Davis (IL)	Goldman (NY)
Bynum	Davis (NC)	Gomez
Carbajal	Dean (PA)	Gonzalez, V.
Carson	DeGette	Goodlander
Carter (LA)	DeLauro	Gottheimer
Casas	DelBene	Gray
Case	Deluzio	Harder (CA)
Casten	DeSaulnier	Hayes
Castor (FL)	Dexter	Himes
Castro (TX)	Dingell	Horsford
Cerfilius-	Doggett	Houlahan
McCormick	Elfreth	Hoyer
Chu	Escobar	Hoyle (OR)

Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jacobs
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy (NY)
Khanna
Krishnamoorthi
Landsman
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latimer
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Levin
Liccardo
Lieu
Lofgren
Lynch
Magaziner
Mannion
Matsui
McBath
McBride
McClain Delaney
McClellan
McCollum
McDonald Rivet
McGarvey
McGovern
McIver
Meeks
Menendez
Meng

NAYS—211

Aderholt
Alford
Allen
Amodei (NV)
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Barr
Barrett
Baumgartner
Bean (FL)
Bentz
Bergman
Bice
Biggs (AZ)
Biggs (SC)
Bilirakis
Boebert
Bost
Brecheen
Bresnahan
Burchett
Burlison
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Ciscomani
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Collins
Comer
Crane
Crank
Crawford
Crenshaw
Davidson
De La Cruz
DesJarlais
Donalds
Downing
Dunn (FL)
Edwards
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Evans (CO)
Ezell
Fallon
Fedorchak
Feenstra

Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flood
Fong
Foxy
Franklin, Scott
Fry
Fulcher
Garbarino
Gill (TX)
Gimenez
Goldman (TX)
Gooden
Gosar
Graves
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hageman
Hamadeh (AZ)
Haridopolos
Harrigan
Harris (MD)
Harris (NC)
Harshbarger
Hern (OK)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Hinson
Houchin
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunt
Hurd (CO)
Issa
Jack
Jackson (TX)
James
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kean
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy (UT)
Kiggans (VA)
Kiley (CA)

Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Simon
Smith (WA)
Sorensen
Soto
Stansbury
Stanton
Neal
Stevens
Strickland
Subramanyam
Suozi
Swalwell
Sykes
Takano
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Tran
Underwood
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Velázquez
Vindman
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Whitesides
Scholten
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)

Rouzer
Roy
Rulli
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Self
Sessions
Shreve
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)

Smucker
Spartz
Staubert
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Strong
Stutzman
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner (OH)
Valadao
Van Drew

Van Duyne
Van Orden
Wagner
Walberg
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westerman
Wied
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Green, Al (TX)

NOT VOTING—11

Begich
Buchanan
Cole
Diaz-Balart
Gonzales, Tony
Grijalva
Meuser
Mullin
Pettersen
Rose
Sherrill

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1652

So the motion to table was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. **BEGICH**. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 60.

Mr. **COLE**. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 60.

□ 1700

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. **DESJARLAIS**). Pursuant to clause 2 of rule IX, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. **NEWHOUSE**) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. **MCGOVERN**) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today for a very serious issue that I think troubles and disturbs every Member of the House of Representatives on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, decorum, order, and respect are the foundations for the way that we conduct business in this Chamber, in this institution.

Respect for the institution is paramount. Respect for each other and respect for the responsibility that each one of us has been given and has been tasked with and who has the responsibility to the American people are the building blocks and the most important facets of our system that truly separate us, the United States of America, from the rest of the world.

During the President's address just last night to a joint session of Congress, Mr. Speaker, those principles were violated. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. **GREEN**) performed one of most shameful acts that I have ever seen on this floor.

As an advocate for bipartisan problem-solving and for working across the

aisle as hard as possible to come up with solutions for the people whom I represent and for the people whom every single one of us represents, I was deeply disappointed to see the behavior that we all saw and that the world saw unfold in this Chamber.

I thank my Republican colleagues and certainly House leadership, particularly Mr. **CRANE** and Mr. **NEHLS**, for helping elevate the Conference's concern on this very, very important matter.

Mr. Speaker, we must maintain a standard in the House of Representatives, and any Member's refusal to adhere to the Speaker's direction to cease such behavior, regardless of their political party and regardless of who is at the lectern giving a speech, has to and must continue to be reprimanded. We cannot afford to let it go by.

Mr. Speaker, we can do better. Mr. Speaker, we must do better for ourselves, for the institution, and for the people who sent us here. Checking our emotion, checking our energy, and checking our rhetoric and prioritizing decency between each other sends the message not only to our colleagues but to the rest of the country and the rest of the world that we are working for the people and not against each other.

With those brief comments, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of outrage in this Chamber about an interruption last night. Republicans are furious—furious—that someone dared to speak up.

Do you know what, Mr. Speaker?

I agree that there was a violation of the dignity and decorum of this Chamber, and it came from the podium where Donald Trump was standing. He gave one of the most bitter, angry, and divisive speeches ever delivered in this room.

He offered no vision and no solutions, just grievance after grievance after grievance. It was 90 minutes of pure propaganda. It made me sick.

He offered zero ideas to fix the egg shortage, zero solutions for inflation, zero plans to lower rent, zero about prescription drugs, and zero about caring for our veterans—he didn't even mention them—and zero about the wildfires devastating South Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, do you know what Donald Trump did mention 13 times? Joe Biden. That is because he is obsessed with the past, and he is obsessed with himself.

Republicans jump into action after someone has the guts to stand up and call BS. It has been less than 24 hours, and here they are on the floor with an emergency censure to soothe Donald Trump's fragile ego. I have never seen them leap into action so fast in my life. It was overnight.

Meanwhile, their own voters are getting hurt by this administration, and it is radio silence. They can't even be

bothered to lift a finger or do a town-hall.

Mr. Speaker, where is the outrage over Trump wanting to cut 80,000 jobs at the Department of Veterans Affairs?

Where is the condemnation for Trump firing 6,000 veterans with no justification?

Where is the anger for Trump firing scientists who are working to fix the egg shortage by fighting the bird flu?

Moreover, where is the immediate action when the people who keep Ebola out of the country are fired or the people who secure our nuclear weapons are fired?

Where is the outrage?

Republicans can't lift a finger about any of those things, but they sprint to the floor to censure AL GREEN because he hurt Trump's feelings. It is pathetic, Mr. Speaker.

Now, look, we know what this is all about. Republicans don't work for America. They don't work for the people. They don't work for veterans, and they don't work for the teachers or the nurses or the firefighters or factory workers or the waitresses or the farmers.

They work for Trump. They work for Trump, for their billionaire donors, and for the greedy corporations who write their campaign checks. Mr. Speaker, if you ever needed proof, then look no further than what is happening right now.

They are desperate—desperate—to distract from their own failings. They are desperate to distract from their betrayal of the middle class. They are so desperate that they are running from their own voters and censuring people who hurt Trump's feelings.

Give me a break.

AL GREEN is not the one trying to gut Medicaid; Trump is. AL GREEN is not the one trying to gut veterans' benefits; Trump is. AL GREEN is not the one cozying up to dictators and screwing over our allies; Trump is.

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. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that I respect Mr. MCGOVERN's opinion and his viewpoints. They may conflict with mine on many occasions, but he has the absolute right to express them on this floor, and we need to continue that tradition. However, this is not about the President. This is not about President Trump.

This is about how we, as Members of the House of Representatives, conduct ourselves while we are doing business on the House floor. This is about how we treat each other. It is about how we treat each other, whether with respect or not. It is so important, especially when the eyes of the world are focused right here in this very room.

In my short time in Congress, which is just about a decade now, I have

never ever seen a Member of the House, by the direction of the Speaker, escorted from the premises by the Sergeant at Arms. That is a first.

Maybe, Mr. Speaker, you know of the last time it happened. It has been a long time.

I am very disappointed and ashamed of the fact, and this is not personal to Mr. GREEN, who is a very amiable fellow, but we must, as Members of this institution, leave our rhetoric, calm our energy, and make sure our emotions do not take over and conduct ourselves in a way that all of us, not just here in this room but across the country, can be proud of because we truly are on display to the rest of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. NEWHOUSE for leading this. It is a regrettable situation we are in. It is not one we enjoy at all.

I have been disappointed over the years at outbursts that come from this Chamber at whoever the President is. I know people on my side of the aisle have done it. In the case I am thinking of, that person later regretted it and apologized for it. That person understands that we have to have decorum in this place.

It is hard to contain emotions, perhaps, but we are in the business to be leaders. We are in a business that we are supposed to be able to contain our emotions and contain ourselves in such a way that we are good leaders and good examples for the American people; that they can be proud of us and what we are doing. They may disagree with us on our policies, and they may disagree strenuously.

I consider Mr. GREEN a friend, at least an acquaintance. We don't hang out a lot or are on the same committees, but we chat together in the hallways. I like him, and I hope he likes me too. We have probably extremely different views on some issues, and I know he expresses himself in some pretty strong views and emotions, as well. That is fine when we are doing that in debate and we are doing that in the proper format here.

However, decorum in this hallowed Chamber and for what this has stood for for well over 200 years requires us to be able to operate much better than that.

I wasn't so much mad last night as I sat just a few chairs over from Mr. GREEN. I was really mostly disappointed that it had to come to that.

□ 1715

I have had Presidents who I have strongly disagreed with over their rhetoric or their policies, and I think they have been, in my view, very harmful to the country.

Members don't act that way and completely disrupt the operations of this Chamber and the joint session last night for their own theater. That is what I am afraid it was.

Did the gentleman feel strongly? Certainly he did, but Members of Congress don't act that way. We don't wave a walking stick around at people like that. It is just not good. It is improper. It is not the way we are supposed to conduct ourselves in this place or at any public forum, city council level, what have you, including townhalls.

Mr. Speaker, I enjoy having townhalls, by and large, but if they are going to be advertised as a forum as a free-for-all for people to come out and do screaming matches, what should we do? Should we just turn on the clock for 90 minutes and have at it?

I would like that the interactions at our local level could be constructive and both sides can hear each other to understand what is going on.

In this Chamber here, during that hallowed event, when the whole country and the whole world was watching, for someone to be able to single out their own interests or their own theater because they disagreed strongly with a President whom they don't like, it is really, really bad decorum and a really bad way of doing business.

I tell the gentleman that I don't enjoy casting this vote at all if it should come up tomorrow. I personally like my colleague on the other side of the aisle. I wish we could have done better last night.

I hope we can count each other as friends after this. I don't hold any long-term anger or angst, but it just wasn't good. I wish I could have taken the gentleman aside last night and said: Let's not do this.

Unfortunately, it happened. This is a proper reaction. We can't just let this stand. It has to be done correctly. We have to have a decorum for this House, and this censure is what is necessary to hit that reset and do so.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding time to me.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for the gentleman who just spoke, but where was he and where were the Republicans when Joe Biden was President of the United States?

I remember sitting here, and there was an entire heckling section on the Republican side. We didn't call for all of those Members to be removed. We wanted to go on with the people's business, but where was the gentleman? Where were my Republican friends?

Nobody apologized for interrupting Joe Biden time and time again. The majority talks about lack of decorum. Go back and look at the tapes.

There was silence on the Republican side. I appreciate the gentleman's selective outrage, but he would have more credibility had he expressed outrage when his colleagues were heckling Joe Biden.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to explain why I did what I did, and I did it with intentionality. The President indicated that he had a mandate.

I said to the President: "You do not have a mandate to cut Medicaid."

I have constituents who need Medicaid. They will suffer, and some will die if they don't get Medicaid.

I heard the Speaker when he said that I should cease. I did not, and I did not with intentionality. It was not done out of a burst of emotion. I was emotional about it, but I did it with intentionality.

I think that, on some questions, questions of conscience, one has to be willing to suffer the consequences. I have said that I will. I will suffer whatever the consequences are because I don't believe that people should be without good healthcare.

Mr. Speaker, I stood up for my constituents then. I am standing up for my constituents now. I am grateful to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for what he has said. I am grateful to those who have been standing with me.

I will tell my colleague on the other side of the aisle: I appreciate him. I have no anger. The officers who escorted me out were kind to me. I don't blame the Speaker for anything.

Mr. Speaker, I would do it again. I have to be candid with the gentleman. I am not trying to insult him in some way. This is a matter of principle. This is a matter of conscience. There are people suffering in this country because they don't have healthcare.

I will close with this: On some issues that are matters of conscience, it is better to stand alone than to not stand at all. This is where I stand.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAUMGARTNER).

Mr. BAUMGARTNER. Mr. Speaker, I will start by thanking my colleague from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, Donald Trump is not the Republican President. He is the American President. What happened last night was beneath the dignity of the House and beneath the dignity of the American people. I say that as someone who is new to this body.

I also point out how it was perceived and how it may have been interpreted.

As Members know, each Member of the House receives a guest ticket. I decided to give my guest ticket, the first one that I was able to give for this kind of occasion, to a teacher from eastern Washington. I gave it to her with the goal of inspiring an interest in civics and public service in the next generation of young people.

In fact, we ran a competition for students to nominate their teacher, and the winning teacher that came had never before been to Washington, D.C., had never been to the Halls of Congress, and was so excited that she was here to watch the joint session.

I have no idea what her political beliefs were, no idea whether she is Republican or Democrat or Independent. She was just excited to be here as part

of this experiment in democracy that we have. All of her students were watching from home.

While it can be regrettable, and it happens on both sides, when people have a spontaneous outburst of emotion and maybe say something they shouldn't, what I saw and what I worry about what her students saw last night was a continued premeditated attack, and some might even say the appearance of a violent and threatening action with the cane.

That may not have been the intent, but I worry that those students perceived what I saw as I watched was a scene that was beneath the dignity of this House, beneath the dignity of the American people, and certainly beneath the dignity of our President.

At some point, America cannot continue on this slide towards continual partisan fighting and all of the divisiveness. We all need to do better, including myself and I think every Member of this body.

Let's join together on this. Let's join together and realize that this episode was beneath the dignity of what the American people expect from Congress. Let's have this be a new beginning in civility from a low point that this body can rise and behave in the manner, I think, that all of the American people want it to behave, and certainly those high school students that were watching from home, who were so excited that their teacher was here to experience this special moment.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the gentleman who just spoke, if he felt that the most offensive thing last night was Mr. GREEN coming to this floor, standing up in this Chamber, and pleading with the President not to cut people's healthcare, if he thinks that was the most offensive thing that occurred on the House floor last night, then I don't think he was paying attention to the speech that was being given by the President of the United States. Go back and reread it.

Go back and reread it. It was a totally divisive and partisan speech. The President was calling Senators names, berating Joe Biden. It was a campaign speech.

The gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAUMGARTNER) says that the President is supposed to be the President of the entire United States, not just Republicans.

Mr. Speaker, I wish we had seen that last night, but we didn't. In all of my years, I have never ever witnessed anything as partisan and as divisive as that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE).

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, one thing we should be talking about are the important investments that we make in medical research.

The United States leads the world in medical research and innovation. Without our investments, more people

would be dying from cancer, heart disease, and diabetes.

Mr. Speaker, medical breakthroughs of tomorrow are at risk because of Trump's research cuts at the National Institutes of Health. These cuts will be especially felt in my home State of Washington, where we are leaders in advancing world-class scientific research that saves lives.

Washington is home to the Fred Hutchinson Cancer Center, where I recently visited to highlight the devastating impacts of these cuts on the 40,000 patients that they serve each year.

In fiscal year 2024, Washington researchers were awarded nearly \$1.3 billion in NIH funding that supports 12,000 jobs in our State. One of my constituents works at an organization that is fighting autoimmune diseases. It is 80 percent funded by NIH investments. She is worried about the devastating impacts that these cuts would have on the patients who rely on their work.

I started my career in medical research, and I know what losing funding or even the threat of it being cut off could have on institutions and their patients.

The consequences of the President's decision will be felt in so many ways. Labs could go dark. Patients could be kicked off of lifesaving critical trials. New cures could be delayed. Future innovators could abandon the field.

The President must stop the senseless attack on the research that saves money but, most importantly, saves lives.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, Mr. GREEN deliberately disrupted Congress' proceedings during a joint session yesterday.

This was an affront to the Constitution, which commands that the President report to the Congress from time to time. It was an insult to the Presidency, and it was a disgrace to this body.

It was perpetrated not by some lunatic wearing buffalo horns but, rather, by an elected Member of the United States Congress. This is worthy of the harshest sanctions that we can apply.

Mr. Speaker, many Members repeatedly interrupted this Presidential address with catcalls and insults and other gestures of disrespect. A Member once did this to President Obama. He apologized, and he was reprimanded.

I didn't hear an apology from Mr. GREEN right now. What I heard was deliberate, calculated defiance.

The whole reason for this building to exist and the whole reason for this House Chamber is to exchange our views, sometimes very sharply different views, and talk out the differences among us. In order for that to work, that discussion has to be accompanied by civility and decorum.

Accordingly, our rules insist on that. I believe that all of those who breach

these rules need to be held accountable, lest this event become just another sad milestone in the denigration of this institution.

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

Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States said a lot of things last night. He used a personal insult against a sitting Senator from my home State, and the gentleman who just spoke is upset that someone stood up and asked him not to cut Medicaid?

□ 1730

Really? That is what this is all about?

You heard from Mr. GREEN. There is not a gentler soul in this Chamber, and he was offended by some of the things the President was saying yesterday. I am all for decorum, but where is the decorum in throwing poor people off of healthcare? Where is the decorum in cutting food benefits and nutrition benefits to people who are in desperate need? Where is the decorum in cutting school meals?

These are unusual times that we are in. They are firing veterans as we are gathered here today, people who serve our country with distinction. Our constituents and your constituents are upset, and here we are upset because somebody got up and pleaded with the President not to cut Medicaid.

Where were all of my Republican friends when we had a heckling session year after year of Republicans berating Barack Obama? There was nothing. There was nothing. I can't believe we are having this debate.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN).

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, thousands of my constituents have been illegally fired by Elon Musk and by Donald Trump. One of them was with me last night, Dr. Lauren McGee, who was an NIH pediatric cancer specialist heading up a team looking into osteosarcoma, bone cancer for children. She got fired on February 14 because she was a probationary employee. Probationary, not because she had done anything wrong, but because she had been promoted into the new job. She was with me last night, and she had to sit here and listen, along with me—and I had spent the day with her—to Donald Trump saying one of their top priorities is to fight childhood cancer, and she got sacked on that Valentine's Day massacre.

Now they want to censure the gentleman from Texas. Why? Because he challenged the President about his claim that he has a mandate to cut Medicaid, and that is what the gentleman was trying to raise.

We have Republicans in the Chamber who have never voted to impeach Donald Trump for inciting a violent insurrection against this Congress, this Constitution, and his own Vice President, who have never voted to even censure the President for doing that, and yet

they want to censure the gentleman from Texas.

Last night, President Trump called a U.S. Senator from Massachusetts "Pocahontas," using an ethnic slur to go after her. If you really want to proceed to censure the gentleman from Texas for talking about no mandate to cut Medicaid, then certainly we are going to have to move to censure the President for using a racial and ethnic slur against a sitting United States Senator.

I would prefer to stand by the tradition of free speech and even the tradition of heckling. There is a fine American art of heckling. If you read the Lincoln-Douglas debates, I recommend the Harold Holzer version of it because the newspapers carried all of the hecklers' comments, too. People would get up and heckle, and Lincoln would interact with them and Douglas would interact with them.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. RASKIN. Let's stop clutching our pearls. There has been lots of heckling over on that side of the aisle. I saw the gentlewoman from Georgia heckle the last President and have a whole heckling section there. We didn't try to censure them or kick them out of Congress or anything. We actually not only say we believe in free speech but we believe in free speech. We will stand up for people's right to speak.

Now, I don't believe in the kind of heckling where you drown somebody out and you make it impossible for them to speak, but the gentleman was trying to start a conversation as opposed to just being spoken to all night.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this is very interesting to listen to the arguments coming from the other side of the aisle about what we are doing here tonight.

In talking about free speech, it seemed to me that the gentleman from Texas was doing all he could to prohibit or get in the way of the President of the United States exercising his free speech and his address to the joint session.

This is not about policy. This is not about whether Republicans are better than Democrats or vice versa. This is about how we conduct ourselves on the House floor. This is about how we treat each other. This is a reflection on every single one of us in this Chamber. As my colleague from the State of Washington said, it is not just us this affects. This affects the kids of our country, as well, who are learning, one way or the other, from our examples.

You can go on and on about how much you disagree and detest some of the policies and positions of the Presi-

dent of the United States. Be my guest, but that is not what is being argued tonight. That is not the issue that we are taking a stand on today. This is how we, as a body, should conduct ourselves in these hallowed Halls, this Chamber, that not very many people ever get to set foot into.

This is something we should hold to a higher standard. We have to or else what are we? Are we just a debate club that yells at each other, or do we stand for something? Do we truly see ourselves as Representatives of the people of the United States?

Something has to change. It truly does. A line has to be drawn. Not all of us on either side of the aisle are perfect examples of what we could or should be, but certainly, as I mentioned before, in my career here, I have never ever seen a Member of Congress escorted from the floor of the House by the Sergeant At Arms. It has never happened in my career, and I don't want to see it happen again.

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

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

Do you know what has never happened in my career? The President of the United States coming before a joint session of Congress and insulting Members by name individually, shouting slurs at people.

I have never seen that before. Would the gentleman agree with me that Trump deserves a censure for calling my Senator from Massachusetts a slur? Would that be appropriate?

Again, this was not business as usual yesterday. To make believe that somehow it was or that the person who was giving the speech yesterday was acting within the structures of decorum is laughable.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON).

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

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker:

"Cowardice asks the question, 'Is it safe?' Expediency asks the question, 'Is it politic?' Vanity asks the question, 'Is it popular?' But conscience asks the question, 'Is it right?' And there comes a time when one must take a position that is neither safe, nor politic, nor popular, but one must take it because one's conscience tells one that it is right."

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the courage, the character, and the great decency of the Honorable Congressman AL GREEN for saying what is right, when there are many amongst us that have cowardice that have seemed to have lost their backbone and spine to call out untruths.

Mr. Speaker, he is a man that is standing up for those who are poor, who are left out, who have been left behind, a man that is standing up for Medicaid and Medicare. As we sit here

and talk about some of this pious irrelevancy and sanctimonious trivialities, this man should be heralded and stand up for his decency, for his courage for standing up for the poor, for the least of these.

There is a theological problem in this institution when we are more kind to those who are rich and powerful than those who are poor, when we are talking about balancing the budget off the backs of those who need healthcare, who need housing, who need food assistance, to give tax breaks to the rich.

Once again, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in celebrating the Honorable Congressman AL GREEN.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. 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 13½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, while Republicans try to distract us with this resolution, our constituents are reaching out to us. What are they asking us? They are asking us to stop the Republican assault on our schools, our livelihoods, and our communities.

Another constituent who reached out to me is named Kris. He is a student at Common Ground High School. Common Ground High School is an innovative, educational, environmental, and community-building venture, combining a charter high school, an urban demonstration farm, and a community environmental education center.

Due to the funding freeze, Kris said essential programs at Common Ground, like the youth workforce development and community food relief, which also partners with CitySeed to help people afford food stamp purchases from the farm, have been shut down. They have been shut down because of this freeze, and 71 student workers have been laid off.

Students like Kris are reaching out not just because of their own future and their education has been affected but because they see how their community is hurt by these cuts, as well.

There are people today around this country, not only in my district, who are getting hurt thanks to Republican cuts. The funding freeze is not just killing the crops at Common Ground, but it is killing academic futures, new ideas for education, and opportunities for young people in this country. This is what Republicans are trying to do by distracting us with their censures.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, AL GREEN is my friend and, for that matter, so is Mr. NEWHOUSE, though I don't know him quite as well.

I think this motion is a serious mistake. I sat here in this House the night

that President Obama made his state of the Union speech, and JOE WILSON from South Carolina jumped up and said: "You lie."

Nothing was done about that.

Mr. GREEN engaged in conduct that I chose not to participate in, though I found that a number of my constituents wished I had joined him. He expressed his strong views in a way that I would not have voiced them myself, but he left this Chamber voluntarily after doing so. To censure him now sets us back. It does not move us forward toward a more bipartisan and a more respectful House.

Indeed, I think many Americans will be surprised that Republicans get upset about decorum on anything. There was no Republican objection when President Trump decided to pardon the criminals that were responsible for the deaths of police officers in this building when they defended us on January 6, sprayed them with bear spray, and harassed and harmed so many officers.

There has been no Republican concern about decorum when the President fired the head of the Office of Ethics at the White House, when he fired the watchdogs of about 17 different Federal departments and agencies, the inspectors general that are designed to uphold and check out corruption and waste in our government.

□ 1745

There has been no outrage when President Trump decided that he would take on General Milley for being the patriot that he is and seek to obtain revenge on him.

What Mr. GREEN was talking about was outrage about something that is very important. There are 700,000 seniors in Texas who rely on Medicaid and nursing homes.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, half the children in my hometown, and probably more in Mr. GREEN's, are at risk of losing their care as seen in our Children's Hospital. Medicaid is a lifeline to individuals with disabilities.

He was passionate. He was emotional. He is deeply committed to protecting the vulnerable. He should not be censured for the way in which he expressed his passion and his concern and his love of justice.

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

I appreciate the comments of Mr. DOGGETT and do consider him a friend as well, but let me just tell you that we are talking apples to oranges when we are speaking about something that happened under President Obama's speech on the Republican side.

Last night, Mr. GREEN was reprimanded at least three times by the Speaker to stop and desist what he was doing, shaking his cane at the President at the rostrum in a threatening

manner, underscoring—what I saw was emotion, energy and emotion; and intentionality, absolutely, intending to disrupt the speech by the President of the United States.

I think we are talking about two different things here. The incident during the Obama administration was over in just a few seconds. This went on and on and on. Certainly, debating the issue is one thing in different circumstances. This was not an open debate. Mr. GREEN was trying to make it one.

This was a message from the President, so the actions that we are proposing to take here are absolutely justified. The President was here under invitation by the House of Representatives for a report to Congress. It was not an open debate. It was a message being received by the joint session, and that is the way it should be treated.

Respect should be given to the Presidency whether or not they are your guy or your gal. It is the Office of the President that needs the respect because it reflects on all of us as Members of the House of Representatives.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO).

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member MCGOVERN for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution. I am here as the ranking member of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to represent the interests of our Nation's veterans when they are callously being targeted.

While our colleagues across the aisle are determined to shift the public narrative away from the harm being done to veterans, we choose to focus on what our President failed to address last night. He spent an hour and 40 minutes touting his so-called accomplishments while veterans watching at home were waiting for answers, answers and explanations they never received.

While President Trump was addressing us last night on this very House floor, movements were being made by the Chief of Staff for Veterans Affairs, Christopher Syrek, to execute a detrimental reduction in force at VA. With the support of this administration, VA plans to move forward with firing an additional 83,000 VA employees.

Sitting in the audience of President Trump's address were 20 veterans who had been indiscriminately fired from Federal agencies, veterans he failed to address. Not once during his speech was he able to look them in the eyes and speak to the merciless effects his administration's decisions have made on their community. He didn't attempt to justify them because he knows there is no justification.

Our veterans served our Nation. They put their lives on the line for us and this country's values, and now look at what they are facing. They are facing attacks on their benefits. They are facing attacks on their healthcare, education, and housing. When we reduce

an agency established to work for them, we fail them.

I stand behind Congressman GREEN as he stood up for the rights of all veterans and all Americans.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire, is the gentleman prepared to close?

Mr. NEWHOUSE. I am prepared to close, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time for the purpose of closing.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say, the virtue signaling we are seeing from Republicans right now is insane. I am sorry. Who was it who yelled: "You lie" at President Obama during his address? A Republican.

Who was it who heckled President Biden, standing up and ranting like lunatics? It was Republicans.

Go back and look at the videos. It was embarrassing. Nothing was done about that.

I am the ranking member of the damn Rules Committee, and I have a question. Why are the rules only applied to Democratic Members?

Are Republicans ready to censure their own Members for wearing campaign hats in the Chamber last night? That is a violation of the rules.

Are they ready to censure the Republican Member who got caught voting from California last month, which is a violation of the House rules? He wasn't even in the Chamber. Hell, he wasn't even on the East Coast.

Are these people going to be censured? Of course not, because their outrage is all BS.

There was a breach of dignity and decorum in this Chamber last night, but it wasn't AL GREEN. It was the President of the United States, who stood at that podium and delivered a manifesto of pure fantasy.

He says he wants to make America affordable again. Well, inflation just hit a 7-month high, and his new trade war will cost families \$2,000 more a year.

Trump says he wants to balance the budget. His plan would add \$3 trillion to the deficit to give billionaires another tax cut—let me repeat that again—to give billionaires a tax cut. All these cutbacks, all these firings are going to fund tax cuts for billionaires.

He says Social Security is paying benefits to millions of people over 100 years old. That is totally wrong, debunked a hundred times.

He says he cares about childhood cancer. He slashed the funding for child cancer research.

He says his tariffs are good for farmers. Last time he did this, farmers lost \$27 billion.

He says he supports law enforcement. He pardoned the people who beat police officers on January 6. He pardoned them: people who tried to overturn the election, people who brutally beat the men and women who protect us in this Chamber every single day.

There was just one outrageous statement after another, and not a single peep from my Republican friends. Nothing. Now, Mr. Speaker, Republicans have the nerve to come down here and censure anyone.

Republicans moved heaven and earth to come down here and defend the honor of their boss, Donald Trump, but they won't lift a finger for their own constituents. Look in the mirror and censure yourselves.

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.

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

One of the things when I was a freshman in Congress that just shocked me, amazed me, is how easily events on the floor would devolve into what I would describe as something akin to a high school pep rally, and that pains me to say that.

We are all adults here, discussing some of the most important issues facing the American public, I would dare say the entire world, right here in this Chamber. The things that happen in this Chamber that reflect poorly on us reflect poorly on every single one of us.

I would say to you, Mr. Speaker, that this is truly a wake-up call for this Chamber. The lack of decorum has reached a new high when the President of the United States cannot even come into our Chamber, invited, and complete his speech without the interaction that we saw last night.

We have to take this action of censure. Let me tell you, there are many people on my side of the aisle that would like to take this even further. The notion of intentionality versus emotion does not justify the actions that we witnessed last night, the disrespect of the institution.

Using the argument that, well, our side did it so we can do it, too, well, that doesn't work. That does not hold water.

Mr. Speaker, we can do better. Mr. Speaker, we must do better. We cannot ignore the willful disruption intended to stop a proceeding.

Let me use another word that is also difficult to say. It was shameful.

Without decorum, without respect, what have we got? What do we have? Truly.

You have all seen the newsreels of other countries that chambers similar

to ours evolve into fistfights on the floor.

Is that where we are headed next? Is that what we want to have happen so that these fine people that work their tails off every day can be part of that and be the referees in a situation that is out of control?

Like I said, this shameful action reflects on every single one of us. You are right. I will concede that all of us need a reminder that we all need to raise our level of accountability due to the actions that we take.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a necessary but difficult step. This resolution is offered in all seriousness. It is something that I believe that we must do in order to get us to the next level of conduct in this hallowed Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, to join with me to attain that better level of conduct. We owe it to our constituents for sure. We owe it to our future constituents in this country. We owe it to our country.

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

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

The question is on adoption of the resolution.

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 are postponed.

—

HOURLY OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

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

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

There was no objection.

—

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), pursuant to House Resolution 191, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 6, 2025, at 9 a.m., as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Honorable SYLVESTER TURNER.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the first and fourth quarters of 2023, the fourth quarter of 2024, and the first quarter of 2025; pursuant to Public Law 95-384, are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO MONGOLIA AND JAPAN, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 24 AND FEB. 2, 2025

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Derek Luyten	1/26	01/29	Mongolia		809.99		13,432.61				14,242.60
Leslie Reagan	1/26	01/29	Mongolia		809.99		13,467.61				14,277.60
Sean Brady	1/26	01/29	Mongolia		809.99		13,467.61				14,277.60
Colby Harriman	1/26	01/29	Mongolia		809.99		18,986.61				19,796.60
Derek Luyten	1/29	02/02	Japan		1,456.44						1,456.44
Leslie Reagan	1/29	02/02	Japan		1,456.44						1,456.44
Sean Brady	1/29	02/02	Japan		1,456.44						1,456.44
Colby Harriman	1/29	02/02	Japan		1,456.44						1,456.44
Committee total											68,420.16

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. VERN BUCHANAN, Feb. 18, 2025.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO PANAMA, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 18 AND FEB. 21, 2025

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
David Hanke	2/18	2/21	Panama	272.00	1,320.00	1,592.00
Charles Morrison	2/18	2/21	Panama	272.00	1,320.00	1,592.00
Joseph Bauer	2/18	2/21	Panama	272.00	1,320.00	1,592.00
Jae Jo	2/18	2/21	Panama	272.00	1,320.00	1,592.00
Committee total	1,088.00	5,280.00	6,368.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. JOHN R. MOOLENAAR, Feb. 27, 2025.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ETHICS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2024

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
HOUSE COMMITTEES											
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return.☐											

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. MICHAEL GUEST, Feb. 5, 2025.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2024

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
HOUSE COMMITTEES											
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return.☒											

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. SAM GRAVES, Feb. 14, 2025.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE STRATEGIC COMPETITION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE CHINESE COMMUNIST PARTY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2023

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
HOUSE COMMITTEES											
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return.☐											

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. JOHN R. MOOLENAAR, Feb. 24, 2025.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE STRATEGIC COMPETITION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE CHINESE COMMUNIST PARTY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2023

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
HOUSE COMMITTEES											
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return.☐											

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return.☐

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. JOHN R. MOOLENAAR, Feb. 24, 2025.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee: Committee on Homeland Security. 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, adversely (Rept. 119-11). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WALBERG: Committee on Education and Workforce. 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; with amendments (Rept. 119-12). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALBERG: Committee on Education and Workforce. H.R. 1049. A bill to ensure that parents are aware of foreign influence in their child's public school, and for other purposes, with an amendment (Rept. 119-13). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALBERG: Committee on Education and Workforce. H.R. 1069. A bill to prohibit the availability of Federal education funds for elementary and secondary schools that receive direct or indirect support from the Government of the People's Republic of China; with an amendment (Rept. 119-14). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. SEWELL (for herself, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. LIEU, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. MENG, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. FIGURES, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. AMO, Ms. ANSARI, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Ms. BALINT, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BELL, Mr. BERA, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BISHOP, 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, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLY-

BURN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CORREA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. CRAIG, Ms. CROCKETT, Mr. CROW, Mr. CUELLAR, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, 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. EVANS of Pennsylvania, Mr. FIELDS, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. FOSTER, Mrs. FOUSHEE, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. FRIEDMAN, Mr. FROST, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. GARCIA of California, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. GILLEN, Mr. GOLDEN of Maine, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, Ms. GOODLANDER, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. GRAY, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HARDER of California, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. HERNÁNDEZ, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. HOYER, Ms. HOYLE of Oregon, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. IVEY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACOBS, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. LANDSMAN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LATIMER, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Ms. LEE of Nevada, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LICCARDIO, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MAGAZINER, Mr. MANNION, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. MCBRIDE, Mrs. MCCLAIN DELANEY, Ms. MCCLELLAN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. McDONALD RIVET, Mr. MCGARVEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. MCIVER, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MIN, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. MORRISON, Mr. MOSKOWITZ, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. MRVAN, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. OLSZEWSKI, Ms. OMAR, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PANNETTA, Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. PEREZ, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PETTERSEN, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. POCAN, Ms. POU, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Ms. RANDALL, Mr. RILEY of New York, Ms. RIVAS, Ms. ROSS, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RYAN, Ms. SALINAS, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. SCHOLTEN, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SHERRILL, Ms. SIMON, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SORENSEN, Mr. SOTO, Ms. STANSBURY, Mr. STANTON, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. SUBRAMANYAM, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. SWALWELL, Mrs. SYKES, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THANEDAR, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TITUS, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. TOKUDA,

Mr. TONKO, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. TRAN, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VASQUEZ, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. VINDMAN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WATERS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WHITESIDES, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 14. A bill to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to revise the criteria for determining which States and political subdivisions are subject to section 4 of the Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. BROWN, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. BISHOP, Mrs. MCIVER, Ms. TITUS, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. KEATING, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. ANSARI, Mr. MRVAN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. BUDZINSKI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MCGARVEY, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. SORENSEN, Mr. CARSON, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. MULLIN, Ms. MCBRIDE, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. GOLDEN of Maine, Ms. SCHOLTEN, Mr. TONKO, Mr. DELUZIO, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. POCAN, Mr. CASAR, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. SALINAS, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. STANSBURY, Ms. CRAIG, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. SOTO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Mr. THANEDAR, Mr. MANNION, Ms. OMAR, Mr. VINDMAN, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK, Ms. TOKUDA, Mrs. SYKES, Mr. LATIMER, Ms. HOYLE of Oregon, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. GILLEN, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. PEREZ, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Ms. DEXTER, Mr. RILEY of New York, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. MENG, Ms. ELFRETH, Ms. RANDALL, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. BEYER, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. LIEU, Mr. CONAWAY, Ms. BYNUM, Mr. LANDSMAN, Ms. CHU, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mrs. TRAHAN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. TORRES of New York, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. NADLER, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. EVANS of Pennsylvania, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RUIZ, Mrs. FOUSHEE, Mr. IVEY, Mr. MAGAZINER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. MORRISON, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. CASE, Mr. FROST, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. ROSS, Mr.

GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. AMO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CROW, Mr. BELL, Ms. BALINT, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. JACOBS, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCLELLAN, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. STRICKLAND, Ms. PETTERSEN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. LEE of Nevada, Mr. MOULTON, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. SUBRAMANYAM, Mr. HOYER, Mr. OLSZEWSKI, Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Ms. McDONALD RIVET, Mrs. MCCLAIN DELANEY, Mr. MFUNE, Ms. POU, Ms. FRIEDMAN, Mr. MIN, Mr. NEAL, Ms. WATERS, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. GOODLANDER, Mr. GARCIA of California, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CASTEN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. MOSKOWITZ, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. MORELLE, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. CROCKETT, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. STANTON, Ms. SIMON, Mr. VASQUEZ, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. RIVAS, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. HIMES, Mr. FIGURES, Mr. TRAN, Mr. PETERS, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. GRAY, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. WHITESIDES, Mr. BERA, Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 20. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, and the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Mr. DUNN of Florida (for himself and Mr. MULLIN):

H.R. 1843. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to increase transparency in generic drug applications; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 1844. A bill to prohibit the availability of Federal funds to support the Armed Forces of Lebanon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VAN ORDEN:

H.R. 1845. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to include, in the Transition Assistance Program, a presentation that promotes the benefits available to veterans under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, 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. MASSIE (for himself, Mr. BIGGS of Arizona, Ms. BOEBERT, Mr. BURLISON, Mrs. CAMMACK, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. CRANE, Ms. GREENE of Georgia, Ms. HAGEMAN, Mr. PERRY, and Mr. ROY):

H.R. 1846. A bill to abolish the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal reserve banks, to repeal the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 1847. A bill to codify Executive Order 14158 relating to establishing and implementing the President's Department of Government Efficiency; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. LAWLER, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. MOSKOWITZ, and Mr. KEATING):

H.R. 1848. A bill to authorize the imposition of sanctions with respect to the Houthis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LAMALFA (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FITZGERALD, Ms. PETTERSEN, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. PETERS, Mr. MULLIN, Ms. CHU, Ms. SEWELL, and Mr. VALADAO):

H.R. 1849. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the exclusion from gross income of amounts received from State-based catastrophe loss mitigation programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ARRINGTON (for himself, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. FALLON, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Mr. CRENSHAW):

H.R. 1850. A bill to revise the authority provided to the President to impose export licensing requirements or other restrictions on the export of crude oil from the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BACON (for himself, Mr. CROW, Mr. BERGMAN, Ms. ELFRETH, Mr. JAMES, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HARRIS of Maryland, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Mr. HOYER):

H.R. 1851. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to preserve and recapitalize the fighter aircraft capabilities of the Air Force and its reserve components, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BIGGS of Arizona:

H.R. 1852. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require that any institution of higher education that is a non-profit organization under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code be deemed a non-profit institution of higher education for purposes of such Act; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Ms. BROWNLEY (for herself, Ms. SALINAS, and Ms. STANSBURY):

H.R. 1853. A bill to require a study of the barriers to conservation practice adoption on leased agricultural land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. BROWNLEY (for herself, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. SALINAS, and Ms. STANSBURY):

H.R. 1854. A bill to require the Natural Resources Conservation Service to review the national conservation practice standards, taking into consideration climate benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CARSON (for himself, Ms. TLAI, and Mrs. MCIVER):

H.R. 1855. A bill to amend the Consumer Product Safety Act to ensure amusement rides permanently fixed to a site are treated as consumer products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COSTA (for himself and Mr. OBERNOLTE):

H.R. 1856. A bill to authorize additional district judges for the district court for the eastern district of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H.R. 1857. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the indexing of certain assets for purposes of determining gain or loss; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. FEENSTRA, Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. NUNN of Iowa, Mr. ROUZER, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 1858. A bill to amend the Agricultural Credit Act of 1978 with respect to the emergency watershed program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. DELBENE (for herself, Ms. SANCHEZ, Ms. SEWELL, and Ms. STRICKLAND):

H.R. 1859. A bill to require income from the first year of an apprenticeship to be disregarded in determining eligibility for assistance under the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. GARCIA of Texas (for herself and Ms. BROWNLEY):

H.R. 1860. A bill to designate Regional Breast and Gynecologic Cancer Care Coordinators to expand the work of the Breast and Gynecologic Oncology System of Excellence at the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas:

H.R. 1861. A bill to require renovation of certain U.S. Border Patrol checkpoints, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. GREENE of Georgia (for herself, Mr. BRECHEEN, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. GILL of Texas, and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 1862. A bill to declare English as the official language of the United States, to establish a uniform English language rule for naturalization, and to avoid misconstructions of the English language texts of the laws of the United States, pursuant to Congress' powers to provide for the general welfare of the United States and to establish a uniform rule of naturalization under article I, section 8, of the Constitution; to the Committee on Education and Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, 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. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 1863. A bill to require executive branch employees to report certain royalties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 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. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 1864. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to establish the Life Sciences Research Security Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 1865. A bill to modify the requirements applicable to locatable minerals on public domain lands, consistent with the principles of self-initiation of mining claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. HAGEMAN (for herself, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mrs. BIGGS of South Carolina, Mr. BRECHEEN, Mr. GILL of Texas, and Mr. MOORE of Alabama):

H.R. 1866. A bill to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to disqualify any State that discriminates against parents or guardians who oppose medical, surgical, pharmacological, psychological treatment, or clothing and social changes related to affirming the subjective claims of gender identity expressed by any minor if such claimed identity is inconsistent with such minor's biological sex from receiving funding under such Act; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Mr. HERN of Oklahoma (for himself, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. LEE of Nevada, and Ms. MALLIOTAKIS):

H.R. 1867. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to remove in-person requirements under Medicare for mental health services furnished through telehealth and telecommunications technology; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HILL of Arkansas (for himself, Ms. TITUS, Ms. TENNEY, and Mr. BEYER):

H.R. 1868. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to postpone tax deadlines and reimburse paid late fees for United States nationals who are unlawfully or wrongfully detained or held hostage abroad, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. HINSON (for herself, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. IVEY, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. LIEU, Mr. KILEY of California, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Ms. ROSS, Mr. FINSTAD, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. CISCOMANI, Mr. CORREA, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARSON, Mr. CLINE, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Mr. RULLI, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. NUNN of Iowa, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. GIMENEZ, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. MORAN, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Ms. LEE of Nevada, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. DELUZIO, Mr. TORRES of New York, and Ms. TOKUDA):

H.R. 1869. A bill to strengthen the Department of Justice's enforcement against trade-related crimes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUDSON (for himself, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. LATTA, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. DUNN of Florida, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. FULCHER, Mr. PFLUGER, Mrs. CAMMACK, Mr. OBERNOLTE, Mrs. HOUGHIN, Mr. FRY, Mr. GOLDMAN of Texas, and Mr. CRENSHAW):

H.R. 1870. A bill to amend the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act to improve the Broadband Equity, Access, and Deployment Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself, Mr. MOORE of Utah, and Ms. CHU):

H.R. 1871. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the exclusion for certain conservation subsidies to include subsidies for water conservation or efficiency measures, storm water management measures, and wastewater management measures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JACKSON of Texas (for himself and Mr. VAN ORDEN):

H.R. 1872. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that the Secretary of Veterans Affairs repays members of the Armed Forces for certain contributions made by such members towards Post-9/11 Educational Assistance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. PANETTA):

H.R. 1873. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude certain broadband grants from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KILEY of California:

H.R. 1874. A bill to amend the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 to establish a conclusive presumption that a State concurs to certain activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LANGWORTHY (for himself, Mr. MORELLE, and Ms. MALLIOTAKIS):

H.R. 1875. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to require certain additional provider screening under the Medicaid program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (for

himself, Mr. NEAL, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. DELUZIO, Mr. NADLER, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. JACOBS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. TITUS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. BUDZINSKI, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. CHU, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. IVEY, Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK, Mrs. McIVER, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. ELFRETH, Ms. ANSARI, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. STANTON, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Mr. CARSON, Mr. SORENSEN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LANDSMAN, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. AMO, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. RILEY of New York, Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. RANDALL, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. BROWN, Ms. PETTERSEN, Mr. MFUME, Mr. SWALWELL, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. MORELLE, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. MCGARVEY):

H.R. 1876. A bill to prevent closure of social security field and hearing offices and resident stations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (for himself, Mr. NEAL, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. DELUZIO, Mr. NADLER, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. JACOBS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. TITUS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. BUDZINSKI, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. CHU, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. IVEY, Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK, Mrs. McIVER, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. ELFRETH, Ms. ANSARI, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. STANTON, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Mr. CARSON, Mr. SORENSEN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr.

LANDSMAN, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. AMO, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. RILEY of New York, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. MORELLE, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. BROWN, Mr. MCGARVEY, Ms. PETTERSEN, Mr. MFUME, Mr. SWALWELL, Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. RANDALL, and Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1877. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to establish that political appointees and special governments may not access beneficiary data systems, to establish civil penalties for certain violations relating to disclosure or access of beneficiary information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAWLER (for himself, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mrs. LUNA):

H.R. 1878. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an income tax credit for fertility treatments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MACE (for herself, Mr. GILL of Texas, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. PERRY, Mr. CLYDE, Mr. MAST, Mr. MCDOWELL, Mr. HARRIS of Maryland, Mr. BURCHETT, Mr. RULLI, Mr. NEHLS, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. GOODEN, and Mr. OGLES):

H.R. 1879. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deny the tax exempt status for bonds issued by sanctuary jurisdictions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself, Ms. BARRAGÁN, and Ms. MCCLELLAN):

H.R. 1880. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify that the Federal Communications Commission may not take action against a broadcast licensee or any other person on the basis of viewpoint, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia (for herself, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, and Mr. DELUZIO):

H.R. 1881. A bill to amend section 45Q of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish the mine methane capture incentive credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia (for herself, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. ESTES, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. HERN of Oklahoma, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. KUSTOFF, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. STEUBE, Ms. TENNEY, Mrs. FISCHBACH, Mr. MOORE of Utah, Ms. VAN DUYN, Mr. FEENSTRA, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. CAREY, Mr. YAKYM, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. BEAN of Florida, and Mr. MORAN):

H.R. 1882. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reinstate the exception for de minimis payments by third party settlement organizations with respect to returns relating to payments made in settlement of payment card and third party network transactions, as in effect prior to the enactment of the American Rescue Plan Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS (for herself and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY):

H.R. 1883. A bill to amend the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 to clarify a provision relating to certain contents of registrations under that Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOOLENAAR (for himself and Ms. SCHOLTEN):

H.R. 1884. A bill to direct the Assistant Secretary of Labor for Veterans' Employment and Training to carry out a pilot program on short-term fellowship programs for

veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself and Mr. ROUZER):

H.R. 1885. A bill to revise the boundaries of a unit of the John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System in Topsail, North Carolina, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. NEGUSE:

H.R. 1886. A bill to expand the use of open textbooks in order to achieve savings for students and improve textbook price information; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Mr. NEGUSE (for himself and Mr. ROY):

H.R. 1887. A bill to amend the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 to require certain disclosures by registrants regarding exemptions under the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. NORTON (for herself, Mr. CASAR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. OMAR, Ms. PINGREE, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. TLAIB):

H.R. 1888. A bill to direct the United States to sign the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons and convert nuclear weapons industry resources and personnel to purposes relating to addressing the climate crisis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign 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 Ms. PEREZ (for herself, Ms. FOXX, Mrs. KIM, and Mr. GRAY):

H.R. 1889. A bill to require that States that receive a grant under the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990, will not prohibit licensed child care providers from performing simple food preparation of fruits and vegetables; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER (for himself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. TITUS, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. PAPPAS, and Mr. GOTTHEIMER):

H.R. 1890. A bill to administratively reassign responsibility for the Republic of Turkey within the Department of State and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 1891. A bill to transfer the administration of the H2A program from the Secretary of Labor to the Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. STEVENS (for herself, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mrs. DINGELL, and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 1892. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to establish a Wireless Electric Vehicle Charging Grant Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THANEDAR (for himself and Mr. ALFORD):

H.R. 1893. A bill to amend the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to increase the maximum loan amount for certain loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. KUSTOFF (for himself, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. GOLDMAN of Texas, Mr. SCHNEIDER, and Mr. LANDSMAN):

H. Con. Res. 17. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. NEWHOUSE (for himself, Mr. ROSE, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. MCGUIRE, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. YAKYM, Mrs. HOUCHIN, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. RULLI, Mr. VAN ORDEN, Mr. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, Mr. GOODEN, Mr. CRANK, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. OWENS, Mr. BRESNAHAN, Mrs. FISCHBACH, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. ESTES, Mr. DUNN of Florida, Mr. HAMADEH of Arizona, Mr. MCCORMICK, Ms. GREENE of Georgia, Mr. WIED, Mr. ONDER, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. BAUMGARTNER, and Mr. FLEISCHMANN):

H. Res. 189. A resolution censuring Representative Al Green of Texas; to the Committee on Ethics.

By Mr. STEIL (for himself and Mr. MORELLE):

H. Res. 190. A resolution electing Members to the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library and the Joint Committee on Printing; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. FLETCHER:

H. Res. 191. A resolution expressing the profound sorrow of the House of Representatives on the death of the Honorable Sylvester Turner; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CARSON (for himself, Ms. OMAR, Ms. SIMON, and Ms. TLAIB):

H. Res. 192. A resolution recognizing the commencement of Ramadan, the Muslim holy month of fasting and spiritual renewal, and commending Muslims in the United States and throughout the world for their faith; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CRANE (for himself, Mr. BIGGS of Arizona, Mr. HARRIS of Maryland, Mr. HARRIS of North Carolina, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. OGLES, Mr. CLINE, Mr. BURLISON, Mr. CLYDE, and Mr. GILL of Texas):

H. Res. 193. A resolution censuring Representative Al Green of Texas; to the Committee on Ethics.

By Mr. JAMES (for himself, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. THANEDAR, Ms. TLAIB, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. MOOLENAAR, and Ms. SCHOLTEN):

H. Res. 194. A resolution expressing support for the designation of March 6, 2025, as "Great Lakes Day"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (for himself, Mr. NEAL, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. CHU, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. EVANS of Pennsylvania, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. BEYER, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. SCHNEIDER, and Ms. PLASKETT):

H. Res. 195. A resolution of inquiry requesting the President of the United States to furnish certain information to the House of Representatives relating to the operations of the Social Security Administration after January 20, 2025, including information on the Department of Government Efficiency's access to the Social Security Administration and to information in the possession of such

Administration; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin (for herself, Ms. SCHOLTEN, and Ms. GARCIA of Texas):

H. Res. 196. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the week beginning March 2, 2025, as "School Social Work Week"; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Mr. NEHLS (for himself, Mr. JACKSON of Texas, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. FALLON, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. FRY, Mr. HARRIS of North Carolina, Mr. GILL of Texas, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. YAKYM, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mr. BARR, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. CLINE, Mr. VAN ORDEN, Mr. VAN DREW, Ms. VAN DUYN, Mr. RULLI, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, Mr. PFLUGER, Ms. GREENE of Georgia, Mr. KILEY of California, Mrs. HOUCHIN, Mr. LUTTRELL, Mr. GOODEN, Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. SELF, Mr. LANGWORTHY, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. HAMADEH of Arizona, Mr. ONDER, Mr. ARRINGTON, and Mr. CARTER of Texas):

H. Res. 197. A resolution censuring Representative Al Green of Texas; to the Committee on Ethics.

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 Ms. SEWELL:

H.R. 14.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill will restore federal oversight of elections.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 20.

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. DUNN of Florida:

H.R. 1843.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 1844.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. VAN ORDEN:

H.R. 1845.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8: to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MASSIE:

H.R. 1846.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 1847.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution

By Mr. ISSA:
H.R. 1848.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. LAMALFA:
H.R. 1849.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The 16th Amendment and Article I, Section 8, Clause 14.
By Mr. ARRINGTON:
H.R. 1850.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution
By Mr. BACON:
H.R. 1851.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. BIGGS of Arizona:
H.R. 1852.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8.
By Ms. BROWNLEY:
H.R. 1853.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Ms. BROWNLEY:
H.R. 1854.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. CARSON:
H.R. 1855.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 18 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.
By Mr. COSTA:
H.R. 1856.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution
By Mr. DAVIDSON:
H.R. 1857.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.
By Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina:
H.R. 1858.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3; to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.
By Ms. DELBENE:
H.R. 1859.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1 Section 8
By Ms. GARCIA of Texas:
H.R. 1860.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8.
By Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas:
H.R. 1861.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Ms. GREENE of Georgia:
H.R. 1862.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, United States Constitution.
By Mr. GRIFFITH:
H.R. 1863.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution as well as Amendment XVI
By Mr. GRIFFITH:
H.R. 1864.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution as well as Amendment XVI
By Mr. GRIJALVA:
H.R. 1865.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Ms. HAGEMAN:
H.R. 1866.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Mr. HERN of Oklahoma:
H.R. 1867.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1 Section 8
By Mr. HILL of Arkansas:
H.R. 1868.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section VIII
By Mrs. HINSON:
H.R. 1869.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.
By Mr. HUFFMAN:
H.R. 1871.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Mr. JACKSON of Texas:
H.R. 1872.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I Section 8 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania:
H.R. 1873.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Article I Section 8 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. KILEY of California:
H.R. 1874.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I Section 8
By Mr. LANGWORTHY:
H.R. 1875.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.
By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:
H.R. 1876.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:
H.R. 1877.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Mr. LAWLER:
H.R. 1878.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution
By Ms. MACE:
H.R. 1879.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.
By Ms. MATSUI:
H.R. 1880.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Amendment I of the Constitution;
Section 8 of article I of the Constitution
By Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia:
H.R. 1881.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia:
H.R. 1882.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS:
H.R. 1883.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution
By Mr. MOOLENAAR:
H.R. 1884.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Pursuant to Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, Congress has the power to "provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United State."
By Mr. MURPHY:
H.R. 1885.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the US Constitution.
By Mr. NEGUSE:
H.R. 1886.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section (A)
By Mr. NEGUSE:
H.R. 1887.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Ms. NORTON:
H.R. 1888.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution
By Ms. PEREZ:
H.R. 1889.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I of the U.S. Constitution
By Mr. SCHNEIDER:
H.R. 1890.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I of the Constitution
By Mr. STEUBE:
H.R. 1891.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Ms. STEVENS:
H.R. 1892.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. THANEDAR:
H.R. 1893.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Congress shall have . . . power to make all laws. 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. STUTZMAN and Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 139: Ms. MACE, Ms. BOEBERT, Mr. EZELL, and Mr. BEAN of Florida.
H.R. 175: Mr. HARRIS of North Carolina.
H.R. 247: Ms. ANSARI.
H.R. 309: Mr. SORENSSEN.
H.R. 347: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina and Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 355: Ms. MACE.
H.R. 381: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 425: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 429: Mr. AGUILAR.
H.R. 433: Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Ms. SANCHEZ.
H.R. 436: Mr. HOYER.
H.R. 439: Mr. CORREA.
H.R. 447: Ms. SALINAS.
H.R. 452: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. McDOWELL, Mr. SHREVE, Ms. KING-HINDS, Ms. MCBRIDE, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. HUNT, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. JACKSON of Texas, Mr. FRY, Mr. LUTTRELL, Mr. KENNEDY of Utah, Mrs. HOUCHIN, Mr. BURLISON, Mr. MCCAUL, Mrs. KIM, and Mr. EDWARDS.
H.R. 633: Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. MEUSER, and Mr. VAN DREW.
H.R. 662: Mr. TAYLOR.
H.R. 696: Mr. GILL of Texas.
H.R. 708: Mr. PFLUGER.
H.R. 710: Mr. TIFFANY and Mr. BERGMAN.
H.R. 721: Ms. TENNEY.
H.R. 759: Ms. RANDALL, Ms. HOYLE of Oregon, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. ANSARI, and Ms. JAYAPAL.
H.R. 761: Ms. DELBENE and Mr. GOMEZ.
H.R. 789: Ms. GOODLANDER.
H.R. 846: Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 884: Mr. MACKENZIE.
H.R. 909: Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Ms. LETLOW, Mr. ALFORD, and Mr. GOODEN.
H.R. 911: Mr. MAGAZINER.
H.R. 925: Mr. TAYLOR and Mr. GREEN of Tennessee.
H.R. 947: Mr. HOYER.
H.R. 979: Mr. LANDSMAN, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. VASQUEZ, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. TITUS, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. DELUZIO, Mrs. FISCHBACH, and Mr. MESSMER.
H.R. 995: Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 1048: Mr. FINSTAD and Ms. PEREZ.
H.R. 1059: Mr. PFLUGER and Ms. TENNEY.
H.R. 1061: Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 1103: Mr. GOODEN.
H.R. 1121: Mr. MCCORMICK.
H.R. 1125: Mrs. FISCHBACH.
H.R. 1144: Mrs. WAGNER and Mr. MOORE of Utah.
H.R. 1151: Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. MORELLE, Ms. TITUS, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, and Mr. GUEST.
H.R. 1171: Ms. MCBRIDE.
H.R. 1178: Mr. SUOZZI.
H.R. 1229: Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. STAUBER, and Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 1266: Ms. KELLY of Illinois and Mr. STEIL.
H.R. 1286: Mr. ISSA.
H.R. 1287: Ms. OMAR.
H.R. 1321: Ms. MENG, Mr. NEGUSE, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, and Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H.R. 1377: Mr. CARSON.
H.R. 1378: Ms. SEWELL and Mr. STEUBE.
H.R. 1379: Mr. LAWLER.
H.R. 1381: Mr. TAYLOR.
H.R. 1389: Ms. SEWELL.
H.R. 1391: Ms. SALINAS.
H.R. 1403: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 1410: Ms. SHERRILL.
H.R. 1417: Mr. FINSTAD.
H.R. 1422: Mr. MOORE of Utah and Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 1423: Mr. OWENS, Mr. LIEU, Mr. LAWLER, Ms. ROSS, and Mr. MAGAZINER.
H.R. 1443: Ms. ANSARI.
H.R. 1464: Ms. BYNUM.
H.R. 1477: Mr. LAWLER.
H.R. 1486: Mr. LAWLER.
H.R. 1497: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 1509: Mr. CAREY, Mr. FINSTAD, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. MULLIN, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Mr. COHEN, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 1514: Mr. COHEN and Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana.
H.R. 1521: Ms. BROWNLEY.
H.R. 1522: Ms. JAYAPAL.
H.R. 1528: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, and Ms. FOXX.
H.R. 1529: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 1542: Mr. MOULTON, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. MOYLAN, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. TOKUDA.
H.R. 1572: Mr. VASQUEZ and Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 1573: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 1576: Mrs. FISCHBACH.
H.R. 1585: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. COSTA, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, and Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 1591: Ms. CHU.
H.R. 1605: Mr. CLINE and Mr. ONDER.
H.R. 1611: Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania and Mr. MANNION.
H.R. 1621: Ms. GOODLANDER.
H.R. 1625: Mr. BUCHANAN.
H.R. 1634: Ms. GOODLANDER.
H.R. 1641: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.
H.R. 1642: Ms. GOODLANDER.
H.R. 1644: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 1645: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.
H.R. 1657: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. MCGARVEY, and Ms. MCCLELLAN.
H.R. 1661: Mr. RUTHERFORD.
H.R. 1662: Ms. MALLIOTAKIS.
H.R. 1695: Ms. GOODLANDER.
H.R. 1701: Ms. SALAZAR and Mrs. RADEWAGEN.
H.R. 1703: Ms. SCHRIER.
H.R. 1713: Mr. ROSE.
H.R. 1715: Ms. SHERRILL.
H.R. 1742: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 1743: Mr. MOORE of Utah.
H.R. 1810: Ms. BYNUM, Mr. LIEU, Mr. SUBRAMANYAM, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mrs. MCIVER.
H.R. 1816: Ms. GOODLANDER.
H.R. 1820: Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia and Mr. BENTZ.
H.J. Res. 31: Mr. MACKENZIE.
H.J. Res. 61: Mr. RULLI.
H.J. Res. 62: Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana.
H.J. Res. 63: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.J. Res. 64: Mr. LOUDERMILK and Mr. MOORE of North Carolina.
H. Con. Res. 8: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H. Con. Res. 12: Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mrs. FISCHBACH, Mr. BRECHEEN, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. FIGURES.
H. Res. 68: Ms. HOYLE of Oregon.
H. Res. 69: Mr. SUOZZI.
H. Res. 106: Mr. MOORE of Utah.
H. Res. 124: Ms. POU.
H. Res. 155: Mr. AUCHINCLOSS.
H. Res. 166: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.
H. Res. 188: Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. TITUS, Mr. COSTA, and Ms. SALINAS.