



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 119th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 171

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 25, 2025

No. 54

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,

March 25, 2025.

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

MIKE JOHNSON,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

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.

MAJORITY OF AMERICANS SUPPORT DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

(Ms. BONAMICI of Oregon was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to condemn in the strongest terms possible President Trump's executive order that threatens millions of students and local public schools through the dismantling of the Department of Education.

This is an illegal and unconstitutional abuse of power straight out of the Project 2025 playbook. Congress

created the Department. Only Congress can dismantle it, something I will fight every step of the way.

I note that Donald Trump and Elon Musk have likely never set forth in a public school, and they certainly do not understand what the Department of Education actually does and why it is important, but students, families, and teachers in Oregon and across the country understand.

In the past few weeks, several Oregon parents have told me they are terrified that their kids will lose access to vital educational services. One mom said she worries about sending her two kids with special needs to kindergarten next year if there are cuts to IDEA, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Unlike Secretary McMahon, I actually know what IDEA stands for and what it means for students. I have been an education advocate for decades, and no one has ever said we need less money to meet the needs of students with disabilities. It is always a plea to fully fund IDEA.

Another mom told me that her kids attend a title I school and get enough to eat because of school breakfast and lunch programs. It is a fact that high-poverty schools, about half the schools in the U.S., have greater educational needs, and that is why title I dollars provide flexibility so districts can determine how to best meet the needs of their low-income students. Cutting that funding will widen, rather than close, the achievement gap.

Nonsensically, Trump and Musk are rejoicing at the idea of returning power to States and local communities. Return what? States and local districts already have power over core functions of education, including curriculum, staffing, and budgeting. In fact, it is against the law for the Federal Government to set curriculum.

Donald Trump also makes a bogus argument that declining test scores jus-

tify abolishing the Department, but test scores don't make the case for slashing Federal investment in education. On the contrary, they show us where we need to direct resources and support to students, especially low-income students and students with disabilities.

Unfortunately, we are losing an important research tool about what students need because the Trump administration has taken a chain saw to the National Center for Education Statistics.

We know that more than 51,000 public schools serve concentrated populations of students from low-income families and receive title I funds. Almost 7.5 million students with disabilities receive a free, appropriate public education because of IDEA.

I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to speak with your local and State legislators and ask them if they have extra resources to fill these gaps.

Also, the majority of Federal funding through the Department of Education is to open doors of opportunity to higher education for students who choose to attend college but can't afford the cost. This includes Pell grants, Federal work-study, and low-interest loans to those who qualify.

I would not be where I am today without the Federal aid I got to first attend community college, then college, then law school.

Importantly, the Department of Education is a civil rights agency. The Office for Civil Rights enforces Federal laws prohibiting discrimination and harassment, investigating thousands of civil rights cases every year, primarily from students with disabilities. This work will be more difficult, if not impossible, with the Trump administration firing at least 240 employees in the Office for Civil Rights and closing more than half of its regional offices.

Donald Trump also says he wants to shut down the Department but keep its

□ 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.

H1223

core functions. Get rid of the people with expertise and give the core functions to other agencies without the expertise or the staff to handle them? That is not government efficiency. It is absurdity.

Last month, I introduced H. Res. 94 in defense of public schools and the Department of Education, and more than 85 of my colleagues have signed on. We will fight all efforts to defund and dismantle the important work the Department does, and we won't back down.

The consequences are clear: Closing the Department of Education will harm students, families, communities, and the economy. The majority of Americans support the Department of Education, and I know public school advocates will be working tirelessly to maintain the strong and vital Federal investment in our system of public education.

Donald Trump and Elon Musk might think that this ill-conceived abuse of power will go unchecked. They are about to find out how wrong they are.

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

CONGRATULATING DAWSON-BOYD BLACKJACKS

(Mrs. FISCHBACH of Minnesota was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Dawson-Boyd Blackjacks on defeating the defending champs to claim their first-ever title 1A championship.

It has been 34 years since the Blackjacks have been to the State tournament, and their hard work paid off. With what felt like the entire town in Williams Arena, this game was a dream come true.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the Blackjacks on their victory. They have made all of their families, community, and the Seventh District proud.

CONGRATULATING ALBANY HUSKIES ON UNDEFEATED SEASON

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the Albany Huskies on their undefeated season, closing it out with a win over Waseca in the Class 2A championship last weekend.

These players were unshakable, even when the score was tied up. They knew their mission and executed, and they have made their families, the Albany community, and the entire Seventh District proud.

CONGRATULATING ALEXANDRIA CARDINALS ON CHAMPIONSHIP

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the Alexandria Cardinals basketball team on defeating Mankato East for their first-ever 3A Boys championship title.

The senior co-captains, Sam Hagstrom and Chase Thompson, were especially excited, saying: "It has been a fun ride," and, "We ended things with a bang and left our mark," after their big win.

This is a closely bonded group of young men, and their teamwork certainly paid off.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the Cardinals on their win and for making their families, community, and the entire Seventh District proud.

CONGRATULATING WEST CENTRAL AREA KNIGHTS

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the West Central Area girls' basketball team, the Knights, on their first-ever State championship in any sport for their school.

As the fourth seed in a season full of upsets, I know this was a hard-fought victory. They should all be so proud of everything they have accomplished this year. They have certainly made their families, community, and the entire Seventh District proud.

CONGRATULATING RON MERGEN

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Ron Mergen on 37 years of service to the city of Paynesville.

A beloved and respected member of the community, unsurprisingly, last year, he was voted Boss of the Year. I know his coworkers are sad to see him go, but I also know he won't be a stranger. He has been named the grand marshal of this year's Paynesville Town and Country Days parade.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Ron so much for his service to the community and congratulate him on a well-earned retirement.

FOOD BANKS FACING URGENT CRISIS

(Ms. MCBRIDE of Delaware was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Ms. MCBRIDE. Mr. Speaker, across the country, food banks are facing an urgent crisis, and Delaware is no exception. Millions of dollars' worth of deliveries of vital food aid have been halted to food banks.

In February alone, more than 50 percent of the food that the Food Bank of Delaware distributed came from the Federal Government. Now, with shipments frozen and no clarity on whether they will be restored, they are in uncharted territory.

The Food Bank of Delaware is now uncertain whether they will receive 14 truckloads over the next 4 months. These halted deliveries represent over a quarter of the food expected to be received from the Federal Government for the rest of this fiscal year. Cathy Kanefsky, the CEO of the Food Bank of Delaware, shared with me that this would be devastating.

This is not an abstract issue. It is not a partisan issue. This is about families, working parents, seniors, veterans, and children. These are people who rely on food banks to get through the month.

One in eight Delawareans face food insecurity, and the Food Bank of Delaware has been a lifeline for thousands of families.

The truckloads in question represent over 600,000 meals that the food bank will not be able to put on the tables of Delawareans.

Yes, the Food Bank of Delaware plays a frontline role in combating hunger, but they offer more than just food. They provide dignity, hope, and a sense of community.

Food banks, which are already stretched thin, are now being asked to do even more with even less. The loss of Federal support jeopardizes their ability to serve effectively, placing additional strain on State and local resources.

At a time when grocery prices remain high and demand for assistance is great, the loss of these shipments could mean fewer meals for families in every corner of my State.

Further cuts at the hands of the administration to the USDA's local food purchasing assistance program only add to this crisis. At the direction of this administration, the USDA axed two programs that give schools and food banks assistance to buy food from local farms and ranchers. In Delaware alone, this will amount to \$2 million in cuts.

Just last month, I stood on this floor to raise the alarm about \$10 million in funding owed to Delaware farmers. Now, I stand here again to raise the alarm about the Trump administration taking their chain saw to another life-saving service that supports our farmers in feeding Delaware. All of this will result in fewer customers for Delaware's farmers and higher prices at the grocery store for Delaware's families.

The Trump administration has broken their promise time and time again to the American people, ripping funding and literal food from the hands of my constituents.

The USDA must restore these shipments and funding before the consequences become dire to families across Delaware.

CELEBRATING SEAFORD'S TRANSFORMATION

Ms. MCBRIDE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the transformation happening in Seaford, Delaware, an investment in economic growth, opportunity, and the future of western Sussex County.

Seaford is a small city rich in history. Just last week, I had the privilege of meeting with Seaford's leadership to discuss the city's progress and their vision for the future.

Over the last decade, Seaford has transformed its small but vibrant downtown through Delaware's innovative Downtown Development District program, started by our former Governor, Jack Markell. Through hard work and dedicated investment, Seaford's Main Street has gone from 90 percent vacancy to more than 90 percent occupancy.

At the center of the next phase of Seaford's revitalization effort is the Nylon Capital Center, a project that will breathe new life into a space that was once a focal point of Seaford and

will soon serve as a hub for education, healthcare, and commerce.

With a \$60 million investment, including \$20 million in American Rescue Plan funds, the new Nylon Capital Center will expand access to education and workforce training with a new DelTech facility. It will make healthcare more accessible with a new TidalHealth medical site. Small businesses will have new space to grow, and a coworking center, the Mill, will foster entrepreneurship. Critically, it will remain home to the beloved Sal's Italian Restaurant.

This is a model of public and private partnership coming together to create shared prosperity. With local, State, Federal, and private investments, the future of Seaford is exactly what we should hope for in our small cities and towns across America. The leaders of Seaford, along with partners from across the State, are demonstrating what is possible when communities come together. I am proud to stand with them in this effort, and I look forward to seeing Seaford become a symbol of progress and opportunities for generations to come.

□ 1015

CONGRATULATING EAST LANSING TROJANS

(Mr. BARRETT of Michigan was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the East Lansing Trojans on an incredible achievement, winning the State championship with a hard-fought 66-46 victory just a couple of weeks ago.

While the Michigan State Spartans are making a deep run in the tournament in the men's college basketball tournament this month, they need to look no further than across town at the East Lansing boys' basketball team to see another championship team in East Lansing.

This championship is the result of countless hours of practice and years of hard work, and it serves as a capstone to all of the time spent perfecting their craft, playing as a team, and working under the leadership of head coach Ray Mitchell.

A sincere congratulations to each and every one of them. This is a wonderful achievement, and our city is very proud of them.

CONGRATULATING FOWLER EAGLES GIRLS BASKETBALL

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Fowler Eagles girls' basketball team, who captured the State championship this past week-end with a commanding 53-29 victory.

I was at the Breslin Center to watch the game with two of my daughters: Eleanor, who just finished her first season of basketball, and Gwen, who is excited to start playing next year. These young ladies on the basketball court really served as a great example

for my own daughters and so many others across our State.

What we saw was more than just great basketball. We saw poise, teamwork, and excellence, especially for young girls like my daughters who could watch that in action.

I thank the Fowler Eagles for inspiring the next generation and making our community proud. Gwen, my 7-year-old, wants autographs from each team member, so I hope we can catch up with them sometime for that.

Congratulations to the team on an incredible season. Our city is so proud of them.

SOCIAL SECURITY IS NOT A GIVEAWAY

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

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to President Trump and Elon Musk's attacks on the safety nets that countless western New Yorkers and people across the country have earned and need. Hardworking Americans rely on the promise of a secure and dignified retirement. That promise is called Social Security, and it is a solemn promise we must keep.

Yet, from Elon Musk accessing private beneficiary data to Trump's hand-picked Acting Commissioner declaring living recipients to be deceased in order to claw back their benefits, Social Security is under fire.

Starting next week, a new rule will create further barriers, requiring in-person identity verification for those who are unable to register online. This will hurt the most vulnerable people in our community: people with disabilities, limited income, inadequate access to technology or transportation, and our seniors who rely on phone-based support. At the same time, the administration is planning to close offices around the country, making it even harder for people to access these services.

These reckless actions are robbing the hardworking men and women that I represent in western New York. It is a slap in the face to every American citizen who has spent decades paying into the system, and every widow, person with a disability, and child who lost a parent too soon who deserves and needs the benefits that allows them to survive.

Social Security is not a giveaway. The program is fully funded by the people who rely on it, by the sweat and hard-earned wages of American workers. Without Social Security, nearly 22 million Americans—many of them seniors on a fixed income or people with disabilities—will be plunged into poverty overnight.

In my district alone, over 167,000 people rely on Social Security benefits to pay their bills, put food on the table, and afford their prescriptions. It has allowed seniors to stay in their homes,

help widows keep the lights on, and ensure that people who have worked their whole lives don't spend their final days scraping by.

Despite the incredible progress we have made as a Nation to keep people out of poverty, President Trump and Elon Musk are rolling back the clock in order to give tax cuts to billionaires and the ultrarich. Elon Musk even called Social Security the biggest Ponzi scheme of all time. Perhaps he has this confused with his own plan to cut taxes for the richest among us, including himself, at the expense of everyone else.

Congress must reject the administration's attempt to weaken Social Security. We need to fight tooth and nail against those who want to raise the retirement age, reduce benefits, or privatize this program for the benefit of corporations and the ultrarich. Instead, we should be strengthening Social Security to protect this vital safety net and fighting for an America where working people get to retire with dignity.

President Trump needs to keep his hands off Social Security.

HAPPY 100TH BIRTHDAY TO EDGAR CARL WILKE

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a true American, World War II veteran Edgar Carl Wilke, as he celebrates his 100th birthday.

A resident of West Seneca, New York, Mr. Wilke served our Nation with courage in World War II, where he was wounded in battle defending the freedoms we hold dear. After enlisting from his hometown of Buffalo, he achieved the rank of private first class while serving in the 24th Infantry Division of the 21st Regiment.

For his bravery and heroic conduct in the Pacific theater, he was awarded the Bronze Star Medal. For wounds taken during the Battle of the Philippines, he received a Purple Heart. Along with these two high honors, he has received numerous other awards, including the American Campaign Medal, the Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal with two bronze service stars, the World War II Victory Medal, the Combat Infantryman Badge, and the Marksman Badge with Rifle Bar.

Mr. Wilke's sacrifice is a reminder that the liberties we enjoy today were secured by the bravery of patriots like him. We owe our veterans more than gratitude. We owe them our unwavering commitment to ensuring that they receive the care, benefits, respect, and recognition that they deserve.

On behalf of the people of western New York and a grateful Nation, I wish Mr. Wilke a very happy 100th birthday. I thank him for his service, and may his century of life continue to be an inspiration to us all.

VOTERS SENT US TO CONGRESS TO LOWER COSTS

(Mr. OLSZEWSKI of Maryland was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. OLSZEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, in November, the American people sent us all here to Congress with one clear mandate: to lower costs, to make life easier for working families, and to ensure that no one in this country has to choose between putting food on the table and keeping the lights on.

I came to this floor 49 days ago with a similar poster. Now, here we are again, 81 days into this session of Congress, and I return with the exact same message. Nearly 3 months in, and what do we have to show for our work? Not one vote, not one serious effort from the Republican leadership of this House to tackle rising costs for struggling families, nothing to lower grocery prices, bring down the cost of gas or prescription drugs, help parents afford childcare, or support seniors who are worried about their retirement.

President Trump promised to lower costs on day one. He has now failed to deliver on his day-one promise for 64 consecutive days. Making matters worse, costs are anything but lower. Instead, the reality is grocery prices are rising, inflation is up, and the stock market is unstable. In fact, rather than lowering costs, the Trump administration is actively promoting policies that are poised to drive up costs even higher.

The Trump tariffs alone will increase costs for the average family by as much as \$2,000 per year, simply to buy essentials like gas and groceries. God forbid your family needs a new car or a home renovation in the near future.

Making matters even worse, as prices go up, safety nets for our most vulnerable families are poised to be slashed under this reckless Republican budget. I voted "no" because it cuts hundreds of billions of dollars in funding for SNAP and Medicaid, which means children will go hungry, seniors will lose care, and people with disabilities will be left behind, period.

You don't have to take my word for it. The Congressional Budget Office issued a letter on March 5 where they reinforced that the math is conclusive: Major cuts are the only way to meet the requirements of the Republican House budget resolution.

The American people are tired of the political theater. They are simply asking for solutions. However, this administration and extreme Republicans have offered no real plans, no real solutions, just more empty promises with painful cuts and a whopping Federal deficit increase looming on the horizon.

That is why I have been tracking congressional inaction day after day after day on my social media, because families in Maryland and across the country cannot afford to waste any more time.

Here we are, on the House floor once again, calling on House leadership to bring real legislation to this floor that will start delivering results for our constituents.

The good news is, there is no shortage of legislative proposals that will

help accomplish this. For example, I am proud to have cosponsored bills that will provide immediate relief by strengthening and modernizing the child and earned income tax credits, expanding paid leave, providing penalty-free retirement withdrawals, and giving Americans more financial flexibility in these tough times.

These aren't partisan bills. These are commonsense solutions. Yet, House leadership refuses to bring a single one forward for a vote.

Mr. Speaker, I will not stop calling for action. Families in Maryland and across the country demand it, and they deserve it. I will not stop until we do what we were sent here to do: lower costs and build a better future for every American.

ROLL BACK ENERGY MANDATES

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, the previous administration, the Biden administration, spent most of its years forcing extreme energy mandates onto everyday appliances: our gas stoves, our water heaters, dishwashers, air conditioners, you name it.

These rules really aren't about efficiency, as the manufacturers have worked for decades to make them more efficient and meet already existing standards. No, it is more of a control situation. These drive up costs, limit the choice for consumers, and force everything onto an already overloaded power grid. Gas stoves, I know, are the preference for many people in their homes. Gas water heaters work well. It is a deal where the government wants to take away the choices.

Natural gas is, indeed, one of the most affordable, reliable energy sources we have. The previous administration was the enemy of that. They did everything they could to push it out of homes and businesses and the production of it on our open lands that have so much potential, especially in the Western States.

We have seen attempts to regulate gas stoves out of existence, and earlier this month we in the House voted to overturn one of those rules. Americans should be able to choose appliances that work best for them, not be forced into expensive, unreliable electric alternatives that they may not be able to afford that the government simply mandates.

The push to electrify everything is reckless. In my home State of California, for example, they want to take away lawnmowers, leaf blowers, even—get this—generators. Now, when the power goes off, that means the power is off, the electricity is off. What are you supposed to run a generator on, if you need to, especially for a couple days, to keep your freezer going, things like that? It doesn't make any sense.

The electric grid is already struggling to keep up. These mandates pile

even more demand onto it while shutting down traditional energy sources that actually work.

Where is the electricity going to come from? In my home district in northern California, they have torn out four hydroelectric dams, and they have their sights on many others. In Mendocino County, they are looking at what is called the Scott Dam, Lake Pillsbury that generates some electricity and is also important for agriculture. It is a constant push to remove water storage.

In California, we lost one nuclear power plant due to an incredible amount of regulations to keep it going. That power plant was in San Diego, San Onofre. We are barely holding on to the one in San Luis Obispo, which represents 9 percent of the power grid. San Diego also represented 9 percent of the grid at that time. It has to be made up for with solar panels or windmills, which the solar one that they have in Ivanpah they are going to decommission pretty soon because it is not working very well. When we are forced into this electricity grid need, we will find that we are going to be running out because at the same time they mandate this, they mandate taking away the generation.

We have rolling blackouts in California, skyrocketing energy prices, and warnings—get this—not to charge electric cars that have been mandated by the State because the grid can't handle it at certain hours. Our Governor came out saying, well, we need to do this thing, and at the same time they are warning people, better not plug your electric car in.

As we know, wind and solar energy aren't enough to power the country. They are a tiny percentage of the overall pie. Wind power seems to work for a few years, and then they have to dispose of it, hauling the blades to some landfill in Utah because they don't have a way to recycle it.

□ 1030

Mr. Speaker, we need a reliable, balanced energy approach. That includes natural gas, which is so abundant in this country with the miracle of hydraulic fracturing. We have much that we can develop here and also be a good exporter to Europe so they don't have to rely on the Russian bear to import through their pipeline. Isn't that something?

Natural gas is affordable and efficient. It keeps costs down for families, businesses, and our economy. Instead of eliminating it, we should use it to strengthen our grid and keep energy reliable and cost-effective.

The regulations previously were nothing more than government overreaches disguised as environmental policy. They don't make life better for working Americans, for the economy, or for U.S. strength and readiness. They make it more expensive, less reliable, and less efficient.

It is time to roll these regulations back and put the power literally back

in the hands of the people. It has been shown these mandates do not make things better; they are less efficient. Let industry and innovation catch up to make more efficient systems. The government can't do it.

CELEBRATING OSBOURN PARK HIGH SCHOOL GIRLS' BASKETBALL TEAM

(Mr. SUBRAMANYAM of Virginia was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the Osbourn Park High School girls' basketball team's historic State championship victory.

The Yellow Jackets' swarming defense propelled them to a buzzing 27-3 season record and the first State championship in school history. Their championship win was a testament to hard work, determination, and overcoming a little bit of adversity, as well.

In fact, just before the game, Head Coach Chrissy Kelly broke her pinky toe. The flu swept through the team, keeping them away from practice. On the day of the championship, the team's bus accidentally traveled to the wrong arena. The Yellow Jackets persevered, and their victory is not just a win for the team but for our entire community.

Mr. Speaker, congratulations to our State champions, the Osbourn Park Yellow Jackets.

HONORING LOUDOUN COUNTY SCIENCE FAIR STUDENTS

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. Mr. Speaker, I am excited for the future after having the honor of meeting some incredibly driven individuals at a local science fair.

Every student who entered the science fair in Loudoun County was a winner, but seven students from Loudoun County Public Schools who participated in this regional fair earned the opportunity to compete at the International Science and Engineering Fair in Columbus, Ohio.

These students include Taha Rawjani, Sanjay Lakshmanan, and Matthew Li from Independence High School; Yash Sreepathi from Broad Run High School; Naija Shah and Nithya Vinodh from John Champe High School; and Naitik Oza from Freedom High School.

All the projects at the fair showed that the sky is the limit for our students as they address some of the world's most pressing challenges. For example, one project conducted groundbreaking research on limiting the spread of esophageal cancer using advanced molecular techniques, while another developed a model to identify potential treatments for pancreatic cancer.

All the young scientists and researchers who participated are paving the way for breakthroughs that can transform the world we live in for the better. Their dedication showcases the

promise of the next generation in tackling complex problems with creativity and determination.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the hard work of all the participants and wish them tremendous success, especially the ones who are moving on to the International Science and Engineering Fair.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF CHANDRA SEKAR

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and memory of Chandra Sekar. He was a devoted husband, loving father, and cherished friend whose presence filled every life he touched with warmth and love.

Chandra built a beautiful life in Loudoun County with his wife, Vasanthi Sekar, and his kids, Ashwin and Santhosh. They were his greatest joy and pride.

Over Chandra's prestigious 30-year career, he rose from software engineer to leading cloud architect at Amazon and Microsoft.

His family said that Chandra's kindness was boundless and his spirit radiant. He had an extraordinary ability to make everyone feel seen, loved, and strong, whether through his smile or his endless compassion. His memory will leave a lasting impact on all who had the honor of knowing him.

Mr. Speaker, may he rest in peace.

HONORING JEKYLL ISLAND, GEORGIA

(Mr. CARTER of Georgia was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jekyll Island, Georgia, for being home to two of the South's best beach bars as highlighted by "Southern Living." These beloved spots showcase Georgia's coastal charm, creating unforgettable experiences.

The Wharf is located on the historic Jekyll Pier with breathtaking marsh views. This institution offers a relaxed, open-air setting, welcoming everyone who enters. Known for serving fresh, Lowcountry seafood, classic burgers, and craft cocktails, this bar is a go-to for locals.

Tortuga Jacks is also recognized for being the only oceanfront, Tiki-style restaurant on the Georgia coastline. It brings a true island feeling to Jekyll with a laid-back, pet-friendly atmosphere. It specializes in Baha Mexican-style cuisine and often hosts live music.

These establishments highlight the essence of Jekyll Island with great food, lively entertainment, and a true coastal experience. I encourage everyone to stop by and enjoy what Jekyll Island has to offer.

HONORING THE LEGACY OF LYDIA THOMPSON

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the legacy of Lydia Thompson, a passionate conservationist, avid birder, and well-known artist, affectionately known as The Bird Lady.

Ms. Thompson was a passionate advocate for avian conservation, having traveled all 50 States in pursuit of her love for birding. She was also active in the Coastal Georgia Audubon Society, Georgia Shorebird Alliance, and the Georgia Coastal Artists Guild.

Ms. Thompson was dedicated to protecting shorebirds on both St. Simons Island and Jekyll Island. She founded Operation Plover Patrol to recruit, educate, train, and manage volunteers to monitor shorebirds in their nesting habitat.

In honor of Ms. Thompson, the Jekyll Island community installed two new spotting scopes behind the Jekyll Island Guest Information Center. Thanks to these new installments, Ms. Thompson's mission of appreciation, conservation, and education will continue to be part of the coastal salt marsh landscape she so dearly loved.

RECOGNIZING PORT OF BRUNSWICK

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Port of Brunswick as the busiest port in the Nation for heavy equipment and auto shipments.

Mr. Speaker, 2024 was a record year for the Port of Brunswick, handling more than 2 million tons of cargo, 600,000 tons of exports, and about 900,000 tons of roll-on, roll-off units of autos and heavy equipment.

New infrastructure and strengthened partnerships contributed to the port's significant growth in many areas including upgraded storage capacity to allow for 160 percent increase in heavy equipment shipping.

Georgia's ports promise auto manufacturers world-class service and long-term gains for their business.

In addition to the growth already recorded, the Port of Brunswick is continuing to make improvements to keep up with the rise in manufacturing and growing population including an upgraded shipping channel to prepare Brunswick to handle larger vessels.

The First District of Georgia is proud to be the home of the Nation's busiest port for heavy equipment and auto shipments, and I look forward to the continued excellence of the Port of Brunswick.

HONORING BRYNN GRANT

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Women's History Month, I rise today to recognize Brynn Grant who recently was named Woman of the Year for Georgia by "USA Today."

As a child, Brynn watched her father being sworn into a State-appointed position by the late President Jimmy Carter, who was then Governor of Georgia. Brynn's career spans more than two decades at the Savannah Economic Development Authority, where she rose to the position of chief operating officer and vice president of the World Trade Center Savannah. She also served as president and CEO of the United Way of the Coastal Empire, guiding the organization through the challenges of the COVID-19 pandemic.

As the chief executive officer of the Liberty County Development Authority, Brynn highlights the link between social and economic issues, advocating for holistic community development. Brynn advocates for collaborative services, embodying the belief that real progress is achieved only when everyone benefits.

Brynn Grant's unwavering dedication and visionary leadership have deeply influenced the Coastal Georgia community, establishing a standard of excellence and compassion.

Congratulations to Brynn Grant. We are so proud of her.

ENHANCING SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to be here.

This morning, I rise to talk about social security, the Nation's number one antipoverty program for the elderly and the number one antipoverty program for children.

Mr. Speaker, I know it comes as no surprise to you that Social Security has not been enhanced since 1971. Richard Nixon was President of the United States then. Congress has done nothing to improve the situation of so many people who desperately need it.

There are more than 70 million Social Security recipients in the United States, and 10,000 baby boomers a day become eligible for Social Security. Yet, Elon Musk is setting about to dismantle the Social Security Administration by cutting regional offices. Whether it is Illinois or Connecticut, we need these regional offices.

He is cutting off the phone services, getting rid of the inspectors general, doing so to the program that is most effectively administrated in the Federal Government. No other agency, public or private, provides insurance for more than 70 million people with administrative costs that are under 1 percent. It delivers and has never missed a payment, not a pension payment, not a disability payment, not a spousal payment, not a dependent child payment.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, in your district you have approximately 180,000 Social Security recipients, 130,000-plus retirees, 21,000-plus disabled, 11,800 widows, 4,500 spouses, and over 10,000 children who rely on Social Security. Mr. Musk is out to dismantle and privatize this.

Some of the American people may have been born at night but not last night, with respect to what Mr. Musk and Mr. Trump are up to: On one hand, they say they will not cut social security. In the next breath, Larry Kudlow or CNN say, no, we have to privatize these systems because that is where we are going to find the \$2 trillion that Mr. Trump has asked us to find.

What a coincidence that in the Social Security trust fund, the trust fund that more than 180,000 people in your dis-

trict have paid into, is \$2.7 trillion, and has never missed a payment but hasn't been expanded since 1971.

Do you think those 10,000 baby boomers a day are going to call your office, my office, every Member of Congress' office? You bet they are, and they should because Congress has done nothing. In the face of this, Mr. Trump is now trying to privatize Social Security, first, by gutting it from the inside and not providing the services to the public that it desperately needs and then indicating this system doesn't work. So I guess we are going to have to grab that \$2.7 trillion and privatize that.

That will be a great benefit for the private sector. That would not help out the day-to-day workforce that relies on it and needs it and is depending on you, Mr. Speaker, and me and all the Members of this body. You owe it to your constituents to look them in the eye and tell them what your plan is. We have a plan to expand Social Security.

You imagine, there are 5 million Americans, mostly women, who get below-poverty-level checks from the wealthiest States in the Nation, having paid in with the guarantee and trust from their government that they would have a pension they could retire on. Instead, they get below-poverty-level checks because of Congress' inaction. Rise up America. Contact your Members of Congress.

□ 1045

RECOGNIZING SALVATION ARMY OF HARRISONBURG AND ROCKINGHAM COUNTY'S 100TH ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. CLINE of Virginia was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, please join me in recognizing the Salvation Army of Harrisonburg and Rockingham County. For over 100 years, they have remained dedicated to sharing the Gospel of Jesus Christ while providing care and support to all those in need.

Just 60 years after the founding of the international movement known as the Salvation Army, the Salvation Army of Harrisonburg and Rockingham County was established on June 27, 1925.

Since its founding, the Salvation Army of Harrisonburg and Rockingham County has partnered with the local community to efficiently and effectively assist individuals and families facing poverty. It has made a positive difference in countless lives, offering a helping hand to those caught in difficult circumstances.

Today, the organization is faithfully led by Lieutenants Douglas and Sharon Ingold, who continue the mission of serving others with compassion and integrity.

The Salvation Army of Harrisonburg and Rockingham County holds its iconic Red Kettle Campaign every year to raise funds for the organization's

programs that benefit the local area. The organization remains steadfast in its commitment to offering programs and services to all those in need without discrimination.

I congratulate the Salvation Army of Harrisonburg and Rockingham County on doing the most good for 100 years.

CONGRATULATING ROANOKE VALLEY CHRISTIAN SCHOOLS EAGLES

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Roanoke Valley Christian Schools Eagles varsity boys' basketball team for winning the 2025 VACA State championship, securing back-to-back titles and etching their names into school history.

After graduating eight seniors last year, expectations were tempered, but led by returning seniors Logan Gutierrez, Luke Somers, Matthew Cummings, Christian Crosby, Ethan Cummings, and Cayden Wayne, along with new senior Colton Bowman, the Eagles rose to the challenge with grit and unity.

Logan and Luke each reached the 1,000-point milestone, while underclassmen like Jacob and Zach Mioduszewski, Landen Gutierrez, Jack Rakes, and Dallas Riles played vital roles in the team's depth and success. Eighth-grader Brayden Hawley rounded out the squad and made his mark, as well.

With Coach Josiah Somers at the helm and a foundation built on relentless defense and selfless play, the Eagles swept the Southwest District, South Region, and State titles.

Mr. Speaker, this team showed the heart of champions. I congratulate the RVCS Eagles.

Eagles soar.

DELIVERING ON PRESIDENT TRUMP'S PRIORITIES IN RECONCILIATION

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, House Republicans are delivering on the mandate the American people gave us last November. We passed a responsible budget resolution, and now we are moving forward with a strong reconciliation package that reflects President Trump's America First agenda.

The bill secures our southern border, keeps taxes low for working families and small businesses, strengthens our economy, protects Social Security, restores American energy leadership, supports our men and women in uniform, and brings much-needed accountability to Washington.

We have taken the lead in the House. Now it is time for the Senate to do the same. When they return to Washington, the Senators should take up the House resolution, move the bill forward, and send it to the President's desk.

The American people expect results. They want a government that works for them, not against them. With this legislation, we have the chance to make real, lasting change for the American people. Let's get it done.

PREVENT PRESIDENT TRUMP FROM INVADING OTHER COUNTRIES

(Mr. MAGAZINER of Rhode Island was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. MAGAZINER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the No Invading Allies Act, a bill to prevent President Trump from invading Canada, Greenland, or Panama without a vote of Congress.

It is crazy that we even have to have this conversation. These places, these nations, are our allies. They pose no threat to the United States. After thousands of brave American soldiers fought in Iraq and Afghanistan, many losing their lives, their limbs, and their loved ones, the last thing the American people want is to send our troops to any new wars, especially against countries that pose no threat to our own.

Now President Trump will not stop talking about taking over Canada, Greenland, and Panama. He is obsessed.

Listen to me when I tell you that he is not joking. When he says he wants to take over Canada, Greenland, and Panama, he means it. He even said that we will "[expand] our territory" in his inaugural speech. When was the last time you heard a President say something like that?

The American people do not want to take over other countries. Nobody voted in the election to take over Canada or Greenland. The President never talked about that during his campaign.

No one was thinking about taking over Canada when they went to vote last November. No. The American people want lower costs, safe streets, and peace. The last thing Americans want is unnecessary war. We cannot trust Donald Trump to keep us out of one.

That is why I am introducing a new bill, the No Invading Allies Act, to prevent the President from sending the Armed Forces to invade Canada, Panama, or Greenland without a vote of Congress.

Our country's Founders feared the possibility of a President engaging in unnecessary wars. In Article I of the Constitution, the Founders gave Congress, not the President, the power to declare war. Congress later passed the War Powers Resolution of 1973, which allows Presidents to engage in military action for up to 60 days without a vote of Congress, but Donald Trump's reckless threats to take over peaceful nations means that he cannot be trusted with this unchecked power.

Congress must reassert our role under the Constitution by passing this bill. With this bill, we send a message to our allies and adversaries alike that the United States does not support the illegal seizure of sovereign territory. Most importantly, we say to American troops and their families that they will not be sent into more unnecessary wars, not on our watch.

I urge my colleagues, whether you believe the President is serious about

wanting to take over other countries or not, whether you take him at his word or not, whether you think he might involve us in unnecessary wars of conflict or not, let's not leave it up to chance.

The decision of whether to make war is perhaps the most important responsibility Congress has under the Constitution. Let's not surrender our responsibility to a President who speaks so casually about taking over other nations. Our men and women in uniform deserve better than that, and our country deserves better than that.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 52 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

God of all creation, we lift up our eyes to the hills from whence our help does indeed come. You, O Lord, maker of Heaven and Earth who directs the stars in the sky and orders the change of the seasons, call us to behold with eyes of faith that winter is over.

As flowers appear on the Earth, let us sing for joy in the mastery of Your design, for You make all things new.

Make a way in the desert of despair, through the wilderness of worry. Bring forth streams of living water in the wastelands of unease. Quench the barrenness of our souls with the hope of Your salvation.

Then enable us to set aside the former things that hold us to our past. Open our eyes to perceive the new things You are doing in our lives, even as You cause the beginning of life springing up around us.

It is in Your eternal name we pray.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms.

ROSS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. ROSS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

MORE MONEY DOESN'T BRING BETTER RESULTS

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, for decades, Washington has poured trillions of dollars into the education system of America with actually very little to show for it.

Since the Department of Education was created by Jimmy Carter in 1979, it has spent over \$3 trillion, yet student achievement hasn't actually improved. It has only gone down in that time.

After Federal taxpayers spent another \$200 billion on education during the COVID era, all we have to show for it is math and reading scores that are at the lowest levels in decades. Per-pupil spending has skyrocketed by 245 percent since the 1970s, proving more money doesn't always achieve better results.

The Federal Government has only added red tape, forcing schools to waste time and resources on compliance instead of teaching. I am married to a teacher who, at the time, was frustrated by additional requirements that were coming down on trying to do her job.

The Biden administration alone added nearly \$3.9 billion in regulatory costs and millions of hours of paperwork and funneled over \$1 billion into grants pushing radical ideologies instead of core academics.

President Trump's executive order directing the closure of the Department of Education returns control over education to the States, parents, and local leaders. Instead of Washington bureaucrats trying to dictate how kids learn, we should have those decisions be made locally. This shift will cut waste and eliminate overreach.

EXPRESSING CONCERN REGARDING JOB CUTS

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

Ms. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned about the Trump administration's act to fire more than 1,000 EPA scientific researchers who have

dedicated their careers to protecting the American people.

I represent part of the Research Triangle Park, home to the largest EPA facility in the Nation, where researchers and scientists are solving some of our most complex environmental problems.

In North Carolina, these committed public servants are working to combat PFAS and address our air quality issues. They were on the front lines of helping our citizens during Hurricane Helene.

The Trump administration is attacking Federal research offices because they expose disastrous policies and hold polluters accountable. Eliminating the Office of Research and Development not only violates the law, it puts our people, public health, and the environment in danger.

I will fight this dangerous plan to fire Federal workers and silence scientists with everything I have.

HONORING MIA LOVE

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of my dear friend and former colleague, Mia Love.

On Sunday, after a courageous battle with glioblastoma, Mia passed away peacefully surrounded by her loved ones. She was a woman of faith, a patriot, an extraordinary leader, and a fighter who inspired many to do great things.

Under the care of the exceptional doctors at Duke University, Mia fought alongside my wife, Patty. I am forever grateful for her enduring friendship and support throughout this journey.

I also extend my deepest thanks to the caregivers, healthcare professionals, researchers, and advocates whose tireless work brings us closer to a future without glioblastoma.

Mia's legacy of strength, resilience, and unwavering dedication to others will never be forgotten and certainly not forgotten by the Williams family. My prayers are with her family as we continue to fight and find a cure for this deadly disease.

In God we trust.

IMPACT OF PROPOSED SNAP CUTS

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, last month Republicans passed a budget that enables massive cuts that are going to kick people off of food assistance. Children, seniors, disabled veterans, workers—people who all rely on SNAP, the Supplemental Assistance Nutrition Program, to help purchase food when times get tough, Republicans want to rip it away, take food off the tables of hungry Americans.

This is a program that is there for all of us. If you lose your job, if your hours get cut, if you become disabled or have trouble paying bills, you can turn to SNAP to help make ends meet.

Republicans don't want to talk about how their cuts are going to hurt people. They haven't held one hearing or briefing on the program, so Democrats went around them. We are holding a hearing today at 3 p.m. to talk about their plan to steal people's food assistance so they can give tax breaks to billionaires.

We will continue to expose the corruption as we work to end hunger now.

SOUTH CAROLINA EXPORT ACHIEVEMENTS

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the leadership of Governor Henry McMaster, Commerce Secretary Harry Lightsey, and Ports President Barbara Melvin, who recently announced that exports from the Palmetto State have reached \$38 billion, creating jobs.

The trade policies of President Donald Trump are succeeding with the announcement I heard yesterday at the White House during the Greek Independence Day program with Ambassador Ekaterini Nassika that there has been \$3 trillion of investment already, fulfilling the reconciliation priorities.

South Carolina is number one in America for exported vehicles, number one in the manufacture and export of tires with Michelin of France, Bridgestone of Japan, Continental of Germany, and Giti of Singapore. I appreciate serving as the co-chair of the Congressional Tire Caucus.

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

America extends its deepest sympathy and appreciation to courageous Congresswoman Mia Love.

CONGRATULATING ROCHESTER COMMUNITY PLAYERS

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

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Rochester Community Players theater group on their 100th season.

As the second oldest continually operating community theater in the State of New York and a part of the Little Theatre Movement in America, their rich history dates back to 1925, with their opening performance at the Historic German House in Rochester, New York.

Today, the group performs throughout our city, providing opportunities for local professionals to share their talents on the stage and behind the scenes. We are blessed to have a vibrant and ever-growing artistic community in Rochester. The Rochester Community Players have been at the helm for an entire century, a remarkable accomplishment.

I congratulate President Michael Krickmire and Vice President Elaine Sauer on this momentous occasion and look forward to their continued work to uplift our local talent and provide high-quality entertainment for years to come.

REMEMBERING PAUL JACKSON

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

Mr. MCGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to remember the life of Paul Jackson from Victoria, Virginia.

On March 15, Paul's life was tragically cut short while doing what he loved, flying his helicopter. Last year, Paul was asked to help with Hurricane Helene relief in North Carolina. Over the next 10 days, he flew critical supplies to North Carolina on his own dime.

Paul was President Trump's number one fan. He was a personal friend to me, and he made anyone he met want to be a better person. His daughter, Raven, described him as a true patriot and a man who loved our country.

Paul is survived by his wife, Christy; his son, Christopher; his daughter, Raven; his five grandchildren; his brother, Nelson; and many, many friends.

I hope everyone hearing this will strive to help others, just like Paul.

HONORING RAÚL GRIJALVA

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

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today to honor the life and legacy of my friend and colleague, Congressman Raúl Grijalva.

Raúl was more than a public servant. He was a force for justice and a relentless champion for working families, the environment, and indigenous communities. He led with passion, conviction, and an unwavering belief that government should serve the people.

As chair of the House Natural Resources Committee, Raúl never backed down from a fight. I had the privilege of serving on the committee under his leadership when I first came to Congress, and I learned so much from his example.

His commitment to environmental justice wasn't just words. It was action. Together, we worked to pass legislation on climate justice grants, urban parks, and ensuring that our

most vulnerable communities weren't left behind.

His mentorship, wisdom, and kindness I will carry with me always. Raúl made a difference in Congress, his community, and in the lives of so many. While we feel his loss deeply, we also feel the responsibility to continue his fight.

My heart is with his family, his loved ones, and all who were fortunate enough to know him.

CONGRATULATING IRONTON FIGHTING TIGERS

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

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Ironton Fighting Tigers for winning their first football State championship in 35 years.

With an incredibly strong work ethic and a commitment to excellence, the Ironton High School football team spent all season training and working together with one goal in mind: the State title.

In the championship game, senior Shaun Terry led his team to victory with 300 all-purpose yards, including 148 receiving yards and three touchdowns. This championship win is evidence of a season full of hard work, dedication, and commitment to excellence.

Since the school's last title in 1989, the Ironton Fighting Tigers have appeared in six State title games in pursuit of a win, which made bringing home this year's trophy even sweeter.

Head Coach Trevon Pendleton and his staff poured their knowledge and experience into eager players all season long, guiding them and pushing them toward excellence on and off the field.

I also recognize each parent who supported their players and encouraged them to work hard. I congratulate each player for their hard-earned victory and new State title.

Congratulations. Go Fighting Tigers.

□ 1215

PROTECTING DETAILS OF ONGOING MILITARY OPERATIONS

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

Mr. VINDMAN. Mr. Speaker, Signalgate is real. Protecting the details of ongoing military operations is a critical and basic requirement to ensure our national security and the safety of our military personnel. I know this from my 25 years in the Army and from my work on the National Security Council.

I join my colleague, Congressman PAT RYAN, in calling for an immediate congressional investigation of Signalgate. If the messages aren't clas-

sified and contain no sensitive war plans, as the administration claims, they should be released immediately.

I am calling for the full conversation to be shared with Congress so that we can fulfill our oversight role and verify the administration's accounting of events. If the administration truly believes no lines were crossed, no war plans discussed, and no classified information shared, then they should release the messages and let Members of Congress and the American people see for themselves, as the President has done in the past, and defend those actions publicly.

The American people deserve transparency and confidence. We must verify that no laws were broken and ensure our national security isn't being used as a shield to avoid accountability. American lives are at stake.

RECOGNIZING CADET OF THE YEAR RECIPIENT CADET LIEU- TENANT COLONEL MIKHAIL KARNAUKH

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Cadet Lieutenant Colonel Mikhail Karnaukh who was named as a recipient of the General Ira C. Eaker Award. This award is the second most prestigious honor in the Civil Air Patrol Cadet Program. Fewer than 1 percent of cadets are selected to receive it.

Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for those in the Civil Air Patrol. Their selfless commitment to duty and country deserves the highest praise from their elected leaders.

We congratulate Mikhail on this special accomplishment. He has earned it. I very much look forward to hearing more about his progress and accomplishments in the coming months and years. May God continue to bless him and his family.

SUPPORTING FEDERAL JUDICIARY AND JUDGES

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of our Federal judiciary and the judges who work tirelessly to uphold and defend our democracy.

The hypocrisy that we are seeing unfold among our colleagues across the aisle and in this administration is deeply concerning. The separation of powers is a cornerstone of our democracy. Each and every day Federal judges work as a check on the powers of both the legislative and executive branches, regardless of who is in charge. This is a good thing and something each and every one of us should be working to protect.

Instead, our colleagues across the aisle are seeking to impeach Federal

judges, calling for unprecedented changes to our judicial system, and trampling on the most basic and fundamental tenets of our Constitution. How much more hypocritical can they be?

The Biden administration faced 133 multistate lawsuits from Republican attorneys general. Texas Attorney General Paxton alone filed over 100 lawsuits against the Biden administration. Republicans are now seeking to undermine and attack the same judiciary they used to take the Biden administration to court, and they are personally attacking judges whose decisions they disagree with.

Mr. Speaker, I urge everyone to stand against this reckless attack on our judiciary.

RECOGNIZING THE 46TH ANNIVERSARY OF C-SPAN

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

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 46th anniversary of C-SPAN's coverage of the U.S. House of Representatives, a milestone in government transparency.

For nearly five decades, since March of 1979, C-SPAN has provided the American people with unfiltered gavel-to-gavel coverage of the debates and the decisions that shape our Nation. It is a service that strengthens our democracy and fosters accountability.

This incredible resource exists thanks to the commitment of American's cable and satellite providers who voluntarily fund C-SPAN as a non-profit service.

Let's be clear. Millions of Americans are being denied access to this vital coverage because major TV streaming platforms like YouTube TV and Hulu + Live TV refuse to carry C-SPAN. At a time when trust in government is more important than ever, no company should stand in the way of public access to democracy and the inner workings of our constitutional republic.

I urge YouTube TV and Hulu + Live TV and all streaming providers to do the right thing. Carry C-SPAN. Give their customers the same access to government that cable and satellite viewers have. The American people deserve nothing less.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 25, 2025.

Hon. MIKE JOHNSON,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on March 25, 2025, at 11:10 a.m.:

Appointment:
Congressional Award Board
With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

KEVIN F. MCCUMBER,
Clerk.

APPOINTMENT OF INDIVIDUAL TO LIBRARY OF CONGRESS TRUST FUND BOARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to section 1 of the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board Act (2 U.S.C. 154), and the order of the House of January 3, 2025, of the following individual on the part of the House to the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board for a 5-year term:

Mr. Steven L. Swig, San Francisco, California

APPOINTMENT OF INDIVIDUAL TO COORDINATING COUNCIL ON JU- VENILE JUSTICE AND DELIN- QUENCY PREVENTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to section 206 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (34 U.S.C. 11116), and the order of the House of January 3, 2025, of the following individual on the part of the House to the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention for a 2-year term:

Mr. Julian Whittington, Benton, Louisiana

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 24, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY RELATING TO "ENERGY CON- SERVATION PROGRAM: ENERGY CONSERVATION STANDARDS FOR WALK-IN COOLERS AND WALK-IN FREEZERS"; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 75, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE OFFICE OF ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RE- NEWABLE ENERGY, DEPART- MENT OF ENERGY RELATING TO "ENERGY CONSERVATION PRO- GRAM: ENERGY CONSERVATION STANDARDS FOR COMMERCIAL REFRIGERATORS, FREEZERS, AND REFRIGERATOR-FREEZERS"; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1048, DEFENDING EDU- CATION TRANSPARENCY AND ENDING ROGUE REGIMES EN- GAGING IN NEFARIOUS TRANS- ACTIONS ACT

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, by the direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 242 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 242

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the

House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 24) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Energy relating to "Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Walk-In Coolers and Walk-In Freezers". All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 75) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy relating to "Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Commercial Refrigerators, Freezers, and Refrigerator-Freezers". All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1048) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to strengthen disclosure requirements relating to foreign gifts and contracts, to prohibit contracts between institutions of higher education and certain foreign entities and countries of concern, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Workforce or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Workforce now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 119-1 shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and con-

trolled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, last night the Rules Committee met and produced a rule, House Resolution 242, providing for the House's consideration of several pieces of legislation: H.R. 1048, H.J. Res. 24, and H.J. Res. 75.

The rule provides for consideration of H.J. Res. 24 and H.J. Res. 75 under closed rules. The rule provides each with 1 hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, or their designees. Additionally, the rule provides each a motion to recommit.

Additionally, the rule provides for consideration of H.R. 1048 under a structured rule. The rule provides for 1 hour of debate equally divide and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Education and Workforce or their designees. The rule also provides for one motion to recommit.

The rule before us today provides Congress with another opportunity to take a stand for consumer choice in America and take a stand against our Nation's foreign adversaries who continue to infiltrate colleges and universities across the Nation.

The DETERRENT Act, one of the bills considered under this rule, offers a necessary injection of transparency, accountability, and clarity to foreign gift reporting requirements for colleges and universities. It offers legislative prescriptions that are long overdue.

Under current law, section 117 of the Higher Education Act, colleges and universities must adhere to reporting requirements related to foreign donations. However, many fail to do so because of how weak the current law actually is.

A 2019 Senate report found that up to 70 percent of colleges and universities fail to comply with reporting requirements outlined in section 117 of the Higher Education Act. You heard that right. Up to 70 percent of colleges and universities fail to comply.

The DETERRENT Act updates section 117 to provide the very clarity and guidance that colleges and universities need to ensure they properly disclose foreign sources of funding and remain in compliance. It also adds a set of razor-sharp teeth to current law to hold colleges and universities accountable for failing to comply with section 117. Again, the DETERRENT Act offers legislative prescriptions that are long overdue.

The other two pieces of legislation under consideration via today's rule are two separate Congressional Review Act resolutions: H.J. Res. 24 and H.J. Res. 75. These two CRAs will strike down separate rules from the Department of Energy that were finalized under the Biden administration.

H.J. Res. 24 overturns a wrongheaded midnight rule from the Department of Energy relating to conservation standards for walk-in coolers and walk-in freezers. The Department of Energy issued this final rule a mere 2 days before Christmas last year. This is yet another gift from the Biden administration that nobody asked for.

This midnight rule piles on additional costs to the shoulders of Main Street businesses, while at the very same time takes a hatchet to consumer choice.

□ 1230

H.J. Res. 75 will overturn yet another wrongheaded rule from the Department of Energy related to conservation standards for commercial refrigerators, freezers, and refrigerator-freezers.

Like the previous rule from the Department of Energy that was just discussed, this rule is yet another example of the regulatory barrage that the Biden administration launched against Main Street as well as consumers. Thankfully, the regulatory warfare of the past 4 years is over. Republicans are back in charge.

Mr. Speaker, regulating this country into the ground benefits absolutely no one. It does not benefit Americans and their families. It does not benefit free enterprise and entrepreneurs. It does not benefit small businesses. Nobody wins when the Federal Government goes hog wild with regulations.

These two CRAs that the House will consider under this rule will help us break out the shovels and bury the Department of Energy's rules in the grave. They won't be missed.

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

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina, Chairwoman FOXX, for the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today yet again to expose to the American public the mis-

placed priorities of the House Republican Conference and the Republican majority here in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican majority gaveled us out of session 11 days ago. Here we are back in Washington, D.C. Of course, for us, it feels a lot like "Groundhog Day" because, notwithstanding all the economic turmoil, the conflicts across the globe, the various ways in which this administration is making life harder for the people of Colorado, for folks across our country, notwithstanding all the challenges that our country is grappling with, House Republicans have decided to spend this week debating what? Three bills: walk-in freezers, commercial refrigerators, and giving new responsibilities to a Department, the Department of Education, that they are seeking to dismantle, that they want to abolish. That is what we are debating here today, Mr. Speaker.

I listened to every word of the chairwoman's address outlining every component of the bills that we are considering, but for folks who are watching, for those who have graced us with their presence in the gallery, please understand the three bills: one regulating commercial refrigerators; another regulating walk-in refrigerators; and the third, a bill to give new responsibilities to an agency that they are seeking to destroy. That is it. That is what we are debating this week in Washington, D.C.

If folks in the gallery stay here through the week, that is what you will hear. You will hear a debate today, a debate tomorrow, and a debate on Thursday on those three bills.

I suspect that the folks who are watching this debate, Mr. Speaker, would agree with me that there are better things for us to spend our time on here in Washington, D.C., than debating walk-in refrigerators. Seriously? I don't know, maybe for Madam Chairwoman it is really important to the people of North Carolina. She may have a lot of constituents who have walk-in refrigerators. I don't know.

For me, I can tell you I just spent a week in Colorado, in the rural communities that I represent, hosting townhalls, visiting with folks in my community, constituents, ranchers, farmers, teachers, working families, packed townhalls. At those townhalls, do you know the one subject that no one brought up? Commercial refrigerators. It never came up.

At a townhall that we held 3 days ago with over a thousand people in my community, no one at that townhall approached me and said: "Congressman, can you please go back to Washington and pass legislation on commercial refrigerators? It is really important." Nobody said that.

They are really concerned about the Republicans' plan to gut Medicaid. They are pretty concerned about the Republican plans to dismantle Social Security offices across the country. They are deeply concerned about re-

ports that this administration is going to end phone line customer service for senior citizens who are relying on Social Security. They are pretty concerned about a Secretary of Defense who apparently is sending out war plans on unencrypted messaging apps, putting our national security at risk.

Those are the topics that my constituents care about. Commercial refrigerators is not one of them.

You can tell the frustration, I suppose, Mr. Speaker, in my voice. It is the frustration borne from having to come to the floor every week and debate appliances. Can the Republicans just put all the appliance bills in for consideration for 1 week? We can just do them all and then be done with it, and we can move on to having a debate about defending Medicaid, defending healthcare for the millions of Americans who rely on it. Is that too much to ask?

I just would beg of the chairwoman, I understand this is an important priority to her. It is important to the Republican Conference. We get it. They are obsessed with appliance regulation. After this week, can we please just be done with these appliance resolutions and get back to debating the issues that the American people expect us to debate?

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds Members that the rules do not allow references to persons in the gallery.

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

Mr. Speaker, I spent time last week in my district, too, talking to people. I spend time every weekend talking to the people in my district. Do you know what they complain about the most? Unnecessary rules and regulations.

I met today with folks from the homebuilding industry. They can document that 25 percent of the rules related to homebuilding are unnecessary and drive up the costs of doing business for homes. We need new homes everywhere.

My colleagues are trying to make it look like what we are doing is frivolous. Mr. Speaker, this is far from frivolous. We in Congress are taking back our authority from unnamed, unaccountable bureaucrats who, in the dark of night, write unnecessary rules and regulations that burden the American people and drive up the cost of business and drive up the cost of products.

It is important for us to have further discussion on this critical Congressional Review Act that we are operating under. The Congressional Review Act agenda as a whole is important. My Democratic colleagues are falling into a repeated trap of copying and pasting comments these days. It is true of remarks for rule debate, as well. Every week, they come before this body to complain that we are undoing this or that regulation and that our collective time could be better spent

elsewhere. Well, Republicans beg to differ.

The Congressional Review Act provides the American people the greatest possible say over the endless tide of regulations that always stem from Democratic administrations, and it is one of the greatest keepers of Congress' Article I authority. It is also upsetting in many ways that the Democrats complain we are doing these individual rules when they opposed the Midnight Rules Relief Act, where we could have taken care of these all in one fell swoop.

Let's not forget it was a Democrat, President Clinton, who signed the Congressional Review Act into law on a bipartisan basis, but our colleagues have obviously fallen far from those past overtures of consensus and common sense.

Republicans and President Trump are constantly emphasizing common sense, which is not very common from the other side of the aisle. Many Members of Congress provide lipservice to excessive rules and regulations, but the Congressional Review Act provides Congress the ability to put our money where our mouth is.

The Competitive Enterprise Institute has tabulated that Federal regulations impose a cost of \$1.9 trillion on the economy. This averages out to more than \$14,000 imposed on every American household, a hidden regulatory tax that is eating up American paychecks.

The amount of rules far exceeds statutes by Congress. In 2022 alone, there were more than 3,100 rules issued by agencies compared to 247 laws passed by Congress. Yet, despite these figures, my Democratic colleagues can't seem to muster the courage to find one regulation that they believe is worthy of repeal.

The fact is that we have a very limited window under the Congressional Review Act to expunge these harmful rules, again, written by unnamed, unaccountable bureaucrats. These rules continue to drive up costs for American families and take away consumer choices.

I am so glad that we are taking up these CRA resolutions, ones that would protect consumer choice and competitive prices for freezers, refrigerators, and walk-in coolers.

To my colleagues on the other side, these may seem like small issues to you, but driving up the cost of appliances is a regressive approach that will hurt low- and middle-income Americans the most. Regulating every possible square inch of the economy in the name of your zealous green radicalism may give the coastal elites a sense of accomplishment, but it is doing real harm to Americans.

When the Congressional Review Act window is completed, we are going to be tabulating the cost of these regulations, as well as the votes to repeal them. It may seem like a little bit of cost here and there, but wait until you

see the cumulative price. I hope my colleagues can heed the warning, but if the past is prologue, I won't be holding my breath.

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

□ 1245

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

Mr. Speaker, just to be clear, I am not trying to make their legislation on commercial freezers look frivolous. It is frivolous. The American people understand that. They get it. Maybe there are a lot of people in the chairwoman's district buying commercial freezers. Again, Mr. Speaker, I can assure you it is not the top priority of the people whom I represent in northern Colorado and in western Colorado. It is far from it.

Now, I must say, I did hear with interest the chairwoman reference visiting with her constituents. I would simply say that my understanding was that the chairwoman doesn't do townhalls. I think she recently said in an interview that she doesn't do townhalls because they are an opportunity for constituents to yell at their Congressperson. So I find it of great interest.

I would just encourage the chairwoman and every member of the Republican caucus to do a townhall. They are nothing to be afraid of. It is a great opportunity to visit with our constituents. Perhaps if the gentlewoman would do that, she would come away with the same conclusion that I did, which is that the legislation we are considering today is a waste of time and grossly disproportionate to the priorities of the American people. It is simple.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), who is the ranking member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, today House Republicans are wasting time talking about walk-in freezers and refrigerators. That is what Republicans think is urgent, commercial freezers and refrigerators.

Do you know what I think that is?

I think that is insane. I think it is unhinged. It is not what I am hearing at my townhalls. I have done six townhalls, and thousands of people have shown up. Maybe if Republicans actually held townhalls and listened to people, they would know what the hell is going on right now. People are not worried about commercial walk-in freezers or refrigerators, Mr. Speaker. They are pissed at Elon and his unelected, unappointed bureaucrats for blowing up the Department of Education. That is what they are worried about.

They are demanding resignations because Trump's national security team recklessly mishandled classified information on unsecured phones. They might as well have mailed a copy to the Kremlin, for God's sake.

People are mad as hell that you guys are going to try to kill Social Security.

Mr. Speaker, you can say whatever you want, but that is what Republicans want to do. They want to kill Social Security. That is a fact.

They want to raid Social Security like a piggy bank so Elon can steal people's money and give more tax breaks to billionaires.

I was at a retirement community in my district on Friday, and seniors are scared out of their minds. They are not stupid. They know what is happening. It is crystal clear. They see through all the BS, and they know Elon and Trump are trying to sabotage Social Security so they can start kicking people off.

The Social Security website crashed four times this month. Millions of Americans couldn't log into their accounts. Elon fired so many people that there is nobody to answer the phones at some Social Security offices. The lines keep ringing and ringing and ringing.

We don't even know how long wait times are because, get this, they eliminated the program to track customer satisfaction. Elon is still lying saying that millions and millions of dead people are collecting Social Security checks and calling Social Security a Ponzi scheme.

Mr. Speaker, that is a lie. It is not true, and he knows it is not true. We heard Donald Trump parrot that same propaganda in this Chamber because president Elon told him to and because they want an excuse to cut seniors off of Social Security. These guys are rich and out-of-touch billionaires who just don't get it. They are having champagne and caviar at Mar-a-Lago while senior citizens wait for hours on the phone to talk to somebody.

Trump's Commerce Secretary said that if Social Security didn't send out checks for a month, his 94-year-old mother-in-law would not complain. That is good for her, but he is a billionaire, for God's sake. It must be nice to have one in the family.

Guess what, Mr. Speaker. Most people are not so lucky.

When I talk to seniors, they tell me that one missed Social Security check means going hungry. It means falling behind on rent. It means skipping medications.

People out there can't afford groceries, but Trump's team is telling them to go buy Tesla stock. That is their retirement plan. These people are nuts, Mr. Speaker.

The bottom line is that for Republicans, Social Security is just another thing they can cut to pay for billionaire tax breaks.

Guess what, Elon. We are not letting you get your greedy, grubby, billionaire hands anywhere near Social Security. It is not a handout. It is not a giveaway. It is a benefit that 70 million Americans paid into for their entire lives expecting that it would be there when they needed it. It is a promise, and we are going to fight like hell to

keep that promise for the people who built this country.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I have said it before. They are cutting and pasting and saying the same things over and over again. Fear-mongering is beneath the dignity of this body. That is not what we are here to do.

We have told our colleagues over and over, and they know this, but they refuse to acknowledge it. Nothing we have done this session has touched the sanctity of Social Security, nothing. In fact, President Trump has over and over again said that he will not touch the sanctity of Social Security. I have said that, and our colleagues have said that. We have done nothing.

Putting out false information to the American people is really unfortunate because it does frighten people. However, we have the facts on our side, Mr. Speaker, and the facts are that no bills we passed, the budget bill nor the Trump administration continuing resolution, hurt in any way Social Security, Medicaid, Medicare, or any other program that the Federal Government has a contract with the American people on. It is time for our colleagues to stop saying that.

In fact, Republicans sued over ads that were being run in certain districts last week, and the Democrats had to pull those ads because the court ruled that they were not factual. They were the same kinds of things that are being said on this floor day after day.

Nonetheless, let's get back to the bill at hand: the rule that we are discussing and the underlying bill of that rule.

We have talked in the abstract, but I would like to drill down on the actual problems this bill would address and the specific failures of disclosure that this bill addresses.

A 2019 Senate report found that up to 70 percent of all institutions, these are postsecondary institutions, failed to comply with section 117 and those that do not comply often underreport.

Investigations by the Trump administration discovered that there was \$6.5 billion in previously undisclosed gifts and contributions provided to so-called elite colleges, and this money came from countries that pose serious national security threats to our country.

In 2020, the Department estimated that schools had anonymously accepted \$8.4 billion in foreign money over the past decade.

Let's keep in mind that the Biden administration did not utilize section 117 authorities at all in its 4 years. You heard that correctly, Mr. Speaker. In 4 years, the Biden administration did not enforce section 117. Despite the Trump administration's uncovering and investigating, the Biden administration didn't invoke section 117 at all, not once.

Let's turn to some more recent examples.

In April 2023, the former chair of Harvard University's chemistry and chemical biology department was sentenced to prison for lying about his affiliation with and income from the Wuhan University of Technology in Wuhan, China.

In July 2024, University of Maryland, College Park paid \$500,000 for failing to disclose foreign funding from the Chinese companies of three researchers who simultaneously received Federal grants.

In September 2024, the Research Foundation of the State University of New York paid \$313,574 after a scientist failed to disclose Chinese support.

In December 2024, the University of Delaware paid \$700,000 for not disclosing that a faculty member receiving a NASA grant taught at a Chinese university.

A 2024 joint investigation between the House Select Committee on the Chinese Communist Party and the House Committee on Education and Workforce found 21 joint U.S.-Chinese education institutes. A case study of two such institutes, UC Berkeley and Georgia Institute of Technology, revealed both a lack of proper disclosure under section 117 and research with clear military applications. Just those two schools alone totaled over \$40 million in unreported contracts with China.

Clearly, Congress needs to do more to bring these unreported contracts, gifts, and funding sources of all sorts into the public eye. Taxpayer dollars are going to these universities. The public is owed the facts about where the rest of these funds are coming from.

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

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. NEGUSE. First, I just want to note, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps it is a point of information for your purposes, you admonished the prior speaker, the ranking member, for not making personalities, or rather making personalities against the President. My understanding is the only person he referenced throughout the duration of his speech was Elon Musk. So I am not sure if that was an accident on your part or if that is intentional, and perhaps the Speaker can clarify because I don't believe he referenced President Trump, but apparently you mistook his references to Elon Musk as a reference to the President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is not going to issue an advisory opinion.

Mr. NEGUSE. I would just say, Mr. Speaker, that would be an important thing to clarify in the House moving forward that references to Elon Musk will be treated as references to the President of the United States, which is apparently what the Speaker is doing, that if someone references Elon Musk, that the Chair, that the Speaker

will treat it as though we are referencing the President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not correct on that point.

Mr. NEGUSE. It is perhaps a point of clarification for a future time. I will say this, before yielding some time to the distinguished gentlewoman from New Mexico, the chairwoman made reference to supposed fear-mongering regarding Social Security. It isn't fear-mongering. It is on the front page of The Washington Post.

I will read you the quote: "Elon Musk put a big target on the Social Security Administration in the first weeks of the Trump administration."

So it is not fear-mongering to share on this floor the concerns that have been articulated by our constituents regarding the dismantling of the Social Security Administration that President Trump and his administration is engaged in. It happens to be the truth.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ), who is a member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, we are in a constitutional crisis. President Trump and his co-president Musk apparently are blatantly rejecting the role of the courts while Republicans in Congress are too scared to stand up for their constituents or the Constitution.

When we talk about Social Security, the idea I kept hearing from the other side is: We have done nothing to Social Security.

Yes, they have. Republicans have done nothing to stand up for their constituents who are worried about their Social Security check. They are appropriately worried about their Social Security check because Republicans have done nothing to complain about the executive cutting the workers at the Social Security Administration. Republicans have done nothing to complain about the closing of offices at Social Security or done nothing about the idea that a person can no longer call Social Security. Republicans have done nothing to reject Project 2025 cuts and proposals to cut Social Security.

Social Security is also important, Mr. Speaker, because we are in a cost-of-living crisis. Prices for groceries, food, and housing are rising thanks to Trump's policies and Trump's tariffs.

What are House Republicans doing in response to these crises? Bringing appliance bills, appliance bills which show how out of touch they are with their constituents. These appliance bills, by the way, have consequences. They raise costs. They raise costs so that American small businesses will pay for utilities so that big companies, those big utility companies, can continue racking up more profit.

Republicans seem to always stand with the greediest corporations and not the consumers.

For those few Republicans—not our colleague here—but those few Republicans who are willing to hold town-halls, they are hearing a lot of anger

about Medicaid and Social Security cuts, but not much about refrigerators, are they?

What do they say in Iowa?

In Iowa they said that Trump and Musk are “moving very rapidly toward a dictatorship and an oligarchy.”

This is in Iowa.

In Wyoming, farmers shared with their Representative that Trump’s cuts will limit the resources they need to deal with the devastating impacts of drought.

H.R. 1048 under this rule continues Trump’s and Republicans’ attacks on higher education and the lifesaving and innovative research conducted at our universities. I don’t know why they hate our universities so much, because we already have a law that requires disclosures of foreign gifts. However, this Republican bill will have impossible burdens of reporting to a Department that they want to eliminate.

What are we doing here with a bill that goes to a Department they want to eliminate?

This bill shows how out of touch Republicans are, once again, to Americans’ concerns because a majority of Americans want to keep the Department of Education that funds programs for kids with disabilities, provides student loans, and makes sure poorer schools can hire enough teachers.

□ 1300

If Republicans were truly worried about national security, they would look at how this administration is destroying America’s leadership abroad, from having Signal chats about our national security to everything else they are doing.

I will end with this Mr. Speaker: While Republicans’ billionaire class might not need public schools for their kids, the kids in my district do.

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

Mr. Speaker, give me a break. We are to believe that something printed on the front page of The Washington Post is always true? Mr. Speaker, only 31 percent of the American people have any faith in the print media in this country, and they are very, very wise in that assessment. That is almost as low as the 27 percent of Americans who have faith in the Democratic Party right now.

I would like to clarify something else that was said. It was said that Republicans hate universities or there is a question as to why we hate universities. Mr. Speaker, we don’t hate universities. We just want the universities to be honest, and we want them to be transparent. That is one of the bills we are discussing here today that this rule covers. It is very important that we have transparency throughout our government, and that is what Republicans want.

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

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

I understand the chairwoman apparently now is saying she won’t believe The Washington Post articles. I wonder if she will believe the sentiments of her own colleagues? I believe it was Mr. LAWLER from New York who a week ago was bemoaning online the closure of one of the Social Security offices in his own district.

What are we talking about? These offices are being closed in North Carolina, as well, I believe. This isn’t some fictional, imaginary hypothetical. The Social Security Administration is closing down offices. Wait times are getting longer.

I just would urge my colleague, whom I have great respect for, to visit with her own constituents, and I suspect that they would share the same frustrations that I am articulating here on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 433, the Department of Education Protection Act, which would shield the U.S. Department of Education from efforts to dismantle the agency and ensure that every student receives the education they deserve.

As my colleague Representative LEGER FERNANDEZ already articulated, it makes no sense that Republicans have pushed forward a bill today to give more responsibilities to an agency that they are trying actively to dismantle.

Nonetheless, there is a way forward to save teachers and students and rural schools across the country, including back in Colorado, and that is by ensuring that the Department of Education Protection Act receives a vote here on the House floor.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. HAYES) to discuss this bill. Mrs. HAYES is the author and the sponsor of this legislation, a former public schoolteacher, and a National Teacher of the Year. She is someone who has spent her life serving the students, the young folks, and the working families of the people of Connecticut.

Mrs. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, last week, the President of the United States signed an executive order to dismantle the Department of Education.

Instead of reaffirming the integrity of the Department of Education or pursuing real plans to explain to parents how services will continue, House Republicans are again fixated on appliances. Today, we are debating eliminating two cost-saving energy regulations and legislation that could hinder

research at institutions of higher education.

It is important to understand what calls for the closure of the Department of Education would mean to local communities.

The Department of Education is responsible for protecting the civil rights of students, exactly what this DETERMENT Act would do. The Department of Education would handle the enforcement. The Department of Education supports students from low-income backgrounds. They develop and prepare educators. They provide resources for English language learners. They collect statistics on enrollment, staffing, and crime in schools and manage the \$1.6 trillion Federal student aid program.

Parents are concerned about disruptions to programs and services that ensure that the 7.5 million children with disabilities and the 49 million students enrolled in K–12 public education will still get the education they deserve.

My legislation, the Department of Education Protection Act, would shield the Department from efforts to dismantle the agency and ensure that every student receives the free and appropriate public education that is mandated by law.

My legislation would prohibit the use of appropriated funds to decentralize, reduce staffing levels, or alter the responsibilities, structure, authority, or functionality of the Department.

The Trump administration has not developed or articulated a clear plan to how these programs would continue their functions without disruption. They keep saying they will return it back to the States. What has been taken from the States, and what are the next steps moving forward?

We need the Department of Education to enforce Federal law and protect the civil rights of students across the country.

I thank the nearly 100 Members of Congress who have already cosponsored my legislation, and I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the previous question so we can bring up my bill, the Department of Education Protection Act.

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman and the gentlewoman seem to believe that the new personnel structure at the Department of Education couldn’t possibly implement this bill, yet our colleagues failed to mention the fact that section 117 investigations weren’t invoked a single time under the Biden administration. What were the people at the section 117 desk doing under President Biden’s watch? They were collecting a check, apparently, or perhaps they were asleep at the switch, which is very fitting for the Biden era.

Mr. Speaker, President Trump has made it clear that the Department of Education will implement the laws that we pass here in Congress until such time as the full transition is made with the Department.

The number of personnel at the Department doesn't really matter if you don't have the political will to carry out the authorities. I know that the people in the Department of Education will carry out these authorities until such time as the Department does not exist, and at that time, whatever laws exist will be implemented by appropriate agencies and departments.

Whatever we do is going to be better than what was done under the Biden administration when this law was never enforced and should have been.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, some of this can get lost in translation, so I will try make this very simple. The gentlewoman, who I respect, wants to abolish the Department of Education. She is unabashed about that. She has voted to close the Department of Education. She supports the President's efforts to dismantle the Department of Education. I presume she supports the President's efforts to reduce the workforce by half. Mr. Speaker, 50 percent of the personnel in the Department of Education are now gone on administrative leave.

Yet, here we are today, debating her bill to create new responsibilities, new requirements, new duties on the very department she seeks to destroy.

What are we doing here?

If they don't want the Department of Education—again, that is their view; they don't want a Federal Department of Education; they are not hiding that—why are we debating a bill to give the Department of Education more power? It is insanity, insanity.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. STANSBURY).

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Speaker, I think "insanity" is a good word for what is happening here on the House floor today. Another good word is "bizarre."

When I go home and I tell my constituents what happens in these Halls, they are amazed. Today is one of those days where I am wondering what the hell are these folks doing. While our economy is in crisis, while groceries and housing are at an all-time high, while our veterans and our firefighters and our teachers are being illegally fired, while Elon Musk is dismantling the U.S. Department of Education, and while the Secretary of Defense is trying to cover up the most incompetent national security leak I have ever heard of in my life, the Republicans in the House are trying to save the American people from the scourge of walk-in cooler and refrigeration efficiency standards.

That is right. We are here wasting precious debate time on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives debating dismantling efficiency standards for walk-in refrigerators. How out of touch are Republicans with the American

people? Like literally, I know Republicans are not holding townhalls and meeting with their constituents anymore, but do they think that the American people voted for them to waste our time on refrigeration standards? That is what they think they were elected to do?

Literally, how out of touch are Republicans? No American voted, no American—I don't care where you are on the ideological spectrum, you did not vote for this. This is ridiculous. It is preposterous and it is just stupid.

Yesterday, it was reported that the Secretary of Defense, the National Security Advisor, and the Vice President leaked war plans to a journalist. This is the same administration that accidentally fired nuclear scientists and engineers who maintain our nuclear stockpile. This is the same administration that is illegally firing Federal employees and dismantling Federal agencies, and they are here running a resolution on refrigerators.

Meanwhile, tomorrow, Republicans are going to hold a hearing and haul NPR and PBS in front of Congress to try to undermine the media just like they did here on this floor just a few moments ago as they are kicking the media out of the Pentagon and the White House because they don't believe in the media anymore.

Well, maybe this is exactly what the end conclusion of dismantling education and American democracy is because this is ridiculous. I will vote "no."

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

Mr. Speaker, I would characterize what we are doing here today as the people's business. We are the people's House. We are here to look after the American people in the best way that we can. We are fulfilling our constitutional duties. Unnamed, unaccountable bureaucrats pass rules and regulations in this city every day that they should not be passing.

Congress gave us the ability to stop them, and my colleagues are complaining that we are wasting time, that it is slow and inefficient to implement the Congressional Review Act. It is slow and inefficient, but we passed a bill called the Midnight Rules Relief Act primarily with Republican votes that would have allowed Congress to dispense with multiple rules and regulations under one bill. That bill is currently in the Senate, and if that would pass and be signed by the President, we could all save time and be much more efficient. We are doing the people's work today.

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

□ 1315

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

Mr. Speaker, I simply echo the sentiments that have been expressed by so many of my colleagues that the policies that Republicans are pursuing here

on the House floor are not the priorities of the American people. I think we all would be far better served if we debated the actual issues of the day, such as the challenges that Representative STANSBURY and so many others described so eloquently.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of discussion about townhalls. I don't quite understand, and perhaps the gentlewoman would be willing to expound upon her opposition and the opposition of so many of my colleagues in the Republican Conference to doing townhalls.

I have held 100 townhalls over the course of the time that I have had the privilege of representing Colorado in the United States Congress. We have held them everywhere in my district. I represent communities and counties that voted for Donald Trump, and I have held townhalls and will continue to hold townhalls in those communities because my obligation is to represent every person in western Colorado and in northern Colorado in the district that I serve.

My job is to be accessible to my constituents regardless of their political beliefs. I understand that Republicans are scared right now to host townhalls because my colleagues on the other side of the aisle know that the policies that the majority is pursuing in Washington are deeply unpopular.

If I spent my week in Washington pushing bills on commercial freezers, I would probably be a little nervous to do a townhall back in my district, too. I get it. I understand where Republicans are coming from. However, maybe the way forward is to spend our time in Washington working on matters of substance. If we do that, I can promise Republicans that their townhalls will go just fine. They will go just fine.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. GOLDMAN).

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE) for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my disappointment that my common-sense amendment to the DETERRENT Act was rejected yesterday in the Rules Committee by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

My amendment would have distinguished between benign donations from friendly democratic countries and donations from potential adversarial, undemocratic states.

My amendment would enact strict oversight on funding from regimes seeking to manipulate students on university campuses and to spread hate, particularly anti-Semitism, on those campuses for their own agendas.

My amendment would have significantly expanded the list of countries whose donations the universities would be required to disclose, including a number of countries not included in the DETERRENT Act that have given

billions and billions of dollars to universities in recent years.

More importantly, my amendment would also require that universities disclose the detailed terms and conditions that they agreed to in return for the foreign donation from this expanded list of countries, critically revealing whether those foreign donations come with strings attached that can foment antidemocratic influences on campuses.

Instead, this bill hampers universities' abilities to engage in important educational programming in conjunction with our democratic allies while failing to confront the real problem of antidemocratic and anti-Semitic foreign influence.

Mr. Speaker, it is a shame that we could not work in a bipartisan way to make this bill better and to address the root issue that both sides of the aisle are trying to address, which is the potential nefarious foreign influence on college campuses from a list of countries far greater than the four countries of concern outlined in the *DETERRENT* Act.

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

Mr. Speaker, being lectured to about how we feel about anti-Semitism on our side of the aisle is not something that I am used to hearing. It is the Republicans who have led the fight against anti-Semitism on our college campuses.

Mr. Speaker, we did make Democratic amendments in order in this rule. If my colleague had submitted his amendment in a more timely fashion and not just a few minutes before the Rules Committee met yesterday, we would have certainly had a chance to consider it. The deadline for submitting amendments was last Thursday, and that gives us an opportunity to review the amendments to see what can be put in.

Mr. Speaker, I urge our colleagues to follow the rules for deadlines because that is very important for all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I am not really amenable to hearing people criticize us about our response to anti-Semitism when I fight it every day of my life. I am wearing my necklace that I wear every day, which says: "Bring Them Home." I am wearing my yellow ribbon. Being told that I am not sympathetic to fighting anti-Semitism is not something that I take lightly.

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

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I don't know if the gentleman from New York (Mr. GOLDMAN) is still here, but I will relay the substance of the chairwoman's remarks regarding his amendment and the timing of his amendment submission.

Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close. I have only a few minutes of debate left. As the chairwoman said, this is the people's House, a House that I have great reverence for.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might, via the Speaker, make a request to the

chairwoman to engage in a brief colloquy. Perhaps that could provide the viewing public a sense of real debate, as opposed to us just giving speeches.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, we are nearly at the end of this, and I don't believe that we need to have a colloquy. We each have an opportunity for closing comments.

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

Mr. Speaker, with much respect to the gentlewoman, I think that is a shame because I think the American people ought to be able to hear a fair and full exchange of views in an active debate. I think that is far more present when we actually have a colloquy as opposed to just making speeches.

I simply say that the question I was going to pose to the chairwoman is that she has made clear that these three bills, the bill to give more power to the Department of Education that she seeks to dismantle and bills on the regulation standards for refrigerant walk-in freezers and commercial refrigerators, that those bills are very important to the House Republican Conference, that they are a top priority. Interestingly enough, not a single Republican Member of Congress in the last hour that we have had allocated for debate has indulged us with their presence today to come to the floor and extol the virtues of the legislation that Republicans have pursued on commercial refrigerators. I wonder why. It is probably not an accident.

Mr. Speaker, I can't imagine that there are a lot of Republican Members of Congress who wanted to sign up to come do floor debate today on commercial refrigerators. In light of the biggest mishap on a national security front in decades and in light of all of the challenges that our country is facing, debating refrigerators apparently was not something that many of my chairwoman's colleagues wanted to do.

Nonetheless, I am grateful that we have had an opportunity to share with the American public and give them full transparency into how the Republicans have decided to spend their time and their majority here in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure we will proceed with a few more days of debate. I am sure Republicans will pass their bills on commercial freezers and walk-in refrigerators, and then we will be back next week. One can only hope that Republicans will have seen the light by then and that we won't be up for appliance week number 4, 5, 6, or whatever it is now.

Mr. Speaker, if my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would like to actually debate substantive issues, there is an easy way to do it: opposing the previous question and opposing the rule and the underlying bills so that the House can get back to doing the people's work.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, House Republicans are laser focused on governing and advancing legislation that addresses pertinent issues across the Nation. It is unfortunate that our colleagues do not agree that protecting Americans from unnecessary rules and regulations is not something that is important to them.

It is very important to us, and we are following regular order here. The Rules Committee is represented by me, the chair, on this important rule today. That is significant.

The three pieces of legislation that will be considered under the rule that will be debated tomorrow are part of our governing efforts and are in alignment with the mandate that Americans gave us last November.

Shielding consumer choice and combating foreign influence within higher education are issues that Americans care about. We have heard their concerns, and we are addressing them yet again this week.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the previous question, "yes" on the rule, and then, later, "yes" on the bills that will be presented as a result of this rule.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 242 OFFERED BY
MR. NEGUSE OF COLORADO

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 4. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 433) to prohibit funds made available to the Department of Education by previous Appropriations Acts from being used for any activity relating to implementing a reorganization of the Department, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Workforce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 433.

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

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

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

Mr. NEGUSE. 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.

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:

The motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 1534;

Ordering the previous question on H. Res. 242; and

Adoption of H. Res. 242, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

INNOVATIVE MITIGATION PARTNERSHIPS FOR ASPHALT AND CONCRETE TECHNOLOGIES ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1534) to strengthen and enhance the competitiveness of American industry through the research and development of advanced technologies to improve the efficiency of cement, concrete, and asphalt production, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 350, nays 73, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 74]

YEAS—350

Adams	Castor (FL)	Espallat
Aderholt	Castro (TX)	Evans (CO)
Aguilar	Cherfilus-	Evans (PA)
Alford	McCormick	Feenstra
Allen	Chu	Fields
Amo	Ciscomani	Figures
Amodei (NV)	Cisneros	Fitzgerald
Ansari	Clark (MA)	Fitzpatrick
Arrington	Clarke (NY)	Fleischmann
Auchincloss	Cleaver	Fletcher
Babin	Clyburn	Flood
Bacon	Cohen	Foster
Baird	Cole	Foushee
Balderson	Comer	Frankel, Lois
Balint	Conaway	Franklin, Scott
Barr	Connolly	Friedman
Barragán	Correa	Frost
Barrett	Costa	Garamendi
Baumgartner	Courtney	Garbarino
Beatty	Craig	Garcia (CA)
Bell	Crank	Garcia (IL)
Bentz	Crawford	Garcia (TX)
Bera	Crenshaw	Gillen
Bergman	Crockett	Gimenez
Beyer	Crow	Golden (ME)
Bice	Cuellar	Goldman (NY)
Bilirakis	Dauids (KS)	Gomez
Bishop	Davidson	Gonzales, Tony
Bonamici	Davis (IL)	Gonzalez, V.
Bost	Davis (NC)	Goodlander
Boyle (PA)	De La Cruz	Graves
Bresnahan	Dean (PA)	Gray
Brown	DeGette	Green (TN)
Brownley	DeLauro	Green, Al (TX)
Buchanan	DelBene	Grothman
Budzinski	Deluzio	Guthrie
Bynum	DeSaulnier	Hamadeh (AZ)
Calvert	Dexter	Harder (CA)
Carbajal	Diaz-Balart	Hayes
Carey	Dingell	Hern (OK)
Carson	Doggett	Hill (AR)
Carter (GA)	Dunn (FL)	Himes
Carter (LA)	Edwards	Hinson
Carter (TX)	Elfreth	Horsford
Casar	Ellzey	Houchin
Case	Emmer	Houlihan
Casten	Escobar	Hoyer

Hoyle (OR)	McGarvey	Schweikert
Hudson	McGovern	Scott (VA)
Huffman	McIver	Scott, Austin
Huizenga	Meeks	Scott, David
Hurd (CO)	Menendez	Sessions
Issa	Meng	Sewell
Ivey	Messmer	Sherman
Jackson (IL)	Meuser	Sherrill
Jackson (TX)	Mfume	Shreve
Jacobs	Miller (OH)	Simon
James	Miller (WV)	Simpson
Jayapal	Miller-Meeks	Smith (MO)
Jeffries	Min	Smith (NE)
Johnson (GA)	Moolenaar	Smith (NJ)
Johnson (LA)	Moore (NC)	Smith (WA)
Johnson (SD)	Moore (UT)	Smucker
Johnson (TX)	Moore (WI)	Sorensen
Jordan	Moran	Soto
Joyce (OH)	Morelle	Stansbury
Joyce (PA)	Morrison	Stanton
Kamlager-Dove	Moskowitz	Stefanik
Kaptur	Moulton	Stevens
Kean	Mrvan	Strickland
Keating	Mullin	Strong
Kelly (IL)	Murphy	Stutzman
Kelly (MS)	Nadler	Subramanyam
Kelly (PA)	Neal	Suozi
Kennedy (NY)	Neguse	Swalwell
Khanna	Newhouse	Sykes
Kiggans (VA)	Norcross	Takano
Kiley (CA)	Nunn (IA)	Taylor
Kim	Obermole	Tenney
Krishnamoorthi	Ocasio-Cortez	Thanedar
Kustoff	Olsewski	Thompson (CA)
LaHood	Omar	Thompson (MS)
LaLota	Onder	Thompson (PA)
LaMalfa	Pallone	Titus
Landsman	Panetta	Tlaib
Langworthy	Pappas	Tokuda
Larsen (WA)	Pelosi	Tonko
Larson (CT)	Perez	Torres (CA)
Latimer	Peters	Torres (NY)
Latta	Pfluger	Trahan
Lawler	Pingree	Tran
Lee (FL)	Pocan	Turner (OH)
Lee (NV)	Pou	Underwood
Lee (PA)	Pressley	Valadao
Leger Fernandez	Quigley	Van Drew
Levin	Ramirez	Van Orden
Liccardo	Randall	Vargas
Lieu	Raskin	Veasey
Lofgren	Rescenhthaler	Velázquez
Loudermilk	Riley (NY)	Vindman
Lucas	Rivas	Wagner
Luna	Rogers (AL)	Walberg
Lynch	Rogers (KY)	Wasserman
Mace	Ross	Schultz
Mackenzie	Rouzer	Waters
Magaziner	Ruiz	Watson Coleman
Malliotakis	Rulli	Weber (TX)
Mann	Rutherford	Weber (FL)
Mannion	Ryan	Westernman
Mast	Salazar	Whitesides
Matsui	Salinas	Wied
McBath	Sánchez	Williams (GA)
McBride	Scalise	Williams (TX)
McClain	Scanlon	Wilson (FL)
McClellan	Schakowsky	Womack
McCollum	Schmidt	Yakym
McDonald Rivet	Scholten	
McDowell	Schrier	

NAYS—73

Bean (FL)	Fulcher	Miller (IL)
Begich	Gill (TX)	Mills
Biggs (AZ)	Goldman (TX)	Moore (AL)
Biggs (SC)	Gooden	Moore (WV)
Boebert	Gosar	Nehls
Brecheen	Greene (GA)	Norman
Burchett	Griffith	Ogles
Burlison	Guest	Owens
Cammack	Hageman	Palmer
Cline	Haridopolos	Perry
Cloud	Harrigan	Rose
Clyde	Harris (MD)	Roy
Collins	Harris (NC)	Self
Crane	Harshbarger	Spartz
DesJarlais	Higgins (LA)	Staubert
Donalds	Jack	Steil
Downing	Kennedy (UT)	Steube
Estes	Knott	Tiffany
Ezell	Letlow	Timmons
Fallon	Luttrell	Van Dyne
Fedorchak	Maloy	Wilson (SC)
Finstad	Massie	Wittman
Fischbach	McClintock	Zinke
Foxx	McCormick	
Fry	McGuire	

NOT VOTING—8

Fong	McCaul	Schneider
Gottheimer	McClain Delaney	Vasquez
Hunt	Pettersen	

□ 1354

Messrs. HIGGINS of Louisiana, OWENS, DESJARLAIS, GOLDMAN of Texas, TIMMONS, FRY, GOODEN, HARIDOPOLOS, LUTTRELL, FALLON, GUEST, STEIL, COLLINS, BEGICH, MCCORMICK, Mses. LETLOW, VAN DUYNE, Messrs. WITTMAN and EZELL changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. LARSEN of Washington, BALDERSON, Ms. MACE, Messrs. FIELDS, PANETTA, Ms. PINGREE, LEGER FERNANDEZ, Messrs. ADERHOLT, SCHWEIKERT, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, WILSON of Florida, and Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 24, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY RELATING TO “ENERGY CONSERVATION PROGRAM: ENERGY CONSERVATION STANDARDS FOR WALK-IN COOLERS AND WALK-IN FREEZERS”; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 75, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE OFFICE OF ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY RELATING TO “ENERGY CONSERVATION PROGRAM: ENERGY CONSERVATION STANDARDS FOR COMMERCIAL REFRIGERATORS, FREEZERS, AND REFRIGERATOR-FREEZERS”; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1048, DEFENDING EDUCATION TRANSPARENCY AND ENDING ROGUE REGIMES ENGAGING IN NEFARIOUS TRANSACTIONS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 242) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 24) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Energy relating to “Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Walk-In Coolers and Walk-In Freezers”; providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 75) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code,

of the rule submitted by the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy relating to "Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Commercial Refrigerators, Freezers, and Refrigerator-Freezers"; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1048) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to strengthen disclosure requirements relating to foreign gifts and contracts, to prohibit contracts between institutions of higher education and certain foreign entities and countries of concern, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 215, nays 208, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 75]

YEAS—215

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

NAYS—208

Adams
Aguilar
Amo
Ansari
Auchincloss
Balint
Barragan
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
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crockett
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Davis (NC)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Dexter
Dingell
Doggett
Elfreth
Escobar
Espaillat
Evans (PA)
Fields
Figures
Fletcher
Foster
Foushee
Frankel, Lois
Friedman
Frost
Garamendi
Garcia (CA)

Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gillen
Golden (ME)
Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Gonzalez, V.
Goodlander
Gray
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
McClellan
McCollum
McDonald Rivet
McGovern
McIver
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Escobar
Mfume
Min
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Morrison
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Nadler
Neal
Neguse

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

NOT VOTING—8

Fong
Gottheimer
Hunt
McCaul
McClain Delaney
Pettersen

□ 1403

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 214, noes 207, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 76]

AYES—214

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

NOES—207

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

Clark (MA)	Jacobs	Pocan
Clarke (NY)	Jayapal	Pou
Cleaver	Jeffries	Pressley
Clyburn	Johnson (GA)	Quigley
Cohen	Johnson (TX)	Ramirez
Conaway	Kamlager-Dove	Randall
Connolly	Kaptur	Raskin
Correa	Keating	Riley (NY)
Costa	Kelly (IL)	Rivas
Courtney	Kennedy (NY)	Ross
Craig	Khanna	Ruiz
Crockett	Krishnamoorthi	Ryan
Crow	Landsman	Salinas
Cuellar	Larsen (WA)	Sánchez
Davids (KS)	Larson (CT)	Scanlon
Davis (IL)	Latimer	Schakowsky
Davis (NC)	Lee (NV)	Scholten
Dean (PA)	Lee (PA)	Schrier
DeGette	Leger Fernandez	Scott (VA)
DeLauro	Levin	Scott, David
DelBene	Liccardo	Sewell
Deluzio	Lieu	Sherman
DeSaulnier	Lofgren	Sherrill
Dexter	Lynch	Simon
Dingell	Magaziner	Smith (WA)
Doggett	Mannion	Sorensen
Elfreth	Matsui	Soto
Escobar	McBath	Stansbury
Espallat	McBride	Stanton
Evans (PA)	McClellan	Stevens
Fields	McCollum	Strickland
Figures	McDonald Rivet	Subramanyam
Fletcher	McGarvey	Suozi
Foster	McGovern	Swaiwell
Foushee	McIver	Sykes
Frankel, Lois	Meeks	Takano
Friedman	Menendez	Thanedar
Frost	Meng	Thompson (CA)
Garamendi	Mfume	Thompson (MS)
Garcia (CA)	Min	Titus
Garcia (IL)	Moore (WI)	Tlaib
Garcia (TX)	Morelle	Tokuda
Gillen	Morrison	Tonko
Golden (ME)	Moskowitz	Torres (CA)
Goldman (NY)	Moulton	Torres (NY)
Gomez	Mrvan	Trahan
Gonzalez, V.	Mullin	Tran
Goodlander	Nadler	Underwood
Gray	Neguse	Vargas
Green, Al (TX)	Norcross	Veasey
Harder (CA)	Ocasio-Cortez	Velázquez
Hayes	Olsewski	Vindman
Himes	Omar	Wasserman
Horsford	Pallone	Schultz
Houlahan	Panetta	Waters
Hoyer	Pappas	Watson Coleman
Hoyle (OR)	Pelosi	Whitesides
Huffman	Perez	Williams (GA)
Ivey	Peters	Wilson (FL)
Jackson (IL)	Pingree	

NOT VOTING—10

Boebert	McCaul	Schneider
Fong	McClain Delaney	Vasquez
Gottheimer	Neal	
Hunt	Pettersen	

□ 1426

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Speaker, I missed the following votes, but had I been present, I would have voted: YEA on Roll Call No. 74, NAY on Roll Call No. 75, and NO on Roll Call No. 76.

□ 1430

DEFENDING EDUCATION TRANSPARENCY AND ENDING ROGUE REGIMES ENGAGING IN NEFARIOUS TRANSACTIONS ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their re-

marks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1048.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 242 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill, H.R. 1048.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HARRIGAN) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1430

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1048) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to strengthen disclosure requirements relating to foreign gifts and contracts, to prohibit contracts between institutions of higher education and certain foreign entities and countries of concern, and for other purposes, with Mr. HARRIGAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Workforce or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 1048.

Foreign nations, including our biggest adversaries like the Chinese Communist Party, contribute billions of dollars to American universities. The lack of transparency around foreign relationships should concern every American as we see stolen research, anti-Semitic propaganda, and academic censorship. None of these things belong inside our borders let alone on our college campuses.

By establishing footholds in American schools, bad actors gain access to valuable research and intellectual property that can be used to bolster their own military and undermine our Nation's best interests.

Under the Higher Education Act, schools are required to report foreign gifts and funding. Unfortunately, loose legislative language, the Biden-Harris administration's inaction, and colleges' refusal to adhere to the law have resulted in billions of foreign funds infiltrating our country undetected. Last year, a congressional investigation of two research universities uncovered

nearly \$40 million in unreported research contracts with the Chinese Communist Party. That is \$40 million in unreported funds at just two universities.

Of course, this is just the tip of the iceberg. Without transparency, we have no idea the true amount or impact of foreign funds at our institutions.

This is why we need the DETERRENT Act. It closes these loopholes and has more strict reporting requirements for foreign funding and contracts. It also will hold institutions accountable by imposing fines, such as the loss of student aid funding for schools that continually fail to comply.

This bipartisan bill is a commonsense solution to an irrefutable problem, which is why it passed last Congress with bipartisan support. We should be loud and clear: No American university should be helping the hidden agendas of the Chinese Communist Party or other nations continue to threaten U.S. national security.

I thank Mr. BAUMGARTNER for introducing this vital piece of legislation. I would also like to highlight that the DETERRENT Act includes bills from my committee colleagues Representative HARRIS, Representative OWENS, and Representative MESSMER.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support the DETERRENT Act. Doing so will help defend against our adversaries while also holding our institutions to a higher standard. Take foreign money first, ask questions later is not the way to go.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1048, the DETERRENT Act.

Let's acknowledge, first of all, the elephant in the room. Just this month, the Secretary of Education fired one-half of the Department's staff, and last week, President Trump signed an executive order aimed at dismantling the entire Department. This administration is actively working to eliminate an agency that has long been the cornerstone of ensuring that every child in America has access to a quality education.

Today, we are discussing a bill that would add even more responsibility to the very Department that they are trying to destroy. It is almost as if they are trying to dismantle the agency, but at the same time, they recognize how critical its role is and are piling on additional duties. This is not only nonsensical but also reckless. Republicans can't argue that the Department of Education is unnecessary and then hand it more work, expecting it to function without the staff, resources, or the leadership that it needs.

This Congress has a responsibility to address the many pressing issues that students face such as closing the achievement gaps, improving college

affordability, and ending gun violence in schools. Instead, we find ourselves considering bills that target vulnerable groups, and now this bill, which risks isolating America from global partnerships in research and education.

Instead of requiring institutions to report foreign gifts or contracts large enough to exert any influence, the bill before us would require institutions to report gifts of any value from people who are not U.S. citizens if they are from a list of countries of concern, a list that is difficult to find and will be very difficult to keep track of because it is subject to change.

The Department of Education has already lost one-half of its staff, and if this bill passes, it will have to process an exponentially larger number of reports than it has to process already.

Now, how can we place these new responsibilities on an agency that is being hollowed out, and how can we expect it to manage these complex issues when the institution is being dismantled?

H.R. 1048 will also impose burdensome and unnecessary penalties on institutions for working with international scholars and organizations. Since faculty really don't know their colleagues' citizenship status, it is reasonable to believe that discrimination will follow and institutions will be disincentivized from hiring talented international faculty.

Mr. Chair, present law already requires reporting of any gift large enough to exert any influence over a university. This bill requires the reporting of gifts of any value, whether it be a cup of coffee or a doughnut, from people who are from so-called countries of concern and requires the Department of Education to process all of those reports, the same Department of Education that just lost one-half of its staff.

If the problem is millions of dollars in unreported gifts, then requiring the reporting of free doughnuts cannot be the answer.

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAUMGARTNER), who is the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. BAUMGARTNER. Mr. Chair, it is an honor to be a Member of this august body, and as the son of a university professor who cares deeply about higher education and a former State Department officer who cares deeply about American national security, I am excited and proud to sponsor this bill.

Indeed, there are many wonderful things that happen on American university campuses, but there are also some nefarious and concerning issues on American campuses that deal with foreign adversaries.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, the numbers do not lie. Foreign adversaries have poured billions into American universities, and much of it remains hidden

from public view. In just two universities alone, congressional investigators have uncovered nearly \$40 million in unreported research contracts tied to the Chinese Communist Party.

Nearly 30 percent of disclosed foreign funding lack even basic details like contract dates or intended purpose. Current regulations permit anonymous giving. These are not clerical errors. This is a systemic failure, one that has left our institutions wide open to foreign influence with real consequences for American society.

Let's be clear. Every dollar from an adversarial nation comes with strings attached, expectations about what gets taught, which research gets funded, and who gets hired or silenced.

We are already seeing the consequences. The committee report accompanying the DETERRENT Act highlighted research from the Network Contagion Research Institute, which analyzed foreign funding data between 2024 and 2019 and found that universities receiving undisclosed donations from Middle Eastern sources saw, on average, 300 percent more anti-Semitic incidents than other institutions.

Correlation is not causation, but one thing is certain: Secrecy allows these influences to operate unchecked and unexamined. The less we know about where this money is coming from and what it is funding, the easier it is for malign actors to push their agendas without scrutiny.

The problem is far bigger than any one country. Sixty percent of all foreign money in U.S. universities comes from just four sources, including China and Qatar, nations that oftentimes have strategic and ideological conflicts with U.S. interests. Despite this, 70 percent of universities fail to comply with foreign funding reporting requirements. Worse, universities can simply list foreign donors as anonymous, further obscuring the source of gifts.

How can we claim to protect academic integrity when billions in foreign influence remain hidden in the shadows?

This is why the DETERRENT Act is necessary. It closes reporting loopholes; it requires universities to fully disclose the source, purpose, and terms of all foreign gifts; and it imposes real consequences for noncompliance, including fines and loss of Federal funding. It also ensures transparency in private university endowments, preventing foreign adversaries from quietly shaping campuses' culture and academic research behind closed doors.

The American people want to know when foreign countries, including our adversaries, are active on our college campuses. That is what this bill is about. Universities have a choice to lead now with accountability.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Ms. CHU).

Ms. CHU. Mr. Chairman, as chair emerita of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, I rise in strong opposition to the DETERRENT Act.

For now, the American university research system is the envy of the world, but the DETERRENT Act would burden our higher education institutions and Federal agencies with massive amounts of reporting of a gift of any value from foreign countries and will cast a chilling effect disproportionately on the Asian-American academic community.

From the incarceration of Japanese Americans in World War II to the racial profiling of Chinese-American scientists under Trump's failed first term China Initiative, countless Asian Americans have had their lives destroyed because our government falsely accused them of being spies.

Already, 72 percent of Asian-American academic researchers report feeling unsafe. By publicizing the private, personal information of certain faculty and staff on databases, this bill would make the problem worse, making them much easier targets for xenophobic attacks.

Safeguarding national security can be done through commonsense reforms Democrats have offered that don't come at the expense of U.S. scientific innovation, global collaboration, and the Asian-American community. As if we needed another reason to oppose this bill, it would create enormous new responsibilities for the Department of Education at the same time that Trump is attempting to illegally dismantle that very Department.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

□ 1445

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the concerns of my colleague, but my committee has worked very closely with the Select Committee on the Strategic Competition Between the United States and the Chinese Communist Party to combat malign influence at our universities.

One type of malign influence is very different than what we are talking about here. The influence is known as transnational repression, which is efforts by the CCP to exert influence over dissidents, dissidents that could be coming here to gain a great education at our universities but are discouraged by the CCP. This legislation would encourage students seeking an education here and be able to push back against the malign influence of the CCP.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HARRIS), a cosponsor of this bill with portions of his bill in this bill, as well.

Mr. HARRIS of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, I thank Congressman BAUMGARTNER for his work on this bill.

Mr. Chair, each year adversarial nations like China, North Korea, Iran, and Russia attempt to buy the ability to influence our next generation through donations and contracts with American colleges and universities.

The DETERRENT Act will shine light on these shady backroom deals

and get malign foreign influence out of our schools. The legislation will strengthen the thresholds of reporting foreign gifts and contracts.

According to *The Wall Street Journal*, in the last 12 years, U.S. schools had nearly 3,000 contracts with China valued at no less than \$2.32 billion. That raises an important question: Why would a country that certainly doesn't have the best interests of American students in mind pay such enormous sums to American universities?

This bill will get to the bottom of it.

The DETERRENT Act includes language from my own legislation, the No Contracts With Foreign Adversaries Act, which requires a college or university to be transparent about the reason they might want to contract with one of the four countries currently designated by our government as a "country of concern."

It is true that there could be an academic purpose for a partnership with a country like China, North Korea, Iran, or Russia, but these partnerships cannot come at the expense of our national security, research integrity, or our future generations.

Students, parents, and taxpayers have a right to know the financial ties of these universities.

The DETERRENT Act strengthens current law by raising the reporting standards and providing a real enforcement mechanism if schools try to hide their dealings with foreign countries.

I urge all of my colleagues to stand and support the DETERRENT Act.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD a letter from the American Council on Education on behalf of the American Association of Community Colleges, American Association of State Colleges and Universities, American Council on Education, Association of American Universities, Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities, and the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, which says in part: "... as currently proposed, the DETERRENT Act would significantly impede critical research activities; duplicate existing interagency efforts; and put in place a problematic expansion of data collection by the Department of Education without ensuring that actual national security or foreign malign influence threats, including those which espouse support for actions that run counter to American foreign policy, are addressed."

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION,
Washington, DC, March 25, 2025.

Hon. MIKE JOHNSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. HAKEEM JEFFRIES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER JOHNSON AND MINORITY LEADER JEFFRIES: On behalf of the American Council on Education and the undersigned higher education associations, I write in op-

position to H.R. 1048, the "Defending Education Transparency and Ending Rogue Regimes Engaging in Nefarious Transactions (DETERRENT)" Act. We appreciate and take very seriously the concerns raised around research security and foreign malign influence, at institutions of higher education. However, as currently proposed, the DETERRENT Act would significantly impede critical research activities; duplicate existing interagency efforts; and put in place a problematic expansion of data collection by the Department of Education without ensuring that actual national security or foreign malign influence threats, including those which espouse support for actions that run counter to American foreign policy, are addressed.

Over the past several years, we have worked with our members to encourage full compliance with reporting obligations in Section 117 of the Higher Education Act, as well as working with the national security agencies, research agencies, and the Department of Education to clarify and improve foreign gift and contract reporting. As a result, since issues with foreign gift reporting were raised by Congress and policymakers in 2018, there has been a substantial increase in Section 117 reporting. Our associations and member institutions have continued to work with the federal research agencies to implement a range of new reporting requirements under NSPM-33, the CHIPS and Science Act, and numerous National Defense Authorization Act provisions. Since 2023, when the DETERRENT Act was first marked up, federal research agencies have now fully implemented common disclosure forms that require more details on foreign affiliations, relationships, and financial interests; started implementing requirements for institutions to maintain research security programs; and created new processes for assessing and mitigating risks prior to award.

Proponents of this bill have also asserted that it may be helpful in deterring antisemitic activity linked to foreign actors on colleges campuses. To be very clear, our institutions take seriously the rise of antisemitic activity across the country, and there is no question that more needs to be done to address it. We continue to work with major Jewish organizations and institutions with a shared conviction that Jewish students, staff, and faculty deserve to study and work without threat of harassment or discrimination. However, the DETERRENT Act is unlikely to solve the societal problem of antisemitism. Instead, it will result in more duplicative reporting, confusion on campuses and among faculty, and an increase in the overall costs of compliance.

We appreciate that the DETERRENT Act would make Section 117 an annual report, rather than the current biannual requirements, which would better align it with the National Science Foundation (NSF) foreign gift reporting requirement. We also appreciate that the legislation exempts tuition payments and certain outgoing contracts from institutions used to purchase goods from foreign companies. Exempting tuition is especially important since the DETERRENT Act would lower the reporting threshold from \$250,000 to \$50,000 for some gifts and contracts and to \$0 for certain countries of concern and foreign entities of concern.

Additionally, we appreciate the alignment of definitions (i.e. "countries of concern" and "foreign entities of concern") with definitions already in use at Department of Defense and NSF to help guide our institutions efforts to address research security concerns. We also support the language clarifying record retention and translations of gift and contract agreements, which provides important guidance to our institutions regarding retention of records.

However, we are concerned that the version of the bill being considered on the floor includes significant changes whose impact on institutions we have not had time to fully understand. This includes the addition of "intellectual property" to the definition of foreign gifts and contracts, as well as adding organizations such as the United Nations, to the definition of foreign sources. We remain concerned regarding the expansion of Section 117 into areas where it is unclear how additional and often burdensome reporting will help to address national security concerns, beyond the new requirements created and implemented over the past few years. Additionally, the proposed expansion and creation of new reports under Section 117 could increase national security concerns by exposing information to malign foreign efforts.

The proposed bill includes several sections with detrimental impacts, and we urge you to strike these sections:

The new Section 117a, "Prohibition on Contracts with Certain Foreign Entities and Countries," would require institutions to receive a waiver from the Department of Education before beginning or continuing a contract with a country of concern or a foreign entity of concern. This provision is particularly concerning because the definition of a "contract" is incredibly broad and therefore will likely capture not only *all* research agreements, but *also* student exchange programs and other joint cultural and education programs. This is especially concerning, given the fact that the U.S. Department of State has paused federal efforts around exchange programs, such as Fulbright and Gilman Scholars, at a time when the United States needs more students to study the Chinese language.

In addition, the Department of Education does not currently have the expertise to carry out the review of contracts, many of which will likely focus on scientific research not under the jurisdiction of the Department. And given the recent reduction in force actions, which greatly reduced staff including at Federal Student Aid, it is unclear how this additional work would be carried out in a timely manner by the Department. Our institutions abide by the regulations and requirements maintained by the U.S. Department of Commerce, the U.S. Department of the Treasury, and the U.S. Department of State regarding U.S. partnerships, export controls, and purchases from foreign entities. There are no indications that expanded Department of Education reviews are necessary; no other industry or government entity, including states, localities, and other nonprofit organizations, must undertake this type of review of an agreement before they can enter into a contract with a country or foreign entity.

Section 117b, "Institutional Policy Regarding Foreign Gifts and Contracts to Faculty and Staff," would require institutions of higher education that receive more than \$50 million in federal research and development funding or any Title VI funding to develop a policy to compel research faculty and staff, including those at "affiliated entities" to report any foreign gifts valued over \$480 and contracts over \$5,000, as well as creating and maintaining a searchable, public database with that information. This requirement is unnecessary given other existing federal statutory mandates that require researchers to disclose all sources of foreign, domestic, current, and pending support for their research to federal research agencies as they apply for research awards and contracts.

While the bill attempts to make the names of the reporting faculty and staff private, this provision raises both privacy and security concerns regarding personal financial

transactions of relatively small amounts, including for example an inheritance from a foreign family member. This could also provide our foreign adversaries with a roadmap for targeting our top-notch U.S. researchers. Section 117b will likely result in the collection of an ocean of data, much of it trivial and inconsequential, and do little to address the fundamental concerns regarding research security and foreign influence.

Section 117c, "Investment Disclosure Report," would create new reports for certain institutions of higher education (private institutions with endowments over \$6 billion or with "investments of concern" above \$250 million). These institutions would need to report those investments with a country of concern or a foreign entity of concern on an annual basis to the Department of Education, which would then be made public on a searchable database. Similar to our concerns with 117a and 117b, it is unclear what national security or foreign malign influence threat this provision is trying to address. Our institutions are in compliance with Treasury rules regulating our investments, regarding outbound investments in certain sensitive technologies in countries of concern. It is unclear how this will address additional issues of national security, beyond existing federal requirements. It is also unclear why endowments at certain private institutions of higher education would be specifically called out as a national security concern when investments made by other entities that are not institutions of higher education, such as other nonprofits, government grantees and private government contractors are not made public.

Section 117d, "Enforcement; Single Point of Contract; Institutional Requirements," establishes new fines regarding compliance with Section 117 reporting and the new subsections of Section 117. The legislation would put into statute the tie between Section 117 and an institution's program participation agreement. By tying the new proposed fines to Title IV, this would punish students for compliance issues at institutions, specifically compliance with foreign gift reporting, which is not likely impacting individual students.

In addition to these recommendations, we strongly encourage the final bill to also include language that requires the Department of Education to carry out negotiated rulemaking on Section 117, in order to ensure that the Department engages fully with the stakeholder community and clarifies important questions around definitions to ensure the reports are completed in the most useful way possible for policymakers, interested public parties, and the national security agencies.

We appreciate the efforts in the DETERRENT Act to clarify Section 117 and codify compliance rules the Department of Education has previously used sub-regulatory guidance to explain. However, we urge you to consider the potentially detrimental impacts of Sections 117a, 117b, 117c, and 117d, and strike those sections. This significant expansion of Department authority and responsibility is especially problematic given the recent reduction in force implemented at the Department of Education, as well as the Administration's efforts to dismantle the Department. We look forward to working with you on this important legislation as it moves forward in Congress. However, if the bill includes those problematic provisions as it moves forward, we will continue to oppose the legislation as drafted. There are better approaches to address the concerns of policymakers and we welcome the opportunity to work with lawmakers on the right solutions.

Sincerely,

TED MITCHELL,
President.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSMER), an upstanding, proud member of this committee.

Mr. MESSMER. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of the DETERRENT Act.

This important legislation will bring vital transparency and accountability to gift reporting requirements for colleges and universities.

For decades, the Chinese Communist Party, Iran, and Russia have targeted America's college systems by pushing dangerous propaganda aimed at influencing impressionable students.

As my colleagues have pointed out, many American universities have been far too cozy with our international adversaries. They accept generous investments masked as research projects and infrastructure opportunities, which turn out to be funded by regimes that wish to do us harm.

Not only did those corrupt arrangements create dangerous environments for our students and faculty, they also put America's national security at risk.

I am pleased that my bill, the INSTRUCT Act, is included as one of the DETERRENT Act's main provisions. My legislation requires that colleges and universities disclose to American intelligence agencies any and all financial investment data so we can ensure they remain free of the exploitation of hostile foreign influences.

I urge my colleagues to pass this bill, not just because it makes sense, but because it will put our adversaries on notice that we are watching them. Most importantly, it will protect our Nation's students from foreign manipulation and provide them with the transparent and safe learning environment that they deserve.

Again, I wish to thank Chairman WALBERG for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chair, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. OWENS), the vice chairman of the House Education and the Workforce Committee as well as the chairman of the Higher Education and Workforce Development Subcommittee.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chair, imagine our esteemed universities, pillars of free thought and innovation, quietly channeling millions into investments linked to the Chinese Communist Party, Russian oligarchs, or the Iranian regime. While our students learn about democracy and liberty, their tuition dollars may be funding governments that stand against these very ideals.

This isn't hypothetical. This is happening. Since 2013, U.S. colleges and universities have received over \$1 billion from Chinese Communist Party-affiliated sources. In return, we have seen professors silenced, student groups threatened, and our intellectual property stolen.

At the same time, these institutions, many of which proudly divest from fossil fuels and boycott Israel, are more than willing to accept foreign funding from adversaries who seek to undermine our Nation.

The DETERRENT Act is our line in the sand. It demands transparency and accountability from higher education. If universities are entangled with foreign adversaries, the American people deserve to know. I am proud that my Reporting on Investments in Foreign Adversaries, or RIFA, Act is included in this legislation. The RIFA Act ensures private colleges and universities disclose whether they are investing their endowments in hostile nations like China, Russia, Iran, and North Korea. These financial partnerships should not be hidden from the public.

For far too long, we have allowed educational institutions to become conduits for foreign influence. Administrators on the taxpayers' dime have given repressive regimes easy access to our students, turning their backs on the very freedoms they claim to uphold. This betrayal must stop, and I must make it clear that profit over patriotism, profit over American values, and profit over American culture is traitorous betrayal.

The DETERRENT Act takes critical steps to safeguard our institutions, protect our students, and preserve American values. We must not allow profit to overshadow patriotism. It is time to reclaim our universities and secure our future. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this legislation.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, we received a letter from the Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities which says in part that Federal agencies since 2023 "have significantly expanded research security efforts" and outlines those efforts and then says: "Rather than advance transparency and meaningfully contribute to the plethora of actions taken by Congress and the Trump and Biden administrations over the last 10 years, the DETERRENT Act will impede important international collaborations and be duplicative of other Federal research agencies' efforts to appropriately strengthen research security and foreign partnership reporting requirements."

Then they outline some specific concerns by saying: "The bill would inappropriately create a new and highly unusual role for the U.S. Department of Education in making determinations about the suitability of international research, education, and cultural partnerships, despite its lack of expertise in scientific research."

It also says: "The bill would require institutions to create new public databases for the disclosure of international gifts to faculty and staff members. This reporting would include the disclosure of non-work-related gifts from any country that grantees receive

from family, for example, even when there are no connections to their work. Records of such gifts would be required to be in a searchable database maintained by institutions, and for public universities, such reporting would potentially be subject to open records requests that could allow foreign actors to identify leading researchers to target for influence operations."

Finally, it says: "The bill would create duplicative disclosure requirements for foreign gift disclosures as Federal research grant applicants already must disclose all sources of support—whether foreign or domestic—for the research activities."

Mr. Chair, I include this letter in the RECORD.

ASSOCIATION OF PUBLIC AND LAND-GRANT UNIVERSITIES,

Washington, DC, March 24, 2025.

Hon. MIKE JOHNSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington DC.

Hon. HAKEEM JEFFRIES,
House of Representatives,
Washington DC.

DEAR SPEAKER JOHNSON AND MINORITY LEADER JEFFRIES: As president of the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities (APLU), a membership association of more than 230 public research universities and systems in all 50 states, I write to share concerns on the DETERRENT Act, H.R. 1048. Regrettably, APLU must oppose this bill as currently constructed as it would ultimately impede innovation that is essential to U.S. competitiveness and add substantial costs to institutions that drive growth in administrative compliance and bureaucracy rather than support for students and science. APLU strongly believes a better approach to address policymaker concerns is possible and welcomes the opportunity to work together to achieve common goals.

In recent years, the public university community has worked with Congress and the intelligence and law enforcement community to bolster research security to prevent undue foreign influence. Congress has already passed numerous bills that have significantly altered U.S. universities' treatment of international partnerships. In fact, since the DETERRENT Act was last considered in 2023, federal agencies have significantly expanded research security efforts including:

- the Department of Defense issued a policy for risk-based security reviews of fundamental research to prevent partnerships with entities and countries of concern;

- the Department of Energy established a new framework for risk-based decisions and ensure transparency;

- the National Science Foundation (NSF) launched a new reporting system for institutions receiving funding, requiring grantees to report all foreign gifts and contracts over \$50,000;

- NSF launched a risk mitigation process to prevent potential national security risks;

- NSF launched a new center to share information and reports on research security;

- the National Institutes of Health created a decision matrix to assess the potential for foreign interference; and

- the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy launched uniform guidelines about foreign talent programs.

While expansive, this is not even a comprehensive list of new federal actions advancing research security just since 2023.

Rather than enhance transparency and meaningfully contribute to the plethora of

actions taken by Congress and the Trump and Biden administrations over the last ten years, the DETERRENT Act will impede important international collaborations and be duplicative of other federal research agencies' efforts to appropriately strengthen research security and foreign partnership reporting requirements. Below, I outline public research universities' most significant concerns with the legislation as currently formulated:

The bill would inappropriately create a new and highly unusual role for the U.S. Department of Education in making determinations about the suitability of international research, education, and cultural partnerships, despite its lack of expertise in scientific research. The Department is ill-equipped to take on such work as it is well outside its responsibility and expertise. Additionally, U.S. universities' partnerships with foreign entities are already regulated by the Departments of Commerce, State, and Treasury, among others.

The bill would require institutions to create new public databases for the disclosure of international gifts to faculty and staff members. This reporting would include the disclosure of non-work related gifts from any country that grantees receive from family, for example, even when there are no connections to their work. Records of such gifts would be required to be in a searchable database maintained by institutions, and for public universities, such reporting would potentially be subject to open records requests that could allow foreign actors to identify leading researchers to target for influence operations.

The bill would create duplicative disclosure requirements for foreign gift disclosures as federal research grant applicants already must disclose all sources of support—whether foreign or domestic—for the research activities. Additionally, NSF established a new reporting portal in 2024 for all gifts or contracts from countries of concern. NSF's newly-created reporting portal is more user friendly and does not have the technical challenges of the Department of Education's currently outdated reporting system. An alternative approach to the DETERRENT Act could build upon rather than duplicate the NSF system.

The bill contains several provisions that APLU supports including unifying definitions across federal agencies, codifying compliance rules the Department of Education has previously used sub-regulatory guidance to explain, providing clarity on the treatment of tuition payments, and requiring the Department of Education to maintain a single point of contact to respond to inquiries and provide technical assistance to institutions. However, concerns about the role and capacities of the Department of Education, which were already significant, are further exacerbated given recent administration announcements on the future mission and staffing of the Department.

Public research universities remain committed to working with policymakers to appropriately enhance research security. APLU strongly believes this can be done without unnecessarily burdening institutions with additional regulations that are overly broad, misdirected, and would further bureaucracy both of schools and the federal government. We welcome the opportunity to work with lawmakers on better balanced solutions.

Sincerely,

MARK BECKER,
President, APLU.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. KILEY), the subcommittee chair of the Early Childhood, Element-

tary, and Secondary Education Subcommittee.

Mr. KILEY. Mr. Chair, America's universities have long been the place where for better or for worse cultural trends tend to begin and then spread throughout the rest of the country. Unfortunately, in recent years, it has been for worse.

An ethos of censorship took hold first in American universities before spreading to tech companies throughout our broader culture and into the government itself.

Of course we saw most vividly on university campuses the absolutely appalling scenes of anti-Semitism that sadly also became part of our broader problem for the rest of the country over the last few years and even before that.

America's adversaries, noticing this phenomenon, have decided that targeting our universities is a way to weaken the United States. Infiltrating our universities is a way to influence our broader institutions and to influence public opinion.

You see, for example, a congressional investigation found that there were nearly \$40 million in contracts with the CCP or CCP-linked organizations. This is just what we know about.

Institutions have accepted billions in anonymous foreign funds without any transparency or accountability. There was even a recent study from the Institute for the Global Study of Anti-Semitism and Policy showing how this has infiltrated K-12 classrooms as well as funding from Qatar ended up at Brown University which developed anti-Israel curricula that then went to 8,000 K-12 schools throughout the entire country.

The DETERRENT Act is a much-needed, commonsense piece of legislation that simply says if you are going to accept funding from foreign countries, you need to disclose that. After all, universities are massively funded in various forms by the Federal Government, so if taxpayer dollars are going to support institutions that are taking foreign money, we should know about that.

The requirements put in place by this bill simply say that if you accept a gift of \$50,000 or more, a foreign gift, then you need to report that, and it is anything of any value if it is from an adversarial nation.

The bill also closes reporting gaps, including faculty-level disclosures and imposes real penalties for noncompliance, including loss of title IV funds.

The good news, Mr. Chair, is that over the last year or so we have seen a reckoning begin in higher education in this country, and we are starting to see very positive changes. A number of university presidents have lost their jobs, and universities are increasingly committing themselves anew to protecting civil rights and promoting academic freedom.

The DETERRENT Act will be an important part of that trend. I am proud to be a cosponsor.

□ 1500

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we received a letter from the Association of American Universities, which says, in part: “. . . as currently proposed, sections 117a, 117b, 117c, and 117d in the bill are unhelpful to advancing the national and research security interests of the United States. Indeed, the new faculty and staff gift reporting requirement for any and all countries is excessive, will prove counterproductive, and divert important university resources away from more valuable and focused efforts to address legitimate research security risks. Additionally, the bill's contract waiver requirement will prevent U.S. researchers and students from participating in important international scientific collaborations and exchange programs, ultimately harming—not helping—the U.S. maintain its global leadership position in critical areas of scientific research.”

Mr. Chair, I include this letter in the RECORD, and I reserve the balance of my time.

ASSOCIATION OF
AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES,
Washington, DC, March 24, 2025.

Hon. MIKE JOHNSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. HAKEEM JEFFRIES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER JOHNSON AND MINORITY LEADER JEFFRIES: I write on behalf of the Association of American Universities (AAU) representing 69 leading U.S. research universities to urge your opposition to H.R. 1048, the “Defending Education Transparency and Ending Rogue Regimes Engaging in Nefarious Transactions (DETERRENT)” Act.

AAU supports some aspects of the bill to improve foreign gift reporting by institutions of higher education as required by Section 117 of the Higher Education Act, including establishing a single (point of contact at the department, exempting reporting for certain tuition payments, aligning some definitions, and establishing annual reporting. However, as currently proposed, section 117a, 117b, 117c, and 117d in the bill are unhelpful to advancing the national and research security interests of the United States. Indeed, the new faculty and staff gift reporting requirement for any and all countries is excessive, will prove counterproductive, and divert important university resources away from more valuable and focused efforts to address legitimate research security risks. Additionally, the bill's contract waiver requirement will prevent U.S. researchers and students from participating in important international scientific collaborations and exchange programs, ultimately harming—not helping—the U.S. maintain its global leadership position in critical areas of scientific research.

We are also concerned: (1) the version of the bill now being considered on the floor contains new language not included in the bill marked up by the House Education and Workforce Committee that raises additional concerns for that the impacts are not yet fully understood; and (2) given recent actions taken by the Trump administration to significantly reduce the staff of and dismantle the U.S. Department of Education, we do not believe it is sensible for Congress to now as-

sign that department with new U.S. national and research security responsibilities. We also endorse separate comments opposing the Act made by the American Council on Education (ACE).

AAU's specific concerns are outlined in greater detail below:

(1) BROAD USAGE OF WAIVERS WILL RESTRICT IMPORTANT INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH COLLABORATIONS AND EXCHANGE PROGRAMS

Section 117a of the DETERRENT Act requires academic institutions to apply for and obtain a waiver from the Department of Education before entering a contract with a country of concern or a foreign entity of concern. The waiver requirement would slow down and require unprecedented approval by the Department of Education for all contracted academic research collaborations and all student academic exchanges or joint cultural and education programs with countries such as China, including collaborations, exchanges, and programs that have minimal national security concern or connection to critical technologies.

Additionally, we are concerned that the Department of Education lacks the expertise necessary to assess national security risks associated with scientific research and related partnerships. These concerns are further heightened by the recent reductions to the department's workforce which raise questions about the department's ability to ever fully implement this new oversight requirement. With new and ongoing staffing constraints, we would expect waivers to go unanswered—effectively halting all activities requiring departmental approval and preventing any collaborations or academic exchanges from occurring.

A waiver requirement at the Department of Education is also unnecessary when universities are already working to ensure appropriate risk evaluation processes are in place. Since 2018, universities have stepped up their efforts to recognize, address, and mitigate research security concerns. Institutions have developed risk criteria, established risk management committees to review international engagements and collaborations, and have started to utilize the new NSF-funded SECURE Center to collaborate and inform their risk mitigation efforts. At a time of intense global competition for talent and knowledge, it would be unwise for the U.S. to slow down or halt productive research activities and other programs and therefore isolate and disadvantage U.S. faculty and students.

(2) REQUIRING INDIVIDUAL FACULTY AND STAFF GIFT AND CONTRACT DISCLOSURES FROM ANY COUNTRY IS EXCESSIVE AND WILL NOT PROTECT OR SECURE SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

Section 117b compels institutions of higher education receiving more than \$50 million in federal research and development funding or any Title VI funding, to implement a policy requiring all research faculty and staff to individually report any foreign gift valued at over \$480 and contracts over \$5,000 and post that information to a publicly available and searchable database.

This provision represents extensive overreach by the U.S. government and would be an unprecedented expansion of oversight by the Department of Education under Section 117. Of particular concern, Section 117b provides unlimited scope and no exceptions so gifts from and contracts with all foreign countries would need to be reported, including even friendly and neighboring countries such as Canada, Mexico, and the UK. For research faculty and staff, this would mean that even personal gifts they receive from family members or family inheritance in excess of \$480 dollars would need to be reported.

While Section 117b now includes language to protect some private information, it still raises privacy concerns for researchers who may be required to report personal, private financial transactions that could be made public through the Freedom of Information Act or other efforts. As a result of this requirement, university researchers and staff would have to report and university administrators would have to collect, record, and publicly post inconsequential data that does nothing to address legitimate research security risks or foreign influence concerns. Some researchers may ultimately decide participating in federal research programs carries too much burden and familial scrutiny, which will only stand to further weaken the talent pool for U.S. research.

AAU supports ironclad enforcement of university and agency disclosure requirements which Congress provided in Section 223 of the FY21 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA). Both the previous Trump and Biden administrations have also updated agency disclosure requirements as required by National Security Presidential Memorandum 33 (NSPM-33). Common disclosure forms were finalized at the end of 2023 and federal research agencies have now adopted or are in the process of final adoption of the harmonized common disclosure form, which requests more details on foreign affiliations, relationships, and financial interests from researchers applying for federal research funding.

(3) NEW REQUIREMENTS THAT DUPLICATE EXISTING REQUIREMENTS WILL BE COUNTER-PRODUCTIVE

AAU sees no need for Congress to impose additional excessive and unnecessary disclosure requirements on university faculty and staff included in the DETERRENT Act. Since December 2023, when the Act was last considered on the House floor, Congress and the federal agencies have taken multiple actions to address research security concerns and help mitigate risks. This includes Section 226 and Section 238 of the FY 2025 NDAA which require DOD to conduct periodic examinations of research awards to ensure compliance with current DOD research security policy and prohibits DOD funding to institutions of higher education that conduct fundamental research in collaboration with covered entities on the Section 1286 list. Additionally, the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Health, the Department of Energy, and the Department of Defense all have announced or already begun implementing new processes to consider risk factors prior to awarding a grant. If a risk is identified, mitigation measures are added to the conditions of the award. The DETERRENT Act piles on additional requirements that are likely to conflict, duplicate, and create confusion with existing requirements.

In conclusion, AAU opposes the DETERRENT Act, as many of the bill provisions will not effectively address U.S. national and research security concerns. They will instead needlessly divert important university resources away from more effective methods of safeguarding and securing research conducted on behalf of American taxpayers, protecting it from undue foreign influence and other international threats.

We urge the House to vote “no” on the legislation unless section 117a, 117b, 117c, and 117d are all removed from the bill. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

BARBARA R. SNYDER,
President.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I know my good friend and colleague's concern is sincere about faculty involvement in reporting in institutions,

of course, that know how to keep records of sports donors, boosters, and alumni who are contributing various things. I think this is even more important.

My colleague argued that requiring researchers to disclose foreign gifts and contracts would be invasive and unnecessary. I first remind my colleague that this requirement applies to specific researchers involved in government contracts who are at specific high research institutions. These are faculty working in crucial and sensitive research, areas our adversaries have targeted time and time again.

This is not just an abstract problem. Just in the last 2 years, prominent research faculty at Harvard, Stanford, the University of Maryland, and the University of Delaware were found to not have disclosed foreign funding from Chinese sources, just to name a few examples. Reporting in-kind support specifically for a researcher's grant is critical, but deterrent provisions also cover other ways our adversaries can influence faculty.

Democrats also continue to falsely claim that the DETERRENT Act would require reporting for everyday activities like doughnuts or coffee. The DETERRENT Act holds faculty to the same standard for monetary gifts as Members of Congress. A gift of a \$5,000 purse from a foreign source rightfully needs to be scrutinized and publicized.

Regarding privacy concerns, I do want to point out that these individuals are often happy to voluntarily publish their own names, their email addresses, and their donors when it comes to their own published works. Many universities have open directories on their websites. However, the DETERRENT Act does have a commonsense privacy protection included.

The American public deserves transparency, and I urge critics of the bill to ask why relationships, including those with our worst enemies and our adversaries, should continue to lie in the shadows.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 1048 as currently drafted. The bill not only targets our Nation's educational institutions but also undermines the very Department we rely on to enforce these very complex policies.

Mr. Chair, you can't effectively dismantle an agency and then demand more from it. You can't ignore the fact that half of the Department's employees have been fired, and these cuts will make it even more difficult for the Department to carry out these increased responsibilities effectively. The contradiction is clear: How can you demand more reporting and enforcement from an agency that has half of its staff?

Furthermore, the bill does not really address any alleged problem. Present

law already requires reporting of gifts large enough to exert any influence, and requiring the reporting of free doughnuts will not do anything to add to national security.

What it will do is add to a feeling of problems with researchers from other countries. The National Academy of Science did a survey of 1,300 Asian-American faculty and found that, although a majority, 89 percent, of these faculty desired to contribute to the United States' advancements in science and technology, many, 72 percent, feel unsafe in conducting research in the United States.

Instead of adding unnecessary burdens and penalties to our educational institutions and adding the feeling of "unsafe" and discrimination against minorities, we need to focus on meaningful reforms to protect the integrity of the education system and promote collaboration around the world.

We also need to use the limited resources left to the Department of Education to focus on things like academic achievement and achievement gaps; violence in schools, especially gun violence; access to college; and things like that. We need to safeguard the Department of Education, not destroy it.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to reject this bill and support the policies that strengthen, rather than dismantle, the systems that serve our students and workforce.

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ONDER), a member of the Committee on Education and Workforce.

Mr. ONDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1048, the DETERRENT Act.

Mr. Chair, this bill will end the influence and downright espionage of the Chinese Communist Party on our American College campuses.

Last Congress, the Select Committee on the CCP issued a remarkable report highlighting how UC Berkeley partnered with Tsinghua University and the city of Shenzhen to create the Tsinghua-Berkeley-Shenzhen Institute, which actively partnered with a Chinese research lab in April 2023 to improve advanced chip technology.

Why in the world should the Chinese Communist Party, which controls the city of Shenzhen and Tsinghua University, have access to American research on sensitive technology with military applications?

Likewise, Alfred University recently received a grant from the Department of Defense to research hypersonic weapons. Unbelievably, the China University of Geosciences in Wuhan then partnered with Alfred University with this research.

China University of Geosciences also happened to be doing very similar weapons research for the CCP. How do we know that our research and development in our hypersonic weapons

isn't going straight to the CCP? The answer is: It probably is.

Additionally, according to the FBI, the CCP is the world's principal infringer of intellectual property. We need to stop the Chinese Communist Party, the number one threat to our security and the security of the world, from taking advantage of American innovation and the openness of our university campuses.

Mr. Chair, I proudly support the DETERRENT Act.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Chair, I thank my colleagues who have come to speak today on such an important matter regarding not just higher education but national security.

International collaboration is not inherently bad, but foreign nations have been able to operate in the dark for far too long. When foreign adversaries give to universities, it is not out of the goodness of their hearts. It is because they want something in return. Sometimes that is extremely negative.

Each dollar that is accepted comes with strings attached, and that can influence student behavior or gain access to research. The DETERRENT Act is a crucial step toward transparency and protecting American education and students from malicious foreign influence. The current system has allowed our Nation's students to become targets for our adversaries, and that is unacceptable.

We must pass this bill.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CRAWFORD). All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Workforce, printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 119-1 shall be considered as adopted and the bill, as amended, shall be considered as read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 1048

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Defending Education Transparency and Ending Rogue Regimes Engaging in Nefarious Transactions Act" or the "DETERRENT Act".

SEC. 2. DISCLOSURES OF FOREIGN GIFTS.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Section 117 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1011f) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 117. DISCLOSURES OF FOREIGN GIFTS.

"(a) *DISCLOSURE REPORTS.*—

"(1) *AGGREGATE GIFTS AND CONTRACT DISCLOSURES.*—An institution shall file with the Secretary, in accordance with subsection (b)(1), a disclosure report on July 31 of the calendar year immediately following any calendar year in which—

“(A) the institution receives a gift from, or enters into a contract with, a foreign source (other than a foreign country of concern or foreign entity of concern)—

“(i) the value of which is \$50,000 or more, considered alone or in combination with all other gifts from, or contracts with, that foreign source within the calendar year; or

“(ii) the value of which is indeterminate; or

“(B) the institution—

“(i) receives a gift from a foreign country of concern or foreign entity of concern, without regard to the value of such gift; or

“(ii) upon receiving a waiver under section 117A to enter into a contract with such a country or entity, enters into such contract, without regard to the value of such contract.

“(2) FOREIGN SOURCE OWNERSHIP OR CONTROL DISCLOSURES.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), in the case of an institution that is substantially controlled (as described in section 668.174(c)(3) of title 34, Code of Federal Regulations) (or successor regulations)) by a foreign source, the institution shall file with the Secretary, in accordance with subsection (b)(2), a disclosure report on July 31 of each year.

“(3) TREATMENT OF AFFILIATED ENTITIES.—For purposes of this section, any gift to, or contract with, an affiliated entity of an institution shall be considered a gift to, or contract with, respectively, such institution.

“(b) CONTENTS OF REPORT.—

“(1) GIFTS AND CONTRACTS.—Each report to the Secretary required under subsection (a)(1) shall include the following:

“(A) With respect to a gift received from, or a contract entered into with, any foreign source—

“(i) the name of the individual, department, or other entity at the institution receiving the gift or carrying out the contract on behalf of the institution;

“(ii) any intended purpose of the gift or contract communicated to the institution by the foreign source, and, as of the date of filing such report, the manner in which the institution intends to use such gift or contract;

“(iii) in the case of a restricted or conditional gift or contract, a description of each restriction or condition that meets the definition of the term ‘restricted or conditional gift or contract’ in subsection (f);

“(iv) with respect to such a gift—

“(I) the total fair market dollar amount or dollar value of the gift, as of the date of submission of such report; and

“(II) the date on which the institution received such gift;

“(v) with respect to such a contract—

“(I) the total fair market dollar amount or dollar value of the contract, as of the date of submission of such report;

“(II) the date on which the institution enters into such contract;

“(III) the date on which such contract first takes effect;

“(IV) if the contract has a termination date, such termination date; and

“(V) an assurance that the institution will—

“(aa) maintain an unredacted copy of the contract until the latest of—

“(AA) the date that is 5 years after the date on which such contract first takes effect;

“(BB) the date on which the contract terminates; or

“(CC) the last day of any period that applicable State law requires a copy of such contract to be maintained; and

“(bb) upon request of the Secretary during an investigation under section 117D(a)(1), produce such an unredacted copy of the contract.

“(B) With respect to a gift received from, or a contract entered into with, a foreign source that is a foreign government (other than the government of a foreign country of concern)—

“(i) the name of such foreign government;

“(ii) the department, agency, office, or division of such foreign government that approved such gift or contract, as applicable; and

“(iii) the physical mailing address of such department, agency, office, or division.

“(C) With respect to a gift received from, or contract entered into with, a foreign source other than a foreign government subject to the requirements of subparagraph (B)—

“(i)(I) the legal name of the foreign source; or

“(II) in the case of a gift received from a foreign source that awarded such gift to the institution as an agent described in subsection (f)(4)(G) on behalf of another foreign source—

“(aa) the legal name of the foreign source that awarded such gift; and

“(bb) the legal name of the foreign source on whose behalf the gift was awarded, or a statement certified by a compliance officer in accordance with section 117D(c) that the institution has reasonably attempted to obtain such name;

“(ii) in the case of a foreign source that is a natural person, each country of citizenship of such person, or, if no such country is known, the principal country of residence of such person;

“(iii) in the case of a foreign source that is a legal entity, the country in which such entity is incorporated, or, if such information is not available, the principal place of business of such entity;

“(iv) the physical mailing address of such foreign source, or, if such address is not available, a statement certified by a compliance officer in accordance with section 117D(c) that the institution has reasonably attempted to obtain such address; and

“(v) any affiliation of the foreign source to an organization that is designated as a foreign terrorist organization pursuant to section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189).

“(D) With respect to a contract entered into with a foreign source that is a foreign country of concern or a foreign entity of concern—

“(i) a complete and unredacted copy of the original contract, and if such original contract is not in English, a translated copy in accordance with subsection (c);

“(ii) a copy of the waiver received under section 117A for such contract; and

“(iii) the statement submitted by the institution for purposes of receiving such a waiver under section 117A(b)(2).

“(E) With respect to a gift received from a foreign source that is a foreign country of concern or a foreign entity of concern, an assurance that the institution will—

“(i) in a case in which the institution received documentation relating to such gift, maintain such documentation until the latest of—

“(I) the date that is 5 years after the date such gift was received by the institution; or

“(II) the last day of any period that applicable State law requires a copy of such documentation to be maintained; and

“(ii) upon request of the Secretary during an investigation under section 117D(a)(1), produce such documentation;

“(2) FOREIGN SOURCE OWNERSHIP OR CONTROL.—Each report to the Secretary required under subsection (a)(2) shall contain—

“(A) the information required under paragraph (1) of this subsection;

“(B) the legal name and the mailing address of the foreign source that substantially controls the institution as described in such subsection;

“(C) the date on which the foreign source assumed such substantial control; and

“(D) any changes in program or structure of the institution of higher education resulting from such substantial control.

“(c) TRANSLATION REQUIREMENTS.—Any information required to be disclosed under this section, or requested by the Secretary pursuant to an investigation under section 117D(a)(1), with respect to a gift or contract that is not in English shall be translated into English, for purposes of such disclosure or such investigation, by a person that is not—

“(1) a foreign source that awarded such gift or entered into such contract; or

“(2) any other foreign source from an attributable country of a foreign source referred to in paragraph (1).

“(d) PUBLIC INSPECTION.—

“(1) DATABASE REQUIREMENT.—Beginning not later than May 31 of the calendar year following the date of enactment of the DETERRENT Act, the Secretary shall—

“(A) establish and maintain a searchable database on a website of the Department, under which all reports submitted under this section (including, to the extent practicable, any report submitted under this section before the date of enactment of the DETERRENT Act)—

“(i) are made publicly available (in electronic and downloadable format), including any information provided in such reports (other than the information prohibited from being publicly disclosed pursuant to paragraph (2));

“(ii) can be individually identified and compared; and

“(iii) to the extent practicable, are searchable and sortable—

“(I) by the institution that filed such report;

“(II) by the date on which the institution filed such report;

“(III) by the date on which the institution received the gift which is the subject of the report;

“(IV) by the date on which the institution enters into the contract which is the subject of the report;

“(V) by the date on which such contract first takes effect;

“(VI) by the attributable country of such gift or contract;

“(VII) by the name of the foreign source;

“(VIII) by the information described in subparagraph (C)(i); and

“(IX) by the information described in subparagraph (C)(ii);

“(B) not later than 30 days after receipt of a disclosure report under this section, include such report in such database;

“(C) indicate, as part of the public record of a report included in such database, whether the report is with respect to a gift received from, or a contract entered into with—

“(i) a foreign source that is a foreign government; or

“(ii) a foreign source that is not a foreign government; and

“(D) with respect to a disclosure report that does not include the name or address of a foreign source, indicate, as part of the public record of such report included in such database, that such report did not include such information.

“(2) APPLICATION OF FEDERAL PRIVACY LAW; PROTECTIONS FOR NATURAL PERSONS.—

“(A) APPLICATION OF FEDERAL PRIVACY LAW.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), a disclosure report filed pursuant to this section is not subject to Federal privacy law (including any exemption from disclosure described in section 552(b) of title 5, United States Code).

“(B) PROTECTIONS FOR NATURAL PERSONS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), with respect to a disclosure report filed under this section, the name or address (other than the attributable country) of a foreign source that is a natural person—

“(I) may not be publicly disclosed; and

“(II) is exempt from disclosure under subsection (b)(3) of section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly referred to as the Freedom of Information Act).

“(ii) EXCEPTIONS FOR CONTRACTS WITH A FOREIGN COUNTRY OF CONCERN OR FOREIGN ENTITY OF CONCERN.—Clause (i) shall not apply to a disclosure report filed pursuant to this section that contains information with respect to a contract described in subsection (a)(1)(B)(ii) entered into with a foreign country of concern or foreign entity of concern.

“(e) INTERAGENCY INFORMATION SHARING.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, not later than 30 days after receiving a disclosure report from an institution in compliance with

this section, the Secretary shall transmit an unredacted copy of such report (including the name and address of a foreign source disclosed in such report) to the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Director of National Intelligence, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Energy, the Director of the National Science Foundation, and the Director of the National Institutes of Health.

“(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) **AFFILIATED ENTITY.**—The term ‘affiliated entity’, when used with respect to an institution, means an entity or organization that operates primarily for the benefit of, or under the auspices of, such institution, such as a foundation of the institution, or an educational, cultural, or language entity.

“(2) **ATTRIBUTABLE COUNTRY.**—The term ‘attributable country’ means—

“(A) the country of citizenship of a foreign source who is a natural person, or, if such country is unknown, the principal residence of such foreign source; or

“(B) the country of incorporation of a foreign source that is a legal entity, or, if such country is unknown, the principal place of business (as applicable) of such foreign source.

“(3) **CONTRACT.**—The term ‘contract’—

“(A) means—

“(i) any agreement for the acquisition by purchase, lease, or barter of property (including intellectual property) or services by the foreign source;

“(ii) except as provided in subparagraph (B)(ii), any agreement for the acquisition by purchase, lease, or barter of property (including intellectual property) or services from a foreign source; and

“(iii) any affiliation, agreement, or similar transaction with a foreign source that involves the use or exchange of an institution’s name, likeness, time, services, or resources; and

“(B) does not include—

“(i) an agreement made between an institution and a foreign source regarding any payment of one or more elements of a student’s cost of attendance (as such term is defined in section 472), unless such an agreement is made for more than 15 students or is made under a restricted or conditional contract;

“(ii) an arms-length agreement for the acquisition by purchase, lease, or barter of property (including intellectual property) or services from a foreign source that is not a foreign country of concern or a foreign entity of concern; or

“(iii) any assignment or license of a granted intellectual property right (including a patent, trademark, or copyright) that is not associated with a category listed in the Commerce Control List maintained by the Bureau of Industry and Security of the Department of Commerce and set forth in Supplement No. 1 to part 774 of title 15, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations).

“(4) **FOREIGN SOURCE.**—The term ‘foreign source’ means—

“(A) a foreign government, including an agency of a foreign government;

“(B) a legal entity, governmental or otherwise, created under the laws of a foreign state or states;

“(C) a legal entity, governmental or otherwise, substantially controlled (as described in section 668.174(c)(3) of title 34, Code of Federal Regulations) (or successor regulations) by a foreign source;

“(D) a natural person who is not a citizen or a national of the United States or a trust territory or protectorate thereof;

“(E) an international organization (as such term is defined in the International Organizations Immunities Act (22 U.S.C. 288));

“(F) a person who is an agent of a foreign principal (as such term is defined in section 1 of

the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 (22 U.S.C. 611)); and

“(G) an agent of any of the entities described in subparagraphs (A) through (F), including—

“(i) a subsidiary or affiliate of a foreign legal entity, acting on behalf of such an entity; and

“(ii) a person that operates primarily for the benefit of, or under the auspices of, such an entity, such as a foundation of such entity, or an educational, cultural, or language entity.

“(5) **GIFT.**—The term ‘gift’—

“(A) means any gift of money, property (including intellectual property), resources, staff, or services; and

“(B) does not include—

“(i) any payment of one or more elements of a student’s cost of attendance (as such term is defined in section 472) to an institution by, or scholarship from, a foreign source who is a natural person, acting in their individual capacity and not as an agent for, at the request or direction of, or on behalf of, any person or entity (except the student), made for not more than 15 students, and that is not made under a restricted or conditional contract with such foreign source;

“(ii) any assignment or license of a granted intellectual property right (including a patent, trademark, or copyright) that is not associated with a category listed in the Commerce Control List maintained by the Bureau of Industry and Security of the Department of Commerce and set forth in Supplement No. 1 to part 774 of title 15, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations); or

“(iii) decorations (as such term is defined in section 7342(a) of title 5, United States Code).

“(6) **RESTRICTED OR CONDITIONAL GIFT OR CONTRACT.**—The term ‘restricted or conditional gift or contract’ means any endowment, gift, grant, contract, award, present, or property (including intellectual property) of any kind which includes provisions regarding—

“(A) the employment, assignment, or termination of faculty;

“(B) the establishment of, or the provision of funding for, departments, centers, institutes, instructional programs, research or lecture programs, or new faculty positions;

“(C) the selection, admission, or education of students; or

“(D) the award of grants, loans, scholarships, fellowships, or other forms of financial aid restricted to students of a specified country, religion, sex, ethnic origin, or political opinion.”.

(b) **PROHIBITION ON CONTRACTS WITH CERTAIN FOREIGN ENTITIES AND COUNTRIES.**—Part B of title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1011 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 117 the following:

“**SEC. 117A. PROHIBITION ON CONTRACTS WITH CERTAIN FOREIGN ENTITIES AND COUNTRIES.**

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—An institution shall not enter into a contract with a foreign country of concern or a foreign entity of concern.

“(b) **WAIVERS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A waiver issued under this section to an institution with respect to a contract shall only—

“(A) waive the prohibition under subsection (a) for a 1-year period; and

“(B) apply to the terms and conditions of the proposed contract submitted as part of the request for such waiver.

“(2) **SUBMISSION.**—

“(A) **FIRST WAIVER REQUESTS.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—An institution that desires to enter into a contract with a foreign entity of concern or a foreign country of concern may submit to the Secretary, not later than 120 days before the institution enters into such a contract, a request to waive the prohibition under subsection (a) with respect to such contract.

“(ii) **CONTENTS OF WAIVER REQUEST.**—A waiver request submitted by an institution under clause (i) shall include—

“(I) the complete and unredacted text of the proposed contract for which the waiver is being

requested, and if such original contract is not in English, a translated copy of the text into English (in a manner that complies with section 117(c)); and

“(II) a statement that—

“(aa) is certified by a compliance officer of the institution designated in accordance with section 117D(c); and

“(bb) includes information that demonstrates that such contract—

“(AA) is for the benefit of the institution’s mission and students; and

“(BB) will promote the security, stability, and economic vitality of the United States.

“(B) **RENEWAL WAIVER REQUESTS.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—An institution that, pursuant to a waiver issued under this section, has entered into a contract, the term of which is longer than the 1-year waiver period and the terms and conditions of which remain the same as the proposed contract submitted as part of the request for such waiver may submit, not later than 120 days before the expiration of such waiver period, a request for a renewal of such waiver for an additional 1-year period (which shall include any information requested by the Secretary).

“(ii) **TERMINATION.**—If the institution fails to submit a request under clause (i) or is not granted a renewal under such clause, such institution shall terminate such contract on the last day of the original 1-year waiver period.

“(3) **WAIVER ISSUANCE.**—The Secretary—

“(A) not later than 60 days before an institution enters into a contract pursuant to a waiver request under paragraph (2)(A), or before a contract described in paragraph (2)(B)(i) is renewed pursuant to a renewal request under such paragraph, shall notify the institution—

“(i) if the waiver or renewal will be issued by the Secretary; and

“(ii) in a case in which the waiver or renewal will be issued, the date on which the 1-year waiver period starts; and

“(B) may only issue a waiver under this section to an institution if the Secretary determines, in consultation with each individual listed in section 117(e), that the contract for which the waiver is being requested—

“(i) is for the benefit of the institution’s mission and students; and

“(ii) will promote the security, stability, and economic vitality of the United States.

“(4) **DISCLOSURE.**—Not less than 2 weeks prior to issuing a waiver under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall notify the authorizing committees of the intent to issue the waiver, including a justification for the waiver.

“(c) **DESIGNATION DURING CONTRACT TERM.**—

In the case of an institution that enters into a contract with a foreign source that is not a foreign country of concern or a foreign entity of concern but which, during the term of such contract, is designated as a foreign country of concern or foreign entity of concern, such institution shall terminate such contract not later than 60 days after the Secretary notifies the institution of such designation.

“(d) **CONTRACTS PRIOR TO DATE OF ENACTMENT.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In the case of an institution that has entered into a contract with a foreign country of concern or foreign entity of concern prior to the date of enactment of the DETERRENT ACT—

“(A) the institution shall as soon as practicable, but not later than 30 days after such date of enactment, submit to the Secretary a waiver request in accordance with clause (ii) of subsection (b)(2)(A); and

“(B) the Secretary shall, upon receipt of the request submitted under such clause, issue a waiver to the institution for a period beginning on the date on which the waiver is issued and ending on the sooner of—

“(i) the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of the DETERRENT ACT; or

“(ii) the date on which the contract terminates.

“(2) RENEWAL.—An institution that has entered into a contract described in paragraph (1), the term of which is longer than the waiver period described in subparagraph (B) of such paragraph and the terms and conditions of which remain the same as the contract submitted as part of the request required under subparagraph (A) of such paragraph, may submit a request for renewal of the waiver issued under such paragraph in accordance with subsection (b)(2)(B).”

“(e) CONTRACT DEFINED.—The term ‘contract’ has the meaning given such term in section 117(f).”

(c) INTERAGENCY INFORMATION SHARING.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Education shall transmit to each individual listed in section 117(e) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended by this Act—

(1) an unredacted copy of each report (including the name and address of a foreign source disclosed in such report) received by the Department of Education under section 117 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1011f) prior to the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) any report, document, or other record generated by the Department of Education in the course of an investigation—

(A) of an institution with respect to the compliance of such institution with such section; and

(B) initiated prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. POLICY REGARDING CONFLICTS OF INTEREST FROM FOREIGN GIFTS AND CONTRACTS.

The Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.), as amended by the preceding section, is further amended by inserting after section 117A the following:

“SEC. 117B. INSTITUTIONAL POLICY REGARDING FOREIGN GIFTS AND CONTRACTS TO FACULTY AND STAFF.

“(a) REQUIREMENT TO MAINTAIN POLICY AND DATABASE.—Beginning not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the DETERRENT Act, each institution described in subsection (b) shall maintain—

“(1) a policy requiring covered individuals at the institution and covered individuals at affiliated entities of the institution to disclose in a report to such institution by July 31 of each calendar year that begins after the year in which such enactment date occurs—

“(A) any gift received from a foreign source in the previous calendar year, the value of which is greater than the minimal value (as such term is defined in section 7342(a) of title 5, United States Code) or is of indeterminate value, and including the date on which the gift was received;

“(B) any contract with a foreign source (other than a foreign country of concern or foreign entity of concern) entered into or in effect during the previous calendar year, the value of which is \$5,000 or more, considered alone or in combination with all other contracts with that foreign source within the calendar year, and including the date on which such contract is entered into, the date on which the contract first takes effect, and, as applicable, the date on which such contract terminates;

“(C) any contract with a foreign source (other than a foreign country of concern or foreign entity of concern) entered into or in effect during the previous calendar year that has an indeterminate monetary value, and including the date on which such contract is entered into, the date on which the contract first takes effect, and, as applicable, the date on which such contract terminates; and

“(D) any contract entered into or in effect with a foreign country of concern or foreign entity of concern during the previous calendar year, the value of which is \$0 or more or which has an indeterminate monetary value, and including—

“(i) the date on which such contract is entered into;

“(ii) the date on which the contract first takes effect;

“(iii) if the contract has a termination date, such termination date; and

“(iv) the full text of such contract and any addenda;

“(2) a publicly available and searchable database (in electronic and downloadable format), on a website of the institution, of the information required to be disclosed under paragraph (1) (other than the information prohibited from public disclosure pursuant to subsection (c)) that—

“(A) makes available the information disclosed under paragraph (1) (other than the information prohibited from public disclosure pursuant to subsection (c)) beginning on the date that is 30 days after receipt of the report under such paragraph containing such information and until the latest of—

“(i) the date that is 5 years after the date on which—

“(I) a gift referred to in paragraph (1)(A) is received; or

“(II) a contract referred to in subparagraph (B), (C) or (D) of paragraph (1) first takes effect;

“(ii) the date on which a contract referred to in subparagraph (B), (C) or (D) of paragraph (1) terminates; or

“(iii) the last day of any period that applicable State law requires a copy of such contract to be maintained; and

“(B) is searchable and sortable—

“(i) if the subject of the disclosure is a gift, by the date on which the gift is received;

“(ii) if the subject of the disclosure is a contract—

“(I) by the date on which such contract is entered into; and

“(II) by the date on which such contract first takes effect;

“(iii) by the attributable country with respect to which information is being disclosed;

“(iv)(I) if the covered individual at an institution is making the disclosure, by the most specific division of the institution (such as the department, school, or college) that the covered individual is at; and

“(II) if the covered individual at the affiliated entity of the institution is making the disclosure, by the name of such affiliated entity;

“(v) by the name of the foreign source; and

“(3) an effective plan to identify and manage potential information gathering by foreign sources through espionage targeting covered individuals that may arise from gifts received from, or contracts entered into with, a foreign source, including through the use of—

“(A) periodic communications;

“(B) accurate reporting under paragraph (2) of the information required to be disclosed under paragraph (1); and

“(C) enforcement of the policy described in paragraph (1); and

“(4) for purposes of investigations under section 117D(a)(1), a record of the name of each individual who makes a disclosure under paragraph (1) and each report disclosed under such paragraph.

“(b) INSTITUTIONS.—An institution shall be subject to the requirements of this section if such institution—

“(1) received more than \$50,000,000 in Federal funds in any of the previous five calendar years to support (in whole or in part) research and development (as determined by the institution and measured by the Higher Education Research and Development Survey of the National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics); or

“(2) receives funds under title VI.

“(c) APPLICATION OF FEDERAL PRIVACY LAW; PROTECTIONS FOR NATURAL PERSONS.—

“(1) APPLICATION OF FEDERAL PRIVACY LAW.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a disclosure made pursuant to this section is not subject to Federal privacy law.

“(2) PROTECTIONS FOR NATURAL PERSONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), with respect to a disclosure made pursuant to this section, the following may not be publicly disclosed:

“(i) The name or address (other than the attributable country) of a foreign source that is a natural person.

“(ii) The name or any other personally identifiable information of a covered individual making such disclosure.

“(B) EXCEPTIONS FOR CONTRACTS WITH A FOREIGN COUNTRY OF CONCERN OR FOREIGN ENTITY OF CONCERN.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to a disclosure made pursuant to this section that contains information with respect to a contract entered into with a foreign country of concern or foreign entity of concern.

“(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the terms ‘affiliated entity’, ‘attributable country’, ‘foreign source’, and ‘gift’ have the meanings given such terms in section 117(f);

“(2) the term ‘contract’—

“(A) means—

“(i) any agreement for the acquisition by purchase, lease, or barter of property (including intellectual property) or services by the foreign source;

“(ii) except as provided in subparagraph (B), any agreement for the acquisition by purchase, lease, or barter of property (including intellectual property) or services from a foreign source; and

“(iii) any affiliation, agreement, or similar transaction with a foreign source that involves the use or exchange of a covered individual’s name, likeness, time, services, or resources; and

“(B) does not include—

“(i) an arms-length agreement for the acquisition by purchase, lease, or barter of property (including intellectual property) or services from a foreign source that is not a foreign country of concern or a foreign entity of concern; and

“(ii) any assignment or license of a granted intellectual property right (including a patent, trademark, or copyright) that is not associated with a category listed in the Commerce Control List maintained by the Bureau of Industry and Security of the Department of Commerce and set forth in Supplement No. 1 to part 774 of title 15, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations); and

“(3) the term ‘covered individual’—

“(A) has the meaning given such term in section 223(d) of the William M. (Mac) Thornberry National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2021 (42 U.S.C. 6605); and

“(B) shall be interpreted in accordance with the Guidance for Implementing National Security Presidential Memorandum 33 (NSPM–33) on National Security Strategy for United States Government-Supported Research and Development published by the Subcommittee on Research Security and the Joint Committee on the Research Environment in January 2022 (or any successor guidance).”

SEC. 4. INVESTMENT DISCLOSURE REPORT.

The Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.), as amended by this Act, is further amended by inserting after section 117B the following:

“SEC. 117C. INVESTMENT DISCLOSURE REPORT.

“(a) INVESTMENT DISCLOSURE REPORT.—A specified institution shall file a disclosure report in accordance with subsection (b) with the Secretary on each July 31 immediately following any calendar year in which the specified institution purchases, sells, or holds (directly or indirectly through any chain of ownership) one or more investments of concern.

“(b) CONTENTS OF REPORT.—Each report to the Secretary required by subsection (a) shall contain, with respect to the calendar year preceding the calendar year in which such report is filed, the following information:

“(1) A list of the investments of concern purchased, sold, or held during such calendar year.

“(2) The aggregate fair market value of all investments of concern held as of the close of such calendar year.

“(3) The combined value of all investments of concern sold over the course of such calendar year, as measured by the fair market value of such investments at the time of the sale.

“(4) The combined value of all capital gains from such sales of investments of concern.

“(c) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN POOLED INVESTMENTS.—

“(1) POOLED INVESTMENT CLASSIFICATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, except as provided in subparagraph (B), a specified interest acquired by a specified institution in a regulated investment company, exchange traded fund, or any other pooled investment that holds an investment of concern shall be treated as an investment of concern and shall be reported pursuant to paragraph (2)(A).

“(B) CERTIFICATION OF POOLED INVESTMENT.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), such specified interest shall not be subject to subparagraph (A) if the Secretary certifies, pursuant to paragraph (2)(B), that such pooled investment is not holding an investment of concern.

“(2) PROCEDURES.—The Secretary, after consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Securities and Exchange Commission, shall establish procedures under which a pooled investment described in paragraph (1)—

“(A) shall be reported in accordance with the requirements of subsection (b); and

“(B) may be certified under paragraph (1)(B) as not holding an investment of concern.

“(d) TREATMENT OF RELATED ORGANIZATIONS.—For purposes of this section, assets held by any related organization (as defined in section 4968(d)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) with respect to a specified institution shall be treated as held by such specified institution, except that—

“(1) such assets shall not be taken into account with respect to more than 1 specified institution; and

“(2) unless such organization is controlled by such institution or is described in section 509(a)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to such institution, assets which are not intended or available for the use or benefit of such specified institution shall not be taken into account.

“(e) VALUATION OF DEBT.—For purposes of this section, the fair market value of any debt shall be the outstanding principal amount of such debt.

“(f) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary, after consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Securities and Exchange Commission, may issue such regulations or other guidance as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section, including regulations or other guidance providing for the proper application of this section with respect to certain regulated investment companies, exchange traded funds, and pooled investments.

“(g) DATABASE REQUIREMENT.—Beginning not later than May 31 of the calendar year following the date of enactment of the DETER-RENT Act, the Secretary shall—

“(1) establish and maintain a searchable database on a website of the Department, under which all reports submitted under this section—

“(A) are made publicly available (in electronic and downloadable format), including any information provided in such reports;

“(B) can be individually identified and compared; and

“(C) are searchable and sortable; and

“(2) not later than 30 days after receipt of a disclosure report under this section, include such report in such database.

“(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) INVESTMENT OF CONCERN.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘investment of concern’ means any specified interest with respect to any of the following:

“(i) A foreign country of concern.

“(ii) A foreign entity of concern.

“(B) SPECIFIED INTEREST.—The term ‘specified interest’ means, with respect to any entity—

“(i) stock or any other equity or profits interest of such entity;

“(ii) debt issued by such entity; and

“(iii) any contract or derivative with respect to any property described in clause (i) or (ii).

“(2) SPECIFIED INSTITUTION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘specified institution’, as determined with respect to any calendar year, means an institution that—

“(i) is not a public institution; and

“(ii) at the close of such calendar year, holds—

“(I) assets (other than those assets which are used directly in carrying out the institution’s exempt purpose) the aggregate fair market value of which is in excess of \$6,000,000,000; and

“(II) investments of concern the aggregate fair market value of which is in excess of \$250,000,000.

“(B) REFERENCES TO CERTAIN TERMS.—For the purpose of applying the definition under subparagraph (A), the terms ‘aggregate fair market value’ and ‘assets which are used directly in carrying out the institution’s exempt purpose’ shall be applied in the same manner as such terms are applied for the purposes of section 4968(b)(1)(D) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.”

SEC. 5. ENFORCEMENT AND OTHER GENERAL PROVISIONS.

(a) ENFORCEMENT AND OTHER GENERAL PROVISIONS.—The Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.), as amended by this Act, is further amended by inserting after section 117C the following:

“SEC. 117D. ENFORCEMENT; SINGLE POINT-OF-CONTACT; INSTITUTIONAL REQUIREMENTS.

“(a) ENFORCEMENT.—

“(1) INVESTIGATION.—The Secretary (acting through the General Counsel of the Department) shall conduct investigations of possible violations of sections 117, 117A, 117B, 117C, and subsection (c) of this section by institutions and, whenever it appears that an institution has knowingly or willfully failed to comply with a requirement of any of such provisions (including any rule or regulation promulgated under any such provision), shall request that the Attorney General bring a civil action in accordance with paragraph (2).

“(2) CIVIL ACTION.—Whenever it appears that an institution has knowingly or willfully failed to comply with a requirement of any of the provisions listed in paragraph (1) (including any rule or regulation promulgated under any such provision) based on an investigation under such paragraph, a civil action shall be brought by the Attorney General, at the request of the Secretary, in an appropriate district court of the United States, or the appropriate United States court of any territory or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, to request such court to compel compliance with the requirement of the provision that has been violated.

“(3) COSTS AND OTHER FINES.—An institution that is compelled to comply with a requirement of a provision listed in paragraph (1) pursuant to paragraph (2) shall—

“(A) pay to the Treasury of the United States the full costs to the United States of obtaining compliance with the requirement of such provision, including all associated costs of investigation and enforcement; and

“(B) if applicable, be subject to the applicable fines described in paragraph (4).

“(4) FINES FOR VIOLATIONS.—The Secretary shall impose a fine on an institution that is compelled to comply with a requirement of a section listed in paragraph (1) pursuant to paragraph (2) as follows:

“(A) SECTION 117.—

“(i) FIRST-TIME VIOLATIONS.—In the case of an institution that is compelled to comply with

a requirement of section 117 pursuant to a civil action described in paragraph (2), and that has not previously been compelled to comply with any such requirement pursuant to such a civil action, the Secretary shall impose a fine on the institution for such violation as follows:

“(I) In the case of an institution that knowingly or willfully fails to comply with a reporting requirement under subsection (a)(1) of section 117, such fine shall be in an amount that is—

“(aa) for each gift or contract with determinable value that is the subject of such a failure to comply, the greater of—

“(AA) \$50,000; or

“(BB) the monetary value of such gift or contract; or

“(bb) for each gift or contract of no value or of indeterminable value, not less than 1 percent and not more than 10 percent of the total amount of Federal funds received by the institution under this Act for the most recent fiscal year.

“(II) In the case of an institution that knowingly or willfully fails to comply with the reporting requirement under subsection (a)(2) of section 117, such fine shall be in an amount that is not less than 10 percent of the total amount of Federal funds received by the institution under this Act for the most recent fiscal year.

“(ii) SUBSEQUENT VIOLATIONS.—In the case of an institution that has previously been compelled to comply with a requirement of section 117 pursuant to a civil action described in paragraph (2), and is subsequently compelled to comply with such a requirement pursuant to a subsequent civil action described in paragraph (2), the Secretary shall impose a fine on the institution as follows:

“(I) In the case of an institution that knowingly or willfully fails to comply with a reporting requirement under subsection (a)(1) of section 117, such fine shall be in an amount that is—

“(aa) for each gift or contract with determinable value that is the subject of such a failure to comply, the greater of—

“(AA) \$100,000; or

“(BB) twice the monetary value of such gift or contract; or

“(bb) for each gift or contract of no value or of indeterminable value, not less than 5 percent and not more than 10 percent of the total amount of Federal funds received by the institution under this Act for the most recent fiscal year.

“(II) In the case of an institution that knowingly or willfully fails to comply with a reporting requirement under subsection (a)(2) of section 117, such fine shall be in an amount that is not less than 20 percent of the total amount of Federal funds received by the institution under this Act for the most recent fiscal year.

“(B) SECTION 117A.—

“(i) FIRST-TIME VIOLATIONS.—In the case of an institution that is compelled to comply with a requirement of section 117A pursuant to a civil action described in paragraph (2), and that has not previously been compelled to comply with any such requirement pursuant to such a civil action, the Secretary shall impose a fine on the institution in an amount that is not less than 5 percent and not more than 10 percent of the total amount of Federal funds received by the institution under this Act for the most recent fiscal year.

“(ii) SUBSEQUENT VIOLATIONS.—In the case of an institution that has previously been compelled to comply with a requirement of section 117A pursuant to a civil action described in paragraph (2), and is subsequently compelled to comply with such a requirement pursuant to a subsequent civil action described in paragraph (2), the Secretary shall impose a fine on the institution in an amount that is not less than 20 percent of the total amount of Federal funds received by the institution under this Act for the most recent fiscal year.

“(C) SECTION 117B.—

“(i) FIRST-TIME VIOLATIONS.—In the case of an institution that is compelled to comply with a requirement of section 117B pursuant to a civil action described in paragraph (2), and that has not previously been compelled to comply with any such requirement pursuant to such a civil action, the Secretary shall impose a fine on the institution for such violation in an amount that is the greater of—

“(I) \$250,000; or

“(II) the total amount of gifts or contracts that the institution is compelled to report pursuant to such civil action.

“(ii) SUBSEQUENT VIOLATIONS.—In the case of an institution that has previously been compelled to comply with a requirement of section 117B pursuant to a civil action described in paragraph (2), and is subsequently compelled to comply with such a requirement pursuant to a subsequent civil action described in paragraph (2), the Secretary shall impose a fine on the institution in an amount that is the greater of—

“(I) \$500,000; or

“(II) twice the total amount of gifts or contracts that the institution is compelled to report pursuant to such civil action.

“(D) SECTION 117C.—

“(i) FIRST-TIME VIOLATIONS.—In the case of an institution that is compelled to comply with a requirement of section 117C pursuant to a civil action described in paragraph (2), and that has not previously been compelled to comply with any such requirement pursuant to such a civil action, the Secretary shall impose a fine on the institution in an amount that is not less than 50 percent and not more than 100 percent of the sum of—

“(I) the aggregate fair market value of all investments of concern held by such institution as of the close of the final calendar year for which the institution is compelled to comply with such requirement pursuant to such civil action; and

“(II) the combined value of all investments of concern sold over the course of all the calendar years for which the institution is compelled to comply with such requirement pursuant to such civil action, as measured by the fair market value of such investments at the time of the sale.

“(ii) SUBSEQUENT VIOLATIONS.—In the case of an institution that has previously been compelled to comply with a requirement of section 117C pursuant to a civil action described in paragraph (2), and is subsequently compelled to comply with such a requirement pursuant to a subsequent civil action described in paragraph (2), the Secretary shall impose a fine on the institution in an amount that is not less than 100 percent and not more than 200 percent of the sum of—

“(I) the aggregate fair market value of all investments of concern held by such institution as of the close of the final calendar year for which the institution is compelled to comply with such requirement pursuant to such subsequent civil action; and

“(II) the combined value of all investments of concern over the course of all the calendar years for which the institution is compelled to comply with such requirement pursuant to such subsequent civil action, as measured by the fair market value of such investments at the time of the sale.

“(E) INELIGIBILITY FOR WAIVER.—In the case of an institution that is fined pursuant to subparagraph (A)(ii), (B)(ii), (C)(ii), or (D)(ii), the Secretary shall prohibit the institution from obtaining a waiver, or a renewal of a waiver, under section 117A.

“(b) SINGLE POINT-OF-CONTACT AT THE DEPARTMENT.—The Secretary shall maintain a single point-of-contact at the Department to—

“(I) receive and respond to inquiries and requests for technical assistance from institutions regarding compliance with the requirements of sections 117, 117A, 117B, 117C, and subsection (c) of this section;

“(2) coordinate and implement technical improvements to the database described in section 117(d)(1), including—

“(A) improving upload functionality by allowing for batch reporting, including by allowing institutions to upload one file with all required information into the database;

“(B) publishing and maintaining a database users guide, which shall be reviewed and updated as practicable but not less than annually, including information on how to edit an entry and how to report errors;

“(C) creating a standing user group (to which chapter 10 of title 5, United States Code, shall not apply) to discuss possible database improvements, which group shall—

“(i) include at least—

“(I) 3 members representing public institutions with high or very high levels of research activity (as defined by the National Center for Education Statistics);

“(II) 2 members representing private, non-profit institutions with high or very high levels of research activity (as so defined);

“(III) 2 members representing proprietary institutions of higher education (as defined in section 102(b)); and

“(IV) 2 members representing area career and technical education schools (as defined in subparagraph (C) or (D) of section 3(3) of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2302(3))); and

“(ii) meet at least twice a year with officials from the Department to discuss possible database improvements;

“(D) publishing, on a publicly available website, recommended database improvements following each meeting described in subparagraph (C)(ii); and

“(E) responding, on a publicly available website, to each recommendation published under subparagraph (D) as to whether or not the Department will implement the recommendation, including the rationale for either approving or rejecting the recommendation;

“(3) provide, every 90 days after the date of enactment of the DETERRENT Act, status updates on any pending or completed investigations and civil actions under subsection (a)(1) to—

“(A) the authorizing committees; and

“(B) any institution that is the subject of such investigation or action;

“(4) maintain, on a publicly accessible website—

“(A) a full comprehensive list of all foreign countries of concern and foreign entities of concern; and

“(B) the date on which the last update was made to such list; and

“(5) not later than 7 days after making an update to the list maintained under paragraph (4)(A), notify each institution required to comply with the sections listed in paragraph (1) of such update.

“(c) INSTITUTIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR COMPLIANCE OFFICERS AND INSTITUTIONAL POLICY REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An institution that is required to file a report under section 117 or 117C, that is seeking a waiver under section 117A, or that is subject to the requirements of section 117B, shall, not later than the earlier of the date on which the institution files the first report under section 117 or 117C, requests the institution's first waiver under section 117A, or first fulfills the requirements of section 117B—

“(A) establish an institutional policy that the institution shall follow in meeting the requirements of sections 117, 117A, 117B, and 117C; and

“(B) designate and maintain at least one, but not more than three, current employees or legally authorized agents of such institution to serve as compliance officers to carry out the requirements listed in paragraph (2).

“(2) DUTIES OF COMPLIANCE OFFICERS.—A compliance officer designated by an institution under paragraph (1)(B) shall certify—

“(A) whenever the institution is required to file a report under section 117 or 117C—

“(i) the institution's accurate compliance with the reporting requirements under such section;

“(ii) that the institution, in filing such report under section 117 or 117C—

“(I) followed the institutional policy established under paragraph (1)(A) applicable to such section; and

“(II) conducted good faith efforts and reasonable due diligence to ensure that accurate information is provided in such report, including with respect to the valuations of any assets that are disclosed in a report submitted under section 117C; and

“(iii) in the case of a report under section 117, any statements by the institution required to be certified by such an officer under clause (i) or (iv) of section 117(b)(1)(C); and

“(B) whenever the institution requests a waiver under section 117A—

“(i) that the institution—

“(I) is in compliance with the requirements of such section; and

“(II) followed the institutional policy established under paragraph (1)(A) applicable to such section; and

“(ii) the statement by the institution required to be certified by such an officer under section 117A(b)(2)(A)(ii)(II); and

“(C) whenever the institution is subject to the requirements of section 117B, that the institution—

“(i) is in compliance with the requirements of such section; and

“(ii) followed the institutional policy established under paragraph (1)(A) applicable to such section.

“(d) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of sections 117, 117A, 117B, 117C, and this section:

“(1) FOREIGN COUNTRY OF CONCERN.—The term ‘foreign country of concern’ means the following:

“(A) Any covered nation defined in section 4872 of title 10, United States Code.

“(B) Any country the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the Director of National Intelligence, determines, for purposes of sections 117, 117A, 117B, 117C, or this section, to be engaged in conduct that is detrimental to the national security or foreign policy of the United States.

“(2) FOREIGN ENTITY OF CONCERN.—The term ‘foreign entity of concern’ has the meaning given such term in section 10612(a) of the Research and Development, Competition, and Innovation Act (42 U.S.C. 19221(a)) and includes a foreign entity that is identified on the list published under section 1286(c)(8)(A) of the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (10 U.S.C. 22 4001 note; Public Law 115-232).

“(3) INSTITUTION.—The term ‘institution’ means an institution of higher education (as such term is defined in section 102, other than an institution described in subsection (a)(1)(C) of such section) with a program participation agreement under section 487.”

(b) PROGRAM PARTICIPATION AGREEMENT.—Section 487(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1094) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(30)(A) An institution will comply with the requirements of sections 117, 117A, 117B, 117C, and 117D(c).

“(B) In the case of an institution described in subparagraph (C), the institution will—

“(i) be ineligible to participate in the programs authorized by this title for a period of not less than 2 institutional fiscal years; and

“(ii) in order to regain eligibility to participate in such programs, demonstrate compliance with all requirements of each such section for not less than 2 institutional fiscal years after the institutional fiscal year in which such institution became ineligible.

“(C) An institution described in this subparagraph is an institution—

“(i) against which judgment has been granted in 3 separate civil actions described in section 117D(a)(2) that have each resulted in the institution being compelled to comply with one or more requirements of section 117, 117A, 117B, 117C, or 117D(c); and

“(ii) that pursuant to section 117D(a)(4)(E), is prohibited from obtaining a waiver, or a renewal of a waiver, under section 117A.”.

(c) GAO STUDY AND REPORT.—

(1) STUDY.—Not later than January 31 of the second calendar year that begins after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall initiate a study to identify ways to improve intergovernmental agency coordination regarding implementation and enforcement of sections 117, 117A, 117B, 117C, and 117D(c) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1011f), as amended or added by this Act, including increasing information sharing, increasing compliance rates, and establishing processes for enforcement.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of the initiation of the study under paragraph (1), the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress, and make public, a report containing the results of the study described in paragraph (1).

The Acting CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in House Report 119–38.

Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by the Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. OGLES

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 119–38.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 57, line 10, insert the following before the period: “, including any special administrative region within such a covered nation or any other territory that the United States recognizes as being under the control of such a covered nation on or after the date of the enactment of this subsection”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 242, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chair, America’s enemies will stop at nothing to destroy us, and they don’t care how they do it. These enemies would stoop so low as to target our young people. For years, countries like the People’s Republic of China have used our own universities to advance agendas that hurt American security.

Aside from the state of Qatar, there is probably no other country in the world that finances U.S. colleges and universities more than the People’s Republic of China. They use this all-access pass to steal our intellectual prop-

erty, abuse our student visa programs, and prop up Communist-inspired Confucius Institutes.

This places the Chinese authorities in a real position of influence among our young people, all the more so because our own government doesn’t try to hold our colleges and universities accountable to the basic disclosure standards.

A 2019 Senate report found that up to 70 percent of all institutions failed to comply with what are called section 117 disclosure requirements. Those that do not comply with section 117 substantially underreport their foreign donations and contracts.

Under current law, if gifts and contracts, either individual or combined, from an originating country meet or exceed \$250,000, these donations must be reported to the Department of Education twice a year.

By failing to enforce our laws, we are signaling to our enemies, especially China, that we don’t care if they use and abuse the American higher education system. As a result, we really don’t have a clear idea of the extent of China’s influence campaign against the youth of America.

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, parliamentary inquiry.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia will state his inquiry.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, what is the amendment that we are considering? Could the Chair give the page and line number?

The Acting CHAIR. It is amendment No. 1 and printed in House Report 119–38, page 57, line 10.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the intent of this amendment, as I understand it, is to ensure that special administrative regions, such as Hong Kong, are listed as a foreign country of concern if they are within a country of concern.

As I have discussed already, we don’t need to fuel xenophobia by targeting citizens in foreign countries. This amendment goes further by singling out residents of certain special administrative regions and requires people to know what that means so they will know who they can accept doughnuts from.

This amendment does nothing to thoughtfully protect our national security, and, therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote “no.”

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

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chairman, when mom and dad send their kids to college, they expect them to get a good education and a return on investment, not to be indoctrinated by our enemies.

The DETERRENT Act does a very valuable service by requiring proper re-

porting and ensuring that four countries, Iran, Russia, North Korea, and China, who actively seek to undermine our sovereignty, are designated as “foreign countries of concern.” Think about that list. This designation means that, for these countries, the foreign gift reporting threshold is zero.

□ 1515

Again, Mr. Chairman, I urge that if we know we have an adversary, we should have access to all of their influence peddling in our country that is targeting our youth so we have the full scale and scope of what they are doing.

There is no country better than China at money laundering. If we ensure that their reporting threshold is zero for the People’s Republic of China, that only solves one part of the equation. What happens when the leaders of the PRC attempt to continue their malign influence through Hong Kong or Macau? It could really marginalize the admirable intent of this legislation and could only temporarily, potentially, derail the PRC when we know they are going to try to get around it. We know they are going to launder money through other means.

We have to clear this up, shore this up, and further clarify.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, as I read the amendment, it says: “insert the following before the period: [comma] including any special administrative region within such a covered nation or any other territory that the United States recognizes as being under the control of such a covered nation on or after the date of the enactment of this subsection,” as to who is going to be a nation of concern.

Like I said, this is a question of whether or not you have to figure out what that means so you will know whether or not you can accept a doughnut from somebody from whatever that language means they come from. I don’t know how that has anything to do with national security.

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

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, I emphasize that we are talking about countries like Iran, Russia, North Korea, and China. Whether it is a bag of doughnuts or a bag of money, we know they are over here. We know they are doing it. It is not being fully reported. Mistakes are being made. They are trying to influence and brainwash our future leaders of this country.

We need to be proactive. We need to send a message that enough is enough. The reference to doughnuts, so be it. Whether it is a bag of doughnuts or a bag of money, if they are over here with malign intent, the American people have the right to know about it.

Those universities should be put on notice. If you are in bed with the enemy, you should be put on notice. If you are allowing subversion of our country on your campus, the American people should know it.

I don't see why anybody would have a problem with this. It is clear. We are talking about national security at a time when our adversaries are on the move.

I will note my sincere gratitude to both the chairman of the Education and Workforce Committee as well as the committee staff for working with my team on these amendments. This amendment ensures that special administrative regions of China, including Hong Kong and Macau, are covered under the definition of a "foreign country of concern" in this bill. Again, we know they are going to launder money through those areas.

It is a commonsense edit that secures American colleges and universities against the number one existential threat to our way of life: the Communist Party of China.

Mr. Chair, again, this is a no-nonsense amendment. This makes sure that we cover our flank, that we identify those areas where we know that other countries can launder money through to influence our campuses. We saw it in the spring. We saw it over this past year, the bad behavior on college campuses. We have to make sure that this money isn't getting through dark channels, back channels, and influencing our universities and our youth.

Mr. Chair, I urge adoption of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, just to say that everyone from a foreign country, even a foreign country of concern, is not here for malign purposes. Some are here to do research. The idea that people are here with malign purposes that are going to use coffee and doughnuts to advance that agenda I think is not necessary for our national defense.

Mr. Chair, I hope we defeat the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. OGLES

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 119-38.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike page 57, line 19 and all that follows through page 58, line 2, and insert the following:

"(2) FOREIGN ENTITY OF CONCERN.—The term 'foreign entity of concern' has the meaning given such term in section 10612(a) of the Research and Development, Competi-

tion, and Innovation Act (42 U.S.C. 19221(a)) and includes—

"(A) a foreign entity that is identified on the list published under section 1286(c)(9)(A) of the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (10 U.S.C. 4001 note; Public Law 115-232); and

"(B) a Chinese military company that is identified on the list required by section 1260H of the William M. (Mac) Thornberry National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2021 (10 U.S.C. 113 note; Public Law 116-283).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 242, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chair, this amendment ensures that Chinese military companies are included as foreign entities of concern for the purposes of this bill, which would subject such companies to a strict zero-dollar threshold for gifts and contracts.

The section 1260H list was established in the FY 2021 National Defense Authorization Act and has since been used as a blacklist for Chinese military companies that are directly or indirectly owned, controlled, or beneficially owned by the People's Liberation Army or the Central Military Commission of the Chinese Communist Party.

Needless to say, these companies aren't here to be our friends. They hate us, and they want to harm us. They are here to steal our technology and advance China's military modernization efforts. Even so, there are going to be colleges in this country that get so captivated by a dollar figure that they would salivate at the chance to work with our enemies.

Some of America's most sensitive property is housed or developed at our universities, and if there is a whiff of partnership between the institution of higher education and a Chinese military company, the American people deserve to know the details of every last gift and contract.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chair, the definition of a "foreign entity of concern" in this bill would include any company subject to the jurisdiction or direction of a government like China's. While constructive, there is still nothing in the underlying text of this bill and nothing within the definition of a "foreign entity of concern" that would automatically refer to the section 1260H list of Chinese military companies.

Since the section 1260H list is something that the Secretary of Defense is instructed to update, it is possible that there is a natural delay as to when Chinese military companies are designated

as foreign entities of concern for the purposes of this act.

This amendment provides clarity and ensures that any U.S. college or university entering into a contract with or receiving a donation from a section 1260H list company is required to first receive a section 117A waiver from the Department of Education.

Again, the reporting threshold for foreign entities of concern is zero, meaning that a gift or contract of any size or scope has to be reported.

Mr. Chair, this is about accountability. We know that they are here to steal our secrets. We know that they want to undermine us. As we go into the next phase of warfare that is not just on the battlefield but is cyber war and its capabilities therein, we know that China is aggressive in these spaces. They are in our universities. They are on our campuses. They want to steal this information. We have to have a mechanism of accountability and reporting so that we know who is doing what and where.

It is that simple. It will require universities to pick their partners carefully and make sure they are safeguarding the very technologies that they are being entrusted to house on behalf of the U.S. Government and the U.S. people.

We don't need to enable the Chinese military through modernization, weaponization, or their attack on us, our Constitution, or our way of life. All this does is require reporting. This isn't calling every Chinese individual a bad actor but is acknowledging the fact that they are our enemy and not our friend, and they want to supplant us as the sole world power.

Mr. Chair, I urge adoption of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would add Chinese military companies to the definition of "foreign entity of concern." It seems to me that if it is a Chinese military company, it would already be considered under the definition of an "entity of concern" because they are subject to the jurisdiction or direction of China, which is a foreign country of concern.

I don't know if this adds anything. I think it would be duplicative language. Therefore, I would recommend a "no" vote.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. SCOTT OF VIRGINIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 119-38.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 1, strike line 1 and all that follows through page 60, line 6 and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “DETERRENT Act of 2025”.

SEC. 2. DISCLOSURES OF FOREIGN GIFTS AND CONTRACTS.

Section 117 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1011f) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 117. DISCLOSURES OF FOREIGN GIFTS AND CONTRACTS.

“(a) DISCLOSURE REPORTS.—

“(1) AGGREGATE GIFT AND CONTRACT DISCLOSURES.—An institution shall file a disclosure report described in subsection (b) with the Secretary not later than July 31 of the calendar year immediately following any calendar year in which—

“(A) the institution receives a gift from, or enters into a contract with, a foreign source, the value of which is \$100,000 or more, considered alone or in combination with all other gifts from, or contracts with, that foreign source within the calendar year; or

“(B) the institution receives a gift from, or enters into a contract with, a foreign source, the value of which totals \$250,000 or more, considered alone or in combination with all other gifts from, or contracts with, that foreign source over the previous 3 calendar years.

“(2) FOREIGN SOURCE OWNERSHIP OR CONTROL DISCLOSURES.—In the case of an institution that is substantially owned or controlled (as described in section 668.174(c)(3) of title 34, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations)) by a foreign source, the institution shall file a disclosure report described in subsection (b) with the Secretary not later than July 31 of every year.

“(b) CONTENTS OF REPORT.—Each report to the Secretary required under subsection (a) shall contain the following:

“(1)(A) In the case of gifts or contracts described in subsection (a)(1)—

“(i) for gifts received from, or contracts entered into with, a foreign government, the aggregate amount of such gifts and contracts received from or entered into with such foreign government;

“(ii) for gifts received from, or contracts entered into with, a foreign source other than a foreign government, the aggregate dollar amount of such gifts and contracts attributable to a particular country and the legal or formal name of the foreign source; and

“(iii) the intended purpose of such gift or contract, as provided to the institution by such foreign source, or if no such purpose is provided by such purpose is provided by such source, the intended use of such gift or contract, as provided by the institution.

“(B) For purposes of this paragraph, the country to which a gift is attributable is—

“(i) the country of citizenship or, if unknown, the principal residence, for a foreign source who is a natural person; or

“(ii) the country of incorporation or, if unknown, the principal place of business, for a foreign source that is a legal entity.

“(2) In the case of an institution required to file a report under subsection (a)(2)—

“(A) for gifts received from, or contracts entered into with, a foreign source, without regard to the value of such gift or contract, the information described in paragraph (1)(A);

“(B) the identity of the foreign source that owns or controls the institution;

“(C) the date on which the foreign source assumed ownership or control; and

“(D) any changes in program or structure resulting from such ownership or control.

“(3) An assurance that the institution will maintain a true copy of each gift or contract agreement subject to the disclosure requirements under this section, until the latest of—

“(A) the date that is 4 years after the date of the agreement;

“(B) the date on which the agreement terminates; or

“(C) the last day of any period of which applicable State public record law requires a true copy of such agreement to be maintained.

“(4) An assurance that the institution will—

“(A) produce true copies of gift and contract agreements subject to the disclosure requirements under this section upon request of the Secretary during a compliance audit or other institutional investigation; and

“(B) ensure that all contracts from the foreign source are translated into English, as applicable.

“(c) ADDITIONAL DISCLOSURES FOR RESTRICTED AND CONDITIONAL GIFTS AND CONTRACTS.—Notwithstanding subsection (b), whenever any institution receives a restricted or conditional gift or contract from a foreign source, the institution shall disclose the following to the Secretary, translated into English:

“(1) For such gifts received from, or contracts entered into with, a foreign source other than a foreign government, the amount, the date, and a description of such conditions or restrictions. The report shall also disclose the country of citizenship, or if unknown, the principal residence for a foreign source which is a natural person, and the country of incorporation, or if unknown, the principal place of business for a foreign source which is a legal entity.

“(2) For gifts received from, or contracts entered into with, a foreign government, the amount, the date, a description of such conditions or restrictions, and the name of the foreign government.

“(d) DATABASE REQUIREMENT.—Beginning not later than 30 days before the July 31 immediately following the date of enactment of the DETERRENT Act of 2025, the Secretary shall—

“(1) establish and maintain a searchable database on a website of the Department, under which each report submitted under this section—

“(A) is, not later than 60 days after the date of the submission of such report, made publicly available (in electronic and downloadable format);

“(B) can be identified and compared to other such reports; and

“(C) is searchable and sortable by—

“(i) the date the institution filed such report;

“(ii) the date on which the institution received the gift, or entered into the contract, which is the subject of the report; and

“(iii) the attributable country of such gift or contract as described in subsection (b)(1)(B); and

“(2) indicate, as part of the public record of a report included in such database, whether the report was submitted by the institution with respect to a gift received from, or a contract entered into with—

“(A) a foreign source that is a foreign government; or

“(B) a foreign source that is not a foreign government.

“(e) RELATION TO OTHER REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) STATE REQUIREMENTS.—If an institution that is required to file a disclosure report under subsection (a) is in a State that has enacted requirements for public disclosure of gifts from, or contracts with, a for-

foreign source that includes all information required under this section for the same or an equivalent time period, the institution may file with the Secretary a copy of the disclosure report filed with the State in lieu of the report required under such subsection. The State in which the institution is located shall provide the Secretary such assurances as the Secretary may require to establish that the institution has met the requirements for public disclosure under State law if the State report is filed.

“(2) USE OF OTHER FEDERAL REPORTS.—If an institution receives a gift from, or enters into a contract with, a foreign source, where any other department, agency, or bureau of the executive branch requires a report containing all the information required under this section for the same or an equivalent time period, a copy of the report may be filed with the Secretary in lieu of a report required under subsection (a).

“(f) MODIFICATION OF REPORTS.—The Secretary shall incorporate a process permitting institutions to revise and update previously filed disclosure reports under this section to ensure accuracy, compliance, and ability to cure.

“(g) SANCTIONS FOR NONCOMPLIANCE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—As a sanction for non-compliance with the requirements under this section, the Secretary may impose a fine on an institution that in any year knowingly or willfully violates this section, that is—

“(A) in the case of a failure to disclose a gift or contract with a foreign source as required under this section, or to comply with the requirements of subparagraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (b)(4) pursuant to the assurances made under such subsection, in an amount that is not less than \$250 but not more than 50 percent of the amount of the gift or contract with the foreign source; or

“(B) in the case of any violation of the requirements of subsection (a)(2), in an amount that is not more than 25 percent of the total amount of funding received by the institution under this Act (other than funds received under title IV of this Act).

“(2) REPEATED FAILURES.—

“(A) KNOWING AND WILLFUL FAILURES.—In addition to a fine for a violation in any year under paragraph (1), the Secretary may impose a fine on an institution that knowingly or willfully violates this section for 3 consecutive years, that is—

“(i) in the case of a failure to disclose a gift or contract with a foreign source as required under this section or to comply with the requirements of subparagraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (b)(4) pursuant to the assurances made under such subsection, in an amount that is not less than \$100,000 but not more than the amount of the gift or contract with the foreign source; or

“(ii) in the case of any violation of the requirements of subsection (a)(2), in an amount that is not more than 25 percent of the total amount of funding received by the institution under this Act (other than funds received under title IV of this Act).

“(B) ADMINISTRATIVE FAILURES.—The Secretary may impose a fine on an institution that fails to comply with the requirements of this section due to administrative errors for 3 consecutive years, in an amount that is not less than \$250 but not more than 50 percent of the amount of the gift or contract with the foreign source.

“(C) COMPLIANCE PLAN REQUIREMENT.—If an institution fails to file a disclosure report for a receipt of a gift from or contract with a foreign source for 2 consecutive years, the Secretary may require the institution to submit a compliance plan.

“(h) COMPLIANCE OFFICER.—Any institution that is required to report a gift or contract

under this section shall designate and maintain a compliance officer who—

“(1) shall be a current employee (including such an employee with another job title or duties other than the duties described in paragraph (2)) or legally authorized agent of such institution; and

“(2) shall be responsible, on behalf of the institution, for compliance with the foreign gift reporting requirement under this section.

“(i) SINGLE POINT OF CONTACT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall appoint and maintain a single point of contact to—

“(A) receive and respond to inquiries and requests for technical assistance from institutions of higher education regarding compliance with the requirements of this section; and

“(B) coordinate and implement technical improvements to the database described in subsection (d), including—

“(i) improving upload functionality by allowing for batch reporting, including by allowing institutions to upload to the database one file with all required information;

“(ii) publishing and maintaining, on an annual basis, a database user guide that includes information on how to edit an entry and how to report errors;

“(iii) creating a user group (to which chapter 10 of title 5, United States Code, shall not apply) to discuss possible database improvements, which shall—

“(I) include at least—

“(aa) 3 members representing public institutions with high or very high levels of research activity (as defined by the National Center for Education Statistics);

“(bb) 2 members representing private, nonprofit institutions with high or very high levels of research activity (as so defined);

“(cc) 2 members representing proprietary institutions of higher education (as defined in section 102(b)); and

“(dd) 2 members representing area career and technical education schools (as defined in subparagraph (C) or (D) of section 3(3) of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2302(3)); and

“(II) meet at least twice a year with officials from the Department to discuss possible database improvements; and

“(iv) publishing, on a publicly available website—

“(I) following each meeting described in clause (iii)(II), recommended database improvements; and

“(II) with respect to each recommended improvement described in subclause (I)—

“(aa) the decision of the Department as to whether such recommended improvement will be implemented; and

“(bb) the rationale for such decision.

“(2) PROHIBITION.—An outside person may not serve as the single point-of-contact required under paragraph (1).

“(3) CONFLICTS OF INTEREST.—The Secretary shall establish a policy to ensure that any person serving as the single point-of-contact under paragraph (1) is free from conflicts of interest.

“(j) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN PAYMENTS AND GIFTS.—

“(1) EXCLUSIONS.—The following shall not be considered a gift from, or contract with, a foreign source under this section:

“(A) any payment of one or more elements of a student's cost of attendance (as defined in section 472) to an institution by, or scholarship from, a foreign source who is a natural person, acting in their individual capacity and not as an agent for, at the request or direction of, or on behalf of, any person or entity (except the student), made on behalf of students that is not made under contract with such foreign source, except for the

agreement between the institution and such student covering one or more elements of such student's cost of attendance.

“(B) Assignment or license of registered industrial and intellectual property rights, such as patents, utility models, trademarks, or copy-rights, or technical assistance, that are not identified as being associated with a national security risk or concern.

“(C) Any payment from a foreign source that is solely for the purpose of conducting one or more clinical trials.

“(2) INCLUSIONS.—Any gift to, or contract with, an entity or organization, such as a research foundation, that operates substantially for the benefit or under the auspices of an institution shall be considered a gift to, or contract with, such institution.

“(k) RESTRICTIONS ON DATA ACCESS.—None of the information submitted to or maintained by the Department of Education pursuant to this section may be made available to an outside person unless—

“(1) the sharing of such information with such person is specifically authorized or required by this section; or

“(2) such information is required to be made publicly available under this section.

“(l) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘clinical trial’ means a research study in which one or more human subjects are prospectively assigned to one or more interventions to evaluate the effects of those interventions on health-related biomedical or behavioral outcomes;

“(2) the term ‘contract’—

“(A) means any—

“(i) agreement for the acquisition by purchase, lease, or barter of property or services by the foreign source, for the direct benefit or use of either of the parties, except as provided in subparagraph (B); or

“(ii) affiliation, agreement, or similar transaction with a foreign source that is based on the use or exchange of an institution's name, likeness, time, services, or resources, except as provided in subparagraph (B); and

“(B) does not include any agreement made by an institution located in the United States for the acquisition, by purchase, lease, or barter, of property or services from a foreign source;

“(3) the term ‘foreign source’ means—

“(A) a foreign government, including an agency of a foreign government;

“(B) a legal entity, governmental or otherwise, created under the laws of a foreign state or states;

“(C) an individual who is not a citizen or a national of the United States or a trust territory or protectorate thereof; and

“(D) an agent, including a subsidiary or affiliate of a foreign legal entity, acting on behalf of a foreign source;

“(4) the term ‘gift’—

“(A) means any gift of money, property, resources, staff, or services; and

“(B) does not include anything described in section 487(e)(2)(B)(ii);

“(5) the term ‘institution’ means an institution of higher education, as defined in section 102, or, if a multicampus institution, any single campus of such institution, in any State;

“(6) the term ‘outside person’—

“(A) means any person who is not a direct employee of the Department of Education; and

“(B) includes any person who is a political appointee, special government employee, or employee detailed from any agency outside the Department of Education; and

“(7) the term ‘restricted or conditional gift or contract’ means any endowment, gift, grant, contract, award, present, or property of any kind that includes provisions regarding—

“(A) the employment, assignment, or termination of faculty;

“(B) the establishment of departments, centers, institutes, instructional programs, research or lecture programs, or faculty positions;

“(C) the selection or admission of students; or

“(D) the award of grants, loans, scholarships, fellowships, or other forms of financial aid restricted to students of a specified country, religion, sex, ethnic origin, or political opinion.”

SEC. 3. REGULATIONS.

(a) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Education shall begin the negotiated rulemaking process under section 492 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1098a) to carry out the amendment made by section 2.

(b) ISSUES.—Regulations issued pursuant to subsection (a) to carry out the amendment made by section 2 shall, at a minimum, address the following issues:

(1) Instructions on reporting structured gifts and contracts.

(2) The inclusion in institutional reports of gifts received from, and contracts entered into with, foreign sources by entities and organizations, such as research foundations, that operate substantially for the benefit or under the auspices of the institution.

(3) Procedures to protect confidential or proprietary information included in gifts and contracts.

(4) The alignment of such regulations with the reporting and disclosure of foreign gifts or contracts required by Federal agencies other than the Department of Education, including with respect to—

(A) the CHIPS Act of 2022 (Division A of Public Law 117-167; 15 U.S.C. 4651 note);

(B) the Research and Development, Competition, and Innovation Act (Division B of Public Law 117-167; 42 U.S.C. 18901 note); and

(C) any guidance released by the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy, including the Guidance for Implementing National Security Presidential Memorandum 33 (NSPM-33) on National Security Strategy for United States Government-supported Research and Development published by the Subcommittee on Research Security and the Joint Committee on the Research Environment in January 2022.

(5) The treatment of foreign gifts or contracts involving research or technologies identified as being associated with a national security risk or concern.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by section 2 shall take effect on the date on which the regulations issued under subsection (a) take effect.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 242, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I am pleased to offer the Democrat amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 1048.

As I have mentioned, universities collaborate with various international entities to advance complex research inquiries that contribute to the advancement of our knowledge of many issues. These international partnerships allow for a diverse range of perspectives and resources that help our Nation make significant strides in health, science, and technology.

As I have mentioned before, my Democratic colleagues and I remain committed to ensuring that universities and colleges have the resources to safeguard their work from undue foreign influence. However, I appreciate the majority's interest in addressing this important issue, but I will emphasize, again, that their proposal is far too extreme and would not promote compliance but rather deter universities from conducting collaborative research.

Specifically, with such harsh fines and limited opportunities for universities to receive guidance from the Department of Education, I am concerned that these changes to section 117 of the Higher Education Act would discourage universities from collaborating with international entities, including our strong allies, that are essential in solving important global issues.

At a time when President Trump is already illegally halting vital research across the country through disruptions to USAID and NIH funding, this international collaboration is now more essential than ever.

I am concerned that we still see language that targets individual faculty members for their collaborations with foreign entities, including their own colleagues on campus. This kind of targeting easily leads to hurtful consequences rooted in xenophobia for innocent scholars and students. We have a responsibility to strike a balance between enforcing the law and fostering safe campuses for students, scholars, and faculty.

Unlike the DETERRENT Act, our Democratic substitute takes a thoughtful approach to section 117 compliance to support universities as they evaluate and implement their research integrity and foreign influence policies.

In addition to requiring the filing of annual reports for gifts and contracts from foreign entities, our amendment would create a robust database at the Department of Education to hold these reports. It establishes commonsense sanctions for noncompliance and allows for room to help universities that need support scaling up their compliance efforts rather than punishing them by pursuing civil penalties. It establishes a single point of contact at the Department, who can't be some unverified DOGE staffer, to coordinate section 117 compliance.

The substitute also builds on the robust work done through implementation of the CHIPS and Science Act and the subsequent interagency work of the Biden administration to protect federally funded research and development from foreign influence. Our amendment would align reporting requirements to those of other Federal agencies and require the Secretary of Education to go through negotiated rulemaking to address key implementation aspects of section 117 with relevant higher education and national security stakeholders.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support the Democratic substitute, rather than the underlying bill, to enhance the ability of our Nation's universities to protect against undue foreign influence while supporting international partnerships that enhance groundbreaking scientific research, build relationships across cultures, and increase our national competitiveness.

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

□ 1530

The Acting CHAIR. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, this is essentially the same amendment that my friend and colleague, Ranking Member SCOTT, offered last Congress on the floor as well as this Congress during committee markup.

Sadly, the same serious problems remain, I believe. Instead of taking the threats of foreign influence seriously, this amendment is insufficient to protect our students and institutions from our worst adversaries.

The amendment, first, makes it easier for foreign sources to be undetected, doubling the threshold for contracts to \$100,000 and allowing gifts under \$250,000 over a 3-year span to be unreported. Bad actors will seek any possible way to avoid transparency about their attempts to harm America through their influence over American postsecondary education. A strict threshold is essential to stop that from happening.

The annual thresholds in the DETERRENT Act are simple and align with other requirements in existing law such as in the CHIPS Act and the Presidential Memorandum on United States Government-Supported Research and Development National Security Policy.

Shockingly, this amendment includes no differences for America's biggest enemies, countries of concern and entities of concern. In my Democratic colleagues' minds, it appears that gifts from Russia, China, and Iran are the exact same gifts as those from England.

I remind everyone here that the DETERRENT Act uses a tailored list of countries and individuals pulled from existing law that have a proven track record of being security threats and actively working against the United States.

The Democratic ANS also has terrible carve-outs that provide gaping loopholes for cunning adversaries. The amendment allows gifts and contracts to be rendered anonymous, with no foreign source identification, and also exempts all clinical trials. These loopholes will make it easier for foreign sources to conceal their relationships,

rendering disclosures all but useless. Simple transparency is the best way to ensure partnerships are as good as institutions claim.

Finally, the Democratic proposal ensures schools have no financial risk for failing to disclose foreign funds. Under this proposal, years of flouting section 117 simply allow schools to go right back to their same financial state before accepting the gift in the first place.

It is time to take foreign influence seriously. I stand against this amendment. It is time we hold institutions accountable for accepting foreign donations and keeping them from the public. The bipartisan support we have for this bill shows the seriousness of this problem. This amendment shows that some Democrats are still willing to turn a blind eye to attempts by hostile regimes to influence students and faculty on our college campuses.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment and support the underlying bill. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I think the gentleman from Michigan had the right to close, so I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. AMODEI). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. SELF

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 119-38.

Mr. SELF. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, line 5, strike "\$50,000" and insert "\$1".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 242, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SELF) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SELF. Mr. Chair, I rise to support my amendment. I am outraged that our universities and institutions are receiving gifts or entering into contracts with foreign countries that seek to destroy or harm the United States.

H.R. 1048, the DETERRENT Act, would strengthen disclosure requirements by reducing the threshold from \$250,000 to \$50,000, but those provisions are not strong enough. The American people deserve to know about every

single dollar coming from adversary foreign sources, no matter how small.

That is why I am introducing an amendment to slash the reporting threshold from \$50,000 all the way down to \$1; total transparency of every cent. Any foreign gift, no matter how small, can influence our democracy, and we must close any loophole that lets foreign actors purchase access or sway our institutions.

This is not about research. This is about human intelligence collection and business espionage. Having spent time in the intelligence community while I was in the military, this is a serious matter.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and ensure full transparency. Our constituents demand transparency today, and I say let's give them transparency. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment and yield myself such time as I may consume.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman has yielded back?

The Acting CHAIR. That is correct.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, by lowering the reporting threshold to \$1, universities would be required to report every single gift from any country if the person is not a citizen of the United States. That would mean every cup of coffee, every doughnut, every ride home would have to be reported. This would create an unworkable increase in reporting requirements for universities and individual faculty members, which would undoubtedly lead to a significant backlog at the Department of Education when trying to review the reports and adhering to tight disclosure guidelines and time-tables.

This doesn't have anything to do with national security. I think it is just an administrative nightmare, and therefore I would ask for a "no" vote.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SELF).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MS. TLAIB

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 119-38.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 57, after line 18, insert the following:

"(C) Any country that is defending against a case before the International Court of Justice relating to an alleged violation by such country of—

"(i) any of the Geneva Conventions of 1949 or their Additional Protocols; or

"(ii) the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide.

"(D) Any country the government of which includes officials that have outstanding arrest warrants issued by the International Criminal Court."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 242, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Chair, this bill is yet another Republican attack aimed at dismantling higher education in our Nation.

Last week, we know that President Trump ordered the illegal elimination of the Department of Education, threatening the future of millions of children across every district in our country. He is using the threat of cutting off Federal funding as a negative approach, very much taking a tool right here to pressure the universities and administrations to submit to his will in violation of freedom of speech for their students.

Mr. Chair, instead of addressing any of these crises threatening our students in our education system, we are here voting today on a bill that goes after foreign scapegoats instead.

We know that President Trump is the biggest threat to our education system in America right now, not someone in North Korea or China. Please, give me a break.

I fully support financial transparency in our universities. No one is against that. No one. That is why I am introducing amendments to this bill to ensure that transparency around our universities and the relationships with so-called countries of concern include countries whose leaders have active arrest warrants issued against them by the International Criminal Court, to include countries actively on trial with the International Court of Justice for violating the Genocide Convention and the Geneva Conventions.

I am calling for transparency, Mr. Chair, around university investments in companies profiting from violations of international law, but my colleagues are not interested, of course, when it comes to that sort of transparency. My colleagues are not interested in holding countries with human rights abuses accountable. They are not interested in voting to uphold international law, Mr. Chair. They are only interested in voting to protect governments like the Israeli Government's apartheid regime.

In fact, many of my colleagues have cheered on expulsion, arrest, and deportation of university students calling for the exact type of transparency and exercising their First Amendment right, Mr. Chair, their constitutional

right. You don't have to agree with them, Mr. Chair, no one does, but it is their right. It is their right to again express their disagreement with policy and decisions by a foreign government.

In fact, many of my colleagues again continue to say there is transparency for some countries in relationships with universities but not certain other countries, even if they have an investigation actively with the international court system.

This is not about transparency, as is claimed. It is truly about destroying freedom of speech and the most important American value in our country, the right to dissent.

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The DETERRENT Act conforms section 117 with other existing regulations, which is why the bill's definitions of countries of concern come from existing law. The four countries on the countries of concern list are rightfully in statute as unique threats to the United States. China, Russia, North Korea, and Iran represent countries that are actively hostile to the U.S. and are serious security threats. The DETERRENT Act ensures that any relationship with these countries is extremely cautious and proactively transparent.

In contrast, this amendment attempts to use the illegitimate International Criminal Court to determine what countries are threats to the United States. The people of the United States in majority do not support that. As President Trump has stated, the ICC has baselessly asserted jurisdiction over the United States—and our citizens agree—and its allies like Israel and further abused its power by issuing frivolous arrest warrants.

There is no reason to use the ICC to define what countries are actively seeking to harm the United States. We can do that. I oppose this amendment that targets Israel and hurts American interests, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1545

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Chair, I think "countries of concern" is perfectly explained in my amendment. That is to say, again, I know for a fact that some of these countries killed American citizens. Some of them are literally openly killing American citizens, and the countries of concern, to explain—this is so important—that the International Court of Justice, if there is any violation, these are violations to the Geneva Convention and the Genocide Convention.

If we are specifically talking about making sure that universities are not engaging in whatever they are calling

so-called threats our country, why is it that certain countries, again, who are under investigation for violating international law, many of which are under investigation for war crimes like bombing hospitals and schools and everything, are using it in the way that is also violating people's freedom of speech? They are using some of the resources they have in silencing many university students, especially those speaking out against genocide that is happening in Gaza.

I think it is important that if we are for transparency, let's talk about all violations of international law and human rights in all countries, again, countries of interest to include all of those folks that have active cases and arrest warrants for the people running their country.

We can go back and forth about whether or not we think the ICC is legitimate, but it exists. It exists to prevent what is actually happening right now. I think it is important that if we are going to be consistent about whether or not we are protecting American interests, what about Americans that are being killed by countries of interest that I am trying to include here? What about them? What about the folks whose rights continue to be violated when they travel to those countries?

I think it is really important and critical that if we are going to say this to universities and that we are targeting higher education, that we are consistent in what we say is a violation of international law and human rights.

I think, Mr. Chair, it is so important that we continue to protect the American interests. Right now it is very clear that this is an attack. The opposition to this is because it is an attack on the fact that many folks want the right to speak out against certain countries that are violating international law.

It is critical that we protect the right to dissent in our country. So many of my colleagues, even when I don't agree with them, I protect their right to speak up and say whatever they want, even if I disagree.

I know what this is about. This is about silencing people. If my colleagues are going to do it, they better include the folks committing genocide. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chair, again, this amendment is designed, I believe, to target Israel at a time when it is desperately seeking to defend its citizens against terrorists.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further pro-

ceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MS. TLAIB

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 119-38.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 39, after line 21, insert the following new clause:

(iii) any entity the Secretary of State determines consistently, knowingly, and directly facilitates and enables state violence and repression, war and occupation, or severe violations of international law and human rights, including as a result of doing business with or providing services to any country—

(I) that is defending against a case before the International Court of Justice relating to an alleged violation by such country of any of the Geneva Conventions of 1949 or their Additional Protocols or the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide; or

(II) the current government of which includes officials that have outstanding arrest warrants issued by the International Criminal Court.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 242, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Chair, this amendment is to discuss whether or not, again, our body, the United States House of Representatives, is standing and making sure that we don't undermine international law and the institutions that work to uphold it, especially the International Court of Justice and the International Criminal Court.

I think it is incredibly harmful to allow many of my colleagues to take great lengths right here to protect war criminals, apartheid regimes, folks that continue to commit war crimes in targeting civilians including tent communities, schools, and hospitals. This bill undermines the international legal system for seeking to hold various officials, again, countries that are violating crimes against humanity.

Again, it is really important. My amendment basically allows us to include countries that are currently under investigation or their leaders have been convicted or have an arrest warrant out for the fact that they have committed violation of international human rights laws.

I know when it comes to Russia or China, my colleagues like to talk about rule-based international order. When it comes to governments like the government of Israel, my colleagues are willing to throw international law in the shredder. Their actions consistently undermine the principle of equal justice under law when they protect perpetrators of the most horrific crimes against humanity.

I wish my colleagues would see what is happening. I wish they would see that, no matter their ethnicity, we should be saving the lives of the children. We shouldn't allow it to be enabled or emboldened. Their actions consistently undermine the principle of equal justice.

Of course, it is up to world leaders everywhere to affirm our commitment to international law, but let's be consistent about it. No matter who is committing it, it still is a violation of international human rights laws.

It is important to support the International Court of Justice and International Criminal Court. They were created so we can prevent genocide and so we can stop what is happening in Gaza.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chair, the DETERRENT Act ensures section 117 is aligned with existing statute. The four countries on the countries of concern list are rightfully in statute as unique threats to the United States. That is our concern. China, Russia, North Korea, and Iran represent countries that are actively hostile to the U.S. and are serious security threats.

Endowment investments in companies controlled by our adversaries could result in dangerous support for our enemies. This is why the DETERRENT Act requires institutions to disclose any such investments of concern. It is important for our wealthiest institutions to be transparent with the public about this danger.

In contrast, this amendment attempts to use the illegitimate International Criminal Court to determine what countries are threats to the United States and targets endowment investments into those threats.

The ICC has baselessly asserted jurisdiction over the United States and its allies like Israel and further abused its power by issuing frivolous arrest warrants. There is no reason to use the ICC to define what countries are actively seeking to harm the United States and what endowment investments should be transparent.

Mr. Chair, I oppose this amendment that targets Israel and hurts American interests.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Chair, I think it is really important to understand the International Criminal Court right now is investigating right now an active case against what is happening in Sudan. Are we saying we are not caring?

I completely agree. Any country—Iran, China, Russia—any country that has an active investigation or has arrest warrants for their leadership in the International Criminal Court system and these international systems that are in place was to prevent and, again, protect the interests of the American people.

All of us support upholding international law because it protects our country, but it protects the rule of law in making sure that war crimes are not being committed.

Mr. Chair, I really urge my colleagues to understand we need to be consistent here. If you are going to say we are going to go after universities—because I know what this is really about. Is this really about China and Russia and protecting our interests, or is this really about trying to not protect certain people for speaking up in regard to what is happening in Gaza?

The attack on higher education right now and freedom of speech is incredibly dangerous. The right to dissent in our country, the freedom of speech, First Amendment—you do not have to agree. I was on my campus when I didn't agree with what people said about immigrants and what people said about other countries. I understood the American value of people having their rights and their First Amendment right to speak up.

What we are doing here is attacking and targeting universities because we don't like that their student body read about the atrocities that the Government of Israel is doing. That is what this is about. I think people need to be honest what this is about and not shy around about it.

I will say the international court system that is in place was created because of some horrific history that has happened in our world, and we are trying to prevent it. For us to now say it is illegitimate is wrong, and it is not the direction we should be going in. This is literally the place, again, that is investigating a number of other countries for egregious war crimes and egregious violence on women and children.

Now, because we don't agree that they went after one country—again, many of my colleagues disagree with me—I can tell you it takes a lot of investigation, talking to doctors, nurses, so many people on the ground, NGOs and other international organizations that led to, again, the investigation that has led into International Criminal Court.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Michigan has 30 seconds remaining.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Chair, in closing, I think it is important to know right now the International Court of Justice is investigating Congo, Uganda, Philippines, Venezuela, and Sudan. These are countries that have been under investigation by the International Criminal Court.

I don't have all the details, but it I think it is important to understand we can't delegitimize when it is a country that we disagree is committing these crimes. The process is there for a reason, Mr. Chair. Again, it is to make sure we uphold international human rights laws, no matter who is committing those egregious crimes.

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the concern and the passion of

my colleague from Michigan. I concur that I and sponsors and cosponsors of this bill believe in First Amendment liberties and freedom of expression.

This bill is about specific concerns, not all of the countries of the world. I am not sure if my colleague was here during the debate to hear the actual statistics of the dollars that have been invested by malign actors, countries of concern, in this country that don't compare with any other that was in the list that my colleague read.

Again, this amendment on this bill, outside of the specifics of the bill, is designed to attack Israel for daring to defend itself from terrorists, which they did. This amendment has no place in the bill.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan will be postponed.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 7 will not be offered.

□ 1600

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania) having assumed the chair, Mr. AMODEI, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1048) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to strengthen disclosure requirements relating to foreign gifts and contracts, to prohibit contracts between institutions of higher education and certain foreign entities and countries of concern, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

FROZEN FOOD

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Frozen Food Month and recognize the vital role that frozen foods play in American households. Frozen food is more than just a convenient option. It is a solution to food waste and a way to save families hundreds of dollars.

Studies show that frozen produce is less likely to be wasted compared to fresh produce that spoils over time, giving consumers access to affordable, nutritious food year-around.

By freezing food at its peak, we preserve both the flavor and nutrients, making it a smart choice for families

looking to eat well while managing their budgets.

For millions of Americans, especially those facing time constraints, frozen food offers an affordable, easy way to enjoy balanced meals. Nearly every American household relies on frozen foods, whether it is vegetables, fruits, breakfast items, or even complete meals.

This March, let's take a moment to recognize the hard work of our Nation's frozen food producers and the critical role that frozen foods play in keeping America nourished.

FEEDING OUR CHILDREN

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

Mr. LATIMER. Mr. Speaker, at a time when food prices are rising and it is harder for families to make ends meet, we should not be cutting food assistance programs, but that is exactly what is happening. Earlier this month the administration announced a billion-dollar cut to local purchasing for schools and food banks.

Local farms who rely on these programs for consistent purchases of their food no longer have an important market, and it means that locally grown, more nutritious food is no longer available for food banks and schools.

Just yesterday, USDA announced that it was ending part of the Farm to School Program. This program for years incentivized local food procurement for school meals. Dozens of schools in Westchester and the Bronx rely on these programs as a way to provide healthy food to students. Similarly, Feeding Westchester and City Harvest do yeoman's work to provide food for families and kids in need at the best value. If fresh food is no longer available, our community will suffer.

These cuts must be reversed and quickly. Time is of the essence when it comes to our children having enough to eat.

ECONOMIC POPULISM

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DELUZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DELUZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am honored and proud to represent the people of Pennsylvania, good, hard-working, patriotic people who are pretty frustrated. We are not living in normal times.

This should not be a normal run-of-the-mill Special Order hour. What I

will convene today, my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle, who you will hear from, these are people who know how to fight for their people. They know how to win. They are not shy or afraid about a righteous fight. They are Members of Congress in this Chamber from across the country, across the ideological spectrum, and may not agree on everything. Certainly we don't, but we agree that too many in our party have lost their way, and it is time to wake the heck up.

Now, don't misunderstand me. This administration and those helping them are wreaking havoc on so much of our country. We see Social Security, and Social Security Administration workers' abilities to deliver the hard-earned benefits that seniors have worked their whole lives for, under attack. We see VA employees on the chopping block, contracts scrutinized and then cut. We see the promise of this country to care for veterans betrayed. We see cancer research, lifesaving medicine trials, and clinical trials interfered with, threatened, with funding on the chopping block.

The American people are mad. They should be mad. This administration's approval ratings are in free fall. The American people are rejecting much of what we see, but too many of our side of the aisle aren't giving a strong enough alternative, a bold enough alternative.

While the President's numbers may be in free fall, we also see favorability of the Democratic Party at record lows, the lowest CNN has seen since 1992. There has not been a strong enough vision from Democrats on this side of the aisle when we have something to say.

Our party needs to change, and economic populism and patriotism should be where we go, standing up for people to revive the American Dream.

Democrats should be fighting hard against corruption and the giant corporations who fund so much of that. We should be fighting against anyone else, any force, any company, you name it, that has made life a rip-off for our people.

Folks are mad and they should be. It is justifiable anger. The American Dream is gone for too many people, people who work hard, who play by the rules, and yet can't catch a break, who see life as too expensive.

People are right. The American people understand our economy has been rigged against so many. I say the American Dream hasn't slipped away; it has been ripped away.

I am 40 years old. My generation and those younger than me, the first generation in a long time, since World War II, have grown up and don't expect to be better off than their parents.

That is what the American Dream is all about. It didn't just happen on accident. There are villains here. Corporate power and corruption have been eating away at the American Dream.

Hedge funds, speculators buying up houses, jacking up the cost of that

housing are becoming lousy landlords, pricing people out of what could be a nest egg for their retirement, their home.

Monopolies are jacking up prices and killing small businesses every chance they can get. Pharmacy benefit managers, or PBMs, are raising the cost of medicine and killing local pharmacies. The list goes on and on.

This President and others on the other side have capitalized on this anger and used it to get power, now lift up their efforts to let robber barons plunder this government, to attack the fundamental bargain with our seniors and veterans and so many others.

Democrats need to wake up and stop defending elites and the establishment. They have failed the American people. Across both parties, those who have been in power have failed at the fundamental task of protecting and strengthening the American Dream.

Today, a group of us are coming forward, coming to the floor, proposing a new way ahead for Democrats, a new way ahead for this country. We need a fighting spirit of economic populism. It is patriotic. We need this patriotism to be at the heart of this fight and our fight against corruption and anyone else that is in the way of our people and who has wrecked the American Dream.

What does this mean, this economic populism? In a sentence, it is fighting for a life that people can afford. It is bringing corporate power to heel. It is taking on the corruption that pervades this town, Washington.

The economy and what life costs people should never be an afterthought for anyone who serves in a chamber like this. It ought to put the people who work their butts off front and center of what our government does and who we think about every day and every action. It is fighting for a life that people can afford, and it is bringing corporate power to heel.

As we know, out-of-control corporate power leads to higher costs, it leads to worse safety, and it leads to lower quality. We see it play out across so much of our economy. It has weakened our defense industrial base, and, thus, it has weakened our military. It has hurt small businesses across Main Streets all over our districts. It has crushed workers. It has led to rising costs that we all live with. We should take on corruption no matter where we see it, no matter the party.

The last thing that we need is a bunch of wimps looking for a win-win every time. Not every fight is going to have a win-win.

There are villains in this story, in this society of ours, who have made life miserable for so many. You can call them robber barons or you can call them oligarchs, whatever you want. We have got to be willing to take them on.

This embrace of economic populism might sound and look different depending on where in the country or who the messenger is. For me, I am a Navy guy.

I served at sea. I served in Iraq. To me, this is a patriotic and righteous fight.

I am from western Pennsylvania, the rust belt, a place where we saw the rich and powerful plot to strip us for parts. We are the people who made the steel that built America. We have always answered this country's call. Those efforts to strip us, to wreck our way of life, are no more.

You will hear from Members across the ideological spectrum and Democratic side today who are united in this: The era of a spineless Democratic Party must end. Now is not the time for wimpy concessions and then call it a win-win, not when the American Dream has been killed for so many people in America.

Now is not the time to shy from a fight against corruption. Our people see it, and they know that our government has allowed the economy to be rigged against people.

Those villains, that corruption, want you to think the problem is some woke college kid or some trans kid who wants their liberty, wants their freedom. That is not why your prescription drugs are expensive. It is not why housing is expensive. It is that corruption and those villains who want you thinking that when they are the ones who made life terrible for people.

We know the real root of the problem is corruption and corporate power run amok. Too many have been pathetic at talking about corruption and showing that they are up for this fight.

Some on this side of the aisle have been complicit in helping corporations plunder this country. That should end. We have to be willing to go to the mat for an economy that works for people who work hard, who play by the rules, and who want the American Dream back.

The roots of this party, that I am proud to be a part of, go back to the New Deal. It is a working-class party at its core. Allowing somebody else to fake economic populism and win power is real and dangerous, and we are living through the cost of it right now.

Again, the people you will hear from today work hard and fight hard for their districts. They get this. They are not faking populism, and they know how to win in places where you have got to win. I am proud to start.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, let me just say a thank-you to my colleague from Pennsylvania, who at his roots understands the plight of working Americans, middle-class families, working families, and the vulnerable and stands tall on their behalf and wants to utilize the good offices of this institution to make sure that it does what the Founding Fathers intended it to do, and that is to provide opportunity for people in this Nation. That is what my friend, Congressman DELUZIO, is all about.

One thing about this current administration is clear. They are doing nothing about the cost-of-living crisis in

this Nation, which is getting worse. President Trump said he will fight for the working class, but instead put Elon Musk and billionaires in charge of our government.

I applaud, again, Representative DELUZIO for hosting this Special Order about economic patriotism, taking on corporate power, as well as for all his work supporting the right to organize, creating well-paying union jobs here in America. High prices are devastating the middle class, working class, and the vulnerable.

□ 1615

Since my very first day in the Congress, I have been focused on lowering the cost of living for Americans who struggle to get by, and I am appalled by how many families are struggling to afford basics while corporations get bigger, richer, and more influential over our lives than ever.

President Trump, as I said, campaigned on lowering prices and pledged to bring food costs down on day one.

Instead, the opposite has happened. Food costs are rising. His own USDA, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, recently reported egg prices could rise 41 percent over the next year. Since taking office, he has done nothing to help families struggling at the grocery checkout.

As a result, big corporations are consolidating, creating monopolies, and making unbelievable profits. Cal-Maine, which controls about one-fifth of the domestic egg market and is the largest producer and distributor of shell eggs in the United States, has reported that its profits through the second quarter of the 2025 fiscal year are 342 percent higher than the same period last year.

Instead of doing anything to address this cost-of-living crisis, the President has stacked his Cabinet with billionaire after billionaire, empowering them to slash the programs American families rely on with no oversight and no disclosures about the conflicts of interest. Elon Musk, the unchecked billionaire leading the efforts to end Social Security as we know it, owes the success of his company to billions in Federal contracts and huge factories in China. Yet he refuses to answer any questions from Congress about his investments.

These issues concern every American. Democrats are standing up for them. We are standing up against the blatant corruption of this administration, the giant corporations padding their profits at the expense of the middle class and the working class. The Republican focus is to rip away programs like Social Security and Medicaid.

The fact is that American families today are living paycheck to paycheck. Some of the biggest corporations in the country are taking advantage of it, all while Americans are paying more for less due to corporate price gouging and shrinkflation while the CEOs of the Na-

tion's largest grocery stores and supermarkets rake in record salaries.

I just came from a congressional hearing of our Democratic Steering and Policy Committee on food prices and food stamps. I listened to the stories of working Americans with families who are hard-pressed and were frightened to death of a \$230 billion cut to the Food Stamp program which would end that lifeline for themselves and for their families.

Last year, the FTC identified that large grocery store chains exploited the product shortages due to the pandemic by raising prices significantly more than needed to cover their added costs, and they have continued to increase their profits.

What is the Republicans' response to this cost-of-living crisis driven by corporate consolidation and power?

Why, it is to give out even more corporate tax cuts, of course, \$4.5 trillion worth of them to be precise, paid for by slashing Medicaid which serves nearly one-third of all Americans.

Enough is enough. It is time for this Congress and it is time for Democrats to act to rein in this habitual price gouging from massive, massive corporations, rein in the unchecked billionaires enriching themselves while Americans suffer, and rein in Republican spending while targeting Social Security and Medicaid.

If the Trump administration continues to prioritize tax cuts for the rich over price cuts for the middle class, then I will continue to stand with my colleagues as we call out their broken promises and fight back against their disastrous policies.

There is another path forward, one which Democrats and Republicans could take together. It is a path of economic patriotism where we take on corporate monopolies and the self-serving billionaires who are squeezing the middle class, the working class, and the vulnerable. It is a path that listens to the American people and protects programs like Medicaid and Social Security while lowering the cost of living through proven policies like the expanded child tax credit which lifted one-half of our children in this Nation out of poverty, lowered the hunger rate, and provided a path forward in economic security for millions of families in the United States.

That is the path that I am taking. It is the path that I know my colleague, Congressman DELUZIO, is taking, and I hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join us in this effort.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for organizing this effort.

Mr. DELUZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut not just for joining us today but for her long commitment to dignity in work, for fighting for people, for better trade policy, and so much else.

I am honored now to welcome in a colleague from California who has strong Pennsylvania roots.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA).

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative DELUZIO for his leadership and for convening this group and focusing us on an agenda of economic patriotism.

The reality is in this country, and as you know in western Pennsylvania, we have watched industry after industry leave the country for China and Mexico.

Western Pennsylvania won us our freedom. They produced more steel than Japan and Germany combined in World War II, and yet today we have got 4 percent of the world's steel. China has 50 percent of the world's steel.

Aluminum left, paper left, and textiles left. Town after town in this country was hollowed out since 2000, and 90,000 factories have closed. That doesn't just mean jobs leaving. We have all heard the stories of people whose families were destroyed. The reality is that these factories left and people faced suicide. One of the folks in Warren, Ohio, told me 13 people, because of these plant closures, took their lives or faced severe depression. Our country has watched for 50 years. ROSA DELAURO didn't watch. She was speaking out against these bad trade deals.

However, for most of American history in the last 50 years we have watched the hollowing out of these communities, and we watched wealth pile up in districts like mine in Silicon Valley and New York. My district has \$14 trillion of wealth. The income inequality in this country soared.

So one of the things this group wants to do is to renew economic revitalization in advanced manufacturing in these communities and to have a real plan for new semiconductors, new robotics, advanced steel, advanced automobiles, and have new factories and new industry come up.

Now, the President and JD VANCE understood that the country was hollowed out, and they understood that people were angry, legitimately angry, and they understood that the ship of America had a huge hole in it.

The problem is they get here and their plan to solve this is to hand the reins to a number of headstrong billionaires who are libertarians. I have known these folks. I have known Elon for 15 years. I don't know what Elon knows about Johnstown, Pennsylvania, or Farrell, Pennsylvania, or Youngstown. He is going to go out and make deals with the UAE, and they are supercharging the private-sector deals. The problem is that is not going to build the communities that have been hollowed out.

We know what builds communities from Hamilton to Lincoln to FDR. We need a government that says: If you make it in America then we will buy it. That is what we did, by the way, for SpaceX. That is what we did for Intel. That is what we did in World War II. We need a government that says: If you skill the factories here we will help finance it. We need a government that

says that we are going to work to invest in the plumbers, electricians, and machinists so we can actually have a workforce that builds the new factories we need.

We need to say that we are going to have housing in this area to have economic revitalization. We need a national economic development strategy, and Senator Rubio and I actually coauthored a bill on that.

That is not what the White House is doing. Instead, they think that just having these billionaires cut deals with the private sector is going to help the working or middle class. It will help my district. We will make more money with AI. It will help more of the financial and technology elites.

I will tell you what it is not going to do, Mr. Speaker. It is not going to rebuild the communities that have had a raw deal in America.

What economic patriots believe, even though we have different ideologies, is that it is ordinary Americans who built this country and it is working-class Americans and middle-class Americans who built the country. The genius lies not with billionaires and technologists. It lies with hardworking Americans. We are going to build this country back from the bottom up. That is our belief.

I appreciate Representative DELUZIO's leadership on this.

My friend, Fareed Zakaria, had this whole spiel on how manufacturing doesn't matter. I like Fareed usually, but on this he is dead wrong. He cited Japan and Germany as countries that did manufacturing and missed the tech boom. So he said: Well, we should do the tech boom and the finance boom, and we don't need to do manufacturing.

He did cite one country that did a bit of both, China. China did a lot of manufacturing. They took all of our manufacturing. America needs to understand if we are going to innovate, then yes, we should innovate on technology, and yes, we should innovate on finance. However, we also have to have advanced manufacturing in this country to remain the world superpower.

People say comparative advantage, but comparative advantage is you get to choose what your comparative advantage is in, Mr. Speaker. If China had just done comparative advantage, then they would have been growing rice for 30 years. That was their comparative advantage. They said: No, we want to build things.

It is time America realizes we want to be building things and realizes the value of advanced manufacturing. Representative DELUZIO certainly gets it. He is one of the brightest voices in Congress.

I also want to recommend his op-ed. It is the best piece written on trade policy in the last 30 years of any that I have read.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's leadership, and I appreciate his convening this.

Mr. DELUZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California who un-

derstands deeply what we need to do on this economic patriotism. The gentleman understands what it means for manufacturing and what it means for communities who saw these jobs not leave but be taken away. They were taken away by this ideology on Wall Street and the politicians around here who helped them, which says that all that matters is chasing the cheapest labor, the weakest labor rules, and nonexistent environmental rules. They made them citizens of nowhere. They didn't care about this country or the communities and the people who worked hard to make them rich, whether they made the steel or anything else as we did in America.

It is a stain on our story in this country, and, frankly, it is not too patriotic.

Our side of the aisle and our party thinks we ought to be dominating the fight to supercharge American manufacturing and jobs, not peddling this crap of telling industrial workers to go learn to code or something. That is nonsense. Let's invest in the jobs here to make stuff. Let's have a more muscular trade and industrial policy. That is how we get back on the road of economic freedom for people.

Members on both sides of the aisle here, both parties, have long embraced this wrong-for-decades neoliberal disaster of unlimited and free trade. I think it has been a failure of government across the board. We should push back on these lousy trade deals. We trade. We trade with our friends, and we trade with others, but we do it on fair terms.

What is not fair is seeing American workers undercut by governments like Communist China that use the power of the state to dump artificially cheap products on our markets. Let's circumvent our trade rules that let the workers be exploited. We have got to beef up trade enforcement on Communist China and others like them. There have to be meaningful consequences. Let's have tariffs be part of that but let's be smart and strategic.

What we have seen this administration do has been chaotic and reckless. Businesses cannot plan. There is no certainty day to day of what the trade environment will be, and it is absent from any full strategic industrial policy that is the heart of economic patriotism. To make more stuff in America, Mr. Speaker, you have to have a full policy that is centered by workers, industrial policy.

One of my colleagues who gets this idea of economic patriotism deeply is Mr. RYAN. He is a West Point graduate. I won't hold that against him too much. He deeply understands the fight that we need and understands that our core of economic patriotism is what we are all about.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, Mr. DELUZIO, for his leadership on this and for bringing this group

together to remind us that as Americans who love this country, we need that strong, muscular economic patriotism to serve my constituents in my district, which is the Hudson Valley of New York State, and across this country.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I love this country. I believe it is the greatest country in the history of the world. I believe it is worth fighting for, and we must fight for it now.

I also believe when you see something that isn't working, Mr. Speaker, you stand up and you do everything in your power to fix it.

Our country and our party are at a crossroads. It is up to us, the people who have the incredible honor to stand on the floor of the United States House of Representatives in this Chamber, to forge the path forward.

□ 1630

Unlike some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, I won't try to deny the outcome of the election in November 2024.

Too many Americans felt Democrats had become the party of the elites and had stopped meeting people where they are, not understanding the pain that they are feeling in their lives and their families at their kitchen tables when they get up go to work and come home exhausted at night.

Democrats need to learn from their mistakes. This moment is not ideological. It is about who fights for the people and who fights for the elites.

I believe first and foremost that if you are using labels like "moderate" or "progressive," you are missing the entire point. I gave former President Biden hell for failing to secure our border. I think that is a nonpartisan issue. That doesn't make me a moderate. I campaigned with my colleague AOC against big corporations screwing over my constituents and polluting the Hudson River in my district. That doesn't make me a progressive.

If the last election made anything clear, it is high costs and economic pain are first and foremost on our constituents' minds.

Donald Trump promised to help with that. He has not unequivocally. In fact, everything he has done in office has helped his billionaire cronies, who, by the way, gave hundreds of millions of dollars to his campaign at the expense of families like the ones that I represent in my district across the Hudson Valley.

Trump's failure to bring down costs is handing Democrats the answer on a silver platter. Our response cannot stop at Donald Trump who works for the wealthy though, which is true. It must go further.

Donald Trump works for the wealthy, and Democrats work and fight for you, the working class and middle class of this country, the economic patriots of the United States of America.

Just over a year ago, I stood on this very floor and ultimately successfully

called on the CEO of a local utility monopoly in my district which had been screwing over my constituents, robbing them blind, literally emptying their dwindling savings accounts due to a failure of their billing practices. I called on that CEO to resign, and he was held accountable, and he did. That company ultimately paid \$62 million back to my constituents in the form of accountability.

Now, Optum, the healthcare company, which is a subsidiary of UnitedHealth Group, the single largest health insurer in our country and really one of only three companies in the United States of America that controls the entire healthcare market has been buying up medical practices across my district.

Just a few weeks ago, I launched a community inquiry. Thousands of my constituents and my neighbors and friends who have been hurt by Optum have responded detailing horrific stories of declining healthcare quality, erroneous billing, and we are continuing to gather this evidence, the voices of the people, the American people, and to ultimately hold this big corporation who has been making record-breaking profits quarter after quarter accountable.

Here is another example. For months, broadcast companies, big telecoms in New York were in a deadlock fight over streaming rights that left over a million New Yorkers, paying customers, staring at blank screens trying to watch sports games to take their mind off of all the pressures in their lives. Knicks fans and Rangers fans who paid couldn't see games. As one of those fans, I was mad as hell that I had paid and couldn't watch a game while a multibillion-dollar corporation kept raking in more profits and didn't seem to care at all about their paying customers.

Thankfully, under pressure, that blackout has ended, and we are now demanding Optimum, the telecom, the main perpetrator of this, pay back the customers who were harmed.

I have also introduced something called the Stop Sports Blackout Act so if this ever happens again, there won't be a question that a company has to pay and give customers the refunds for games they couldn't watch.

Whether in their utility bills, their healthcare bills, or just trying to watch a sports game, that is putting money back in people's pockets when pressure is so high, and that matters.

In closing, there is so much power now in the voices of our communities, but only if we, their elected Representatives, listen and act and elevate it. That is economic patriotism.

I am proud that as a Democrat our party stands with law enforcement and police officers, stands with small businesses, stands with veterans, stands with hardworking families, with nurses, teachers, and truck drivers. Democrats stand with our constituents, whether they voted for us or not,

and, yes, we stand against Donald Trump and his harmful policies, but we stand for so, so much more.

A group of patriots unyielding and unwavering in their dedication to fighting for the people and against anyone who would do them harm, that is the Democratic Party that I am proud to be a part of, and that is our path out of this moment.

Mr. DELUZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for his fight and his stiff spine in this.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. MAGAZINER), who knows how to take on a good fight and win one.

Mr. MAGAZINER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. DELUZIO for bringing us together and helping us have an important conversation about how we restore the mantle of fighting for working people.

I was born and raised in the most patriotic town in the country, Bristol, Rhode Island. We have the oldest and longest running Fourth of July celebration in the country. I learned from a young age to be patriotic, but I also learned that patriotism is not just about parades and parties and barbecues, it is about believing in a country where anything is possible for those who are willing to work hard. I know that because it is my family's story.

At the turn of the last century, my mother's family came to America from Ireland and Poland. My grandfather fought in the Pacific then came home and worked in a factory that made airplane parts. His wife, my grandmother, worked in a department store. Their jobs weren't glamorous. They weren't anything special, but they earned enough to buy a house, to raise four kids, and to build a stable, middle-class life.

My father's side of the family had a similar story. They came from Eastern Europe and settled in New York City. My great-grandfather got involved in labor organizing, and my grandfather was a bookkeeper at a company that sold fruit.

They all came of age during the New Deal era, and they voted Democrat because they knew that the Democratic Party had the backs of working people.

Then my parents met, and they started a small business together. They were successful, and now here I am in the United States Congress thanks to the hard work of the generations that came before me.

Today, in Rhode Island, I meet working people every day who remind me of my grandparents: factory workers, house cleaners, nurses, kitchen workers. They are grinding out a living, believing that if they work hard and do the right thing that better days lie ahead.

The more I hear from the working people I represent, they are frustrated with politics. They don't think either party represents them. They are working harder than ever and are having a

hard time paying their bills. They certainly can't afford to save money.

They see billionaires on Wall Street and in Silicon Valley get richer while they can't afford everything on their grocery list. They see Elon Musk, the richest man in the world, gleefully cutting services for seniors and veterans while Donald Trump pushes yet another tax cut for the very rich.

They see a Republican Party hell-bent on taking away people's healthcare and a Democratic Party that means well but tries to be all things to all people and too often fails to deliver.

Our grandparents knew a Democratic Party that not only had good intentions but that knew how to get things done. The working people I represent don't want a handout, but they do expect a level playing field and a fair shot, and they want a Democratic Party with a real plan.

What does that look like? It looks like making billionaires like Elon Musk pay their fair share so that we can give tax relief to the middle class. It looks like passing the PRO Act so that workers in retail and fast food can join a union and earn a ticket to the middle class like my grandfather did in his factory. It looks like universal preschool and affordable childcare, not just because it is good for kids, but because it helps parents work and build their savings. It means passing my bill to guarantee 10 days of paid vacation for all workers because Americans work hard, and they deserve to take some time off every once in a while and enjoy their lives without losing their jobs or their income.

For too long the system in this town has been rigged for the wealthy and well-connected, but that does not have to be our future. There is a new generation rising, people who are tired of being left behind and are ready for something better.

We don't need the Democratic Party to be all things to all people. We just need to reclaim our position as the party for working people. That work begins now, and I thank my colleagues who are here tonight who get it. I thank Representative DELUZIO for bringing us together. I am ready to roll up my sleeves alongside of you.

Mr. DELUZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Rhode Island for his comments. He gets it, and this is not some hypothetical problem. We are living through the cost of losing and what it is to see the chaos and harm that comes from it. The Democratic Party has to do better.

I am honored to introduce a colleague from the other side of the country who has been a bulldog in the fight against monopolies and so much else, a former chair of the Progressive Caucus.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for leading this conversation about how we can stand up

for our people and unrig the economy. That is economic patriotism.

I want to be very clear. Our economy has been rigged by giant corporations and the wealthiest for way too long, and as these corporations consolidate more power, the rich get richer, and everyone else is just struggling to get by just on the basics. They need groceries, housing, healthcare, basic medications.

Private insurance companies are now buying up your local healthcare clinics and doctors' offices. In my home State of Washington, a handful of healthcare systems control 90 percent of hospital beds. What does that mean? It means that people are seeing their costs triple while the quality of care goes down all so that Big Pharma and corporate CEOs can pad their already overflowing pockets.

Mergers are pushing independent grocery stores out of business. Today, just a few supermarket chains control all of the grocery stores in the country. Albertsons and Kroger, two of the big grocery chains, actually tried to merge, and I was so proud to lead the amicus brief with other Members of Congress to actually oppose that merger. Thanks to Democrats and the FTC under Lina Khan, we were able to stop that merger because we know and we have seen that when these mergers happen, corporations shut down stores, they fire workers, and they raise prices.

Look at the housing market. When rents are sky high and there literally is not a single place in the country where someone can afford rent on minimum wage, private equity is coming in to buy up the apartments and colluding to drive up the rents so it is even more unaffordable to keep a roof over your head.

It wasn't always this way.

From World War II to the late 1970s, we actually rigorously enforced our antitrust laws to ensure that mom-and-pop businesses had a chance to compete against these megacompanies. Consumers had choices, and workers had good jobs. You know what? Our economy actually grew.

Starting with Republican President Ronald Reagan, that antitrust enforcement dwindled down, and large corporations took over. Today, income and wealth inequality are higher than they have been in a century.

Mr. Speaker, 2 months into the Trump administration, wages are still low, and prices are still high. It does not need to be this way. In the richest country in the world we do not suffer from scarcity, we suffer from greed, and we have to be willing to take that on. We must take on corporate power and corruption and make a meaningful difference in the everyday lives of working people.

We have to lower prices so that everyone can have a roof over their heads, put food on their table, send their kids for an education, and retire with dignity. We have to have living wages for every worker, and we have to

tax the billionaires so that they just pay a little bit more of their fair share like everyone else is doing.

We can and have to break up the largest corporations so they can't keep screwing regular people. We have got to stand up and fight back against corruption, against greed, against consolidation, and for the American people to have that American Dream.

That is economic patriotism. That is what we are going to fight for, and I am so grateful to my colleague from Pennsylvania for making sure we put that out there.

Mr. DELUZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Washington for her remarks. She is spot on.

I am reminded of a quote from President Franklin Roosevelt who faced the same kind of complaints from then who he called the economic royalists. We can call them robber barons, oligarchs, you name it. They complained and said that FDR was trying to overthrow the institutions of America. President Roosevelt said: "What they really complain of is that we seek to take away their power. Our allegiance to American institutions requires the overthrow of this kind of power." Here we are again.

I think we can no longer allow anyone over here to play footsies with the corporate overlords and robber barons who have their heels on the necks of the American people. We need to restore competition and break the monopolies.

My colleague from the Granite State gets this, having worked in the Justice Department to take on monopolies. She has been in the trenches in the fight against this kind of corporate power run amok.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. GOODLANDER).

□ 1645

Ms. GOODLANDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. DELUZIO) for bringing us together this afternoon.

Economic patriotism—we are coming from all across the country. We are coming from different backgrounds with different ideas, but we are united by things that are really powerful. We are united by a love of our country, by a belief in our country, and by a belief fundamentally in the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I was born and raised in the greatest State in the Nation, the State of New Hampshire, the State that made the Nation. We were the ninth to ratify the Constitution.

I was born and raised down the road from the family farm that my great-grandfather built when he came to this country. He was 16 years old. He didn't speak a word of English, but he believed in the American Dream. He raised my grandfather, Sam, on that farm.

My grandfather, Sam, was an economic patriot. He really believed that your word is your bond. He believed

that hustle was the name of the game. He milked cows, bailed hay, and got his start as a businessman selling airplane rides at the Nashua Airport. His slogan was: "A \$1 million thrill for a \$1 bill."

He went on to become a door-to-door salesman for Electrolux vacuum cleaners. He worked hard because he believed in the American Dream. He was a lifelong Republican who loved one of our great Presidents with his whole heart, I think maybe the greatest economic patriot we have seen in the White House, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

I was reminded today of a great speech that President Roosevelt gave 81 years ago. "The Economic Bill of Rights," it has been called. He talked about economic rights that are self-evident, but, as with all self-evident rights that we know in this great document, our Constitution, they aren't self-executing.

I want to focus for a moment on one of the rights that President Roosevelt talked about. He said that there is a right of every businessman—businesswoman, too—large and small, to trade in an atmosphere of freedom from unfair competition and domination by monopolies at home or abroad.

It has been said on the floor of this House and on the floor of the United States Senate that monopolies are inconsistent with our form of government. It is true.

The antimonopoly spirit is as old as America. It is rooted in the simple idea that power has to be checked. Just like political power, economic power has to be checked, too, but the fact is that big corporations and monopolies have too much power in America today. I see it everywhere I go.

I come to Congress having worked in the Department of Justice in the Antitrust Division. It is a division full of patriotic men and women, many of them nonpartisan, who come to this work with the basic belief in this country and in the power that must be checked by government.

What do we mean? What kind of power are we checking?

Every day on this job, as I have traveled around the State of New Hampshire, I hear about how big agricultural corporations are screwing family farmers like the family farm I grew up down the road from. I hear about big health insurers who are charging people more for less, big health insurers who are rolling up the entire industry, from providers to hospital beds and to the prescription drugs that people rely on for their lives. I hear about big tech companies that are using your valuable data for their own gain. The list goes on.

As we look across our consolidated economy, we see that corporate power has reached its apex in industries big and small, from door locks to the defense industrial base.

We have always found common ground in this country around the basic idea that, just like political

power has to be checked, economic power has to be checked, too.

Mr. Speaker, I am so grateful to my colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. DELUZIO) for bringing us together today.

Our antitrust laws are alive and well, but they could use an update, and I look forward to working with everyone here today and in the days ahead to make that dream a reality because it is core to the American Dream.

Mr. DELUZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. GOODLANDER) for her comments.

Mr. Speaker, this corporate power we feel in so much of our economy is also what we feel corrupts this place, our Nation's Capital.

We see it with the unlimited money that runs through our elections, unlimited super-PAC spending that corporations can dump in to buy the favors that they get from politicians.

The people who we represent—Democrat, Republican, Independent, you name it—hate this corruption. They see it. They smell it. They know it is crooked.

It is why you have pharmacy benefit managers extracting profits on the backs of people's medicine, killing pharmacies.

It is why you can't even fix your own stuff and why we even have to fight for the right to repair. What can be more American than the idea that you can fix your own stuff, whether it is a tractor, a car, an ice cream machine, you name it? This right to repair goes to the heart of this.

It is why you see housing costs out of control, with Wall Street buying up housing and then buying influence down here.

It is also why you see the obscene practice of people getting rich in Congress, trading stock on information that they may learn in their job serving the people in Congress. It is corrupt. We ought to end it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield now to a colleague of mine who gets this fight against corruption, who has organized workers, and who leads the Congressional Progressive Caucus, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASAR).

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

Mr. Speaker, I am GREG CASAR. I am proud to represent the heart of Texas in the United States Congress and to chair the Congressional Progressive Caucus.

Before all of that, I started my career as a labor organizer, and I saw up close how corporate lobbyists and corrupt politicians would trade campaign contributions for corporate tax breaks and how they would trade lower wages for workers for fatter paychecks for CEOs and their political friends.

They thought that working people could do nothing about this. They thought their workers were too divided to push back. On construction sites, guys who spoke different languages and who came from different places were

pissed off, and they were willing to put their differences aside to come together and fight back, stop the corruption, and demand a fair paycheck.

We didn't win by going on bended knees and begging big corporations for better treatment. We did it by unifying working people around some central ideas that Americans deserve good pay for a full day's work and that taxpayer dollars are meant for the common good, not for corporate welfare.

Those ideas brought workers together to win historic wage increases and better benefits in the heart of Texas. This is what we need today in America. This is what we need the Democratic Party to be all about.

The central goal of the Democratic Party should be to break the unholy alliance between corporate greed and corrupt government. We can't just beg CEOs to please bring down prices. We have to break up the giant monopolies that are screwing over consumers and small businesses alike.

We can't just beg big CEOs to please be nicer to us. No. We have to get big money out of politics so that the ultrarich don't have a bigger say in this country than the everyday person.

We cannot just beg corporations to give people a raise. We have to unionize workplaces and pass laws that protect the American worker and the American worker's wages.

To get there, we have to transform the Democratic Party into a party that fights for working people first no matter what and into a party that is willing to stand up to the powerful special interests that are screwing over working people because, if we love our country, we have to be willing to fight for the people who make it work.

Mr. DELUZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASAR) for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, if you want to respect hard work, you have to respect the people who do that hard work. That is at the core of this, and respecting the labor movement is so central.

I am from western Pennsylvania, which is sacred ground in that labor movement, where people bled for the right to organize. That fight continues.

Mr. Speaker, I yield now to a colleague from Oregon who gets this, who understands about the dignity of work and fighting for our people, the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOYLE).

Ms. HOYLE of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I am VAL HOYLE, and I represent the central and south coasts of Oregon. I am a proud third-generation union member with a background in sales and international trade, and I came to Congress to fight for working people.

My family's path to the middle class was made possible because of the labor movement. My grandfather emigrated from Ireland and worked as a union laborer building bridges. It was hard work in unsafe conditions. Those conditions are significantly better because of the building trades unions.

My father was a firefighter and became president of his union to fight for

better wages and safer working conditions. The contract that he and his team negotiated while management tried and failed to break his spirit took his members from poverty wages to a family-wage job. IAFF Local 789 is still working under that contract 40 years later.

Mr. Speaker, I grew up going to union halls and picket lines and with my father fighting to elect proworker candidates. Naturally, I became a member of UNITE HERE Local 26 as a union waitress during the AIDS crisis, where fellow union members had the dignity of healthcare and death benefits when they needed them because we belonged to a union. I am proud to say that my son is a Teamster.

I understand what is at stake for the working people of this country and my district because it is my story, too, and I came to Congress to fight for everyday people to have a fair shot, live in dignity, and make a fair wage while they work hard to provide for their families.

That is why I believe in economic populism, which is not just about talking at people. It is about listening to them and truly representing them. The fact is that workers feel left behind and that the two-party system doesn't represent them.

Republicans have tied in with billionaires and restricted the rights of workers to organize and have union representation wherever possible while they are telling them that their enemy is their neighbor.

Too many Democrats show up on a job site seemingly from a sense of noble obligation with wonky academic explanations about why everything is fine, even when everyday Americans can't make ends meet. I had an operating engineer tell me last week that he thinks that both parties are pissing on his leg and telling him that it is raining.

We have to understand that working people do not want a handout. They want a good job, a pathway to the middle class, and a comfortable retirement. Those opportunities have slipped away for too many people.

When people tell us that they are struggling to afford prescription medications, we can't turn around and tell them that they are wrong. We need to listen to them and hold Big Pharma accountable.

When people tell us that they see government as overly bureaucratic and complex, we can't dismiss that experience and say that it is all fine. We need to ensure that taxpayer dollars are spent responsibly.

Of course, addressing waste, fraud, and abuse is important. We also need to make sure that our veterans, our seniors, and the most vulnerable among us receive the benefits that they have earned and not break government under the guise of efficiency.

Democrats are the party that champion and protect the things that working people rely on, like the Affordable

Care Act, Social Security, stronger unions and workplace protections, the 40-hour workweek, overtime pay, public education, and strong consumer protections. However, we need more Democrats whose filter for what they do in Congress is: Will this help working people, as opposed to giving lip-service in some disconnected way?

We should all be fighting hard against corruption and for a real path to the middle class. Young people want to be able to work one job and afford to buy a home and raise a family, and that is not the reality for too many Americans.

That is what Democrats should stand for and be working for every day. Our party must embrace economic populism and fight to revive the American Dream, standing up for working people and giving them a chance to succeed.

Mr. DELUZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOYLE) for her comments.

Tonight, we have heard from Members from my side of the party, Democrats from across the country representing a lot of different districts, but we are all speaking out on ways that we are fighting corruption and the excess of corporate power and the ways that the Democratic Party ought to move forward, not for Democrats but for everyone in this country.

I thank my colleagues for joining me here today to say loud and clear that things need to change. Economic populism and patriotism ought to be where we go, standing up for our people, without apology, to revive the American Dream.

Mr. Speaker, I have the honor of representing a battleground, competitive district in western Pennsylvania. In my time here in Congress, I have been dead set on lowering costs, battling corruption, and confronting corporate power. That means promoting competition and taking on monopolies, giving small businesses a shot to compete, and fighting against these lousy trade deals that stripped communities for parts. It means making more stuff in America, cracking down on junk fees and price gouging, and standing up without apology for the union way of life.

These are economic priorities to bring down costs, and they are good policies. The American people support them. We know that.

Everybody hates getting ripped off. Everybody hates working hard yet still not seeing a life that you can succeed in.

If you want American capitalism to succeed, you have to have competition in our economy. There is a tendency by some in politics to try to please everybody. You should take pride in when they get the bad guys—the villains who are screwing over your people are your enemy—it means you are doing something right.

I am sick and tired of folks in Washington or the think tanks or wherever else looking for a win-win when there

is a villain hurting our people. If a railroad sends a toxic fireball into the sky over your community, you don't look for a win-win. You fight them for your people. When PBMs are killing pharmacies and jacking up drug costs, you fight them.

□ 1700

Sometimes, there is a bad guy. There is not a win-win because our way of life is on the line. Our safety is at risk. We have to stand up for our people. You don't cower like wimps. You don't go beg for donations from the people hurting yours.

The goal is simple and popular here. It is to make life better and less of a rip-off and to take on the corporate power and corruption that is hurting people. That is the path back to the American Dream.

This is our vision of economic patriotism and populism, and it is a winning one. It is one that can resonate from the Rust Belt to the Sun Belt and everywhere in between in this great country.

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

TELL THE TRUTH ABOUT MATH

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

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, this one is going to be a little thick, so put on your economics hat, and let's have a ride here.

On Friday, the Congressional Budget Office responded to a request I made in my capacity as chairman of the Joint Economic Committee. I was trying to get an answer to whether the economists' projections from the Joint Economic Committee are correct. You have to understand that there is actually a weird little battle going on here between the Senate and those of us in the House and those of us on Ways and Means.

A number of our brothers and sisters over in the house of lords have decided that we have current tax policy from the 2017 TCJA, the tax reform, which I was on the committee and was one of the people who helped author that, but they expire at the end of this year. They want to play this game and say that we are just going to pretend that there is no cost, that the law is not the law, that the policy is the law. This is when you hear people say, current policy baseline, just do it.

We have been trying to do the math. The Congressional Budget Office, a couple of months ago, actually did a projection saying that if we want to maximize economic growth over the next 10 years, what you do is extend those tax cuts but pay for them. The basic idea is that by paying for them, you don't have government gobbling up the capital stack that is used to finance growth, to finance business, to

finance when you want to buy a truck or a new home or your business wants to expand.

We got an updated letter from the Congressional Budget Office. Apparently, it didn't make me particularly popular with a few people, which actually provides me a perverse joy. If you read it, in the 30-year window, it looks like if we do all this without an attempt to pay for, if we drive up interest rates by 1 percent, in the 30-year window, it looks like you break CBO's budgetary model because you hit 250 percent of debt to GDP.

If I am reading one of the paragraphs here correctly, they are basically saying our computer model doesn't go beyond 250 percent. The point is, you have a government that—here is our baseline. Let's see if I can make this make sense. At the end of this fiscal year, \$37.2 trillion is going to be the country's debt. Over the next 10 years, we are expected to borrow an additional \$22 trillion.

On top of that, if you play with these folks that say we don't really need to pay for things, just keep it going, that is about another \$5 trillion, \$5.5 trillion, another \$1.3 trillion in interest. Then, if we were to be able to make the President's wish list without finding offsets or modernizations—and I am going to walk through a whole series of things where it is not cuts. It is modernization, legalizing the technology that disrupts the costs that makes our society better, happier, more efficient. If you were to do all those things without an attempt to pay for them, without an attempt to adopt policy to modernize the way we deliver services, in the previous 240 years, we borrowed about \$28 trillion from the public. That is from investors around the world, from your pension system, from everything. It would mean, over the next 10 years, it pretty much would double. We are going to double it or come close to doubling it in the next 10 years.

That is the perversity of what you have going on around here, yet the people coming behind these microphones keep having a wish list and want more stuff and more stuff. The people walking through our hallways here are in our offices demanding more stuff. They want more carve-outs in the tax code, barriers to entry to their competition, or just another check.

I am going to walk through just how dangerous the game we are playing right now is because when you look at these charts—this is online. Just go on CBO from last Friday and read it for yourself. It is not a hard read. Why are my brothers and sisters so terrified to tell the truth to the public?

You have a country—I am going to show the charts—that in about 7.5 years, we have more deaths than births. You have a country that when we get out of the extraordinary measures—remember, right now, we are borrowing from our different funds because we are up against the debt ceiling. We may be borrowing almost \$70,000 every second of every day.

For those of you who turn to me and say, "DAVID, I demand you balance the budget," I can do it tomorrow. Let's see, if I use the 2024 numbers, for every dollar we took in tax collections, we spent \$1.39. Tell me the 39 cents of the government you want me to cut.

The problem with that math is, when you look at the charts, do you see what is in blue? That is everything a Member of Congress gets to vote on, defense and nondefense. Your only problem is that it is 26 percent of the spending.

If you ask a Member of Congress right now to balance the budget, we can do it. We can do it. You have to get rid of all defense, all nondefense discretionary. That is basically the Park Service, the EPA, all the agencies, and then tell me what portion—because you have to pay your interest or you blow up the world economy—tell me what portion of Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and other things you want to hack away at.

The reality of it is, in this fiscal year, our projection is up till the recent—now, we are starting to downgrade our growth. For every dollar we take in tax collections, we are going to spend, functionally, \$1.36.

Do you understand how screwed—actually, that is a technical, economic term—we are when we don't tell the truth about the math? It is not fixable, but it is possible to stabilize. We can stabilize this. We just have to think and do things that are hard.

So often around here, the thinking part is complex, and it is hard when we have to go home and tell our constituents the truth about math.

Remember, the math will win. How many of you have heard about people out protesting? They are terrified there are going to be cuts. Okay, let's actually have a moment of truth about math.

This was baseline. Over the next 10 years, we were going to spend \$86 trillion. Next 10 years, CBO baseline, we are going to spend \$86 trillion. The reconciliation budget had—what?—\$1.3 trillion in cuts, and if we got lucky and did everything, you might get to \$2 trillion. So, we are talking about \$2 trillion in cuts over 10 years on \$86 trillion of spending.

That is what the left over here is losing their minds over because they need something. They have lost the working middle class. They have lost so many American voters because they no longer trust them because they have spent decades not telling them the truth about the math.

It is not hard, except the problem is 30 percent of that is borrowed. People are losing their minds that we are trying to cut \$2 trillion on \$86 trillion of spending. That is what this place has become. This place has become a clown show of math.

Once again, I need to disclose I have had a stunning amount of coffee today, so forgive me if I am a bit cranky.

We were trying to do projections of what our interest coverage would be

this year. Let's see if I can make this make sense.

How many of you saw on Thursday or Friday that the Federal Reserve actually lowered economic growth for this year and, functionally, for the next 3 years? They lowered us down to 1.7, I think. Just that lowering, if you do the math on the back of an envelope, it is not that hard. It is just a little less than \$200 billion of loss of tax receipts. If you plug that into our committed spending, it basically means what we are going to have to borrow—you may have interest this year of \$1.1 trillion and a borrow this year when the economy is fairly good of \$2.2 trillion. One of my folks has a number that it is up to 2.3, but let's stick with the \$2.2 trillion of borrowing in a year when the economy is good.

Think about this. We are functionally going to spend about \$7 trillion this fiscal year. We are going to take in about \$5 trillion, and this is in a time when the economy is good. We are not in a pandemic. We are not in a war. We are not in a recession.

Understand that when you take some of these charts of interest exposure into the future—there is one of my charts that shows, in 9 budget years, interest, just interest, is over \$2 trillion a year.

□ 1715

Why aren't we running around terrified here? I mean, if you care about your retirement—or someone that is crazy, like my wife and me, we are older parents. I have a 2½ year old and a 9-year-old. You do realize for my 2½ year old, when he turns 23, 24, or 25, every tax in the United States has to have been doubled just to maintain baseline services. This is the morality of this place.

Look, the last slide I am going to pound on, it is called interest fragility. We had Ray Dalio in one of our offices. Those of you who don't know him, please look him up. He is the Bridgewater CEO, founder. I think he has now stepped down from that. It is the biggest hedge fund in America. He happens to have 50 years of being one of the hyper-experts on interest rate markets and debt markets. He was saying: You guys are screwed. You guys have a really interesting problem.

The United States and other countries are borrowing, bingeing on debt. The United States borrows about 40 percent of all the world capital that goes into sovereign loans. His argument is: Our problem is, there are not enough savings in the world. We are consuming more money; it is us, China, Europe. Now Germany is going into the debt markets as they are raising their spending caps.

What happens in the world when there is a shortage of borrowable money? Remember, every day when we borrow at \$6 billion a day that debt has to be sold. Most of it is actually financed domestically, it is in this pension, it is in this bank. And then there

are the foreigners, except the foreigners have been lowering their U.S. debt because they are having to finance their own governments.

You start to look at our interest payments, and there is this concept called a term premium. When we make the bond markets nervous, we pay higher interest rates. So the clown show will go around and say: Well, let's just not pay our debts. Hey, we are up against the debt ceiling. Let's just not raise it.

Okay. Fine. I mean, enjoy your decade of world depression because when you collapse the U.S. currency, you also collapse the world. Stability is our goal. Stability is how you minimize interest rates. If you are financing \$37 trillion and another \$22 trillion, plus whatever else we are going to stack on top of that over the next decade, you really want the debt markets to think we are acting like adults.

In many ways, when you look at these charts and you see our interest coverage and how fragile we are, the bond market basically may be the greatest influence on this government.

However, how many people have you seen come behind these microphones and talk about debt?

Yet, the one thing we are not allowed to tell our voters, our public, our staff, each other, is the truth about what drives debt. Over the next 10 years, almost 100 percent of U.S. sovereign debt issued will be to cover interest and Medicare.

In 7½, let's call it 8 years, the Social Security trust fund is empty. That first year we have to make a decision, are we going to let the poverty of seniors double when they get a 21 percent cut in their checks? Or how much are we going to raise taxes?

Are we actually going to do something complex to fix the system and make all the adjustments and those things?

Except the moment you actually talk about saving Social Security, they have a consultant on the Democratic side writing an attack ad because they care so much more about winning the next election than the morality of not doubling senior poverty.

The brain trust runs around and says: Oh, just raise the cap. Okay. Except you just covered 38 percent of the shortfall. What do you want to do with the rest?

Mr. Speaker, 38 percent of the shortfall is our math, meaning that first year—so if the trust fund of Social Security is empty in 2033, 2034 the full year, I think \$608 billion was our estimate on that first year.

Think about that. Think about that scale. Then you hold up a chart like this. This is CBO's number for the next 30 years. Nondefense and defense discretionary actually have a positive balance, meaning they grow slower than tax receipts. Medicare and Social Security create \$124 trillion of debt during those 30 years.

It is not Democrat. It is not Republican. It is just demographics. We have

a saying in our office: debt, deficits, and demographics. Deal with the facts. Deal with the math. Tell the truth.

This place has been so busy spinning stories, though. We were listening to the Democrats a few minutes ago tell stories: There is an enemy out there. No, these things, we can fix them. We can stabilize it. However, so many care so much more about winning the next election.

The point I am trying to make is: You look at the next 10 years, okay, there is growth. Mr. Speaker, 24 percent of the growth in spending over the next 10 years is interest, 31 percent of the growth in spending over the next 10 years is Social Security and disability, 28 percent of the growth in spending over the next 10 years is Medicare, other mandatory and discretionary grows about 13 percent, but a portion of that is actually, I think, defense and other things in that. The fact of the matter is your government is an insurance company with an army.

Now, here is the other part that makes doing the math so incredibly difficult. Every year there are fewer workers, fewer working-aged people to support our older population. This really seems to upset people, but understand, look at our fertility, look at our demographic charts.

Go back to 1990, the year we started to roll over. There is a dataset out there—I don't believe it yet; I haven't had the chance to try to prove it—saying even last year we may have had more deaths than births. Okay. You want us to finance pay-as-you-go systems, which is Social Security and Medicare, at a time when we have a shortage of young people. There is a way to make it work.

Are you going to allow people like me, people who are here willing to think to be able to refine the process, to modernize?

Look, we will try to touch on this if I have time. Here is the MedPAC report from last week. A whole bunch of apparently really smart people examined Medicare and walked up and down through the growth in spending and what we could do to modernize it and use technology to stabilize the prices. On some things, particularly on Medicare Advantage, they have hundreds of billions of dollars in here that wouldn't require cutting any service, any access to healthcare. It is just using technology and modernizing.

You have got to understand, when we start to look at a chart like this, we are functionally here. Let's call it 2024. We have 2.9 in the population—there is another chart that is going to scare you even more—for every one person receiving benefits. Then you see, it gets down to 2 people in society.

I am going to bounce around just a little bit on some of these.

When you actually look at the Social Security trustees' data, something is happening out there where some of these numbers may be much worse than we expected because it turns out

people actually are taking retirement earlier than we expected, meaning the participation in the labor force is actually starting to get soft on the high-skill populations, higher income population.

Actually we had a debate on this one about how upset this would make people. Here we are, we are going to start the 2026 budget year. We are actually supposed to be working on that budget. Without immigration, working-aged people will start to disappear from the labor force. You go: Huh? Huh?

Basically, 2026 is the last year where the age population is functionally stable. Then the next year you start to actually fall in your numbers of working-aged people in the population. It is demographics. It is not Republican or Democrat, it is just math.

One more chart of this, and then I am going to give you the one that scares me the most. This is Social Security and disability benefits. Here we functionally are, and let's get about to where we are. Right now if you add both those programs together, you have 2.67 workers for every beneficiary. At one point, it gets all the way down to just a little over two people working for every beneficiary.

If you actually do the big chart, which is how many people are actually in the labor force compared to how many people are receiving benefits. Remember, I am not talking about changing people's benefits. I am talking about dealing with the reality of our demographics and ways we can deal with it, particularly when we start talking about healthcare.

Let's take a look at 2023. Functionally, for every 100 people we had working in America, we probably had 36, 37 people receiving benefits. Remember, the whole concept of labor force participation. I have done presentations here about, functionally, the 7 million—that was my old number—of prime-age males that are missing from the labor force.

What do we do as a society to make it possible to encourage our brothers and sisters who are not working to actually get into the labor force? Yet, my colleagues on the left say: Oh, you are going to have work requirements. You can't do that.

If you don't do it, tell me how I make these numbers actually work.

That is some of the miserable stuff. Let's actually sort of walk through how I make it work. Okay?

I have come here and done a presentation showing that if this is our demographics, we are going to have to be willing to have a brutally honest conversation.

Let me walk through a concept. Back in the 1970s and 1980s, what was the world conflict? It was for hydrocarbons, oil. The previous decade, much of the world conflicts were for rare earth materials. I will argue, we are in a decade right now where the conflict is for smart people, people with skill sets. Yet the United States has barely shown up for the battle.

When you hear President Trump talk about the insanity that we educate people and then send them home to compete with us, the President is absolutely right.

We have a whole presentation we have done here showing a talent-based, a STEM-based immigration system that turns out to be remarkably beneficial for tax receipts, for economic growth, and for prosperity. It turns out you need that as one of an entire unified theory of things to do.

I want to walk through just a handful of quirky things. When you hear people talk about DOGE and how upset they are, one of the primary things that is being discussed is that the United States has a handful of huge databases. The problem is, they don't talk to each other.

You saw the story last week of, hey, we just looked at some of the Social Security death files. The oldest person in America is, what, 114 years old? We took people over 114 years old and then wondered how they were getting loans at the Small Business Administration.

Forgive my math. I am doing this from memory from last week. There were like 3,300 people who were over 114 years old who got SBA loans. Mr. Speaker, \$300 million in loans. Can you believe not a dollar has been paid back?

What would happen if there was a way to eliminate waste and fraud without an army of auditors, without an army of bureaucrats? It turns out it is technology. You actually have to start having your data talk to each other. Is it really that scary? The government already has the data. Why can't they bounce against each other saying, hey, this person is on the death file. Maybe they are not actually applying for a Small Business Administration loan.

□ 1730

Mr. Speaker, some of our Democrat colleagues remark that, oh, waste and fraud doesn't really exist except for the billions of dollars we are identifying.

Let's walk through a couple of other frustrating things. We provided \$42.5 billion for the Broadband Equity, Access, and Deployment program. Stick with me on this one. We have spent over \$42.5 billion to get broadband to communities. Not a single community, not a single house has been connected to that broadband; but we spent \$42 billion doing it.

Between Christmas and the new year, I took my little girl out on the Navajo Reservation. For those of my colleagues who are not from the Southwest, the Navajo Reservation is immense. It is bigger than many States.

We chased around, and we met with a number of people who said they were tired of waiting. They weren't going to wait another decade to get that wire or that fiber, whatever it was, to their chapter or to their community so they could get broadband. They were doing something crazy. They ordered a satellite dish, and 48 hours later they had broadband. They were sharing it with

WiFi repeaters. For a few hundred dollars, they were fixing something that was going to take another decade and how many hundreds of millions of dollars.

Think about adopting technology. Is the morality that we want to spend lots of money to actually subsidize these people who should be running wire; or do we actually want these communities to have telehealth, tele-schools, and tele-monitoring of their lives to help them? Adopt the technology. Make it so it is actually useable. Instead of saying we will never get that wire out to our rural communities, put up a satellite dish.

Why does this scare people? It is because there is no good lobbyist running around here saying: Have ever thought about doing this? What we do is archaic.

Another example is millions of taxpayers call the IRS for help. Two-thirds don't reach anyone. Think of this. The auditors of the IRS last year put out a report that only 31 percent of phone calls were getting answered at the IRS.

Folks are trying to fill out a tax form and give the government money. They call and call and can't get the phone answered. There was a little pilot program done. It was an experiment. Let's actually do a chat, like a ChatGPT, that picks up the phone 24 hours a day, will stay on the phone as long as the caller needs, will help them fill out the tax forms, will actually email or text the PDF of the form, and maybe even send the YouTube video on how to fill out the form.

Why does this scare the hell out of the IRS? It is because the IRS is the second most unionized bureaucracy in the Federal Government. It turns out the union loses its mind when we start talking about technology to take care of the American people. Wouldn't we like to pick up the phone and call, whether it be the Social Security Administration or the IRS, and get the phone answered?

How do I get my brothers and sisters here to help us adopt this technology? I have a handful of articles here using AI to functionally crash parts of the cost of delivering healthcare. Here is one about actually making the environment much cleaner, much faster, much cheaper, and actually identifying bad acts with almost no bureaucracy. Here we have ability to fix our logistics.

We live in a time of miracles. When we start to say just our baseline, just a couple of the pieces of legislation we have, we think we can get \$100 billion a year just using technology and healthcare.

How about another \$100 billion to \$150 billion to actually step into supply chains and these others? With the adoption of technology, we can crash parts of the price of this government. Is that a cut? Is that a chain saw? It is just doing things that aren't scary.

Mr. Chairman, the last one I will talk about is in the MedPAC report. The

majority of Medicare recipients in America now use Medicare Advantage. For those of us in the Scottsdale-Phoenix area, we actually have a much higher penetration.

According to the report and even with the adjustment of the portion of the population that only takes the Medicare part A, which is the hospital portion, the trust fund, and which also runs out in 12 or 13 years, it is 20 percent more expensive than fee-for-service.

If we take it back to the fact that when Medicare Advantage was designed and it was supposed to come in at 95 percent of fee-for-service, do that delta. That is approaching \$100 billion a year.

Mr. Speaker, what if we got together—and we have been working on this for months and months—and we said we need to align the incentives with the insurance providers, with the healthcare providers, and with the person receiving the benefits. How about if we make the profit by helping the population be healthier?

A capitated model or something of that nature, which actually I think a capitated model makes the most sense, is here is our cost; and we make more money by helping our population be healthier than what is happening today, according to this report, saying we sign the public up and then we spend lots of time and resources to score them as sicker and sicker because we get spiffs the sicker we score them.

Is that a cut? In today's world, when we know diabetes is 31 percent of all Medicare spending, let's get the incentives aligned so it cuts the cost, cuts the debt, but we end up with a healthier country.

There are solutions here. The problem is it requires doing difficult things and thinking. I beg my brothers and sisters. Let's go do the hard stuff. If you have ideas, bring them to us. We are working our hearts out right now on everything from technology to auditing the Pentagon because we had our eighth or ninth year where the Pentagon was not auditable. We are trying to design a talent-based immigration system that maximizes economic growth from tax receipts for the country.

How about saving Medicare Advantage for everyone who loves it but in a way where it also will provide hundreds of billions of dollars of savings? We can do this. We can do this. We just have to do hard things.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Matthew Hanley, one of his secretaries.

IMPOSING TARIFFS ON COUNTRIES IMPORTING VENEZUELAN OIL—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 119-32)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WIED) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*), I hereby report that I have issued an Executive Order that takes additional steps with respect to the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13692 of March 8, 2015 (Blocking Property and Suspending Entry of Certain Persons Contributing to the Situation in Venezuela).

The Maduro regime's refusal to cooperate with the United States on matters of illegal immigration exacerbates threats to public safety and border security. The activities of the Tren de Aragua gang, a transnational criminal organization originating in Venezuela and designated as a Foreign Terrorist Organization and a Specially Designated Global Terrorist organization, have intensified these threats. Further, the Maduro regime's ongoing destabilizing actions, including its support for illicit activities such as narcotics trafficking, kidnapping, and human trafficking necessitate further measures to protect United States interests. All of these actions are due in part to the oil revenues that the Maduro regime and its network of criminals and cronies are able to earn.

Effective on April 2, 2025, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the United States Trade Representative, is authorized to determine whether a tariff of 25 percent will be imposed on goods from any country that imports Venezuelan oil. Once imposed at the Secretary of State's discretion, the tariff shall remain in effect for a period of 1 year after the last day a country imports Venezuelan oil, or at an earlier date if the Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with other relevant heads of executive departments and agencies, determines it appropriate. To encourage full accountability for these actions, I have directed the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Commerce to submit periodic reports to me within 180 days of the date of this order and no less than every 180 days thereafter assessing the effectiveness of the tariffs described in this order and the ongoing conduct of the Maduro regime.

My Administration will continue to consult with the Congress on our efforts to address the ongoing problems in Venezuela that undermine United States interests and look forward to working on these issues together.

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

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 25, 2025.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 26, 2025, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-596. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 26-25, "Office of Juvenile Justice Facilities Oversight Plan Temporary Act of 2025", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 813); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

EC-597. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a compilation and summary of reports received from chief district judges detailing each public event conducted in accordance with the POWER Act's requirements during the previous fiscal year, pursuant to Public Law 115-237, Sec. 4(b)(1); (132 Stat. 2448); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-598. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; De Havilland Aircraft of Canada Limited (Type Certificate Previously Held by Bombardier, Inc.) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2024-2420; Project Identifier MCAI-2024-00143-T; Amendment 39-22978; AD 2025-05-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 24, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-599. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Canada Limited Partnership (Type Certificate Previously Held by C Series Aircraft Limited Partnership (CSALP); Bombardier, Inc.) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2024-0225; Project Identifier MCAI-2023-00725-T; Amendment 39-22979; AD 2025-05-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 24, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-600. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2024-2421; Project Identifier MCAI-2024-00221-T; Amendment 39-22973; AD 2025-05-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 24, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-601. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Deutschland Ltd & Co KG Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2024-2544; Project Identifier MCAI-2024-00569-E; Amendment 39-

22975; AD 2025-05-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 24, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-602. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2024-2547; Project Identifier AD-2024-00334-E; Amendment 39-22987; AD-2025-05-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 24, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-603. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Austin, TX; Establishment of Class E Airspace; Austin, Lago Vista, and Lakeway, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2024-2511; Airspace Docket No.: 24-ASW-21] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received March 24, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-604. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Edenton, NC [Docket No.: FAA-2024-1983; Airspace Docket No.: 24-ASO-24] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received March 24, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-605. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31593; Amdt. No.: 4155] received March 24, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-606. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31594; Amdt. No.: 4156] received March 24, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-607. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31591; Amdt. No.: 4153] received March 24, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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. GRAVES: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. House Concurrent Resolution 9. Resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers Memorial Service and the National Honor Guard and Pipe Band Exhi-

bition (Rept. 119-39). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JORDAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1526. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to limit the authority of district courts to provide injunctive relief, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 119-40). 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. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. FIGURES, Ms. SEWELL, Ms. ANSARI, Mr. STANTON, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BERA, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. SIMON, Mr. GRAY, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. LICCARDO, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. WHITESIDES, Ms. CHU, Ms. RIVAS, Ms. FRIEDMAN, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. GOMEZ, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. LIEU, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. GARCIA of California, Ms. WATERS, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. TRAN, Mr. CORREA, Mr. MIN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. PETERS, Ms. JACOBS, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. CROW, Ms. PETTERSEN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. HIMES, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MCBRIDE, Mr. SOTO, Mr. FROST, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. MOSKOWITZ, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CASE, Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. CASTEN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. BUDZINSKI, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. SORESENSEN, Mr. MRVAN, Mr. CARSON, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. MCGARVEY, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. NEAL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. KEATING, Mr. OLSZEWSKI, Ms. ELFRETH, Mr. IVEY, Mr. HOYER, Mrs. MCCLAIN DELANEY, Mr. MFUME, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. GOLDEN of Maine, Ms. SCHOLTEN, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. McDONALD RIVET, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. THANEDAR, Ms. CRAIG, Ms. MORRISON, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. OMAR, Mr. BELL, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Ms. ROSS, Mrs. FOUSHEE, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. GOODLANDER, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. PALONE, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. POU, Mrs. MCIVER, Ms. SHERILL, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. STANSBURY, Mr. VASQUEZ, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Ms. TITUS, Ms. LEE of Nevada, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. GILLEN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. GOLDMAN of

New York, Mr. NADLER, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mr. LATIMER, Mr. RYAN, Mr. RILEY of New York, Mr. TONKO, Mr. MANNION, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. LANDSMAN, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. BROWN, Mrs. SYKES, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. DEXTER, Ms. HOYLE of Oregon, Ms. BYNUM, Ms. SALINAS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. EVANS of Pennsylvania, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. HOULAHAN, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Mr. DELUZIO, Mr. HERNÁNDEZ, Mr. AMO, Mr. MAGAZINER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. CUELLAR, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. CROCKETT, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. CASAR, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. MCCLELLAN, Mr. VINDMAN, Mr. BEYER, Mr. SUBRAMANYAM, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. BALINT, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. PEREZ, Ms. RANDALL, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. POCAN, and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin):

H.R. 17. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MCCLELLAN:

H.R. 2313. A bill to require the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to develop celestial time standardization to support future operations and infrastructure on and around the Moon and other celestial bodies other than Earth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mrs. HARSHBARGER (for herself, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. GRAVES, Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, and Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina):

H.R. 2314. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require hospitals with approved medical residency training programs to submit to the Secretary of Health and Human Services certain information regarding osteopathic and allopathic candidates for such programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. BIGGS of Arizona, Mr. GILL of Texas, Ms. HAGEMAN, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. OGLES, Mr. ROY, and Mr. BURCHETT):

H.R. 2315. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate the Optional Practical Training Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HURD of Colorado (for himself and Ms. ELFRETH):

H.R. 2316. A bill to amend the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act to provide that interest on obligations held in the Federal aid to wildlife restoration fund shall become available for apportionment at the beginning of fiscal year 2033; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. AMODEI of Nevada:

H.R. 2317. A bill to provide for transfer of ownership of certain Federal lands in northern Nevada, to authorize the disposal of cer-

tain Federal lands in northern Nevada for economic development, to promote conservation in northern Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. ANSARI:

H.R. 2318. A bill to modernize permitting systems at the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2319. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to conduct a review to evaluate the status of research on lung cancer in women and underserved populations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia):

H.R. 2320. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a refundable credit for expenses incurred for mobility devices; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. DELBENE (for herself and Mr. PFLUGER):

H.R. 2321. A bill to establish the Immersive Technology Advisory Panel to promote the use of immersive technology in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FEENSTRA (for himself, Mr. MANN, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. CARBAJAL):

H.R. 2322. A bill to provide technical assistance to improve infrastructure in foreign markets for United States agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas:

H.R. 2323. A bill to adjust the boundary of Big Bend National Park in the State of Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. HOULAHAN (for herself, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. PANETTA, and Mr. BACON):

H.R. 2324. A bill to establish an Interagency Council on Service to promote and strengthen opportunities for military service, national service, and public service for all people of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, Foreign Affairs, 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. HUIZENGA (for himself and Mr. MEUSER):

H.R. 2325. A bill to withhold United States support for any action in the International Monetary Fund relating to member states of the Central African Economic Monetary Community until a determination as to gross foreign exchange reserves is made; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. JACKSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. MANN, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. HARRIS of Maryland, and Mr. BACON):

H.R. 2326. A bill to amend the National Nutrition Monitoring and Related Research Act of 1990 to improve the dietary guidelines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JAMES (for himself and Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina):

H.R. 2327. A bill to require the Secretary of the Air Force to take steps to ensure the continued production and procurement of advanced capability fighter aircraft and fifth generation fighter aircraft until the fighter

units of the Air National Guard are fully recapitalized, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JAMES:

H.R. 2328. A bill to study the security of the Soo Locks and effects on the supply chain resulting from a malfunction or failure of the Soo Locks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. KELLY of Mississippi (for himself and Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas):

H.R. 2329. A bill to authorize the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (normal trade relations treatment) to products of Uzbekistan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia (for herself, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. MCGUIRE, Mr. CLINE, Mr. VINDMAN, Mr. BEYER, and Mr. SUBRAMANYAM):

H.R. 2330. A bill to accelerate the income tax benefits for charitable cash contributions for the relief of the families of two law enforcement officers shot and killed in Virginia Beach, Virginia, on February 22, 2025; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOUDERMILK (for himself and Mr. BARR):

H.R. 2331. A bill to enhance rulemaking requirements for the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MANN (for himself, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. GRAVES, Ms. BOEBERT, Mr. MCCAUL, Mrs. BICE, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. SCHMIDT, and Mr. WIED):

H.R. 2332. A bill to authorize the use of Federal Bureau of Investigation criminal history record information for administration of certain licenses; to the Committee on Education and Workforce, 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. MANNION (for himself, Mrs. HAYES, and Mrs. MCBATH):

H.R. 2333. A bill to prohibit the use of appropriated funds to eliminate, consolidate, or otherwise restructure any office within the Department of Education that administers or enforces programs under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Mr. MAST:

H.R. 2334. A bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to preempt any squatter's rights established by State law regarding real property owned by a member of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MFUME (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CARSON, Ms. BROWN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. CROCKETT, Ms. SEWELL, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. LYNCH, and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin):

H.R. 2335. A bill to authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to Doris Miller posthumously for acts of valor while a member of the Navy during World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MFUME:

H.R. 2336. A bill to award posthumously a Congressional Gold Medal to Doris Miller, in recognition of his acts of valor while a member of the United States Navy during World War II; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in

each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MILLS (for himself and Mr. HARRIS of Maryland):

H.R. 2337. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to clarify birthright citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin (for herself, Ms. CHU, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. KHANNA, and Ms. JAYAPAL):

H.R. 2338. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand and improve the earned income tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. MAGAZINER, Mr. COHEN, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Ms. TOKUDA, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CARSON, Ms. DEXTER, Ms. CHU, Mr. EVANS of Pennsylvania, Mr. SORESENSEN, and Mr. THANEDAR):

H.R. 2339. A bill to require the Office of Children's Health Protection to be maintained within the Environmental Protection Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PAPPAS (for himself and Mr. TONKO):

H.R. 2340. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the automatic qualification of certain Medicaid beneficiaries for premium and cost-sharing subsidies under part D of the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROUZER (for himself and Mr. CARTER of Louisiana):

H.R. 2341. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to waive certain prohibitions on duplication of benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ROUZER (for himself and Mr. CARTER of Louisiana):

H.R. 2342. A bill to establish alternate procedures for lump sum payments for certain covered small disasters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. SALAZAR (for herself, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. OWENS, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. KIM, Mr. ROUZER, and Mr. TONKO):

H.R. 2343. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage and payment of Alpha-1 Antitrypsin Deficiency Disorder treatment under part B of such title, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 2344. A bill to establish a program to increase drinking water and wastewater system threat preparedness and resilience, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia (for himself, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. MCCORMICK, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. JACK, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. GREENE of Georgia, and Mr. COLLINS):

H.R. 2345. A bill to establish the Ocmulgee Mounds National Park and Preserve in the State of Georgia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SHERMAN (for himself, Mr. KUSTOFF, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. McCAUL, Ms. MCBRIDE, and Mr. LAWLER):

H.R. 2346. A bill to require the imposition of sanctions on the Popular Resistance Committees and other associated entities, 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. SMUCKER (for himself and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin):

H.R. 2347. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income any damages, other than punitive damages, received on account of any sexual acts or sexual contact; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STAUBER (for himself, Mr. YAKYM, Ms. BROWNLEY, and Mr. MOULTON):

H.R. 2348. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to produce and distribute a national public safety messaging campaign, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SUBRAMANYAM (for himself, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. BEYER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. NUNN of Iowa, Mr. CARSON, Mr. MAGAZINER, Ms. TITUS, Mr. MOULTON, and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY):

H.R. 2349. A bill to designate residents of the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region as Priority 2 refugees of special humanitarian concern, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida (for herself, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Ms. BALINT, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BELL, Mr. BERA, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BISHOP, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWN, Ms. BROWNLEY, Ms. BUDZINSKI, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CARSON, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Ms. CHU, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CORREA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DELUZIO, Ms. DEXTER, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. ELFPRETH, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. EVANS of Pennsylvania, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. FOSTER, Mrs. FOUSHEE, Mr. FROST, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACOBS, 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, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MAGAZINER, Mr. MANNION, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCBRIDE, Mrs. MCCLAIN DELANEY, Ms. MCCELLEAN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. MOSKOWITZ, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NEAL, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. OLSZEWSKI, Ms. OMAR, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PETTERSEN, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Ms. RANDALL, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. ROSS, Ms. SALINAS, Ms. SANCHEZ, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. SCHOLTEN, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SHERRILL, Ms. SIMON, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. STANSBURY, Mr. STANTON, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. SUBRAMANYAM, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. SWALWELL, Mrs. SYKES, Mr. THANEDAR, Ms. TITUS, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. TOKUDA, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. TAKANO):

H. Con. Res. 21. Concurrent resolution recognizing the significance of equal pay and the disparity between wages paid to men and women; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Mr. LAHOOD (for himself and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY):

H. Res. 247. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the week of March 23, 2025, through March 29, 2025, as "National Cleaning Week"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. AMO (for himself and Mrs. KIM):

H. Res. 248. A resolution emphasizing the importance and power of distributed ledger technologies (DLT) to support democratic governance, human rights, internet freedom, and transparency; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself, Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Ms. TITUS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. AMO, Mr. MAGAZINER, and Ms. MENG):

H. Res. 249. A resolution recognizing the 204th anniversary of the War of Greek Independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CASTEN (for himself and Ms. STEVENS):

H. Res. 250. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1101) to prohibit unlawful access to the payment system of the Bureau of the Fiscal Service within the Department of the Treasury, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER (for himself and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H. Res. 251. A resolution recognizing the longstanding friendship between the Kingdom of Morocco and the United States of America; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STUTZMAN (for himself and Mr. YAKYM):

H. Res. 252. A resolution recognizing a century of broadcasting excellence from WOWO and celebrating the radio station's 100th anniversary; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. TONKO (for himself and Ms. SALAZAR):

H. Res. 253. A resolution expressing support for the designation of May 15, 2025, as "Prader-Willi Syndrome Awareness Day" to

raise awareness of and promote research on the disorder; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

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. DELAURO:

H.R. 17.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. MCCLELLAN:

H.R. 2313.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, U.S. Constitution

By Mrs. HARSHBARGER:

H.R. 2314.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 2315.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. HURD of Colorado:

H.R. 2316.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 18

By Mr. AMODEI of Nevada:

H.R. 2317.

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 land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. ANSARI:

H.R. 2318.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section VIII

By Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2319.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Spending Clause, Article 1, Section 8, Cl. 1 and the Necessary and Proper Clause, Article I, Section 8, Cl. 18.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 2320.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States

By Ms. DELBENE:

H.R. 2321.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. FEENSTRA:

H.R. 2322.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

To provide technical assistance to improve infrastructure in foreign markets for United States agricultural commodities.

By Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas:

H.R. 2323.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV Section 3 clause 2: "The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States;"

By Ms. HOULAHAN:

H.R. 2324.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution

By Mr. HUIZENGA:

H.R. 2325.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, the Necessary and Proper Clause

By Mr. JACKSON of Texas:

H.R. 2326.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. JAMES:

H.R. 2327.

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. JAMES:

H.R. 2328.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the constitutional authority for Congress to enact this legislation is provided by:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, which grants Congress the power "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes." The Soo Locks are a critical component of interstate and international commerce, facilitating the movement of goods essential to national security and economic stability.

Additionally, authority is derived from Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, which provides Congress the power "To provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States." Ensuring the security and resilience of the Soo Locks is vital to the defense industrial base and the national security interests of the United States.

Furthermore, Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, the Necessary and Proper Clause, empowers Congress to enact legislation essential to carrying out its enumerated powers, including the regulation and protection of infrastructure critical to national defense and economic security.

By Mr. KELLY of Mississippi:

H.R. 2329.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 1 and Article I, Section 8, clause 3

By Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia:

H.R. 2330.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article one section eight of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LOUDERMILK:

H.R. 2331.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1. Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. MANN:

H.R. 2332.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. MANNION:

H.R. 2333.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. MAST:

H.R. 2334.

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. MFUME:

H.R. 2335.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 provides Congress with the power to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

By Mr. MFUME:

H.R. 2336.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 14 provides Congress with the power to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 2337.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin:

H.R. 2338.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Sections 7 & 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 2339.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. PAPPAS:

H.R. 2340.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution states that "Congress shall have the authority to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department of Office thereof."

By Mr. ROUZER:

H.R. 2341.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. ROUZER:

H.R. 2342.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. SALAZAR:

H.R. 2343.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 2344.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 3 and 18 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution

By Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia:

H.R. 2345.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, clause 2

By Mr. SHERMAN:

H.R. 2346.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution. [Page H1714]

By Mr. SMUCKER:
H.R. 2347.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause I of Section 8 of the Constitution
By Mr. STAUBER:
H.R. 2348.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution
By Mr. SUBRAMANYAM:
H.R. 2349.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I Section 8

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 7: Mrs. CAMMACK and Mr. MCGUIRE.
H.R. 22: Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 44: Ms. STANSBURY.
H.R. 142: Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. RULLI, and Mr. MOORE of North Carolina.
H.R. 225: Mr. LOUDERMILK and Mrs. WAGNER.
H.R. 247: Mr. CISNEROS.
H.R. 272: Mr. ROUZER, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mrs. CAMMACK.
H.R. 286: Mr. HARRIGAN.
H.R. 347: Mr. PETERS and Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 349: Mr. VINDMAN and Ms. JAYAPAL.
H.R. 381: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 425: Mr. AMODEI of Nevada, Mr. BAIRD, and Mr. HURD of Colorado.
H.R. 433: Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. BYNUM, Mr. KEATING, Ms. PETTERSEN, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. RIVAS, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. CISNEROS, and Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 451: Mr. AMODEI of Nevada, Mr. CLYDE, and Mr. BEAN of Florida.
H.R. 452: Mr. HARRIS of Maryland, Mr. STUTZMAN, Ms. ELFRETH, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. STEUBE, Ms. LETLOW, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, and Mr. CLOUD.
H.R. 486: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois and Ms. TLAIB.
H.R. 507: Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 515: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.
H.R. 539: Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. ROUZER, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, and Mr. DELUZIO.
H.R. 584: Mr. BOST and Mr. BRECHEEN.
H.R. 610: Ms. JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 649: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 672: Mr. NUNN of Iowa.
H.R. 697: Mr. HARRIS of North Carolina.
H.R. 728: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.
H.R. 740: Mr. MILLER of Ohio.
H.R. 747: Mr. MOORE of North Carolina.
H.R. 785: Mr. FULCHER.
H.R. 801: Ms. BYNUM.
H.R. 802: Ms. MCBRIDE.
H.R. 833: Mr. KILEY of California.
H.R. 879: Mr. PETERS, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, and Mr. GOMEZ.
H.R. 909: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. POCAN, and Ms. PETTERSEN.
H.R. 930: Ms. JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 935: Ms. DELBENE and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 942: Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia and Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 944: Mr. BELL and Mr. CISNEROS.
H.R. 945: Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 1004: Ms. BYNUM and Mr. BISHOP.
H.R. 1024: Ms. PLASKETT.
H.R. 1027: Mr. CISNEROS.
H.R. 1041: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
H.R. 1046: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 1056: Mr. TURNER of Ohio and Mr. MOULTON.
H.R. 1065: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.
H.R. 1101: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.

H.R. 1102: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.
H.R. 1103: Mr. VAN ORDEN.
H.R. 1106: Mr. LIEU.
H.R. 1116: Mr. CRANE.
H.R. 1151: Mr. SHREVE.
H.R. 1181: Mr. HARRIGAN, Mr. MCGUIRE, and Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas.
H.R. 1189: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 1196: Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 1207: Mr. ELLZEY and Mr. BACON.
H.R. 1216: Mr. VAN ORDEN.
H.R. 1229: Mr. VAN ORDEN.
H.R. 1231: Mr. LANDSMAN.
H.R. 1256: Mr. VAN DREW.
H.R. 1262: Mr. KILEY of California, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Mr. TURNER of Ohio, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. POCAN, Mrs. HOUGHIN, Ms. MCBRIDE, Mr. LANDSMAN, Mr. ALFORD, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. LATIMER, Mr. MOYLAN, Ms. ROSS, Mr. COLE, and Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.
H.R. 1266: Mr. VINDMAN.
H.R. 1267: Mr. CARBAJAL and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 1300: Ms. MCCLELLAN, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mrs. MCCLAIN DELANEY, and Mr. VINDMAN.
H.R. 1303: Mr. MANN, Mrs. HINSON, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, and Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 1314: Ms. UNDERWOOD.
H.R. 1319: Mr. KEAN.
H.R. 1320: Mr. KEAN.
H.R. 1330: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. GARCIA of California, and Mr. CISNEROS.
H.R. 1340: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 1378: Ms. CLARKE of New York and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H.R. 1410: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1422: Mr. VAN ORDEN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. BARR, Mr. PERRY, and Mr. STANTON.
H.R. 1441: Mr. MACKENZIE.
H.R. 1447: Mr. CLYDE.
H.R. 1456: Mrs. TRAHAN and Mr. LATIMER.
H.R. 1461: Mr. BRESNAHAN.
H.R. 1464: Ms. CHU and Ms. SÁNCHEZ.
H.R. 1479: Mr. VINDMAN.
H.R. 1484: Mr. CROW, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 1492: Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 1493: Mr. DELUZIO.
H.R. 1517: Mr. VAN DREW and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.
H.R. 1520: Mrs. HINSON.
H.R. 1521: Ms. PETTERSEN and Mr. RESCHENTHALER.
H.R. 1526: Mr. BABIN and Mr. LALOTA.
H.R. 1530: Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 1564: Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. BYNUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. GARCIA of California, Mrs. FLETCHER, Ms. SIMON, Mr. VASQUEZ, Mr. LATIMER, and Ms. ELFRETH.
H.R. 1572: Ms. MCBRIDE.
H.R. 1575: Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 1585: Mr. PANETTA.
H.R. 1637: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.
H.R. 1656: Mr. GIMENEZ.
H.R. 1666: Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. JACOBS, and Mr. CISNEROS.
H.R. 1674: Mr. LATIMER.
H.R. 1688: Mr. QUIGLEY and Mr. LANDSMAN.
H.R. 1699: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 1700: Mr. CISNEROS.
H.R. 1701: Mr. BAIRD and Mr. STANTON.
H.R. 1704: Ms. TOKUDA.
H.R. 1732: Ms. MCBRIDE, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LAWLER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. DEXTER, Ms. STANSBURY, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Ms. PETTERSEN.
H.R. 1742: Mr. STANTON.
H.R. 1743: Mr. BACON.
H.R. 1788: Mr. OLSZEWSKI.
H.R. 1810: Ms. LEBER FERNANDEZ and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 1818: Mr. OWENS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. ROSE, Ms. SCHOLTEN, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. MANN, and Mr. SHREVE.
H.R. 1822: Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 1835: Mr. STANTON and Mr. CISNEROS.
H.R. 1903: Mr. STANTON.
H.R. 1919: Mr. CLINE, Mr. MORAN, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. YAKYM.
H.R. 1923: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 1929: Mrs. TORRES of California.
H.R. 1930: Mrs. FLETCHER and Mr. LATIMER.
H.R. 1938: Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. VAN ORDEN, and Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 1949: Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. CLYDE, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 1989: Mr. MOULTON.
H.R. 1993: Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. TORRES of California, and Ms. BROWNLEY.
H.R. 2005: Mr. MEUSER.
H.R. 2006: Mr. SELF.
H.R. 2039: Mr. HARRIS of Maryland and Mr. MCGUIRE.
H.R. 2049: Mr. DELUZIO, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 2052: Mr. BAIRD.
H.R. 2059: Mr. CARSON, Mr. FROST, and Ms. OMAR.
H.R. 2065: Mr. HARRIGAN.
H.R. 2066: Mr. WIED.
H.R. 2102: Ms. ELFRETH, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Ms. GILLEN, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. CAREY, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. VASQUEZ, and Mr. FALLON.
H.R. 2127: Mr. BARR.
H.R. 2137: Mr. MILLS.
H.R. 2165: Mr. MANN.
H.R. 2166: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania and Mr. VINDMAN.
H.R. 2184: Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Mr. MANN.
H.R. 2187: Mr. CLYDE.
H.R. 2191: Mr. HARRIS of Maryland.
H.R. 2192: Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 2202: Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Ms. TENNEY, and Mr. BOST.
H.R. 2221: Ms. OMAR.
H.R. 2222: Mr. CLYDE.
H.R. 2228: Mr. VAN ORDEN.
H.R. 2230: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 2243: Mr. RUTHERFORD and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 2264: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 2272: Mr. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida and Mr. VAN ORDEN.
H.R. 2273: Mr. VAN ORDEN.
H.R. 2277: Mr. SUBRAMANYAM.
H.R. 2282: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
H.R. 2290: Ms. LEE of Nevada and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 2294: Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. CASTEN, Mr. CASE, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
H.R. 2295: Mr. VINDMAN.
H.R. 2296: Mr. CRAWFORD and Ms. PETTERSEN.
H.J. Res. 24: Mr. MESSMER.
H.J. Res. 75: Ms. TENNEY.
H.J. Res. 78: Mr. KILEY of California and Mr. OBERNOLTE.
H. Con. Res. 12: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.
H. Con. Res. 20: Mr. WIED.
H. Res. 23: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H. Res. 64: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. MOYLAN, and Mr. BEYER.
H. Res. 70: Mr. MOSKOWITZ, Mr. OLSZEWSKI, Ms. SHERRILL, Ms. GILLEN, Ms. ELFRETH, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Mr. VAN DREW.
H. Res. 94: Mr. LATIMER, Mr. BERA, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. MORELLE.
H. Res. 120: Mr. NORCROSS.
H. Res. 145: Mr. BRECHEEN, Mr. BURLISON, Mr. COLLINS, Ms. GREENE of Georgia, and Mr. HARRIS of North Carolina.
H. Res. 155: Mr. DOGGETT.
H. Res. 166: Mr. WALBERG, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. EVANS of Colorado, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H. Res. 173: Ms. TOKUDA.
H. Res. 206: Mr. EVANS of Colorado.

H. Res. 219: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. JACK-
SON of Illinois.
H. Res. 229: Mr. BRECHEEN.

H. Res. 238: Mr. LATIMER, Mr. MORELLE,
Mrs. FLETCHER, and Mr. VARGAS.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 119th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 171

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 25, 2025

No. 54

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

God of all life, we seek You in a world filled with challenges. Today, prepare the Members of this body for the rigors of solving life's riddles. Give them the wisdom to seek common opportunities to accomplish Your will in our Nation and world. Teach them to spend and be spent for the good of others.

Lord, give them the spiritual tools for strength of thought, lightness of heart, sincerity of conviction, and clarity of purpose.

Renew their commitment to You, for You are their inspiration, their strength, their courage, their guide, and their Lord.

We pray in Your magnificent Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORENO). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The Senator from Iowa.

RUSSIA

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, on this day in 1949, the Russian-Soviet regime occupying the Baltic countries rounded up 95,000 people, mostly women and children, and sent them to Siberia.

During Stalin's rule, more than 220,000 innocent people were deported to cold Siberia. This doesn't even include political prisoners sent to the gulag camps.

This day is observed by those Baltic countries of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania by lighting candles in the memory of these deportees.

The reason the Soviets did this is pretty simple: They wanted to crush civil society in newly occupied areas because they took over the Baltic countries in 1940.

The ultimate goal was to eliminate Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian national identity entirely, replacing it with, of course, a Soviet-Russian identity. The Soviets did not succeed in this effort.

Now, you may not remember this from history, but the United States never recognized the illegal Soviet occupation of these three Baltic States.

Now, the people of those three countries kept the flame of freedom alive by quietly telling their children the truth about how their countries were once free and independent.

Then, when the Soviet empire showed signs of weakness, their desire for freedom burst forth in what is called the Singing Revolution. It got the name because of the use of national songs banned by the Soviet, and this, by singing it, was their means of protest.

Fifty years of brutal Soviet occupation could not extinguish the flames of freedom and all Baltic countries are again free and prosperous and these three countries happen to be among the most pro-American allies.

I wonder if we can learn a lesson because we know that when Putin invaded Ukraine in 2022, he has since kid-

napped about 20,000 young people from Ukraine and taken them to Russia to "Russify" them, I guess you would say.

We don't hear enough of that. We ought to be reminded of what the Soviets did after World War II, and it seems like the world has not learned a lesson or Putin wouldn't get away with his kidnapping of 20,000 children to take them to Russia from Ukraine.

We should not allow this to continue, and the United States of America ought to be very cautious in any dealings with an international war criminal as Putin has been so condemned.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, from the day he took office, President Trump made it clear that he would not hesitate to take action to deter our enemies and protect our Nation, and that is exactly what he has been doing, both here at home and abroad.

Needless to say, 4 years of record-breaking illegal immigration at our southern border, under President Biden, left a gaping hole in our national security. The chaos that raged at our southern border was an invitation to terrorists and criminals, and law enforcement was stretched thin trying to deal with the flood of illegal immigration.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S1809

During his campaign, President Trump made it very clear that putting an end to our border crisis was going to be at the top of his agenda, and he has been delivering on that promise.

In just 2 months, his bold action to secure our border and enforce our immigration laws has led to a precipitous drop in illegal crossings at the southern border. U.S. Customs and Border Protection recorded just 11,709 encounters—apprehensions between ports of entry, plus inadmissible aliens—at our southern border for the month of February—11,709.

Just to put that number into perspective, in February 2024, with President Biden, Customs and Border Protection recorded 189,913 encounters at our southern border—189,913 to 11,709, a 93-percent drop.

President Trump and his administration have made incredible progress, and our Nation is more secure because of their efforts.

IRAN

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, meanwhile, on the international front, President Trump is taking a similarly assertive approach to protecting our country and our interests.

Over the last 18 months, since Hamas's October 7, 2023, attack on Israel, Iran-backed Houthis in the Middle East have carried out literally hundreds of attacks on U.S. international shipping and on U.S. forces. Airstrikes by the Biden administration failed to stop the Houthis' activities, and international shipping has been significantly affected. Ships now routinely avoid the Red Sea and the Suez Canal in favor of going around the southern tip of Africa, a route that means longer travel times for goods. And those ships that do traverse the Red Sea face significant danger to their cargoes and, above all, to their personnel.

This is an unacceptable situation, and so President Trump is taking action. Within days of taking office, President Trump had redesignated the Houthis as a foreign terrorist organization—after the Biden administration took them off the list—and 10 days ago, President Trump ordered extensive airstrikes against Houthi targets. Even more importantly, he has made it very clear to the Houthis that those strikes will continue, unless and until the Houthis cease their attacks on U.S. forces and commercial shipping in the Red Sea.

And because the Houthis do not act alone but with the support of Iran, President Trump is also making it clear to Iran that it needs to stop aiding and abetting Houthi terror. So much of the violence and unrest in the Middle East is carried out by groups funded, armed, and sometimes trained by Iran, and any response to this violence must recognize Iran's role, as well as that of its proxies, like the Houthis.

I am grateful for the long-overdue action that President Trump is taking,

both here at home, on our border, and against Houthi terrorists abroad. It is this kind of decisive action that will encourage our enemies to think twice before menacing our Nation or threatening our interests.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 43.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Paul Lawrence, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 43, Paul Lawrence, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

John Thune, Mike Crapo, Roger Marshall, Shelley Moore Capito, Tommy Tuberville, Jim Justice, James Lankford, John Barrasso, Markwayne Mullin, Tim Sheehy, Mike Rounds, Todd Young, Kevin Cramer, Ted Budd, Roger F. Wicker, Katie Boyd Britt, David McCormick.

Mr. THUNE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Democratic leader is recognized.

THE ATLANTIC REPORT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, yesterday, it was reported that classified war plans were leaked by the Secretary of Defense over unsecured text messages. These text exchanges, confirmed by the administration as authentic, included the Defense Secretary, the National Security Advisor, the CIA Director, the Vice President of the United States, and, unintentionally, a journalist with no security clearance.

For the Defense Secretary to coordinate war plans in such a haphazard and dangerous way puts our national security, our troops, and every single

American at risk. They intentionally put highly classified information on an unclassified device.

Every single Senator, Democrat and Republican and Independent, must demand accountability. I am calling for a bipartisan investigation in the Senate of this mishandling. I am also calling for the Defense IG to fully investigate. This is too serious not to know exactly what happened, why it happened, and how to prevent it from ever happening again.

The Senate and the executive branch have an obligation to fully investigate how this mishandling of sensitive national defense information was allowed to happen. Republicans must not just shrug their shoulders and call this incident "one of those learning moments"—no, no, no. This is a serious matter—a potential breach of classified intelligence, of imminent war plans against America's adversaries.

The Senate as well as all relevant authorities within the executive branch must investigate this incident fully. We need to know how this conversation was allowed to happen in the first place on an unsecured channel. We need to know the potential damage it could have caused our national security. We need to know how to prevent this from ever, ever happening again.

Any Senate Republican who was up in arms years ago about emails and unsecured servers should be outraged by the Secretary of Defense's carelessness. What if Russian intelligence gained access to this text thread and shared it with their Iranian allies? What if the Iranians had shared it with their allies the Houthis—a terrifying thought, putting American lives, the lives of our Armed Forces, in jeopardy.

At best—at best—Secretary Hegseth showed a colossal lack of judgment. At worst, he put America's national security and perhaps American troops in danger. Once he got caught, did Secretary Hegseth take responsibility for this fiasco? Did he exhibit any kind of leadership Americans expect from the man who may deploy our troops into battle, from the man who may send our family members, our friends, our neighbors into harm's way? Did he show how he would do things differently next time? No, he did not. Instead of accepting responsibility, outrageously, Secretary Hegseth attacked the journalist and called him deceitful. He took the "deny till you die" approach even though these messages were already authenticated by the National Security Council spokesperson.

Secretary Hegseth's refusal to accept responsibility yesterday was eerily similar to the way he conducted himself during the confirmation process. I fear how he will react to future moments of crisis. Again, when Pete Hegseth came before the Senate as a nominee, Democrats warned something like this could happen.

These people—Secretary Hegseth and so many others—are clearly not up for the job. We warned that confirming

them was dangerous, that they would behave recklessly, and unfortunately—unfortunately—we were right.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. President, now on Social Security, what is happening at the Social Security Administration is an utter travesty, and Senate Republicans are doing nothing—absolutely nothing—at all to stop it.

As we all know, Social Security is among the most beloved programs that have ever existed in American history, but right now, Donald Trump and Elon Musk—two billionaires, one of them the richest man on Earth—are taking a chain saw—a chain saw—to Social Security. This is one of the darkest examples of Donald Trump's attempt to erode away the American dream. He and Musk are rigging the system more and more in favor of billionaires while stealing from working people in order to cut taxes for the rich.

Let's be very clear. What is happening right now to the Social Security Administration is already a benefit cut. They are shutting off phone lines, closing down field offices, firing staff by the thousands, adding redtape—not reducing redtape, adding redtape—with burdensome new rules. Wait times to talk to someone over the phone are now 2 hours, and in some cases, people wait for 4 or 5 hours. This is not efficiency; it is sabotage.

What Musk and DOGE are doing is a classic hostile takeover. They are swooping in, cannibalizing Social Security from within, and then they will sell what is left for parts.

Make no mistake, if the American people don't believe this is coming directly from Donald Trump, just listen to his address to Congress, where he spent a full 10 minutes spreading lie after lie after lie about fraud, about checks to people who are 150 years old. This is a lie that Trump's own Acting Commissioner has said is false.

What Senate Republicans are allowing to happen to Social Security is deeply immoral, and their silence is an absolute disgrace.

Today, the Senate Finance Committee will hold a hearing on the nomination of Frank Bisignano to lead the beleaguered Social Security Administration. Someone with Mr. Bisignano's background is the last person we need at the Social Security Administration. The Agency is standing on a knife's edge, and now Republicans want to appoint someone famous for shrinking the organizations he has led.

Mr. Bisignano's nomination should go no further after today's hearing. If Republicans care one bit about seniors and their benefits, they should immediately reject his nomination and stand up to DOGE.

A "yes" vote on Bisignano is a vote to cut Social Security. Let me say it again. A "yes" vote on Mr. Bisignano is a vote to cut Social Security, plain and simple.

During today's hearing, we need the answers to some very important ques-

tions—not just from the nominee but also from our Republican colleagues themselves. Do Senate Republicans and Mr. Bisignano agree, for one, that Social Security is a scam like Elon Musk and Donald Trump said? Do they agree with Secretary Lutnick that if seniors miss benefits for 1 month, they will be perfectly fine with it? Do Senate Republicans and Mr. Bisignano plan to do anything—anything at all—to reverse the profound damage that is happening right now to the Agency?

Time is short to stop permanent damage to the Social Security Administration. If Republicans continue to do nothing, the political backlash will be unprecedented.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

TRUMP ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, you know better than anyone, having just won election to this body, that Americans elected Republicans all across the country to get our country back on track. That is what this last election was about, and Republicans are keeping our promises.

Today, more Americans say our country is on the right track than they have said for the last 20 years, and that is because President Trump and Republicans' commonsense revolution is working.

By contrast, what we see with the Democrats—they have abandoned all common sense. The American people are resoundingly—amazing numbers—according to a recent poll—CNN did a poll. They are no friends of Republicans. What did they say? They said that only 29 percent of the American people view the Democratic Party favorably. Even worse, according to a recent NBC poll, only 27 percent of Americans had a positive view of the Democrats.

The Democrat approval rating is at its alltime low in the history of polling in this country. Why is that? Well, let me tell you. It is because Democrats in this body—in this Senate—are taking positions and continuing to take positions that are truly radical. Democrats in this body support people who support terrorism. That is who they side with.

They refuse to protect women in sports. Eighty percent of Americans say we need to protect women and girls in sports against biological men.

Democrats refuse to stand with Israel.

Democrats, through their votes, are trying to support higher energy prices, not lower energy prices. It was inflation which cost them the election—the open borders and the high prices of the last administration. Democrats are refusing to protect taxpayers.

In terms of specific wasteful Washington spending that we have been seeing, Democrats are refusing to allow us to remove some of this wasteful Washington spending. They want Americans to pay higher taxes—\$4 trillion in in-

creased higher taxes is what they are hoping for at the end of this year.

The minority leader, who just spoke, appeared last week on a television show called "The View." What did he do? He spent his time attacking not the abuses against America but against hard-working and successful American families—people who just want to keep more of their hard-earned money; people who don't want to see the government waste it, fritter it away, as we have seen from these examples and lists of money being spent in ways you just wouldn't think makes sense to anyone.

The minority leader had nothing good to say about the innovators or the job creators, the hard-working Americans who make this country great.

Over the last 4 years—the 4 years of the last administration—wasteful spending caused the worst inflation in 40 years. Democrats raised our taxes. They took our money, and they spent it recklessly.

Today, Democrats are pulling out all the stops to block our bold Republican agenda. This is an agenda that the American people support. How do they do it? They don't have the votes in the House. They don't have the votes in the Senate. They don't have the White House. How can Democrats and their radical views be reflected in what is happening in this country? You know they are doing it through radical district court judges.

That is what the American people are hearing about today in the news—radical district court judges who oppose President Trump, oppose his agenda. How many district court judges are there in the country? The number is 677. That is how many there are in the United States. Last week, 1 of them—1 of the 677, just 1 of them at the district court level—ordered a nationwide ban to stop deportation of illegal immigrant gang members. This is wrong. One district court judge in one district court out of 677 of these district judges is saying "stop" for the entire country.

Well, these gang members, these illegal immigrants, they are part of a criminal group, and it is a criminal group designated by President Trump as terrorists. They are murderers and rapists. They are drug dealers. They threaten the safety and security of every American community.

Last month alone, there were 15 nationwide injunctions issued against the Trump administration by who? By activist district judges from Washington to Seattle. These activist district judges think they know better than the American people. Their radical order blocks signature pillars of our Republican agenda, the agenda the American people voted for in November.

These radical activist judges are protecting criminals, they are protecting terrorists, and they are after people that we know we need out of the country—they want to keep them here. They are against accountability. It is clearly an effort by the Democrats and

their activist judges to try to undo the will of the voters.

Let me be very clear. When partisan, unelected district court judges try to micromanage the President of the United States, that is not judicial review, it isn't checks and balances, it is purely partisan politics, and it is wrong. Radical district judges are not going to succeed in blocking Republicans from getting this Nation back on track.

I applaud President Trump. He is fighting to uphold the rule of law. He is appealing these bad rulings. He is representing the values of the American people.

Let me go back to where I began. Last week, NBC reported Democrats are at the lowest level of support in the history of polling. At the same time, more Americans say that our country is on the right track than they have in the last 20 years. The Republican agenda for America continues to be popular.

Americans want to escape the last 4 years of high prices and open borders. Republicans' shared agenda will deliver safer communities, secure borders, affordable prices, and peace through strength. Republicans are committed, Mr. President, to getting America back on track.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, let me take you back to January of 1985.

Ronald Reagan had just begun his second term as President, and one of his policy priorities was to include the abolition of the Department of Education. What did it finally take to get him to back down from that commitment? Congress. Congress stood firm to protect this vital Agency in 1985.

In a letter to Senator Orrin Hatch, a Republican Senator from Utah, President Reagan said that, although he wanted to dismantle the Department, "the proposal has received very little support in Congress," and because of the lack of support from Congress, which would be necessary, of course, to close down the Agency, President Reagan decided not to proceed with his plan.

Sound familiar?

That is because, currently, another Republican President, who ran on the slogan of "making America great again," has suggested abolishing the Department of Education—only this time, he is not consulting with Congress; he is taking steps to do it. Last week, President Trump signed an Executive order to close down the Department of Education.

Demolishing the Federal Agency dedicated to the success of our next

generation is shortsighted and deeply damaging to the future of this country. Families, schools, and young people in my State of Illinois and across the Nation depend on the Department of Education. In Illinois, the Department provides critical annual funding for K-through-12 schools to meet the needs of 4,000 schools and more than 2 million students. This includes \$652 million in annual Federal funding for nearly 300,000 kids with disabilities.

I can remember a time when I went to school, and it was rare that you saw a disabled child in school. I don't know where they were—they were being hidden or something or held back—but they certainly weren't being given the opportunities they have today.

That also includes \$778 million in annual funding for schools enrolling 1.3 million students from low-income backgrounds and so much more. These are kids who are attending schools which aren't in the best and wealthiest neighborhoods. They have got good families who care about their educations, and we give them a helping hand to make sure those kids have a fighting chance.

President Trump has repeatedly promised to "send education back to the States," but State and local funds already account for the vast majority of K-through-12 education funding, and States and school districts decide what is taught in schools, not the Federal Government.

Cuts to Federal education programs and funds will hurt the Nation's students and the communities they live in. Shuttering the Department of Education threatens funding for low-income students and special education, and it makes uncertain the future of Federal student loans and Pell grants.

We all know what a Pell grant is. It is an opportunity for a child from a family of modest means to finally go to college. Funding degrees with these Pell grants opens the door for opportunity. It prepares these students to be part of the future workforce and the economy, and it allows America to continue to compete on the global stage. In Illinois, 226,000 students receive \$1 billion in Pell grants to afford higher education—a program that has received bipartisan support.

So what does President Trump plan on doing with these student loans if he abolishes the Department of Education?

Well, they made a proposal. They want to shift the administration's loan program to the Small Business Administration—a separate Agency—while, at the same time, the President and the DOGE folks have planned to fire 40 percent of the Federal employees at the Small Business Administration.

So follow the bouncing ball here. He wants to eliminate the Department of Education and call into question the administration of a program that literally millions of students rely on to go to school, and he is going to shift the responsibilities for administering

that program to the Small Business Administration, which is not a large Agency. At the same time, he is going to cut the number of employees at the SBA by 40 percent.

Do you have any idea what is going to happen as a result of that? Most people know. It is going to be an administrative disaster.

Donald Trump is not trying to move education back to the States. In a real-life shell game, he is moving pieces around until we lose sight of the ball and, in the process, making drastic changes to our education system.

This administration will not stop in its relentless effort to weaken America's public schools. Before signing last week's Executive order, President Trump made significant staff cuts at the Department—already one of the smallest Agencies. He fired more than half the staff at the Department of Education.

Why does he need this money that he is going to bring back to the Treasury by firing these people? Because, of course, he needs to pay for tax cuts for wealthy people. We have seen it before. In President Trump's first administration, he had the distinction of having created more national debt in 4 years than had any previous President. He is out to set a new record this time. It is not that he is just for tax cuts; they have to be tax cuts that really favor the wealthiest taxpayers in America. That is just wrong.

He has fired employees at the Office of Federal Student Aid. He has slashed the staff at the Office for Civil Rights. This means students applying for financial aid will have to wait longer to learn whether they can afford to go to college. It means students defrauded by predatory for-profit colleges won't see the student loan relief they are entitled to.

What am I talking about here?

You can tell the story of for-profit colleges and universities with two numbers: 8 and 30. Eight percent of the graduates of high school in America end up in for-profit colleges and universities, but 30 percent of all the student loan defaults are these same students.

Why this difference, this disparity? They charge too much for tuition. They offer far less education than promised, and the students are often defrauded in the process.

Historically, they have turned to the Office for Civil Rights in the Department of Education to get forgiven some of the loans they have incurred because of the fraudulent conduct of these schools. Now, of course, in closing the Department of Education and closing the Office for Civil Rights, it denies them their opportunity and their day in court. It means weaker enforcement of Federal laws passed by Congress to protect students from marginalized backgrounds and students with disabilities, and it means the students and families with open cases in the Office for Civil Rights are unlikely to see any resolution.

Meanwhile, instead of investigating instances of genuine discrimination, the administration is laser-focused on targeting universities that do not align with its values, in hopes of suppressing free speech and banning transgender athletes from participating in women's sports.

How does closing the one Agency responsible for shaping our Nation's young people and for building the competitive workforce of tomorrow make America great?

It doesn't. Not only will closing down the Department of Education hurt millions of young people across the country and weaken our Nation's future; it is also illegal. The President does not have the power or the authority to unilaterally close these Agencies. That is being tested in court, and the President is not doing well in those tests.

I want to make sure the Department of Education is efficient, and I want to make sure it is responsive. But the notion that we are going to shift all of the student loans to the SBA is an example of someone who didn't think it through. With fewer employees at that Agency, they will be unable to do the job which they were assigned the responsibility of doing, and they will change the lives of a lot of American students in the process.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHEEHY). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Texas.

RUSSIA

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, for some reason, the Presiding Officer has drawn the short straw to be the Presiding Officer during my daily or frequent speeches here on the floor, though I appreciate your patience and indulgence.

This morning I come to the floor to talk about the Intelligence Committee's "Worldwide Threats" hearing that is ongoing now in the Hart Office Building. We have all the leaders of the intelligence community, including the Director of National Intelligence, there.

We hold this hearing once a year. It serves as an important reminder of where the United States stands in terms of the rest of the world and what you should be concerned about and what we should protect against.

Key among the threats that have been testified to already in open session—and we will be going to a closed, classified session here shortly—but key among the threats discussed this morning was the threat of Russia.

Russia is engaged, of course, in an ongoing hot war with Ukraine, a conflict that President Trump is rightly seeking to end. While this is perhaps

toward the forefront of many people's minds when they think about Russia, it is not the only threat Russia poses to the West, and I use the term "West" advisedly. That is not just the United States. That includes the United States, but it is far broader than that.

Some have described—and I think even the Director of National Intelligence, Tulsi Gabbard, this morning confirmed—that Russia is engaged in a shadow war against the West.

One of the ways that they have engaged in this shadow war is through sabotage. That, again, was also confirmed by the Director of National Intelligence this morning. She said these have included attacks against transportation targets like trains, airplanes, and other vehicles, attacks against government and military targets. And some of these attacks have been directed toward critical infrastructure like pipelines, undersea fiberoptic cables, and the electric grid.

Russia has also targeted industries like defense companies and the leaders of such companies that support their adversaries. These attacks have accelerated in recent years.

Between 2022 and 2023, Russia has quadrupled its orchestrated sabotage attacks in Europe. And then they nearly tripled again in 2024.

And while this behavior has escalated in recent years, it should come as no surprise to anyone who is familiar with Russian history or the history of Russian actions when it comes to their adversaries.

Given Russia's geography, it has always been part of their strategy to extend their westernmost border to provide a larger buffer and a smaller border for Moscow to have to defend. But above and beyond their history of aggressive expansionism, trying to restore, really, the now-collapsed Soviet Union, Russia also has a history of using tactics outside of conventional warfare.

These are tactics that advance Russia's strategic interests and weaken those of its adversaries but may not rise to the level that would merit countermeasures by the target of these efforts.

The Soviet Union, the predecessor to the Russian Federation, has historically heavily relied upon such tactics during the Cold War; for example, the KGB, which was the name of the premier Russian intelligence agency back during the Cold War. The KGB led a campaign to influence public opinion among certain populations to advance Soviet interests. And, of course, that has continued today under Vladimir Putin and the Russian Federation.

One of the reasons the KGB and now the modern intelligence agencies of the Russian Federation use these methods is they do not necessarily trigger article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization agreement. Article 5 is the agreement that an attack against one member of NATO will be considered an attack against all, which is why it is

called a collective defense agreement. And the United States, of course, is one of the signatories to that North Atlantic Treaty Alliance.

And one of the risks of Russia triggering article 5 is that it would necessarily risk a broader war, regional or even worse. And, of course, I know we are all acutely aware of the dangers posed by any country triggering article 5 of NATO.

This is, in part, why President Trump has rightly insisted that our NATO allies increase their defense spending in line with their NATO commitments. It is just not fair or appropriate or, actually, in NATO's self-interest for those countries to depend entirely on the United States, which is why President Trump has said the 2 percent of GDP defense spending requirement is really out of date and that really NATO countries should be spending somewhere closer to 5 percent of their gross domestic product on their defense. Again, that is also to relieve the burden on the American taxpayer who has been picking up the tab for far too long.

And we see the success that President Trump has had by urging our NATO allies to provide more for their self-defense, with France and Germany leading the charge to reinvigorate their defense budgets. That is encouraging, but it takes time. But it needs to start, and it has already started.

But in any case, it is clear that Russia is concerned about anything that might trigger article 5 treaty obligations. Russia, in fact, knows that in a conventional war, it is no match for the West or NATO. And so they resort to behind-the-scenes activities to indirectly advance their own interests and harm those interests of their adversaries without triggering a reaction from the West.

Now, some of these are the reasons why—because Russia knows that it cannot win a conventional war in Europe, were one to break out, is why it continues to rattle the nuclear saber and why Putin, over and over and over again, threatens the possibility of the use of tactical nuclear weapons, which, of course, would be catastrophic for everybody involved.

Some of my colleagues may be familiar—I am sure the public is—with the analogy of a frog in boiling water. If you drop a frog in a pot of boiling water, it will immediately jump out, but if you put a frog in a pot of lukewarm water, you can slowly acclimate the frog to that temperature and it will not jump out. But, of course, once the water comes to a boil again, it will kill the frog and, obviously, be too late.

That analogy, I believe, applies to the threat that Russia continues to pose to the United States and our friends and allies around the world.

This could, in fact, be the West, if we are not vigilant, because we know that the approach and the tactics and the intentions of the Russian Federation have really not changed over time.

They are slowly, however, turning up the temperature to weaken us and perhaps to lull us into complacency. But this is not the only tactic that Russia has employed in its war against the West. They also have a history of more blatant war crimes.

In 2014, Russia violated its commitments in the 1994 Budapest Memorandum by annexing Crimea, which is part of Ukraine. The Budapest Memorandum, which, again, was dated in 1994, was a treaty signed by Russia, the United States, and the United Kingdom. Under this agreement, Ukraine, which had become newly independent after the fall of the Soviet Union, Ukraine would dispose of its nuclear arsenal in exchange for an agreement to protect its territorial integrity and independence.

And at the time, Ukraine had the third largest nuclear weapons stockpile in the world. So it was certainly in the interest of the United States and world peace to see Ukraine dispose of that nuclear stockpile.

But then, again, in 2022, Russia violated its commitments under the Budapest Memorandum by launching a full-scale invasion of Ukraine. These actions are a clear signal to the West that Russia has a history of reneging on its agreements and simply cannot be trusted.

And so the task at hand for the West, including the United States, is to reestablish deterrence of Russia and to make sure that we do everything we can to disincentivize them from continuing this long train of abuses.

And, of course, one of the consequences of rising feelings of insecurity in Europe is that now you have countries like Poland talking about acquiring nuclear weapons. You have the incoming chancellor of Germany saying that perhaps the UK and Germany should share its nuclear weapons with Ukraine.

Now, I had the chance to question the head of the Defense Intelligence Agency, and I asked whether this threat of proliferation of nuclear weapons made the world a more dangerous place. It seems like an obvious question. But, of course, he confirmed that that would be the case.

So proliferation of nuclear weapons in Europe is a bad thing and something we ought to seek to avoid at all costs. So I know President Trump has a big task in front of him, and I personally will do everything I can to support his efforts.

But we need to reestablish deterrence without seeing nuclear weapons proliferate, which will, in fact, make the world more dangerous and not safer.

As I have said before, and I think is obvious to all of us, we are living in the most dangerous time since World War II. And, certainly, this morning's hearing on the world threat assessment before the leaders of the intelligence community have driven home this reality and confirmed what we already knew.

NATIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR DAY

Mr. President, on another related matter, today is the National Medal of Honor Day, where we honor the bravery of our military heroes who have been awarded the Medal of Honor. Last Saturday, I had the chance, along with the Presiding Officer, to attend the grand opening of the Medal of Honor Museum in Arlington, TX, where I was moved by, among other things, the words of General Rainey, the head of Army Futures Command, headquartered in Austin, TX. General Rainey reminded us:

Nobody hates war more than the men and women who served in it, but we all hope that when we find ourselves at that moment, the darkest hour of the darkest day when it is our turn to [be] tested, we hope that we will measure up to the courage and valor of these men.

So as we consider the challenges that face not only the United States, but the rest of the free world, I think the words of General Rainey can serve as a reminder in this moment. And while we may have some differences among us about our preferred approaches and tactics, we should all be united in our goal of preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons and, Heaven forbid, another reoccurrence of the world war that my dad fought in many years ago.

And hopefully, to be able to keep our young men and women out of harm's way, rather than to have them exposed to the same dangers that previous generations were exposed to in two world wars in the European continent.

Again, I applaud the efforts of President Trump and Vice President VANCE to do everything possible to wind down the current conflict in Eastern Europe in order to avoid it from morphing into a larger regional or even global conflict.

And I think those of us who believe in a higher power would do well to continue to say our prayers that that ultimately is a successful effort, and I certainly will join in that effort.

WAIVING QUORUM CALL

Before I yield the floor, I would ask unanimous consent to waive the mandatory quorum call with respect to the Kratsios nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS). Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 38, Michael Kratsios, of South Carolina, to be Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy.

John Thune, Tim Sheehy, Mike Crapo, Markwayne Mullin, Joni Ernst, David McCormick, Rick Scott of Florida, Bernie Moreno, Mike Rounds, Tommy

Tuberville, Katie Boyd Britt, Shelley Moore Capito, Jim Justice, John Barrasso, Steve Daines, Jon Husted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Michael Kratsios, of South Carolina, to be Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN).

Further, if present and voting: the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) is necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 73, nays 25, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 138 Ex.]

YEAS—73

Baldwin	Fischer	Moran
Banks	Gallego	Moreno
Barrasso	Graham	Mullin
Bennet	Grassley	Murkowski
Blackburn	Hagerty	Paul
Boozman	Hassan	Ricketts
Britt	Hawley	Risch
Budd	Heinrich	Rosen
Cantwell	Hickenlooper	Rounds
Capito	Husted	Schmitt
Cassidy	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Collins	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Coons	Justice	Shaheen
Cornyn	Kelly	Sheehy
Cortez Masto	Kennedy	Slotkin
Cotton	King	Sullivan
Cramer	Klobuchar	Thune
Crapo	Lankford	Tillis
Cruz	Lee	Tuberville
Curtis	Lujan	Warner
Daines	Lummis	Warnock
Duckworth	Marshall	Wicker
Durbin	McConnell	Young
Ernst	McCormick	
Fetterman	Moody	

NAYS—25

Alsobrooks	Merkley	Schumer
Blumenthal	Murphy	Smith
Blunt Rochester	Murray	Van Hollen
Booker	Ossoff	Warren
Gillibrand	Peters	Welch
Hirono	Reed	Whitehouse
Kaine	Sanders	Wyden
Kim	Schatz	
Markley	Schiff	

NOT VOTING—2

Hoeven Padilla

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 73, the nays are 25.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Michael Kratsios, of South Carolina, to be Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:57 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mrs. BRITT).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

VOTE ON KRATSIOS NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Kratsios nomination?

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 74, nays 25, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 139 Ex.]

YEAS—74

Baldwin	Fischer	Moody
Banks	Gallego	Moran
Barrasso	Graham	Moreno
Bennet	Grassley	Mullin
Blackburn	Hagerty	Murkowski
Boozman	Hassan	Paul
Britt	Hawley	Ricketts
Budd	Heinrich	Risch
Cantwell	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Capito	Hoeven	Rounds
Cassidy	Husted	Schmitt
Collins	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Coons	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Justice	Shaheen
Cortez Masto	Kelly	Sheehy
Cotton	Kennedy	Slotkin
Cramer	King	Sullivan
Crapo	Klobuchar	Thune
Cruz	Lankford	Tillis
Curtis	Lee	Tuberville
Daines	Lujan	Warner
Duckworth	Lummis	Warnock
Durbin	Marshall	Wicker
Ernst	McConnell	Young
Fetterman	McCormick	

NAYS—25

Alsobrooks	Merkley	Schumer
Blumenthal	Murphy	Smith
Blunt Rochester	Murray	Van Hollen
Booker	Ossoff	Warren
Gillibrand	Peters	Welch
Hirono	Reed	Whitehouse
Kaine	Sanders	Wyden
Kim	Schatz	
Markey	Schiff	

NOT VOTING—1

Padilla

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The majority leader.

WAIVING QUORUM CALL

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to waive the mandatory quorum call with respect to the Bhattacharya nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 44, Jayanta Bhattacharya, of California, to be Director of the National Institutes of Health.

John Thune, Tim Scott of South Carolina, Ashley B. Moody, Ted Budd, Tommy Tuberville, Jim Justice, James Lankford, Steve Daines, Ron Johnson, Josh Hawley, John R. Curtis, Tim Sheehy, Marsha Blackburn, David McCormick, Katie Boyd Britt, Todd Young, Cindy Hyde-Smith.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Jayanta Bhattacharya, of California, to be Director of the National Institutes of Health, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) is necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 53, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 140 Ex.]

YEAS—53

Banks	Graham	Moreno
Barrasso	Grassley	Mullin
Blackburn	Hagerty	Murkowski
Boozman	Hawley	Paul
Britt	Hoeven	Ricketts
Budd	Husted	Risch
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Cassidy	Johnson	Schmitt
Collins	Justice	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Lankford	Sheehy
Cramer	Lee	Sullivan
Crapo	Lummis	Thune
Cruz	Marshall	Tillis
Curtis	McConnell	Tuberville
Daines	McCormick	Wicker
Ernst	Moody	Young
Fischer	Moran	

NAYS—46

Alsobrooks	Hickenlooper	Sanders
Baldwin	Hirono	Schatz
Bennet	Kaine	Schiff
Blumenthal	Kelly	Schumer
Blunt Rochester	Kim	Shaheen
Booker	King	Slotkin
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Smith
Coons	Lujan	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Markey	Warner
Duckworth	Merkley	Warnock
Durbin	Murphy	Warren
Fetterman	Murray	Welch
Gallego	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Peters	Wyden
Hassan	Reed	
Heinrich	Rosen	

NOT VOTING—1

Padilla

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BANKS). On this vote, the yeas are 53, the nays are 46.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Jayanta Bhattacharya, of California, to be Director of the National Institutes of Health.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

TRUMP ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, in the last couple of weeks, I have had the opportunity to travel in many parts of our country, and I have been able to talk to folks in Nebraska, in Iowa, Wisconsin, Michigan, Nevada, Colorado, and Arizona.

What I am hearing from in all of these States and, in fact, all over the country is that our Nation right now faces enormous crises—unprecedented crises in the modern history of our country.

How—right now, at this moment—we respond to these crises will not only impact our lives, it will impact the lives of our kids and future generations, and in terms of climate change, the well-being of the entire planet.

Mr. President, what I have to tell you is that the American people are angry at what is happening here in Washington, DC, and they are prepared to stand up and fight back.

In my view, and what I have heard from many, many people is that they will not accept an oligarchic form of society where a handful of billionaires control our government; where the wealthiest person on Earth, Mr. Musk, is running all over Washington, DC, slashing the Social Security Administration so that our elderly people today are finding it extremely difficult to access the benefits that they paid into; where Mr. Musk and his friends are slashing the Veterans' Administration so that people who put their lives on the line to defend us will not be able to get the healthcare that they are entitled to or get the benefits that they are owed in a timely manner; slashing the Department of Education; slashing USAID.

And why is all of this slashing taking place? It is taking place so that the wealthiest people in this country can receive over \$1 trillion in tax breaks. Now, I don't care if you are a Democrat, a Republican, or an Independent. There are very few people in this country who think that you slash programs that working families desperately need in order to give tax breaks to billionaires.

I am the former chair of the U.S. Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and I have had the honor of meeting with veterans in my own State of Vermont—all over Vermont—but all over the country. These are the men and women who put the uniform of this country on and have been prepared to die to defend our Nation and American democracy.

These veterans and Americans all over our Nation will not accept an authoritarian form of society with a

President who undermines our Constitution every day. Every day there is something else out there where he is undermining our Constitution and threatening the very foundations of American democracy. That is not what people fought and died to allow to happen.

I am not a historian, but I do know that the Founding Fathers of this country were no dummies. They were really smart guys, and in the 1780s, they wrote a Constitution and established a form of government with a separation of powers—a separation of powers—with an executive branch, the President; a legislative branch, the Congress; and a judicial branch.

These revolutionaries in the 1780s had just fought a war against the imperial rule of the King of England, who was an absolute dictator—the most powerful person on Earth—and these revolutionaries here in America forming a new government wanted to make absolutely sure that no one person in this brandnew country that they were forming would have unlimited powers.

That is why we have a separation of powers. That is why we have a judiciary, a Congress, and an executive branch. In other words, way back in the 1780s, they wrote a Constitution to prevent exactly what Donald Trump is trying to do today.

So let us be clear about what is going on: Donald Trump is attacking our First Amendment and is trying to intimidate the media and those who speak out against him in an absolutely unprecedented way. He has sued ABC, CBS, Meta, the Des Moines Register. His FCC is now threatening to investigate NPR and PBS. He has called CNN and MSNBC illegal.

In other words, the leader—or the so-called leader—of the free world is afraid of freedom. He doesn't like criticism. Well, guess what, none of us likes criticism, but you don't get elected to the Senate; you don't get elected to the House; you don't become a Governor; you don't become a President of the United States unless you are prepared to deal with that criticism. And the response to that criticism in a democracy is not to sue the media, is not to intimidate the media. It is to respond in the way that you think best.

But it is not just the media that Trump is going after. He is going after the constitutional responsibilities that this body, the U.S. Congress, has. I will say it amazes me—it really does—how easily my Republican colleagues here in the Senate and in the House are willing to surrender their constitutional responsibilities, give it over to the President.

Trump has illegally and unconstitutionally withheld funds that Congress has appropriated. You can't do that. Congress has the power of the purse. We make a decision. We argue about it here, big debates, vote-aramas, the whole thing, make that decision; that money goes out. The President does not have the right to with-

hold funds that Congress has appropriated.

Trump has illegally and unconstitutionally decimated Agencies that can only be changed or reformed by Congress. You don't like the Department of Education? You don't like USAID? Fine. Come to the Congress, and tell us what reforms you want to see. You do not have the right to unilaterally do away with these Agencies.

Trump has fired members of independent Agencies and inspectors general that he does not have the authority to do.

But it is not just the media that he is trying to intimidate. It is not just the powers of Congress that he wants. Now, in an absolutely outrageous, unconstitutional, and extraordinarily dangerous way he is going after the judiciary.

His view is that if you don't like a decision that a judge renders, you get rid of that judge. You try to impeach that judge. You intimidate judges so that you get the decisions that you want.

You know, I am thinking back now as someone who is not a supporter of the Roberts' Court, and I am thinking about one of the worst Supreme Court decisions that has ever been rendered, and that is *Citizens United*. I will say more about that in a moment.

I am thinking about the Supreme Court's decision to overturn *Roe v. Wade*, taking away American women's right to control their own bodies. In my view, these were outrageous decisions, unpopular decisions, but it never occurred to me—because maybe I am old-fashioned and conservative and I believe that you live by the rule of law—to say: Hey, look at the decision Roberts made. We are going to impeach him.

No. We try to elect a new President, who is going to appoint new Supreme Court Justices. That is the system that people have fought and died to defend.

But it is not just the movement or oligarchy which is outraging millions of Americans, Democrats and Republicans, by the way, and it is not just the movement toward authoritarianism that we are seeing; the American people, especially with Mr. Musk and 13 billionaires in the Trump administration running Agency after Agency, the American people are saying as loudly as they can that they will not accept a society of massive economic and wealth inequalities where the very richest people in our country are becoming much richer while working families are struggling to put food on the table.

Having gone all over this country, I can tell you that the American people are sick and tired of these inequalities, and they want an economy that works for all of us, not just the 1 percent.

You know, we deal with a whole lot of stuff here in the Congress, and you know, virtually all of it is important in one way or another. Well, let's do something fairly radical today. Let's

try to tell the truth—the real truth—about what is going on in our society today, something that we don't talk about too much here in the Senate. We don't talk about it too much in the House. We don't talk about it too much in the corporate media. But the reality is that today we have two Americas, two very, very different Americas.

In one of those Americas, the wealthiest people have never ever had it so good. In the whole history of our country, the people on top have never ever had it so good as they have it today.

Today, we have more income and wealth inequality than there has ever been in the history of America. I know we don't discuss it. You don't see it much on TV. You don't hear it talked about here at all. But the American people do not believe that it is appropriate that three people—one, two, three; Mr. Musk, Mr. Bezos, and Mr. Zuckerberg—three Americans own more wealth than the bottom half of Americans in society—170 million people. Really? Three people own more wealth than 170 million people? Does anybody here think that is vaguely appropriate?

By the way, those very same three people—the three richest people in America—were right there at Trump's inaugural, standing right behind the President.

Do you want to know what oligarchy is? I know there is some confusion out there. What is oligarchy? Well, it starts off when you have the three wealthiest people in the country standing right behind the President when he gets inaugurated.

The top 1 percent of our country now owns more wealth than the bottom 90 percent. CEOs make 300 times more than their average worker. Unbelievably, real, inflation-accounted-for wages today for the average American worker, if you can believe it, despite a massive increase in worker productivity, is lower today than it was 52 years ago. During that period, there was a \$75 trillion transfer of wealth that went from the bottom 90 percent to the top 1 percent. That is the reality of the American economy today. Do you know what? Maybe we might want to be talking about that.

In our America today, that top America, that one America, the 1 percent are completely separate and isolated from the rest of the country. Do you think they get on the subway to get to work? Do you think they sit in a traffic jam for an hour trying to get to work? Not the case. They fly around in the jets and the helicopters that they own. They live in their mansions all over the world, in their gated communities. They have nannies taking care of their babies. They don't worry about the cost of childcare. They send their kids to the best private schools and colleges. Sometimes they vacation not in a Motel 6, not in a national park, but on their very own islands that they have. On occasion, for the

very, very richest, just for a kick, to have a little bit of fun, maybe they will spend a few million dollars flying off into space in one of their own spaceships. Sounds like fun.

But it is not just massive income and wealth inequality that we are dealing with today; we have more concentration of ownership than ever before. While the profits on Wall Street and corporate America soar, a handful of giant corporations dominate sector after sector, whether it is agriculture, transportation, media, financial services, et cetera, et cetera. A small number of huge corporations, international corporations, dominate sector after sector. As a result of that concentration of ownership, they are able to charge the American people outrageously high prices for the goods and services we need.

We don't talk about it too much, and maybe we should, but there are three Wall Street firms—BlackRock, Vanguard, and State Street—that, combined, are the major stockholders in 95 percent of our corporations. Got that? Three Wall Street firms—three—are the major stockholders in 95 percent of American corporations.

So that is one America—people on top doing phenomenally well. Not only do they have economic power, they have enormous political power. That is what is going on there. They live like kings.

That is one America, but there is another America. In that other America, 60 percent—60, 60 percent—of our people are living paycheck to paycheck, and millions of workers from one end of this country to the other are trying to survive on starvation wages.

Now, unlike Donald Trump, I grew up in a family that lived paycheck to paycheck, and I know the anxieties that my mom and dad had living in a rent-controlled apartment. Can we afford to buy this? Why did you buy that? That is the story taking place all over America.

What does living paycheck to paycheck mean? It means that every single day millions of Americans worry about how they are going to pay their rent or their mortgage, all over the country. Rents are skyrocketing, and people wonder, what happens? What happens to me and my kids if rent goes up by 20 percent and I can't afford it? Where do I live? Do I have to take my kid out of school? Where do I put my kid? In a worst-case scenario, do I live in my car?

Let's be clear. There are many people who are working today who are living in the back of their cars.

How do I pay for childcare?

I talked to a guy the other day, a police officer, who spends \$20,000 a year for childcare.

How do I buy decent food for my kids when the price of groceries is off the charts? What happens if I get sick or my kid gets sick or my mother gets sick and I have a \$12,000 deductible and I can't afford to go to the doctor? How,

at the end of the month, am I going to pay my credit card bill even though I am being charged 20 or 30 percent interest rates by the usurious credit card companies?

People are worrying about such things.

What happens if my car breaks down and the guy at the repair shop says it is going to cost a thousand dollars and I don't have a thousand dollars in the bank? If I don't have a car, how do I get to work? If I don't get to work, how do I have an income? If I don't have an income, how do I take care of my family?

Those are the crises that millions of Americans are experiencing today. But it is not just working-age Americans; today in our country, half of older workers—older workers—have nothing in the bank as they face retirement. They are watching TV, and they are seeing Mr. Musk firing Social Security workers and are actually worrying whether Social Security will be there for them.

It is not just older workers with nothing in the bank wondering what happens when they retire; 22 percent of seniors are trying to survive on \$15,000 a year. I dare anybody in this country, let alone somebody who is old, who needs healthcare, who needs to keep the house warm—try to survive on \$15,000 a year. And there are people here, by the way, talking about cutting Social Security.

It is not just about income and wealth inequality; it is about a healthcare system which everyone in the Nation understands is broken, is dysfunctional, and is outrageously expensive.

I hear my Republican friends—you know, I don't know where they are today—wanting to destroy the ACA, and my Democratic friends say: Oh, we have to defend the ACA.

The ACA is broken. It doesn't work. In my State, the cost of healthcare is going up 10, 15 percent. In America today, you have 85 million people who are uninsured or underinsured.

The function of the healthcare system today is not to do what a sane society would do: guarantee healthcare to all people in a cost-effective way—something which, by the way, every other major nation on Earth manages to do. The function of our healthcare system, as everybody knows, is to make billions of dollars in profits for the insurance companies and the drug companies.

So I say to my Democratic friends: It is not good enough to defend the Affordable Care Act. It is a broken system. You have to have the guts to stand up and allow us to do what every other major nation does: guarantee healthcare for all people as a human right, not allow the drug companies and the insurance companies to make massive profits every year.

I want to touch on an issue that gets virtually no discussion, but I think it is enormously important, and it says a hell of a lot about what is going on in

our society today. In America, according to international studies, our life expectancy—how long we live as a people—is about 4 years lower than other countries. In most European countries, people there live longer lives. In Japan, they live even longer lives than in Europe.

So question No. 1 is, Why is that happening? We spend \$14,000 a year per person on healthcare—almost double what any other country spends—and yet people around the world are living on average 4 years longer than we do.

But here is the really ugly fact, even worse than that, and that is that in this country, on average, if you are a working-class person, you will live a 7-years-shorter life than if you are in the top 1 percent. If you are a working-class person, your life will be 7 years shorter than if you are wealthy. In other words, being poor or working class in America today amounts to a death sentence.

It is not only a broken healthcare system; we have to ask ourselves a simple question—and the Biden administration began a little bit of movement in this direction—and that is, Why are we living in a nation where one out of four people can't even afford the prescription drugs their doctors prescribe? Why are we in some cases paying 10 times more than our neighbors in Canada or in Europe? How does that happen?

The answer, of course, has to do with the greed of the pharmaceutical industry and their power right here, all of the campaign contributions they make, which has prevented us from negotiating prices.

But it is not just healthcare or prescription drugs when we look at what is going on in America. In Vermont and throughout this country, we have a major housing crisis. Here we are, the richest country on Earth, and 800,000 people are sleeping out on the streets and 20 million people are spending more than 50 percent of their limited incomes on housing. Can you imagine that? If you are a working person spending 50 percent of your income on housing, how do you have money to do anything else? And the cost of housing is soaring.

Do not tell me that in a nation which can spend a trillion dollars on the military, a nation that can give massive tax breaks to the rich, that we cannot build the millions of units of housing we desperately need.

So why is all of this happening? Why do we have a healthcare system that is broken and prescription drugs that are the most expensive in the world and a housing system and education in deep trouble?

I talk to educators in Vermont and all over the country. I talked to a principal the other day in Vermont. The starting salary at a public school is \$32,000 a year. But don't worry—they can't afford to even bring people in because they can't afford housing in the community.

Why have we let education sink to the level that it has?

I think the bottom line of all of this is that the American people, I think, are catching on. And Mr. Musk—I must thank him because he has made it very clear. We are living in an oligarchic form of society.

If anybody out there thinks Mr. Musk is running around out of the goodness of his heart trying to make our government more efficient, you have not a clue as to what is going on. What these guys want to do is destroy virtually every Federal program that impacts the well-being of working people—Social Security, Medicare, the Postal Service, public education, you name it—so they can get huge tax breaks for the rich and eventually make government so inefficient that they will have the ability as large corporations to come in and privatize everything that is going on.

So this is a pivotal moment in American history, and I sense that the American people have had it up to here. They are prepared to fight back. They do not want a government run by billionaires who have it all, whose greed is uncontrollable.

We have in Vermont and I think all over this country a serious problem with addiction, with drugs, people drinking too much alcohol, people smoking too many cigarettes. The worst form of addiction this country now faces is the greed of the oligarchy. You might think that if you had \$10, \$20 billion, it would be enough—you know, kind of enough to let your family live for the next 20 generations—but it is not. For whatever reason, for whatever compulsive reason they have, these guys want more and more and more, and they are prepared to destroy Social Security, Medicare, and nutrition programs for hungry people in order to get even more. That, to me, is disgusting.

Now we are at a pivotal moment in American history. Now, having been all over this country, many parts of this country, I am absolutely confident that the American people—and I am not just talking about Democrats, who are as complicit in the problems that we have right now as are Republicans. We have a two-party system which is basically corrupt.

You have Mr. Musk over on the Republican side saying to any Republican who dares to stand up and defy the Trump agenda: We are going to primary you. On the Democratic side, you have AIPAC and you have other super PACs saying: You stand up for working people, you are in trouble as well. We have a corrupt campaign finance system in which billionaires are able to buy elections. And that is why, all over this country, people are not happy with our two-party system, the Republicans and the Democrats.

So this is a pivotal moment in American history, but we have had difficult moments before. I am confident from the bottom of my heart that if we

stand together and we do not allow some rightwing extremists to divide us up by the color of our skin or our religion or where we were born or our sexual orientation—if we stand together, we can save this country, we can defeat oligarchy, we can defeat the movement toward authoritarianism, and, in fact, we can create an economy and a government that works for all, not just the few.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

RECOGNIZING WOWO RADIO

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I am so glad the junior Senator from Indiana occupies the chair as Presiding Officer at this time because it was 100 years ago next week that “The Voice of a Thousand Main Streets” first began broadcasting from the second floor of the Main Auto Supply Building in downtown Fort Wayne, IN—an area that the Presiding Officer knows well.

On March 31, 1925, at 500 watts, 1320 on the dial, the voice of the Midwest, WOWO Radio, hit the airwaves. In Indiana, from such humble beginnings, great things often rise, and those distinctive call letters, “WOWO,” endure today.

In fact, over the past century, through good times and bad, Hoosiers in the northeast part of our State have turned on and tuned in to WOWO radio. Although the number on the dial has changed, the studio was moved, the station’s wattage has expanded, and the world of media has evolved, Hoosiers still listen to WOWO today.

WOWO is not just a radio station in this community; it is the community’s radio station, one it has loved and taken care of for 100 years now. Its programs didn’t just entertain Fort Wayne but became part of its culture. Its personalities didn’t simply report the news but made history.

During the Great Depression, WOWO turned Fort Wayne into a midwest hub of country music and helped Hoosiers escape from hard times, if only for an hour.

After Pearl Harbor, WOWO provided desperately needed updates as they arrived over the wire with word of the progress of the war effort to the families of the 12,000 soldiers from Fort Wayne fighting overseas.

No matter the era or the decade, WOWO always looked out for its audience. It brought them the local news, helped them stay informed and engaged. Every morning, the legendary Bob Sievers called the Fort Wayne Police Department before going on the air.

When the station moved to the Gaskins Building on Washington Boulevard, where there were no nearby windows, a reporter ran down the hall, climbed out on the fire escape, and looked to the sky to determine the weather. The Gaskins Building is now gone, but, as WOWO listeners know, the station still reports the weather from its “world famous fire escape.”

During the events that defined the last century for people in and away from northeast Indiana—from the blizzard of 1978 to that terrible September morning in 2001, from the thrill of the Moon landing to the loss of the space shuttle Challenger—listeners can still remember not just where they were when they heard the news but how they heard it: from WOWO through the radio in the car, on the kitchen table, in their classroom.

During tough times, WOWO provided welcome distractions. The audience could tune in to the “Hoosier Hop,” where local talents Nancy Lee and the Hilltoppers played and Kenny Roberts yodeled. They could visit the Little Red Barn on a farm down in Indiana for the latest in ag news. “Modern Home Forum,” hosted by the fictional Jane Weston, offered cooking lessons. Broadcasts of Komets and Pistons games brought the people of Fort Wayne together around their beloved hockey and basketball teams. The innovative and much imitated “Man on the Street” and “One Moment” programs turned the shows’ listeners into stars.

If a member of the Fort Wayne community lost their dog, WOWO could help them find it. If they fell on hard times, it offered them a hand up.

In the 1940s, the station created the Penny Pitch, encouraging listeners to contribute pocket change for a disabled young man so he could realize his ambition of pursuing a career in journalism. The annual drive still raises money to provide resources to charities across northeast Indiana. Last year, the Penny Pitch raised over \$135,000 for Habitat for Humanity of Greater Fort Wayne.

Throughout WOWO’s history, many of its personalities became household names across northeast Indiana. Broadcasters like Bob Chase, who served our Nation in World War II and then served WOWO listeners as sports director and the voice of the Komets hockey team for over six decades, were beloved figures. More recently, Charly Butcher, Patrick Miller, and Kayla Blakeslee became well known and trusted by the WOWO audience. Brian Ford, WOWO news director, recalled that as a child, when the sky grew dark and storms neared, his grandmother would simply say: Turn on WOWO.

When news breaks, good or bad, at home or far away, at the beginning of another day in Fort Wayne, and the world turned beyond it, families still find WOWO on their dial or on their phones.

So today, I join my fellow Hoosiers in marking this milestone, offering WOWO and its staff past and present congratulations on creating a truly remarkable bond with their audience and for serving fellow Hoosiers with news and entertainment.

Oh, about that call sign—it is a bit counterintuitive, perhaps, but back in 1925, the “W” in “WOWO” designated the station’s location east of the Mississippi River. The other three letters

didn't stand for anything; they were just catchy.

At the time of the station's founding, a newspaper reported that WOWO "expects to become a familiar voice of the middle west despite the low wave length. The trick call letters, it is believed, will add to the novelty of the plant." The station's leaders were right on both accounts.

A listener contest later determined that "WOWO" would stand for "Wayne Offers Wonderful Opportunities." But "WOWO" will never be just call letters. If you grew up in its listening range, you know what it stands for, what it means, and what it has meant to north-east Indiana since that first broadcast a century ago.

I have no doubt, however much change that time and technology may bring, a hundred years from now, WOWO will remain on the air and remain an important part of the fabric of northeast Indiana.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, Social Security is under attack. It is under attack from Donald Trump. Social Security is under attack from Republicans. Social Security is under attack from Elon Musk. Social Security is under attack from greedy billionaires who want to loot Americans' hard-earned money to line their own pockets.

Trump, Musk, and DOGE know they can't come right out and cut Social Security. That would be wildly unpopular. Instead, they are revving up their chain saw—cutting staff, reducing services, closing offices, and lying about the program, finding so-called fraud where no fraud exists.

Here is their reckless roadmap: first, lie about the program to undermine it with the public; second, use those lies as an excuse to gut Social Security and cut benefits; and third, raise the retirement age and privatize Social Security, handing your benefits over to Wall Street—making the billionaires richer and our seniors poorer. It is a very shameful plan.

Now cue Elon Musk and his DOGE lackeys who descended on the Social Security Administration, claiming there are millions of dead people over the age of 150, over the age of 200, over the age of 360 years. They are claiming that people born in 1665 are claiming Social Security benefits, that they are fraudulently applying for benefits. The only problem with what they are saying is that none of it is true. They are just lying.

Former inspectors general and Social Security Administration leaders have never found any of this phantom fraud—none of it.

But following the Trump playbook, Musk, DOGE, and Republicans have repeated this lie over and over again. Again, the key to their messaging on Social Security is lying about Social Security. That is their campaign plan.

So Trump, in his State of the Union, repeated the lie, telling the country that there were millions of people fraudulently receiving Social Security benefits. That is the Trump way: If at first you don't succeed, lie, lie again.

While Trump and Musk see 200-year-old ghosts—360-year-old ghosts—collecting Social Security benefits, they are gutting the Social Security Administration to the bare bones. That lie of massive fraud in Social Security is now their excuse to make changes that could force Grandma and Grandpa and people with disabilities to travel more than 100 miles to sign up for Social Security benefits. They want to make it as tough as possible for Grandma and Grandpa and for people with disabilities to collect Social Security—just make it something difficult.

The Social Security website crashed 4 times in 10 days this month. They are bringing all the DOGE boys who are supposed to be geniuses—AI, bringing efficiency to the government. The Social Security website crashed 4 times in 10 days just in the past month.

But Trump and Musk, they won't stop there. They are also cutting the phone lines. By the end of this month, telephone services could be eliminated at the Social Security Administration, with assistance only offered online or in person or at a field office. So good luck, Grandma and Grandpa. Sorry you didn't take that computer course 40 years ago. Sorry that you are 85 now. Can't call in any longer; you are going to have to figure out how to do everything online. It is just another way of making it harder and harder for people who are older to be able to collect.

The person running the Agency right now has already pushed out more than 12 percent of the staff, and he has admitted that the Agency's phone service "sucks." That is what he said, talking about his own work at the Agency. Yeah, you did such a great job on it that now you yourself say that the phone service sucks. Excellent work. You are deliberately trying to make the system fail.

And he said the quiet part out loud, that Musk and DOGE are the ones really in charge at the Social Security Administration. And they have one primary goal right now: find fraud, despite the truth that they have not reported any yet because there is so little to find at the Social Security Administration.

But by hollowing out the Agency—cutting staff, closing offices, and making it harder to access benefits—the Trump administration is effectively cutting Social Security benefits. But if you complain too loudly, the Trump administration might just accuse you of being a fraudster as well. Commerce Secretary Howard Lutnick, another billionaire, said last week that his 94-year-old mother-in-law wouldn't complain about missing her Social Security check and that the only person who would complain would be a fraudster themselves, because they would be so upset, the fraudster.

But his 94-year-old mother-in-law wouldn't complain. Maybe if everyone had a billionaire as a son-in-law, maybe you wouldn't complain. But that is not 99.999 percent of all people receiving Social Security benefits. They would be very concerned if that check did not, in fact, arrive. Maybe if your son-in-law is a billionaire, you can afford to miss a check.

But how out of touch can Lutnick be because, without Social Security, more than 22 million people would be thrown into poverty. Get that number? Without the check they get each month, 22 million Americans would go into poverty. That includes over 16 million seniors, including 268,000 in Massachusetts and nearly 1 million children. Nearly one in four people drawing Social Security rely on it for 100 percent of their income.

Let me say that again because it is very important to internalize the reality of our country in 2025: One in four people receiving a Social Security check rely upon it for 100 percent of all of their income. If that gets stopped, people don't have access to it, those people immediately go to poverty because they are living check to check.

And more than two-thirds of seniors rely on it for the majority of their income. That would have been my mother and father—my father who drove a truck for the Hood milk company. They were dependent upon Social Security. There was not a big pension in the old days, so you needed Social Security just to make it by week by week, month by month.

And 55 percent of all Social Security beneficiaries are women. This increases to 66 percent for beneficiaries aged 85. Two-thirds of all people receiving a Social Security check over 85 are women. That is who they are playing with here. They are truly playing with Grandma, her life, her security, what she earned, what she deserves. Social Security would do to women—who only still earn 82 cents to a man's dollar and live longer after retiring—they would perform an enormous disservice for all of those women. A greater proportion of women's retirement income comes from Social Security.

For the millions of seniors that rely almost entirely on Social Security for their income, a missed check means missed meals, missed medications, missed rent payments. That is who they are in our country right now.

Social Security is not rife with fraud. It is not a Ponzi scheme, as Elon Musk has said. It isn't something that can just be "turned off," as Trump's acting director threatened to do in response to a court order blocking DOGE access to your private Social Security information. He threatened to turn it off unless all this information about every one of us in the Social Security system was turned over to DOGE. Well, where we all worked, the income that we earned, every single job—that is all there in order for Social Security to make the right decisions about how big

the check is that we get. And Trump's acting director at Social Security threatened, in response to a court order blocking DOGE access to your private Social Security, to just, basically, turn it all off.

This is, bottom line, a huge threat to Americans, to seniors, to people with disabilities in our Nation. It is a direct assault.

The nominee to be the next Social Security administrator, Frank Bisignano, today before the Senate, refused to undo any of the harmful actions taken by DOGE. He refused to even acknowledge DOGE was behind the cuts and closures. He refused to call benefits delayed benefits denied. He refused to commit to adequate staffing levels for the Agency.

For these reasons, I am refusing to give him my vote to be our next administrator. I am voting no on the administrator. I am saying absolutely unqualified for this job because he doesn't understand the core of this intergenerational responsibility and obligation that we have to seniors in our country.

The Trump administration can tell lie after lie, but Americans know the truth. Social Security is a promise we make to current and future generations. For our parents, for our grandparents, and for all of us, the assurance of Social Security means that we need never worry about living out our final years in poverty in the United States of America. That is why Social Security was put on the books in the 1930s, because of the wave of poverty among seniors in our Nation. People have contributed to Social Security throughout their entire lives. Social Security is not an entitlement; it is an earned benefit.

But this isn't a new formula that Trump and Musk and Republicans have come up with. In 2005, President George W. Bush and Republicans tried to privatize Social Security. Can you imagine what would have befallen our Nation's seniors if George W. Bush and Republicans had succeeded and then millions of Americans' nest eggs had been wrapped up in the 2008 stock market crash? Our "greatest generation" would have become a destitute generation.

Today, Donald Trump and his billionaire advisers, like Secretary Lutnick, have said that a recession wouldn't be so bad, that it would be "worth it." A recession would be worth it. Ask people who lived through the Great Depression, like my parents. How did that go for them and their families? I will tell you what: In my family, it didn't go well. It set my family on both sides—my father's and mother's side—back an entire generation. That is how devastating the Great Depression was.

So tell the retired workers; tell their survivors; tell the vulnerable, the poor, the disabled Americans for whom Social Security isn't just a budget line, it is a lifeline. But Trump only cares about his billionaire donors' bottom lines.

Social Security has paid out benefits on schedule for nearly 70 years. But to keep our promise in the future, changes to the program will have to be made. To shore up Social Security, we must require millionaires and billionaires, like Donald Trump, Howard Lutnick, and Elon Musk, to pay as much into Social Security as everyone else. It is time they pay their fair share and stop trying to pay for their tax cuts with the earnings of those who built this country.

It is essential that Social Security be preserved for today's retirees and for future generations. It has served as a never-fail insurance program for every single American worker's retirement since the program's inception. It is the crown jewel of the New Deal. And Republicans have been going after it from day one. Republicans haven't been able to destroy Social Security yet, and we are not going to let Trump and Musk or billionaires succeed in looting all of that Social Security money so they get a tax break.

The health of all of those seniors is more important than the wealth of the billionaires who will benefit from the slashes to the Social Security system, which they are planning.

Elon Musk said the truth about how they view Social Security. He called it a Ponzi scheme. That is all you have to know about the Republican Party. They opposed Social Security when it was put on the books in the 1930s, and they always harbored an ancient animosity towards Social Security; waiting for the moment, waiting for the opportunity where they could slash Social Security to send us back to before the 1930s when families were gutted, when there was no income for Grandma and Grandpa. That is what we are talking about.

But I am going to tell you this: They are going to have a fight on their hands. We are going to stand up and fight for them. We are going to make sure that Social Security is preserved. We are going to make sure that Donald Trump and Elon Musk, that the Republican Party does not destroy Social Security as we know it today. They have a fight on their hands.

I am ready for this fight. I am ready to defend the seniors in our Nation. I am ready to protect the disabled who depend upon Social Security. This is the time to have this showdown, and they are going to regret ever putting Social Security into play. I am ready for this fight.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. RES. 136

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I come to the floor to make a unanimous consent request. That is a process in the Senate where we agree on things because no one disagrees—unanimous consent.

I have made this request before. Senator GRASSLEY, who is my colleague and friend from the State of Iowa—different political party, but occasionally we do agree—he has a different point of view. He is likely to object. I will keep my fingers crossed that my speech will be so convincing that perhaps he will change his mind. We will see.

But what we are basically discussing on the floor, at this point, is whether or not, if the court issues an order, a public official has to follow the order. It is pretty basic. It gets down to the daily routine of courtrooms across the Nation.

Now, it has more meaning because there is a question as to whether this new President—President Trump—is going to follow a court order, if it is handed down by a court.

So my unanimous consent request is one on basic principle, as to whether or not people—elected officials—are required to follow court orders. I would like to make a statement in support of my offer.

I have come to the floor several times in recent weeks to speak about unacceptable attacks on the Federal judiciary—the Federal courts—by President Trump and his allies. These attacks are not only wrong but dangerous. It is posing a serious threat to our constitutional order.

I am sorry to say that the attacks on our judges and our judiciary have not stopped, as I have made these requests on the floor. Instead, they have grown worse.

Last week, President Trump himself called for the impeachment of a Federal judge simply because the judge ruled against the Trump administration. The President's MAGA loyalists were quick to pile on when he did that. Elon Musk has demanded the impeachment of Federal judges dozens of times, and House Republicans rushed to introduce articles of impeachment in the House.

In response to this unprecedented attack on the Federal judiciary, Chief Justice Roberts and the Supreme Court issued a rare statement. It reads:

For more than two centuries, it has been established that impeachment is not an appropriate response to disagreement concerning a judicial decision. The normal appellate review process exists for that purpose.

Yet this relentless campaign against the judiciary has continued.

On Friday, President Trump issued a wild rant that read, in part—this is the President: "Unlawful Nationwide Injunctions by Radical Left Judges could very well lead to the destruction of our country! These people are Lunatics" the President's Tweet read.

There has been a lot of debate about when we will cross the threshold into a

genuine constitutional crisis. I pray that it will never happen, but it will come down to a basic principle.

The question is not when we are going to face this. It is whether we can afford to hold our breath and wait to see if the President will formally announce he will defy a court order.

We must respond to the dangerous attacks on our courts and judges now. The Senate must speak with one voice, Republicans and Democrats, in defense of the judiciary, the separation of powers, the Constitution, and the country we love. This cannot and should not be a partisan issue.

Last month, my colleague Senator KENNEDY, a Republican of Louisiana, admonished two Trump nominees who suggested, in a hearing in the Judiciary Committee, that the executive branch can ignore court orders.

Senator KENNEDY said:

Don't ever, ever take the position that you are not going to follow the order of a Federal court—ever. Now, you can disagree with it within the bounds of legal ethics, you can criticize it, you can appeal it, or you can resign.

Earlier this month, Senator CORNYN, a Republican of Texas, said:

You don't impeach judges who make decisions you disagree with. That happens all the time. What you do is appeal. If you are right, then you are going to win on appeal.

These words by my Republican colleagues demonstrate an understanding of checks and balances and our Constitution.

Some have argued that impeachment of judges is necessary because of the number of injunctions issued against President Trump compared to other Presidents. They claim this is evidence that Federal judges are biased against President Trump. I would suggest there is a more obvious explanation: The number of injunctions issued against the first and second Trump administrations is evidence of a President who has repeatedly violated the law.

I also want to respond to the baseless claims from, of all people, unelected Elon Musk and other MAGA allies that the most recent judge to be targeted by President Trump is some sort of radical ideologue. Let's be clear: Judge Boasberg is no partisan. He was actually appointed to the Superior Court of the District of Columbia by a Republican President, George W. Bush.

As a DC district court judge, Judge Boasberg has issued many rulings that illustrate—clearly illustrate—impartiality. For example, he was the judge who ordered the release of thousands of Hillary Clinton's emails, and his decisions have favored President Trump's interests on several occasions.

Other judges who have ruled against the Trump administration were appointed by Republican Presidents, including some who were appointed by President Trump himself. He is not always going to win in court, but he seems to think he should.

As Chief Justice Roberts said, in 2018, in response to an earlier attack on the

judiciary by the same President—President Trump—"we do not have Obama judges or Trump judges, Bush judges or Clinton judges. What we have is an extraordinary group of dedicated judges doing their level best to do equal right to those appearing before them."

Unfortunately, leading Republicans, including Secretary Rubio and Elon Musk, have aligned themselves with the likes of El Salvador's Nayib Bukele, a foreign dictator in El Salvador who destroyed judicial independence in his own country and now is attempting to interfere in our internal affairs. Musk went so far as to endorse Bukele's false claim that "the U.S. is facing a judicial coup."

Fortunately, the American people know better. A recent Washington Post poll found that an overwhelming majority of Americans believe President Trump must follow Federal court orders, including 79 percent of Republicans who agree with that.

With strong bipartisan support, America knows no President is above the law, and the danger posed by the Trump administration's attack on the judiciary is not abstract. The recent invective by the President and his allies has resulted in increased threats to the lives of judges and their families.

That is absolutely unacceptable. Our judges should not fear for their lives and those of their loved ones because of their work. If judges feel compelled to decide cases in favor of the President to avoid his wrath, we will no longer have an independent judiciary. We can debate the value of nationwide injunctions and the merits of any particular judicial decision, but violence or threats of violence, whether from the right or the left of the political spectrum, are never, never acceptable.

In December of 1862, in the midst of the Civil War, a month before he issued the Emancipation Proclamation, Abraham Lincoln submitted his second annual address to Congress. It was read aloud by the Secretary of the Senate. It included these famous words:

We shall nobly save, or meanly lose, the last best hope of earth.

America retains this last best hope of Earth—for democracy, for freedom, for liberty, and justice. It is up to both political parties to protect it. We have sworn to uphold and defend this Constitution. Now, we will be tested.

An independent judiciary has nobly saved our Nation many times throughout history. It is a critical pillar upholding our constitutional order. As Chief Justice Marshall famously declared, "it is emphatically the province and duty of the judicial department to say what the law is."

And it is the duty of Congress to support the judicial branch against unwarranted attacks by the executive. For that reason, the resolution I offer today affirms that the Senate supports the rule of law, the judicial branch, and the Constitution.

Mr. President, as if in legislative session and notwithstanding rule XXII, I

ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 136, affirming the rule of law and the legitimacy of judicial review, which is at the desk. Further, I ask that the resolution be agreed to and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Reserving the right to object, before I give my reasons for objecting, I want to comment on a couple of things in your remarks.

Before you spoke, you spoke about the times that we often agree. Just today, you and I—I won't go into the subject matter. But just today, you and I cosponsored a bill together, as an example.

The other thing I would like to say, before I go to my remarks, is that I want to associate myself with your quote from our colleague Senator CORNYN that you don't impeach judges just because of a decision, because we would be impeaching judges all the time. That is my additional comment.

The third thing is to inform you that I hope I can get, as chairman of the Judiciary Committee, something moving in this area. I happen to agree with some Democrats, in previous years, that said some judges have gone way beyond what a judge should do on national injunctions, and I hope to find a solution for that. I would hope that you and I maybe could work on that together because I know Democrats have made that same accusation about district court judges in 1 district out of 93 in the United States applying their decision nationally.

So now, I would like to go to my reason for objecting. A few weeks ago, I objected to a version of this resolution because I considered that something that both Democrats and Republicans do too much around here is nothing but a political messaging exercise. Today, I come here for the same reason.

I won't stand by and allow my colleagues to imply that "the rule of law"—those three words—only matters when there is a Republican President.

As I explained a few weeks ago, the Biden administration engaged in 4 years of complete lawlessness. Instead of condemning it, Democrats viciously attacked the legitimacy of the courts for ruling against the Biden administration. The silence that we heard from Democrats about the rule of law during the Biden years is quite deafening.

I won't repeat my last speech, but I will expand on one of my previous objections.

This resolution demands that the President comply with all court orders, but it is completely silent about the role of the Federal courts to adhere to the law themselves. For a number of years, but particularly in the last few months, we have seen increasingly sweeping, potentially lawless orders coming from any 1 of our 600 district judges out of the 93 districts we have.

Although our Founders saw an important role for the judiciary, individual judges have empowered themselves to become nationwide policy-makers, as opposed to interpreting law. I consider this very dangerous.

In the last few weeks, individual unelected judges made policy decisions for the whole country. Some examples include: ordering the President to stop deporting foreign terrorists; directing the military to enlist and retain transgender servicemembers; directing who will and will not staff the President's administration—that is really extraordinary, I think—and then, lastly, an example, ordering the immediate expenditure of billions of dollars. One judge even went so far as to order the government to pay out 2 billion taxpayer dollars and to do it within 36 hours.

Much of this would go to organizations not even involved in the case, and the government would never be able to get this money back, even if they ultimately won on appeal.

In the 2 months since President Trump has entered office, his administration has suffered more of these sweeping orders at the hands of district court judges than the Biden administration experienced in 4 years.

I want to emphasize that—more obstacles to carrying out what the President wants to do in 2 months and stopped by the court more than the entire 4 years of the Biden administration.

Has President Trump chosen to ignore this avalanche of irresponsible court orders? Flat-out no. He has appealed these outrageous decisions, just as he promised he would do when he said:

I always abide by the courts and then I'll have to appeal it. . . . The answer is I always abide by the courts.

Appellate courts have responded by striking down many of the unlawful intrusions into Presidential authority, but the core problem remains: The President of the United States shouldn't have to ask permission from more than 600 different district court judges to manage the executive branch that he was elected to lead.

The practice of sweeping, nationwide injunctions, broad restraining orders, and judicial policymaking must end. It is unconstitutional, it is anti-democratic, and it is imprudent. If the Supreme Court won't stop it, then Congress must. And I wish the Supreme Court would get on this and do it right away.

This issue isn't a partisan issue. I want to work with Democrats, as I just said to the Senator from Illinois.

Democrats, work with us to fix this.

In the past, Democrats and Republicans have both criticized nationwide injunctions and the power of individual district judges. My Democratic colleagues have even proposed legislation to rein in some of these abuses.

You don't have to take my word for it. In 2022, Justice Elena Kagan correctly observed:

It just can't be right that one district judge can stop a nationwide policy in its tracks and leave it stopped for the years it takes to go through the normal process.

In 2024, President Biden's Solicitor General, Elizabeth Prelogar, argued before the Supreme Court. Now listen to this quote:

A court of equity may grant relief only to the parties before it. The district court violated that principle by issuing a universal injunction purporting to enjoin the Act itself and forbidding the enforcement of the Act even against non-parties.

So, as I told Senator DURBIN, I hope to soon be holding a hearing in the Senate Judiciary Committee to address this matter and even introduce legislation to end these abuses. I hope both my Democratic and Republican colleagues join me in this effort.

For the resolution at hand, I propose an amendment so it reads "the Constitution of the United States and established precedent require the executive branch to comply with all lawful Federal court rulings." This simple change of one word—"lawful"—will show that Congress expects both the executive branch and the judicial branch to respect the rule of law and constitutional constraints.

My amendment mirrors what the Chief Justice said in 2024. The Chief Justice rightly raised concerns about the intimidation and the threats leveled at the Court in the wake of the Dobbs decision. He said:

The final threat to judicial independence is defiance of judgments lawfully entered by courts of competent jurisdiction.

He had no problem adding the word "lawful" in. We shouldn't have it any other way.

So therefore I ask the Senator, my friend from Illinois, to modify his request such that the GRASSLEY amendment to the resolution at the desk be considered and agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection to the modification?

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the resolution I offered today is short and straightforward. It is not complicated. It simply restates a bedrock principle of our democratic system of government that it is the responsibility of the judiciary to say what the law is, and, second, the executive branch is required to comply with court orders. It is just that simple.

I offered a similar resolution 3 weeks ago. It included some language which my friend from Iowa did not like. I took that language out. I want to get down to the basics here, the very basics.

He made reference to the Dobbs decision. That overturned *Roe v. Wade* on abortion—a controversial issue in the United States since that decision in 1972 but a decision that was overturned by the Court. There were many who disagreed with the Court's approach to it and said that it was inconsistent with precedent and inconsistent with

what the Justices had promised. Yet, when it was all over, no one filed Articles of Impeachment against the Supreme Court, and there were no threats that I know, personal threats and physical threats, on the Justices and their families. There should never be. Violence is never acceptable.

After my colleague from Iowa objected to my previous language, I made it very simple—the simple fact that the Vice President and other prominent officials have suggested that the executive branch may disregard a Federal court order.

This, unfortunately, would be an item of controversy that could really threaten our constitutional democracy, and that is why I have asked that this very simple statement that everyone must follow the law when it comes to court orders be made part of the official record of the Senate.

With those changes, there is absolutely nothing objectionable in this resolution. Yet my colleague seeks to add language that would only muddle what this sentence should make clear. By stating that the executive branch only needs to follow "lawful" court orders, which is what the Senator from Iowa has suggested, it then begs the question of who decides a court order is lawful.

This suggests that in some cases, the President is going to decide rather than the judiciary. The responsibility to decide whether a court order is lawful is, in the words of Chief Justice Marshall, "emphatically the province and the duty" of the judiciary. If the President disagrees with a court order, his only option is to appeal it, and I have added language to my resolution stating that simple fact. Otherwise, the President would be above the law. America does not accept it, the Constitution does not accept it, and we should be bold enough and courageous enough to stand on a bipartisan basis and reject it as well.

The other amendment implies that courts are ruling against the administration because of "different policy preferences" rather than following the law.

Over and over and over again, thousands and thousands of times, we have had judicial nominees appear in the Judiciary Committee. But when asked the basic question of "What would you do in court if you had to make a decision?" they say "I will follow the law." That is basic. Now, their decision on the law may be different than yours or mine or some other judge's, but the fact of the matter is, they do believe—at least they tell us—that is their bedrock responsibility.

This resolution is nonpartisan. It is clear. It should be bipartisan. We ought to make it clear once and for all that no President—Biden or President Trump or any other President in the future—is above the law. Any further amendment is unnecessary. It undermines the simple, straightforward message which we should stand together and speak.

For these reasons, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. GRASSLEY. Are you asking about the original one?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my amendments at the desk be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(Purpose: To improve the resolution)

On page 2, line 5, insert "lawful" after "all".

(Purpose: To improve the resolution)

On page 2, between lines 5 and 6, insert the following:

(4) Article III of the Constitution of the United States limits Federal courts to deciding specific "cases" or "controversies";

(5) it is inappropriate for courts of the United States to override legislative or executive action by the elected branches of government because of different policy preferences; and

Mr. GRASSLEY. I know of no further debate on the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

VOTE ON BHATTACHARYA NOMINATION

There being no further debate, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Bhattacharya nomination?

Mr. GRASSLEY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 141 Ex.]

YEAS—53

Banks	Graham	Moreno
Barrasso	Grassley	Mullin
Blackburn	Hagerty	Murkowski
Boozman	Hawley	Paul
Britt	Hoeven	Ricketts
Budd	Husted	Risch
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Cassidy	Johnson	Schmitt
Collins	Justice	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Lankford	Sheehy
Cramer	Lee	Sullivan
Crapo	Lummis	Thune
Cruz	Marshall	Tillis
Curtis	McConnell	Tuberville
Daines	McCormick	Wicker
Ernst	Moody	Young
Fischer	Moran	

NAYS—47

Alsobrooks	Gillibrand	Murphy
Baldwin	Hassan	Murray
Bennet	Heinrich	Ossoff
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Padilla
Blunt Rochester	Hirono	Peters
Booker	Kaine	Reed
Cantwell	Kelly	Rosen
Coons	Kim	Sanders
Cortez Masto	King	Schatz
Duckworth	Klobuchar	Schiff
Durbin	Lujan	Schumer
Fetterman	Markey	Shaheen
Gallego	Merkley	Slotkin

Smith	Warnock	Whitehouse
Van Hollen	Warren	Wyden
Warner	Welch	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

WAIVING QUORUM CALL

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to waive the mandatory quorum call with respect to the Makary nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 45, Martin Makary, of Virginia, to be Commissioner of Food and Drugs, Department of Health and Human Services.

John Thune, Tim Sheehy, Mike Crapo, Markwayne Mullin, Joni Ernst, David McCormick, Rick Scott of Florida, Bernie Moreno, Mike Rounds, Tommy Tuberville, Katie Boyd Britt, Shelley Moore Capito, Jim Justice, John Barrasso, Steve Daines, Jon Husted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Martin Makary, of Virginia, to be Commissioner of Food and Drugs, Department of Health and Human Services, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 56, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 142 Ex.]

YEAS—56

Banks	Graham	Moreno
Barrasso	Grassley	Mullin
Blackburn	Hagerty	Murkowski
Boozman	Hassan	Paul
Britt	Hawley	Ricketts
Budd	Hoeven	Risch
Capito	Husted	Rounds
Cassidy	Hyde-Smith	Schmitt
Collins	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Justice	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Kennedy	Shaheen
Cramer	Lankford	Sheehy
Crapo	Lee	Sullivan
Cruz	Lummis	Thune
Curtis	Marshall	Tillis
Daines	McConnell	Tuberville
Durbin	McCormick	Wicker
Ernst	Moody	Young
Fischer	Moran	

NAYS—44

Alsobrooks	Hirono	Rosen
Baldwin	Kaine	Sanders
Bennet	Kelly	Schatz
Blumenthal	Kim	Schiff
Blunt Rochester	King	Schumer
Booker	Klobuchar	Slotkin
Cantwell	Lujan	Smith
Coons	Markey	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Murphy	Warnock
Fetterman	Murray	Warren
Gallego	Ossoff	Welch
Gillibrand	Padilla	Whitehouse
Heinrich	Peters	Wyden
Hickenlooper	Reed	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas are 56, the nays are 44, and the motion is agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Martin Makary, of Virginia, to be Commissioner of Food and Drugs, Department of Health and Human Services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

FIRST AMENDMENT

Mr. WELCH. Mr. President, as you know, in 1791, our Nation's Founders had the boldness to ratify the First Amendment to the Constitution.

At the time, it was an extremely radical concept—protecting our fundamental individual freedoms to religion, to speech, to assembly, to the right to petition the government, and to have a free press that would operate without fear or government censorship.

The First Amendment deeply reflects our new Nation's view that we can have a society where individuals can freely voice their views, participate in civic life, and hold our political leaders accountable. These five guaranteed liberties are part of what makes us a free and democratic society.

I believe that all of the Members of the U.S. Senate share the commitment to the First Amendment, but there are extreme divisions among us about what that means. Let me explain where I do believe right now there is a significant assault on the First Amendment.

President Trump has sought to silence or to punish journalists who report negatively on him. This is not about a President because Democratic Presidents and Republican Presidents have been critical of journalists, but he is taking it to an entirely unprecedented level—banning the Associated Press from parts of the White House press pool because they don't use his own personal preferred name for the Gulf of Mexico. He is controlling the viewpoint of the Associated Press, and they are not relenting.

In a speech at the Department of Justice, President Trump said that the press that reports on him negatively should be, and this was his word, "illegal."

At the FCC, the Chairman has opened investigations into press organizations

that it doesn't like—PBS and NPR. That is not an investigation that was opened on the basis of a determination by the full Commission—in fact, two members have been fired—but on the political preferences of the Trump administration.

Of course, we have had lawsuits against the press when the President did not like a report of a poll that was printed in a newspaper in Iowa.

I am very concerned about attacks on the freedom of speech.

We have had Executive orders that target law firms because the President did not like some members of that law firm and who they represented. The President has issued Executive orders punishing firms that represent his political opponents and who, in his opinion, were involved in litigation against him when he was a private citizen.

This is not actually an assault based upon an investigation; it is an attack that is based upon the personal annoyance of the President himself.

We are seeing the Trump administration arresting students who are in the country legally. They are here legally, and they are arrested not because they committed a crime but because they took a viewpoint that the President disagreed with.

We have even seen the censoring of words that the administration doesn't like, and there is a whole list of words that cannot be used. Of course, one of the incredibly petty examples that shows how extreme this is and how wanton it is was removing references to the Enola Gay from Department of Defense websites because they included the word "gay."

This is a very important inflection point in our democracy. The First Amendment is being challenged by the Executive, who is unravelling the protections that have been absolute through thick and thin.

We all, in this Chamber, have to stand up for the First Amendment. And we can have disagreements on the speech that we agree with and we disagree with vehemently; but our obligation, as a separate branch of government, as Members of the U.S. Senate, is to defend the rights of people to have free speech, whether they agree with our political position or they don't.

So all of us must defend to our core the constitutional rights so essential to the well-being of our democracy: the freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of assembly, freedom of petition government, and, of course, the freedom of the press.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

TARIFFS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I want to talk a few minutes tonight about a couple of topics—only one, if I run short of time, because I don't want to delay our vote. The first topic I would like to talk about—I know it is very sensitive—is trade and tariffs. They have both been much in the news lately.

There are really only two reasons why a country would impose a tariff, and every country in the world, to my knowledge, does have tariffs. There are only two reasons for a country to impose a tariff: first, for national security.

I think it is virtually unchallenged that China, if it could, would destroy the United States of America—not the people of China, but the Government of China. I regret to say that, and I hope someday we will live in a world where that isn't the case, but I think it is undoubtedly and unconditionally the truth.

So if China is determined to—let me try to use a more neutral word—to undermine the United States of America, I could see where we would limit, want to limit, some of our goods such as, let's say, semiconductor design equipment. We would limit the sale of some of our precious technology to China. That is what I mean by "national security."

But the other reason, and the reason that most countries use the tariff, is to protect the domestic industry.

Let me give you an example. These are not two countries, but they are two States; and this would be unconstitutional, but I think it will serve my purpose. Let's suppose that Louisiana, which has the best king cakes in the Milky Way, can produce a king cake for \$10, and our friends in Alabama, they can produce a king cake—not nearly as good as Louisiana's—but the best they can do is produce it for \$12. Well, I would not agree, but I could understand why the elected officials in Alabama are going to say: Well, Louisiana's king cake is 10 bucks, our king cake is \$12. We want to protect our king cake bakers here in Alabama, so we are going to impose a tariff.

What would that do? Let's suppose they impose a \$4 tariff. So now the king cake, the better king cake made in Louisiana sold in Alabama would cost \$14, and that would force people to buy the \$12 Alabama king cake.

Now, my personal opinion is that most Alabamians, who are very smart people, would pay extra for the Louisiana king cake because it is so much better, but that is how tariffs work. If you have a domestic industry, like a king cake bakery, and you want to protect it from competition to allow it to grow and employ the people in that particular country, maybe you impose a tax, a tariff, on folks on the outside of your country who want to sell into your country.

I want to say this unequivocally. Canada is one of my favorite countries in the world, and the American people and the people of Canada are friends, and I would like our economies to be friends. And I mean that. But lately, we have been having a gentle disagreement—some would say not so gentle—in terms of tariffs and trade and our economy.

Canada and the United States of America do a lot of business with each

other. In 2024, the United States sold to the people of Canada about \$350 billion in goods—that is a lot of goods, \$350 billion. Canada sold American goods to the United States in the amount of \$412 billion. So there is what we call a trade deficit of \$63 billion.

And then you drill a little deeper, and you realize that the U.S. economy is 10 times bigger than the Canadian economy, and the population of the United States of America is 8 times bigger than the population of Canada. Canada has 41 million people; America has 340 million.

So you step back for a second, and you go, huh. Now, the United States is 8 times bigger, and our economy is 10 times larger than Canada's, but yet Canada is selling more of its goods into the United States than the United States is selling into Canada.

Any fair-minded person would have to conclude that it is because of tariffs. It is because the Canadian tariffs on American goods are higher than the American tariffs on Canadian goods. And that is what the dispute is all about.

President Trump, who believes passionately in the virtue of tariffs, thinks that the tariffs ought to be equal. That there shouldn't be a trade deficit.

Now, trade is very complicated, and I don't think that all trade deficits are bad. I am also not saying that all trade deficits are good. Trade in the complex global economy today is very complex.

But I see the President's point. I am not suggesting that I agree with the President on everything about tariffs, but when you have got your neighboring country and good friend that is 8 times smaller than you are, and in terms of population, it is 10 times smaller than you are, and your neighbor is selling \$63 billion more in goods to you than you are selling to them, that seems kind of unfair. And the President, as we all know, has made that point very vociferously.

In response, the Canadian Government, the new Prime Minister Carney, he has pretty much bowed up. When President Trump said: Well, the tariffs are uneven, so I am going to raise American tariffs, Prime Minister Carney has bowed up and said: Well, President Trump, you don't believe in free trade. You are not a free trader. If you raise your tariffs, then I am going to raise mine even more.

And that is how you get into a trade war. And I don't want a trade war. And I don't think Prime Minister Carney wants a trade war, and I don't think President Trump wants a trade war.

But I think Prime Minister Carney is wrong when he says that President Trump is not a free trader. President Trump is a free trader, but like most of us, he also believes in fair trading as well.

So here is my respectful, gentle challenge to Prime Minister Carney tonight. Prime Minister Carney, you have criticized President Trump, and I

see your point of view. You said, because he is raising tariffs on Canada, that he, President Trump, doesn't believe in free trade. You have said that he doesn't—he believes in tariffs. And you have said you are going—you, Mr. Carney, are going to change your tariffs.

I hope Prime Minister Carney does change his tariffs, but I hope he does so in a way that we have a race to the top and not to the bottom. Rather than the Prime Minister of Canada raising tariffs on the United States of America after the United States of America raises tariffs on Canada, which will cause us—friends, friends—to have a trade war, I would respectfully suggest to the Prime Minister Carney of Canada that he should reduce tariffs to zero. He should reduce all Canadian tariffs on United States' goods to zero and then turn to President Trump and say: I am asking you to remove all tariffs on Canada as well.

Now, if Prime Minister Carney believes in free trade—and I take him at his word that he does—and if President Trump believes in free trade, but fair trade—and I take him at his word that he does—then let's both go to zero. How much freer can trade be? How much fairer can trade be?

Let's avoid a trade war. Let's let those good Canadian companies compete with good American companies and selling goods into the United States, and let's let those good American companies compete with those good Canadian companies in terms of selling goods into Canada. And may the best, cheapest product win.

That is my respectful challenge to Prime Minister Carney tonight. If you think President Trump is being unfair and is not a free trader, then reduce your tariffs to zero, and ask President Trump to reduce our tariffs to zero on Canada, and let's go back to being friends again.

COVID

Mr. President, I want to talk briefly on another topic. Martin King famously said that “the arc of the moral universe”—the arc of the moral universe—“is long, but it bends toward justice.” Smart man. He was right. And if you believe in the fundamental goodness of humans—I am not saying that there is not some evil in all of us, but the fundamental goodness of humans, then you know he was right:

The arc of the moral universe is long, but it bends toward justice.

This month, we finally got justice with respect to one of the individuals and one of the companies that, in my opinion, helped cause the coronavirus. Now let me explain what I mean. I am talking about a gentleman by the name of Dr. Peter Daszak. We have all heard that name. The name of his company is EcoHealth.

COVID, as we know, killed 20 million people across the world. It caused \$25 trillion of damage across the planet Earth.

Where did COVID come from? COVID, of course, coronavirus is a virus. That

is why we call it the coronavirus. It had to come from one of two places. First, it could have occurred naturally. It started in a bat, we know. Our scientists tell us that. And then viruses, which are very aggressive and very interested in self-survival, the virus jumped from another animal into another animal, which was consumed by a human being, and that is how the coronavirus became a human virus. It occurs naturally. It jumps from one animal to another.

But there is another way the coronavirus could have happened. It could have been engineered. We know that the FBI and we know that the Department of Energy and we know that the CIA and we know that Germany's top intelligence service all think the coronavirus was engineered.

What do I mean by engineered, engineering a virus? That means they think that someone took that virus that came from a bat and genetically altered it so that it would expose humans to the disease that the bats would get. That is coronavirus, and that is what happened. Many of our intelligence agencies think that is how the coronavirus started. They think it started in the Wuhan Institute of Virology in Wuhan, China, where the first folks who got ill first appeared.

What does this have to do with Dr. Daszak? The Wuhan Institute of Virology—the Chinese lab that was conducting this research on engineering the virus—was funded in part with American taxpayer dollars. It was funded in part by Dr. Peter Daszak and his company EcoHealth.

Dr. Daszak was good friends and professional colleagues with Dr. Tony Fauci and with Dr. Francis Collins. Dr. Collins ran the National Institutes of Health. Under him was Dr. Anthony Fauci, who ran the NIAID, dealing with infectious diseases.

Dr. Collins and Dr. Fauci gave Dr. Peter Daszak, who ran EcoHealth and is a British zoologist, millions of dollars in grants, taxpayer money. Dr. Daszak took some of that money, and he gave it to the Wuhan lab. When he gave it to the Wuhan lab, the instructions to the Wuhan lab were to use the money to “understand the risk of bat coronavirus emergence.”

What does that mean? The purpose of this project at the Wuhan lab, funded in part by American taxpayer dollars, was to take the bat virus—the virus in the bat—modify it, and make it 10,000 times more infectious for lab mice, and that is what they did.

Many commentators and many news accounts say that what Dr. Daszak—with the money from American taxpayers that he had gotten from Dr. Fauci and Dr. Collins—what they were doing was conducting gain-of-function research. You have heard that term. Gain-of-function research just means taking in this context an animal virus, a bat virus, and altering it genetically so it would jump into a human—pretty dangerous stuff.

Dr. Fauci has said that didn't happen, Dr. Collins says that didn't happen, and Dr. Daszak says that didn't happen, but everybody else says it did. The FBI says it did. The CIA says it did. The top spy agency in Germany says it did. The Department of Energy says it did.

So what happened? What happened? Well, we do know that the first two people that we know of in the world who got the coronavirus—the first two humans—were not people in the city of Wuhan; they were workers in the Wuhan lab. Remember, coronavirus supposedly hit, what, January, February? These two people who worked in the lab got it in November.

We also know that when the virus became really contagious, other than these two people who were working in the Wuhan lab, it became contagious in Wuhan, China, a few miles away from the Wuhan lab—pretty curious.

We also know that when word first broke of the coronavirus, Dr. Fauci learned about it. Do you know one of the first persons he called was Dr. Peter Daszak and said: What is going on?

We also know that Dr. Daszak was trying to convince the American people and the people of the world that the virus started naturally, that it didn't start from his gain-of-function research. We know that he rounded up a bunch of epidemiologists to write a fake article and start publishing it and others in a lot of professional scientific magazines to try to convince the world that the bat virus jumped to human beings naturally. We know that. That has all come out.

We also know that after the coronavirus happened, Dr. Fauci and Dr. Collins, instead of taking money away from Dr. Daszak, gave him extra money. We are not sure why, but they did.

As a result of this, let me say—you say: How did it escape the Wuhan lab? I just want to make this point. A molecular biologist at Rutgers University, Dr. Richard Ebright, studied the Wuhan lab. He said that its safety standards were about the same level of a typical dentist's office. I mean, you would think if you are going to do this gain-of-function research, you would do it in an environment so that once you take the bat virus and make it a human virus 10,000 times more contagious, you would try to keep it within the lab. Wuhan didn't do a very good job of that, we know now.

Well, there were denials back and forth, so we asked—“we” meaning the Congress—the Department of Health and Human Services to study this, and they did. They announced their decision this month. The Department of Health and Human Services has cut off all funding and formally debarred Dr. Peter Daszak and EcoHealth Alliance—of which he is the former president—for 5 years based on evidence uncovered by a congressional committee.

This is what the Department of Health and Human Services found, according to Professor Ebright, who has read the report. He said:

EcoHealth Alliance provably defrauded the US Government, provably breached contractual terms of US-Government grants, and, through the reckless gain-of-function research it conducted in Wuhan, probably caused the COVID-19 pandemic, killing 20 million people and costing \$25 trillion.

Wow. That is what the professor said.

The Department of Health and Human Services, in its official debarment letter of Dr. Daszak and EcoHealth Alliance, said that EcoHealth and Dr. Daszak routinely ignored government oversight requests, failed to report dangerous gain-of-function experiments conducted at the Wuhan Institute of Virology, and produced a required research report 2 years late.

It took a while, and some will call this only partial justice, but we now have justice at least for 5 years and I hope forever. Dr. Peter Daszak and any company with which he is affiliated will no longer receive taxpayer dollars from the National Institutes of Health because he was doing it, according to many people smarter than me and many news reports—he was funding gain research in Wuhan. He also was given money by Dr. Fauci and by Dr. Collins to study viruses in Bangladesh, Myanmar, Laos, Vietnam, and other Southeast Asian nations. Pretty scary stuff. We know how it all turned out.

The arc of the moral universe is long, but it bends towards justice. Dr. Daszak and EcoHealth Alliance received at least partial justice this month thanks to President Trump's Department of Health and Human Services. As one taxpayer, I am grateful.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

FRANCIS SCOTT KEY BRIDGE

Ms. ALSOBROOKS. Mr. President, at 1:28 a.m. on March 26, 2024—a year ago tonight—a tragedy struck Maryland. A container ship crashed into the Francis Scott Key Bridge. While many were asleep, the Key Bridge collapsed into the icy waters.

Although struck with fear and shock, Team Maryland didn't hesitate. We jumped into action right away and got to work.

We have this phrase—"Team Maryland"—that we have been saying for years, but it is true. We work as a team, one of the strongest teams in the country—a coordinated effort between our Federal delegation, our Governor, and our county executives and mayors on the local level. It is true in good times, it is true when we face adversity, and it was never truer than we saw 1 year ago today.

Governor Moore and Mayor Scott raced to the bridge. Our Federal delegation immediately started asking questions, pushing for funding to rebuild. County executives across the

State, like me at the time, sent our resources and our first responders to help with rescue efforts. We are so grateful we had a President and administration willing to help.

Team Maryland is just that—a team. We have always been, and we always will be. That is how you get through moments of crisis—together. And we have stayed as a team every day since the collapse of the bridge, working together in coordination to ensure we can rebuild.

Our teamwork in the face of a crisis is proof of how your government should work for you: jumping into action when tragedy strikes, asking questions, demanding answers, and rebuilding—doing what needs to be done on behalf of the people.

Team Maryland responded quickly and capably, but we lost a lot that morning, none more priceless than the six lives that perished: Maynor Yassir Suazo Sandoval, Miguel Angel Luna Gonzalez, Jose Mynor Lopez, Alejandro Hernandez Fuentes, Dorlian Ronial Castillo Cabrera, and Carlos Daniel Hernandez. They are irreplaceable. Their names are forever remembered—six hard-working men devoted to their community, beloved by their families, and forever Marylanders in our hearts.

Maynor was a father of a 5-year-old daughter and an 18-year-old son. He moved from Honduras to America in search of a better life for his family, a life that included working through the nights to repair our infrastructure—all in the name of building a better life for his wife and two children.

Maynor had dreams of one day owning a small business. He would say: You had to triple your efforts to get ahead.

He said: It didn't matter what time or where the job was; you had to be where the work was.

Maynor's outlook reminds me of my own father, who worked as a newspaper deliveryman and a car salesman. I once went to work with my dad on a very early morning, delivering newspapers.

He said to me: You know, I hop up and down on this dirty truck every morning so you don't have to.

Just like my own father, Maynor worked day in and day out, hard and long hours, to build a better life for his family.

Miguel was a Marylander for more than 19 years. He made such an impact on his State and community. A husband to Maria and a father of three, Miguel was known for his kind and hard-working spirit.

Miguel and Maria had a food truck in Glen Burnie. Just days before Miguel's tragic death, he brought Maria, his wife, to a storefront they soon planned to rent to continue to build their business. His coworkers remember him fondly as always wanting to share his food with them.

Jose moved to the United States from Guatemala over two decades ago. His life surrounded his family—his wife Isabel and his children.

Alejandro was a man of faith, just like me and so many others in this Chamber. He was active in his church and devoted to his loving family. A father of four, Alejandro was a big personality. Some even described him as a "fireball."

Dorlian moved from Guatemala to the United States to pursue his dreams and to help his mother. He was only 26 years old.

Carlos came from Mexico, seeking a better life, and was willing to work hard for it. He was only 24 years old—taken from us far too soon.

Six individual lives, connected to their coworkers through service, connected to their families through love, connected to our community through their work to make our infrastructure stronger—1 year later, we remember their loss. They are greatly missed. One year later, their families and communities are still grieving. May we continue to pray for their strength and peace.

We also remember the two men, including Julio Adrian Cervantes Suarez, who miraculously survived the devastating collapse.

As Julio was falling into the Patapsco River, he prayed to God, giving thanks, asking for protection over his wife and family and asking for forgiveness. Determined to survive, he was able to hang onto a piece of the bridge to stay afloat. He immediately started calling for his coworkers, including his brother-in-law and his 18-year-old nephew, who, unfortunately, lost their lives.

Thanks to a light on his work helmet, which he was still wearing in the water, search boats were able to rescue him. Today, he continues to keep the memories of his coworkers and friends alive.

These men were essential workers, working the dangerous jobs that build and strengthen our State's infrastructure. It is in their loving memory that we dedicate our own efforts to rebuilding the Key Bridge.

When the bridge collapsed on that early morning, people across the globe immediately predicted our economy would crash. One of the world's biggest ports was instantly shut off to traffic, and we would be challenged to recover. But Team Maryland proved them wrong. We were quickly and efficiently able to perform a controlled demolition in May. By June, we reopened the Fort McHenry Federal Channel and the Port of Baltimore, and last month, we revealed the design for the new Key Bridge—the State's first cable-style bridge—which will stand 40 feet taller than the original bridge and is set to open as soon as fall 2028.

Some may doubt our ability to rebuild. Team Maryland will prove them wrong again.

Now, we still have a lot of work to do to get to fall 2028, but we are in this together on every level. Here in the Senate, I will use my position as ranking member of the Environment and Public

Works' Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee to ensure that the funding is implemented as intended.

Thanks to the leadership of Senator Cardin, Senator VAN HOLLEN, and our entire Maryland delegation, the Baltimore BRIDGE Relief Act was included in last year's continuing resolution and ensured Congress is now committed to covering the full cost of replacing the bridge. The Baltimore BRIDGE Relief Act promises that Federal taxpayers will be reimbursed through proceeds from insurance payments and litigation taken on by the Department of Justice, the Maryland attorney general, and others. It also includes critical funding for the Federal Highway Administration Emergency Relief Fund to provide this project and others around the country with the resources they need. This is the Federal Government working effectively for our State in a time of disaster, as it should.

Team Maryland won't stop fighting for our State. I am proud of what we have accomplished and am proud of what we will continue to do. We will rebuild, and we won't rest until it is done. We won't rest because we are doing it all for Maryland—for the six Marylanders who lost their lives that day, the brave Marylanders who dove into the frigid water during the rescue operation, the strong Marylanders whose businesses and livelihoods were impacted by the collapse, the Marylanders who depend on our port for resources, the Marylanders who count on our infrastructure to stand tall.

When it is completed, we will serve as an example to the Nation and the world of what teamwork and togetherness can achieve.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I rise to join my Senate colleague Senator ALSOBROOKS to talk about the 1-year anniversary of the collapse of the Key Bridge in Baltimore. We speak today on the floor on the eve of that solemn anniversary, and we remember those who died that day.

We probably all remember—at least all of us in Maryland—where we were when we learned that the Key Bridge had collapsed. It was a local, national, and, in fact, international tragedy. It echoed around the world, and its impact was felt far from Maryland's shores.

First and foremost, it was a human tragedy for the six Baltimore construction workers who were working the overnight shift that day. As my Senate colleague Senator ALSOBROOKS has said, each of them had loved ones who depended on them, and four of them were fathers. I, too, would like to read their names into the RECORD on this solemn anniversary eve of their passing away: Alejandro Hernandez Fuentes was 35 years old. Dorian Ronial Castillo Cabrera was 26 years old. Maynor Yassir Suazo Sandoval was 38 years old. Carlos Daniel Hernandez

Estrella was 24 years old. Miguel Angel Luna Gonzalez was 49 years old, and Jose Mynor Lopez was 37 years old.

These six men came to Maryland in search of better lives, and they made our State and, indeed, our country a better place. Their tragic deaths came as they quietly worked on the overnight shift to maintain the bridge that millions of people depended on. We know that 1 year does not take away any of the pain or the grief of their families or their loved ones. We know that this anniversary can be an especially difficult time, bringing up the most painful memories, and, today, we grieve with them.

The Key Bridge collapse also disrupted the lives and the livelihoods of countless Marylanders. For 47 years, the Key Bridge was an indelible part of the Baltimore City skyline and a vital part of our lives. More than 34,000 travelers crossed that bridge each day. It was the gateway to the Port of Baltimore, which welcomes 1,800 ships every year and supports 20,000 direct jobs, including 2,400 union longshoremen, as well as 24,000 jobs spurred by local purchases, and then an additional 7,200 indirect jobs. So you can see its huge economic impact. In fact, it generates \$70 billion annually of economic revenue for the city.

The Port of Baltimore is the busiest in the Nation for farm and construction machinery and imported forest products and is the second busiest for automobiles and light trucks. When the bridge collapsed that morning, the debris blocked the channel to the Port of Baltimore, putting 8,000 individuals temporarily out of work and halting the flow of trade for millions of Americans. But, as the bridge came apart, we came together, and out of this tragedy came unity of purpose and unity of action.

We will remember the first responders, including the three Maryland Transportation Authority officers who were on site and quickly acted to stop additional traffic from going onto the bridge, preventing further tragic loss of life: Sergeant Paul Pastorek, Corporal Jeremy Herbert, and Officer Garry Kirts. Those officers and all of the first responders on scene that morning deserve our thanks and enduring gratitude for preventing more loss of life and rescuing the two workers who did survive the crash that day.

After the bridge fell, I woke up, sometime in the middle of the night to early morning hours, to a call from my team. Immediately, everybody sprang into action. First of all, President Biden and Secretary Buttigieg quickly reached out to the Maryland congressional delegation at that time, Senator Cardin and Congressman MFUME; and at the State level, to Governor Moore and Mayor Scott and our State and local partners, all of whom quickly rallied to the site of the bridge collapse to both get briefed on what happened and to plot the early stages of the way forward.

Federal, State, and local agencies established what was called the unified command, led by the U.S. Coast Guard, to manage the scene and begin the recovery effort. The Maryland State Police worked to recover the bodies of the six workers from the depths below the river. We were grateful for their quick and their careful work.

Today is Maryland Day, and I want to commend our first responders for embodying the very best of our State.

Following the recovery efforts, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers led the charge at the unified command to clear the debris from that channel. They deployed precision explosives to remove a large section of the bridge from the top of the Dali—the Dali was the ship that crashed into the bridge—and they coordinated the response across agencies. On May 20 of last year, the ship was finally floated away from the site, and on June 12—just 78 days after the bridge collapsed—the Port of Baltimore was fully reopened, which is a testament to the unified efforts of Federal, State, and local partners.

I would like to thank COL Estee Pinchasin, who was the Army Corps of Engineers person in command of the effort to clear the debris from under the bridge, for her leadership as commander of the Baltimore District at the time.

As the colonel noted when we all spoke about reopening the Port of Baltimore, “it is not a hope—it is a plan.”

As the Army Corps and others cleared the channel, Federal Team Maryland worked to secure the resources that Baltimore City and our State would need to rebuild the bridge. Senator Cardin, Congressman MFUME, and I worked to coordinate the Federal response, and we quickly secured the Biden administration's approval of Baltimore's eligibility to receive emergency highway funding to aid in the recovery effort. That was a critical first step.

We then introduced the bipartisan Baltimore BRIDGE Relief Act, legislation to ensure 100 percent Federal funding for the bridge replacement, with bipartisan support and the entire Maryland delegation. We also ensured that, with any government litigation regarding the bridge, the proceeds from that, as well as insurance proceeds stemming from the collapse, would go directly to the costs of replacing the bridge.

This bridge merited the 100 percent Federal match because of the scale of the disaster and the precedent that we have applied to similar disasters of that scale. It was not simply a Baltimore City tragedy. It did have economic consequences across our region and, indeed, rippled across the Nation.

But securing those funds required a monthslong effort and an all-hands-on-deck mission. We worked with colleagues on both sides of the aisle, and that bill finally passed in December of last year. Included in that legislation was an increase in funding for the national emergency relief fund.

I want to thank a number of our colleagues who worked with us hand in hand to secure those funds at this moment of tragedy for Baltimore and the country. I want to thank Senator CAPRTO and former Senator Carper of the Environment and Public Works Committee. I want to thank Senators COLLINS and MURRAY of the Appropriations Committee, as well as their staffs and our other colleagues.

I appreciate all of those who came to visit the site of the bridge collapse and to learn of our needs and what would be required to rebuild.

At the end of the day, passing this bill was not just about the funding. It was about keeping the promise that our government made to Baltimore and upholding a deeper national tradition that lies at the foundation of our Union: that when one huge disaster strikes any one State, the rest of us assist and come to their help. No one has to go it alone.

I also want to thank my former partner in the U.S. Senate, Ben Cardin, for all his work in this endeavor and our Governor, who worked so hard here on Capitol Hill to help make the case. I also want to thank my new partner in the Senate, Senator ALSOBROOKS, as she takes up the baton and makes sure that we move full speed ahead.

Because of the Federal funds, we have gotten the necessary permits to proceed. We must continue to work to rebuild not just the bridge itself but to rebuild all that was lost that day. And the way we do it is by being united.

That is the message that I just want to close on, which is that out of this terrible tragedy that happened in Baltimore City, first of all, people came together to comfort the families who lost loved ones. People came to support our first responders. People worked together to clear the channel of debris so the Port of Baltimore could reopen. And colleagues here in the U.S. Senate and those in the House of Representatives rallied to help Maryland in its time of need.

So I thank my colleagues for their efforts, and I thank everybody across America who helped Baltimore City and the State of Maryland at that moment of tragedy. As I say, out of that horrible moment came a ray of hope and unity that has helped us get to this point.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. LUMMIS). The Senator from Michigan.

NOMINATION OF JAMES BISHOP

Mr. PETERS. Madam President, I rise today in opposition to Congressman Bishop's nomination to be the Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

The Office of Management and Budget, or OMB, is responsible for a range of critical functions, from developing and executing the Federal budget to improving Agency performance and reviewing regulations.

Given his record and views, I have serious concerns about how Congressman

Bishop will help lead this important office.

First of all, I am concerned by his willingness to break the law, especially when it comes to Congress's power of the purse. He supports the administration's efforts to illegally withhold funding that Congress has passed into law.

Like all of my colleagues in Congress, I swore an oath to uphold and follow the laws set forth in our Constitution, which affirms that Congress—and Congress alone—is responsible for deciding how Federal funds are spent, not the President or members of his administration.

The administration's actions so far to freeze congressionally approved funds have already rocked communities all across my home State of Michigan, as well as across the entire Nation. These communities count on the funds appropriated by Congress to upgrade their roads and bridges and pay their police and first responders.

If confirmed, Congressman Bishop will only be a rubberstamp for Donald Trump and Director Vought's flagrant disregard for the spending laws passed by Congress.

Congressman Bishop has also been a staunch supporter of mass layoffs within the Federal workforce that undermine our government's ability to provide vital services to the American people.

Our nonpartisan civil servants play vital roles in protecting our national security, caring for our veterans, and ensuring the safety of our transportation system. If we allow the Trump administration to indiscriminately fire these nonpartisan experts and replace them with their political cronies, they will only put our Nation and our people at risk.

Finally, I am alarmed by his complete disregard for the law when it comes to whistleblower protections. As a Member of Congress, he revealed the name of a whistleblower—in direct violation of the law—and jeopardized the safety of that individual and their family. We simply cannot trust anyone who is willing to break the law to retaliate against a whistleblower exposing wrongdoing to help such a critical Agency within the Federal Government.

And if Congressman Bishop is confirmed, I am concerned that he will defy our duly passed laws and our Constitution to continue President Trump, Elon Musk, and Director Vought's assault on the Federal Government and the critical services that it provides all Americans.

Because of this, I oppose Congressman Bishop's nomination, and I would urge my colleagues to do the same.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WAIVING QUORUM CALL

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to waive the mandatory quorum call with respect to the Bishop nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOTE ON MAKARY NOMINATION

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, I know of no further debate on the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Makary nomination?

Mr. KENNEDY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 143 Ex.]

YEAS—56

Banks	Graham	Moreno
Barrasso	Grassley	Mullin
Blackburn	Hagerty	Murkowski
Boozman	Hassan	Paul
Britt	Hawley	Ricketts
Budd	Hoeven	Risch
Capito	Husted	Rounds
Cassidy	Hyde-Smith	Schmitt
Collins	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Justice	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Kennedy	Shaheen
Cramer	Lankford	Sheehy
Crapo	Lee	Sullivan
Cruz	Lummis	Thune
Curtis	Marshall	Tillis
Daines	McConnell	Tuberville
Durbin	McCormick	Wicker
Ernst	Moody	Young
Fischer	Moran	

NAYS—44

Alsobrooks	Hirono	Rosen
Baldwin	Kaine	Sanders
Bennet	Kelly	Schatz
Blumenthal	Kim	Schiff
Blunt Rochester	King	Schumer
Booker	Klobuchar	Slotkin
Cantwell	Lujan	Smith
Coons	Markey	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Murphy	Warnock
Fetterman	Murray	Warren
Gallago	Ossoff	Welch
Gillibrand	Padilla	Whitehouse
Heinrich	Peters	Wyden
Hickenlooper	Reed	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby

move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 39, James Bishop, of North Carolina, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

John Thune, Tim Sheehy, Mike Crapo, Markwayne Mullin, Joni Ernst, David McCormick, Rick Scott of Florida, Bernie Moreno, Mike Rounds, Tommy Tuberville, Katie Boyd Britt, Shelley Moore Capito, Jim Justice, John Barrasso, Steve Daines, Jon Husted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of James Bishop, of North Carolina, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 144 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Banks	Graham	Mullin
Barrasso	Grassley	Murkowski
Blackburn	Hagerty	Paul
Boozman	Hoeven	Ricketts
Britt	Husted	Risch
Budd	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Capito	Johnson	Schmitt
Cassidy	Justice	Scott (FL)
Collins	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Lankford	Sheehy
Cotton	Lee	Sullivan
Cramer	Lummis	Thune
Crapo	Marshall	Tillis
Cruz	McConnell	Tuberville
Curtis	McCormick	Wicker
Daines	Moody	Young
Ernst	Moran	
Fischer	Moreno	

NAYS—47

Alsobrooks	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Baldwin	Hirono	Sanders
Bennet	Kaine	Schatz
Blumenthal	Kelly	Schiff
Blunt Rochester	Kim	Schumer
Booker	King	Shaheen
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Slotkin
Coons	Lujan	Smith
Cortez Masto	Markey	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warrnock
Fetterman	Murray	Warren
Gallago	Ossoff	Welch
Gillibrand	Padilla	Whitehouse
Hassan	Peters	Wyden
Heinrich	Reed	

NOT VOTING—1

Hawley

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 52, the nays are 47.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James Bishop, of North Carolina, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session and be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING DEIMCO FINISHING EQUIPMENT

• Ms. ERNST. Madam President, as chair of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, each week I recognize an outstanding Iowa small business that exemplifies the American entrepreneurial spirit. This week, it is my privilege to recognize Deimco Finishing Equipment of Tama, IA, as the Senate Small Business of the Week.

In 1983, Tom Deimerly established Deimco Finishing Equipment with its first product, a pneumatic reciprocator, setting the stage for the manufacturing operation. Originally based in Marshalltown, IA, the company grew steadily, fueled by a dedication to innovation and engineering excellence. In 2002, Kirk and Cindy Shirar bought Deimco with the vision of providing high-quality, American-made finishing and material handling solutions to businesses across the country. One year later, the couple relocated the business to Tama, IA, to accommodate the company's expanding operations and capabilities. Deimco Finishing had two major facility expansions, including a 10,800-square-foot addition in early 2021 that is now fully operational. After two decades of running the business, the Shirars passed the family business to their son and daughter-in-law Jacob and Kyrsten Shirar in 2024.

Today, Deimco Finishing Equipment is a leading manufacturer of custom finishing and material handling solutions. The company specializes in designing, engineering, and fabricating high-quality finishing systems that cater to a wide range of industries, including automotive, military, medical, agricultural, and so much more. Additionally, Deimco Finishing offers powder coating systems, liquid paint and stain systems, as well as automation solutions. Their automated gun movers and robotic integration enable each system to be tailored to meet specific industry needs. With nearly four decades of experience, Deimco Finishing has built a reputation as a trusted partner in the manufacturing sector, continuously innovating to meet the changing needs of their clients while maintaining high-quality craftsmanship and customer satisfaction.

Since 2016, Deimco Finishing Equipment has provided engineering experi-

ence and mentorship to students at South Tama County High School during the summer. This experience inspired one past participant to pursue a manufacturing-focused degree before returning to the business, where he is now one of the company's 25 full-time community-based employees. The company also supports local charities and organizations, including the Tama American Legion, Retrieving Freedom—a charity providing service dogs to veterans—and the Red Cross, among others. Through its charitable contributions and community involvement, Deimco Finishing has demonstrated a commitment to giving back to the community that has supported its growth. Later this year, Deimco Finishing Equipment will celebrate its 42nd anniversary in Iowa.

When I visited Deimco Finishing Equipment in 2021, I witnessed their entrepreneurial spirit that allows them to play such an essential role in the manufacturing industry. I want to congratulate the Shirar family and the entire team for their hard work and dedication to high-quality craftsmanship and customer satisfaction to businesses across Iowa and beyond. I look forward to seeing their continued growth and success.●

RECOGNIZING MULHOLLAND GROCERY

• Ms. ERNST. Madam President, as chair of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, each week I recognize an outstanding Iowa small business that exemplifies the American entrepreneurial spirit. This week, it is my privilege to recognize Mulholland Grocery of Malvern, IA, as the Senate Small Business of the Week.

In 1875, Fred E. Mulholland opened Mulholland Grocery as a dry goods store in the heart of Malvern, IA. In 1903, Fred added a small cash-and-carry grocery section to the corner of the store. Eventually, the grocery section grew to become the entirety of the family business. After he passed away in 1945, Fred left the business to his son Fred A. Mulholland, who managed the company for close to 30 years until 1972 when he retired. He sold the store to his son Gordon and longtime employee Cork Hansen. Cork and Gordon eventually split, and Mulholland Grocery changed hands several times before the business returned to the Mulholland family's ownership. In 2008, Tom Mulholland, the great-grandson of Fred the founder, purchased the long-standing community grocery store now known for its meat processing services, homestyle meals, and warm customer service.

Tom worked hard to serve the Malvern community and keep the town's only grocery store within 11 miles afloat. In 2013, his dedication was recognized when Mulholland Grocery won Iowa's Dream Big, Grow Here award. This statewide honor equipped

Mulholland Grocery to reinvest in the store and buy catering equipment. Its reputation grew as local newspapers, radio shows, and magazines also circulated stories about the store and its specialty offerings. The beloved Malvern grocery store became widely recognized for its iconic ham salad, breakfast bratwurst, and smoked meats.

In December 2021, tragedy struck when a massive fire devastated the Main Street location, prompting Tom to debate the future of the community's cherished business. Ultimately, Tom postponed his retirement, dedicating himself to a 3-year rebuild and expansion process. With help from community leaders and several Iowa-based design firms, Tom transformed the disaster into an opportunity and modernized the grocery store's floor plan to suit their 21st-century operations. During the rebuilding, Mulholland Grocery was featured in a short documentary, produced by an Oscar-winning filmmaker that premiered in April 2023. The film highlighted the importance of small businesses to their communities and gave the team an opportunity to travel around the country to advocate for fellow small businesses in Iowa and beyond.

Tom and the family business remain active in the community as members of the Mills County Chamber of Commerce and the Malvern Area Betterment Association. I want to congratulate the Mulhollands and the entire team at Mulholland Grocery for their hard work and dedication to providing essential products and services to the Malvern community and families across Iowa. This April, Mulholland Grocery plans to officially commemorate its grand reopening and its 150th business anniversary in Iowa.●

TRIBUTE TO KENNETH CHAPMAN

● Ms. HASSAN. Madam President, I am honored to recognize Kenneth Chapman of Woodstock as March's Granite Stater of the Month. Kenneth recently retired after serving as Woodstock's town moderator for 50 years.

Kenneth was raised to believe that service to his community and to others needed to be a priority. After settling in Woodstock as a young adult, Kenneth began attending school board meetings and joined different town committees. Kenneth enjoyed the ways in which the small town allowed him to directly feel the impact of his efforts to give back to his community. After being asked to moderate a special town election in 1975, Kenneth realized that he had a passion for upholding democracy and ran for the official role of town moderator. He continued to serve in this all-important role through this year's town meeting season, marking 50 years in service to Woodstock.

During his half century of service, Kenneth has had a tangible impact on his community. He has seen the town grow and adapt to new technology, per-

sonally overseeing the switch to more modern voting machines, even as he has continued to ensure that Woodstock voters freely and civilly participated in countless elections and town meetings. Over the years, Kenneth also helped his community as a nationally registered paramedic, as an incorporator and trustee of the North Country Center for the Arts, as a member of the Western White Mountains Chamber, and as a member of the Lincoln-Woodstock Cooperative School Board.

Kenneth's commitment to service as town moderator is an excellent reflection of New Hampshire's commitment to safeguarding free and fair elections, the foundation of our democracy. And his devotion to serving the Woodstock community in countless other ways as well is a great example of the way Granite Staters take it upon themselves to work with their friends and neighbors to solve problems. I am proud to name Kenneth Chapman as March's Granite Stater of the Month.●

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Hanley, one of his secretaries.

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE

REPORT RELATIVE TO THE
ISSUANCE OF AN EXECUTIVE
ORDER THAT TAKES ADDI-
TIONAL STEPS WITH RESPECT
TO THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY
DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE
ORDER 13692 OF MARCH 8, 2015
(BLOCKING PROPERTY AND SUS-
PENDING ENTRY OF CERTAIN
PERSONS CONTRIBUTING TO THE
SITUATION IN VENEZUELA)—PM
17

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), I hereby report that I have issued an Executive Order that takes additional steps with respect to the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13692 of March 8, 2015 (Blocking Property and Suspending Entry of Certain Persons Contributing to the Situation in Venezuela).

The Maduro regime's refusal to cooperate with the United States on matters of illegal immigration exacerbates threats to public safety and border security. The activities of the Tren de Aragua gang, a transnational criminal organization originating in Venezuela and designated as a Foreign Terrorist Organization and a Specially Designated Global Terrorist organization, have intensified these threats. Further,

the Maduro regime's ongoing destabilizing actions, including its support for illicit activities such as narcotics trafficking, kidnapping, and human trafficking necessitate further measures to protect United States interests. All of these actions are due in part to the oil revenues that the Maduro regime and its network of criminals and cronies are able to earn.

Effective on April 2, 2025, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the United States Trade Representative, is authorized to determine whether a tariff of 25 percent will be imposed on goods from any country that imports Venezuelan oil. Once imposed at the Secretary of State's discretion, the tariff shall remain in effect for a period of 1 year after the last day a country imports Venezuelan oil, or at an earlier date if the Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with other relevant heads of executive departments and agencies, determines it appropriate. To encourage full accountability for these actions, I have directed the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Commerce to submit periodic reports to me within 180 days of the date of this order and no less than every 180 days thereafter assessing the effectiveness of the tariffs described in this order and the ongoing conduct of the Maduro regime.

My Administration will continue to consult with the Congress on our efforts to address the ongoing problems in Venezuela that undermine United States interests and look forward to working on these issues together.

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

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 25, 2025.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:41 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 359. An act to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to require reporting relating to certain cost-share requirements, and for other purposes.

H.R. 730. An act to coordinate Federal research and development efforts focused on modernizing mathematics in STEM education through mathematical and statistical modeling, including data-driven and computational thinking, problem, project, and performance-based learning and assessment, interdisciplinary exploration, and career connections, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1318. An act to amend the Research and Development, Competition, and Innovation Act to clarify the definition of foreign country for purposes of malign foreign talent recruitment restriction, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1325. An act to provide for transparent licensing of commercial remote sensing systems, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1326. An act to provide for Department of Energy and Department of Agriculture joint research and development activities, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1368. An act to provide for Department of Energy and National Aeronautics and Space Administration research and development coordination, and for other purposes.

At 4:13 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced the House has agreed to the following resolution:

H. Res. 240. Resolution relative to the death of the Honorable Raúl M. Grijalva, a Representative from the State of Arizona.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 359. An act to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to require reporting relating to certain cost-share requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 730. An act to coordinate Federal research and development efforts focused on modernizing mathematics in STEM education through mathematical and statistical modeling, including data-driven and computational thinking, problem, project, and performance-based learning and assessment, interdisciplinary exploration, and career connections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 1318. An act to amend the Research and Development, Competition, and Innovation Act to clarify the definition of foreign country for purposes of malign foreign talent recruitment restriction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 1325. An act to provide for transparent licensing of commercial remote sensing systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 1326. An act to provide for Department of Energy and Department of Agriculture joint research and development activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 1350. An act to provide for Department of Energy and National Science Foundation research and development coordination, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 1368. An act to provide for Department of Energy and National Aeronautics and Space Administration research and development coordination, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-525. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Administrator, Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-526. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Transportation,

transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-527. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to nominations, vacancies, designation of service in acting roles, discontinuation of service in an acting role and an action on nomination for positions covered by the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-528. A communication from the Chief of the Policy and Rules Division, Office of Engineering and Technology, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Unlicensed Use of the 6 GHz Band; Expanding Flexible Use in Mid-Band Spectrum Between 3.7 and 24 GHz" ((ET Docket No. 18-295) (GN Docket No. 17-183) (FCC 24-125)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-529. A communication from the Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Connect America Fund, the Uniendo a Puerto Rico Fund and the Connect USVI Fund, Rural Digital Opportunity Fund (Auction 904), Rural Digital Opportunity Fund" ((RIN3060-AK57) (WC Docket Nos. 10-90, 18-143, 19-126) (AU Docket No. 20-34)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-530. A communication from the Supervisory Program Analyst, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Advanced Methods to Target and Eliminate Unlawful Robocalls" ((RIN3060-AL00) (CG Docket No. 17-59)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-531. A communication from the Secretary of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Negative Option Rule" ((RIN3084-AB60) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-532. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Implementation of Executive Orders Addressing Energy, Climate Change, Diversity, and Gender" received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-533. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Ensuring Reliance Upon Sound Economic Analysis in Department of Transportation Policies, Programs, and Activities" received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-534. A communication from the Director of Rulemaking Operations, National

Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Anthropomorphic Test Devices, Hill 5TH Percentile Female Test Dummy; Incorporation by Reference" ((RIN2127-AM13) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-535. A communication from the Director of Rulemaking Operations, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Fuel System Integrity of Hydrogen Vehicles; Compressed Hydrogen Storage System Integrity; Incorporation by Reference" ((RIN2127-AM40) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-536. A communication from the Director of Rulemaking Operations, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Child Restraint Systems, Child Restraint Anchorage Systems, Incorporation by Reference" ((RIN2127-AL20) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-537. A communication from the Director of Rulemaking Operations, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Occupant Crash Protection, Seat Belt Reminder Systems, Controls and Displays" ((RIN2127-AL37) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-538. A communication from the Director of Rulemaking Operations, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; FMVSS No. 305a Electric-Powered Vehicles; Electric Powertrain Integrity Global Technical Regulation No. 20 Incorporation by Reference" ((RIN2127-AM43) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-539. A communication from the Deputy Chief, Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Wireless Emergency Alerts; Amendments to Part 11 of the Commission's Rules Regarding the Emergency Alert System, Seventh Report and Order and Eleventh Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (2025)" ((PS Docket Nos. 15-91 and 15-94) (FCC25-14)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-540. A communication from the Supervisory Program Analyst, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Ethete, Wyoming)" ((MB Docket No. 24-667) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-541. A communication from the Attorney for Regulatory Affairs Division, Office of the General Counsel, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Standard for Non-Full-Size Baby Cribs” (Docket No. CPSC-2019-0025) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-542. A communication from the Attorney for Regulatory Affairs Division, Office of the General Counsel, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Standard for Play Yards” (Docket No. CPSC-2019-0025) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-543. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Implementation of Executive Orders Addressing Energy, Climate Change, Diversity, and Gender” received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-544. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Ensuring Reliance Upon Sound Economic Analysis in Department of Transportation Policies, Programs, and Activities” received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-545. A communication from the Secretary of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Adjustments to Civil Penalty Amounts” received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-546. A communication from the Secretary of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Negative Option Rule” (RIN3084-AB60) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-547. A communication from the Secretary of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Trade Regulation Rule on Unfair or Deceptive Fees” (RIN3084-AB77) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-548. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 4152” ((RIN2120-AA65) (Docket No. 31590)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-549. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Proce-

dures; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 4151” ((RIN2120-AA65) (Docket No. 31589)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-550. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 4156” ((RIN2120-AA65) (Docket No. 31594)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-551. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 4155” ((RIN2120-AA65) (Docket No. 31593)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-552. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 4154” ((RIN2120-AA65) (Docket No. 31592)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-553. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 4153” ((RIN2120-AA65) (Docket No. 31591)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-554. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Establishment of Class E Airspace; Mott, ND” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2023-2223)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-555. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Establishment of Class E Airspace; Zeeland, MI” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2024-2084)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-556. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of Class E Airspace; Austin, TX; Establishment of Class E Airspace; Austin, Lago Vista, and Lakeway, TX” ((RIN2120-AA66)

(Docket No. FAA-2024-2511)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-557. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Establishment and Amendment of Multiple United States Area Navigation (RNAV) Routes; Eastern United States; Correction” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2024-1157)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-558. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of Class E Airspace; Ahoskie, NC” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2024-2530)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-559. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of VOR Federal Airways V-68, V-76, V-212, V-222, and V-558, and United States Area Navigation Route T-220 in the Vicinity of Industry, TX” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2024-1707)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-560. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of Class E Airspace; Austin, TX; Establishment of Class E Airspace; Austin, Lago Vista, and Lakeway, TX” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2024-2511)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-561. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Establishment of Class E Airspace; Windsor, NC” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2024-1982)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-562. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of Class E Airspace; Austin, TX; Establishment of Class E Airspace; Austin, Lago Vista, and Lakeway, TX” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2024-2511)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-563. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of Class E Airspace; Edenton, NC” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2024-1983)) received during adjournment of the Senate

EC-584. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39-22965" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2024-2549)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-585. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39-22973" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2024-2421)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-586. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Canada Limited Partnership (Type Certificate Previously Held by C Series Aircraft Limited Partnership (CSALP); Bombardier, Inc.) Airplanes; Amendment 39-22979" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2024-0225)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-587. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Engines; Amendment 39-22987" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2024-2547)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-588. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Deutschland Ltd & Co KG Engines; Amendment 39-22975" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2024-2544)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-589. A communication from the Acting General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Civil Monetary Penalty Inflation Adjustment Rule" (Docket No. RM05-5-31) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2025; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-590. A communication from the Legal Advisor, Office of the Intellectual Property Enforcement Coordinator, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Chairman, Council on Environmental Quality, Executive Office of the President, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-591. A communication from the Legal Advisor, Office of the Intellectual Property Enforcement Coordinator, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Chairman, Council on Environmental Quality, Executive Office of the President, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-592. A communication from the Senior Attorney Advisor, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Rescission of Build a Better America Memoranda" received during ad-

journment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-593. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Extending the Reporting Deadline Under the Greenhouse Gas Reporting Rule for 2024 Data" ((RIN2060-AW50) (FRL No. 12676-01-OAR)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-594. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Renewable Fuel Standard Program: Extension of 2024 Compliance Reporting Deadline" ((RIN2060-AW46) (FRL No. 12015.1-02-OAR)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-595. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; California; Eastern Kern Air Pollution Control District; Tehama County Air Pollution Control District; San Diego County Air Pollution Control District; Emissions Statement Requirements" (FRL No. 11613-02-R9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-596. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; SC; Updates to the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule" (FRL No. 12050-02-R4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-597. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Revisions; California; Feather River Air Quality Management District" (FRL No. 12098-02-R9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-598. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Extension of Effective Date for Removal of Gasoline Volatility Waiver for Ohio and Nine Counties in South Dakota" ((RIN2060-AW51) (FRL No. 9845.1-03-OAR)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-599. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Hazardous and Solid Waste Management System: Disposal of Coal Combustion Residuals From Electric Utilities; Legacy CCR Surface Impoundments; Correction; Withdrawal of Direct Final Rule" ((RIN2050-AH34) (FRL No. 7814.1-05-OLBM)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of

the Senate on March 20, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-600. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; New York; Knowlton Technologies LLC" (FRL No. 12249-02-R2) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-601. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Interim Final Determination to Stay and Defer Sanctions; California; Sacramento Metro Area" (FRL No. 12637-01-R9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McCONNELL, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Special Report entitled "Review of Legislative Activity during the 118th Congress" (Rept. No. 119-5).

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE

The following executive report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. CRAPO for the Committee on Finance.

*Mehmet Oz, of Pennsylvania, to be Administrator of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. HAWLEY (for himself, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. MORENO):

S. 1099. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to limit the authority of district courts of the United States to provide injunctive relief, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 1100. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act to modify the definition of food under the supplemental nutrition assistance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. KING):

S. 1101. A bill to authorize the use of Federal Bureau of Investigation criminal history record information for administration of certain licenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. WELCH):

S. 1102. A bill to incentivize States and localities to improve access to justice, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 1103. A bill to require a pilot program on the use of big data analytics to identify vessels evading sanctions and export controls and to require a report on the availability in the United States of emerging and foundational technologies subject to export controls; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. SCHMITT (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. FETTERMAN, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. PETERS, and Ms. ERNST):

S. 1104. A bill to amend section 495 of the Public Health Service Act to require inspections of foreign laboratories conducting biomedical and behavioral research to ensure compliance with applicable animal welfare requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1105. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve risk adjustment under Medicare Advantage; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 1106. A bill to establish the Immersive Technology Advisory Panel to promote the use of immersive technology in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself and Mr. BENNET):

S. 1107. A bill to amend the Agricultural Credit Act of 1978 with respect to preagreement costs of emergency watershed protection measures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. RICKETTS (for himself and Ms. ROSEN):

S. 1108. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude all military retirement and related benefits from Federal income tax; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. RICKETTS:

S. 1109. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a temporary reduction of the inclusion in gross income for old-age and survivors insurance benefit payments under the Social Security Act, as well as tier 1 railroad retirement benefits; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HUSTED (for himself, Ms. ERNST, and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

S. 1110. A bill to require the use of artificial intelligence to review agency regulations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 1111. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow for payments to certain individuals who dye fuel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. LUJÁN):

S. 1112. A bill to adjust the boundary of Big Bend National Park in the State of Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. ROUNDS, and Ms. LUMMIS):

S. 1113. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to conduct a study and prepare a report on the exposure of the United States to the financial sector of the People's Republic of China, and for other purposes; to the

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. CURTIS):

S. 1114. A bill to amend the Agricultural Credit Act of 1978 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out emergency watershed protection measures on National Forest System land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. ALSOBROOKS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FETTERMAN, Mr. GALLEGOS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KELLY, Mr. KIM, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. OSSOFF, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. SLOTKIN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WARNOCK, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 1115. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages of the basis of sex, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BANKS (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1116. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the provision of certain additional burial benefits for individuals for whom an urn or plaque is furnished, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 1117. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to modify a provision relating to quality loss adjustment coverage; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. MARKEY:

S. 1118. A bill to establish a program to increase drinking water and wastewater system threat preparedness and resilience, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BANKS (for himself and Mr. FETTERMAN):

S. 1119. A bill to provide technical assistance to improve infrastructure in foreign markets for United States agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. COONS):

S. 1120. A bill to establish an Interagency Council on Service to promote and strengthen opportunities for military service, national service, and public service for all people of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 1121. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the adjusted gross income limitation for above-the-line deduction of expenses of performing artist employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WARNOCK:

S. 1122. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the basic allowance for housing inside the United States for members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BANKS (for himself and Mr. HAWLEY):

S. 1123. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to prohibit an institution of higher education that employs unauthorized aliens from receiving funds from Federal student assistance or Federal institutional aid and to require institutions of higher education to participate in the E-Verify Program in order to be eligible to participate in any program authorized under title IV of such Act; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. BUDD, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 1124. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to prohibit the Federal reserve banks from offering certain products or services directly to an individual, to prohibit the use of central bank currency for monetary policy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

S. 1125. A bill to promote exports by creative industries and occupations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. RICKETTS (for himself and Mr. SCHIFF):

S. 1126. A bill to require the imposition of sanctions on the Popular Resistance Committees and other associated entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. FETTERMAN (for himself, Mr. MCCORMICK, and Mr. CRAMER):

S. 1127. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand eligibility for memorial headstones and markers furnished by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to certain individuals who died before November 11, 1998; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. BANKS, Mr. BUDD, and Mr. CAPITO):

S. 1128. A bill to prohibit any direct or indirect United States funding for the territory of Gaza unless certain conditions are met; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

S. 1129. A bill to amend the National Nutrition Monitoring and Related Research Act of 1990 to improve the dietary guidelines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HOEVEN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. JUSTICE, Mr. BENNET, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. KELLY, Mr. ROUNDS, Ms. ROSEN, and Mr. GALLEGOS):

S. 1130. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to provide technology grants to strengthen domestic mining education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. OSSOFF (for himself and Mr. WARNOCK):

S. 1131. A bill to establish the Ocmulgee Mounds National Park and Preserve in the State of Georgia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Ms. HIRONO):

S.J. Res. 38. A joint resolution establishing the ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. BANKS (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. Res. 135. A resolution recognizing a century of broadcasting excellence from WOWO and celebrating the radio station's 100th anniversary; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. COONS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. WELCH, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. OSSOFF, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. KELLY):

S. Res. 136. A resolution affirming the rule of law and the legitimacy of judicial review; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUBERVILLE (for himself and Mrs. BRITT):

S. Res. 137. A resolution commending Volkert, Inc. on the occasion of its 100th anniversary and its century of service to the State of Alabama and the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. LUJÁN):

S. Res. 138. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of "Deep Vein Thrombosis and Pulmonary Embolism Awareness Month"; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 107

At the request of Mr. TILLIS, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 107, a bill to amend the Lumbee Act of 1956.

S. 110

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 110, a bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to exclude extensions of credit made to veterans from the definition of a member business loan.

S. 195

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. KIM) were added as cosponsors of S. 195, a bill to amend the Visit America Act to promote music tourism, and for other purposes.

S. 198

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. JUSTICE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 198, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to the system of compensation of the Palestine Liberation Organization and the Palestinian Authority that supports acts of terrorism.

S. 199

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 199, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide special rules for the taxation of certain residents of Taiwan with income from sources within the United States.

S. 262

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 262, a bill to award a

Congressional Gold Medal to Master Sergeant Roderick "Roddie" Edmonds in recognition of his heroic actions during World War II.

S. 339

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 339, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for Medicare coverage of multi-cancer early detection screening tests.

S. 356

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGOS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 356, a bill to extend the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000.

S. 364

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) and the Senator from Alabama (Mrs. BRITT) were added as cosponsors of S. 364, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to remove silencers from the definition of firearms, and for other purposes.

S. 367

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 367, a bill to prohibit the importation, sale, manufacture, transfer, or possession of .50 caliber rifles, and for other purposes.

S. 410

At the request of Mr. WARNOCK, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 410, a bill to amend titles 10 and 38, United States Code, to improve benefits and services for surviving spouses, and for other purposes.

S. 478

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 478, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to prohibit the Secretary of Veterans Affairs from transmitting certain information to the Department of Justice for use by the national instant criminal background check system.

S. 556

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) and the Senator from Maryland (Ms. ALSOBROOKS) were added as cosponsors of S. 556, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to persons engaged in logistical transactions and sanctions evasion relating to oil, gas, liquefied natural gas, and related petrochemical products from the Islamic Republic of Iran, and for other purposes.

S. 567

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 567, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the First Rhode Island Regiment, in recognition of their dedicated service during the Revolutionary War.

S. 578

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 578, a bill to pilot the use of image technician positions in the U.S. Customs and Border Protection Office of Field Operations.

S. 599

At the request of Mr. WELCH, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 599, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the mileage rate offered by the Department of Veterans Affairs through their Beneficiary Travel program for health related travel, and for other purposes.

S. 739

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine) were added as cosponsors of S. 739, a bill to amend title XXXIII of the Public Health Service Act with respect to flexibility and funding for the World Trade Center Health Program.

S. 780

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 780, a bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to address certain issues relating to the extension of consumer credit, and for other purposes.

S. 881

At the request of Mr. RICKETTS, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 881, a bill to amend the Clean Air Act to include fuel for ocean-going vessels as additional renewable fuel for which credits may be generated under the renewable fuel program.

S. 948

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 948, a bill to reauthorize the HOME Investment Partnerships Program, and for other purposes.

S. 959

At the request of Ms. ALSOBROOKS, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 959, a bill to require the United States International Trade Commission to conduct an investigation and submit a report on the impact on businesses in the United States of duties, and the threat of duties, on imports from Mexico and Canada, and for other purposes.

S. 997

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 997, a bill to enhance the security operations of the Transportation Security Administration and stability of the transportation security workforce by applying the personnel system under title 5, United States Code, to employees of the Transportation Security Administration, and for other purposes.

S. 1009

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) were added as cosponsors of S. 1009, a bill to establish the Baltic Security Initiative for the purpose of strengthening the defensive capabilities of the Baltic countries, and for other purposes.

S. 1032

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1032, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for concurrent receipt of veterans' disability compensation and retired pay for disability retirees with combat-related disabilities, and for other purposes.

S. 1079

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SCHMITT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1079, a bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to establish a grant program for law enforcement agencies, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 52

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 52, a resolution recognizing religious freedom as a fundamental right, expressing support for international religious freedom as a cornerstone of United States foreign policy, and expressing concern over increased threats to and attacks on religious freedom around the world.

S. RES. 86

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 86, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding United Nations General Assembly Resolution 2758 (XXVI) and the harmful conflation of China's "One China Principle" and the United States' "One China Policy".

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. COONS):

S. 1120. A bill to establish an Interagency Council on Service to promote and strengthen opportunities for military service, national service, and public service for all people of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I believe that Americans are ready and willing to answer the call to serve and come together to meet the challenges that we face at the local, national, and international level. We just need to create the conditions to mobilize them.

That is why I am proud to join Senators YOUNG and COONS and Representatives HOULAHAN, PANETTA, BACON, and BERGMAN in introducing the Unity through Service Act.

Our bipartisan legislation is based on the recommendations of the National Commission on Military, National, and Public Service. The Commission was established in the 2017 National Defense Authorization Act. Back then, Senate Armed Services Committee Chairman John McCain and I were trying to look at how we could encourage the most qualified individuals of all backgrounds to volunteer for military service. We quickly understood that the question was also about something bigger. What does it mean for the Nation when so many people do not have the common experience of service, whether in the military or in their communities? And what happens when those who want to serve do not have the opportunity to do so? With those thoughts in mind, we established the Commission to look at the issue of service comprehensively.

One of the statutory mandates of the Commission was to explore the "means by which to foster a greater attitude and ethos of service among United States youth." We as a government must be prepared to invest in what is truly one of our Nation's greatest assets—our public servants. This has been an urgent matter for decades, but it is ever more urgent today.

The Commission published its final report and recommendations just as the COVID-19 pandemic began to grip the Nation. It set a 10-year goal for 5 million Americans to begin participating in military, national, or public service each year. Additionally, the Commission set targets for ensuring there are more than enough qualified individuals seeking to serve in the Armed Forces, and it called for modernizing government personnel systems to attract and enable Americans with critical skills to enter public service. The Unity through Service Act would help to implement those recommendations, providing the architecture and focus to mobilize a whole-of-government approach.

Specifically, the Unity through Service Act would establish an Interagency Council on Service to coordinate and lead initiatives that extend across military, national, and public service. The Council would be tasked with preparing and submitting to the President a national strategy on service, including a review of current programs, initiatives, and online content. The legislation would promote cross-service marketing, recruitment, and retention through joint advertising campaigns and shared market research. It would also ensure that transitioning military members and AmeriCorps members are informed about other service opportunities open to them.

The Unity through Service Act would elevate all forms of service, leveraging the strengths of existing programs and

would provide a roadmap for bringing a new generation of Americans together in service to our Nation. Americans want to serve. We just need to provide the opportunities and the connections for them to do so.

I urge my colleagues to join us in reaffirming our national culture of service by working with Senator Young and me to take up and pass the Unity through Service Act.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 135—RECOGNIZING A CENTURY OF BROADCASTING EXCELLENCE FROM WOWO AND CELEBRATING THE RADIO STATION'S 100TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. BANKS (for himself and Mr. YOUNG) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

S. RES. 135

Whereas WOWO began in 1925 as one of the early radio stations in the United States and expanded into one of the strongest stations in the Midwest after joining CBS Radio Network in 1927;

Whereas, in true Hoosier fashion, WOWO was the first radio station to ever broadcast a basketball game;

Whereas, by the 1950s, WOWO became a popular station for news, sports, and entertainment, ushering Fort Wayne into the rock and roll era and serving as a home to beloved radio personalities like Bob Sievers;

Whereas, in the 1990s, WOWO evolved into the conservative talk radio powerhouse we know today;

Whereas WOWO has been a consistent source of well-articulated conservative values, from the trusted and reliable voices of local commentators like Pat Miller, Charly Butcher, and Kayla Blakeslee, to nationally syndicated figures like Rush Limbaugh and Sean Hannity;

Whereas WOWO has inspired and informed countless families in the United States about the issues that matter, and helped shape its community into a stronghold of conservative principles and common sense; and

Whereas WOWO has been affectionately known as "The Voice of a Thousand Main Streets", a fitting tribute to its deep roots in the heartland of the United States and its role in delivering news, conversation, and connection to its listeners: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) celebrates March 31, 2025, as WOWO's 100th anniversary on air;

(2) recognizes WOWO's record of exemplary broadcasting, which has strengthened communities and educated countless families on the most important issues; and

(3) supports WOWO's efforts to continue informing and inspiring generations to come.

SENATE RESOLUTION 136—AFFIRMING THE RULE OF LAW AND THE LEGITIMACY OF JUDICIAL REVIEW

Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. COONS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. WELCH,

Mr. PADILLA, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. OSSOFF, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. KELLY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 136

Resolved, That the Senate affirms that—

(1) Article III of the Constitution of the United States vests the “judicial Power of the United States . . . in one supreme Court, and in such inferior Courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish”;

(2) as Chief Justice Marshall held in the Supreme Court’s landmark 1803 decision *Marbury v. Madison*, “It is emphatically the province and duty of the judicial department to say what the law is”;

(3) the Constitution of the United States and established precedent require the executive branch to comply with all Federal court rulings; and

(4) if the executive branch disagrees with a ruling by a Federal court, it may appeal that ruling when authorized by law.

SENATE RESOLUTION 137—COMMENDING VOLKERT, INC. ON THE OCCASION OF ITS 100TH ANNIVERSARY AND ITS CENTURY OF SERVICE TO THE STATE OF ALABAMA AND THE UNITED STATES

Mr. TUBERVILLE (for himself and Mrs. BRITT) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 137

Whereas Volkert, Inc. was founded in 1925 and chartered “to act as Civil Engineers in all capacities”;

Whereas Volkert, Inc. established an office in Mobile, Alabama, in 1926, after being selected to develop the bridges of the Mobile Bay Causeway;

Whereas Volkert, Inc. played an integral role in the Mississippi River and Tributaries Project, following the Great Mississippi Flood of 1927;

Whereas, during World War II, Volkert, Inc. expanded the Alabama State Docks and developed dry docks for Liberty Ships in support of the war effort’s supply and logistics;

Whereas Volkert, Inc. partnered with the Waterman Steamship Company to expand the Port of Mobile and later became part of the Waterman Steamship Company under the leadership of David Volkert, an engineer and World War II test pilot;

Whereas, in 1946, Volkert, Inc. established its corporate headquarters in Mobile, Alabama, and in 1954, was acquired by David Volkert, who renamed the company in 1963;

Whereas Volkert, Inc. contributed to the early development of the National Interstate Highway System;

Whereas Volkert, Inc. designed the world’s longest bridge over water at the time, the Lake Pontchartrain Causeway in Louisiana, which opened in 1969;

Whereas Volkert, Inc. established an employee stock ownership plan, making the company 100 percent employee-owned;

Whereas Volkert, Inc. designed the Interstate 10 Twin Bridges, the Mobile Bayway, which opened in 1978;

Whereas Volkert, Inc. designed Interstate 565, connecting Huntsville, Alabama to the interstate system, which opened in 1991;

Whereas Volkert, Inc. led the development of Alabama’s only cable-stay bridge, the Cochrane Africatown Bridge in Mobile, Alabama, which opened in 1992;

Whereas Volkert, Inc. worked to preserve the USS *Alabama* and USS *Drum* in Battle-

ship Memorial Park, which is Alabama’s most visited attraction and a National Historic Landmark;

Whereas Volkert, Inc. designed the restoration of Alabama’s gulf coast at Bayou La Batre, following the catastrophic Hurricane Katrina;

Whereas Volkert, Inc. designed major infrastructure projects, including the interchange of Interstate 22 and Interstate 65 and the renewal of Interstate 59 in Birmingham, 2 of the largest transportation projects in the history of Alabama;

Whereas Volkert, Inc. has been inducted into the Alabama Engineering Hall of Fame, along with 3 of its leaders and 8 of its projects;

Whereas Volkert, Inc. continues to be headquartered in Mobile, Alabama, with over 1,500 employee owners in 60 offices across 25 States, including over 250 Alabamians;

Whereas Volkert, Inc. has consistently ranked among the top 100 engineering firms in the United States; and

Whereas Volkert, Inc. celebrated the 100th anniversary of its founding on February 4, 2025: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commends Volkert, Inc. on the occasion of its 100th anniversary and its century of service to the State of Alabama and the United States;

(2) recognizes Volkert, Inc. for its significant contributions to engineering, infrastructure, and economic development; and

(3) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to—

(A) the Chief Executive Officer and Chairman of the Board of Volkert, Inc., Mr. Thomas Hand; and

(B) the President and Chief Operating Officer of Volkert, Inc., Mr. Leon Barkan.

SENATE RESOLUTION 138—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF “DEEP VEIN THROMBOSIS AND PULMONARY EMBOLISM AWARENESS MONTH”

Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. LUJÁN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 138

Whereas deep vein thrombosis (referred to in this preamble as “DVT”) is a condition that occurs when a blood clot forms in the deep veins of the body, such as in the arm, abdomen, around the brain, and most commonly in the leg;

Whereas a potentially life-threatening complication of DVT is a pulmonary embolism (referred to in this preamble as a “PE”), where a blood clot breaks off, travels through the blood stream, and lodges in the lung;

Whereas DVT and PEs are serious but often preventable medical conditions;

Whereas DVT and PEs affect as many as 900,000 individuals in the United States each year;

Whereas DVT and PEs kill an estimated 60,000 to 100,000 individuals in the United States each year, and 1 out of 4 individuals who have a PE die without warning;

Whereas deaths caused by DVT and PEs are often preventable;

Whereas DVT and PEs are among the leading causes of preventable hospital deaths in the United States;

Whereas DVT and PEs are common complications faced by cancer patients, and survival rates are lower for individuals with cancer who also have blood clots;

Whereas pregnancy increases the risk of DVT and PEs, and that risk remains elevated for up to 3 months after giving birth;

Whereas immobility, surgery, older age, and a family history of clotting and thrombophilia increase the risk of DVT and PEs;

Whereas DVT and PEs contribute to up to \$10,000,000,000 in incremental medical costs each year in the United States; and

Whereas the establishment of March as “Deep Vein Thrombosis and Pulmonary Embolism Awareness Month” would raise awareness about these life-threatening but preventable conditions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of “Deep Vein Thrombosis and Pulmonary Embolism Awareness Month”; and

(2) recognizes the importance of raising awareness of deep vein thrombosis and pulmonary embolisms.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I have eight requests for committees to meet during today’s session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority Leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today’s session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 25, 2025, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a closed briefing.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 25, 2025, at 9:30 a.m., to consider a nomination.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 25, 2025, at 10:10 a.m., to consider a nomination.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 25, 2025, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 25, 2025, at 2 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 25, 2025, at 10 a.m., to conduct an open hearing followed by a closed hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CYBERSECURITY

The Subcommittee on Cybersecurity of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 25, 2025, at 2:30 p.m., to receive testimony in closed and open session.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SEAPOW

The Subcommittee on Seapower of the Committee on Armed Services is

authorized to meet in open session during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 25, 2025, at 2:30 p.m., to receive testimony.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF DEEP VEIN THROMBOSIS AND PULMONARY EMBOLISM AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 138, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 138) supporting the goals and ideals of "Deep Vein Thrombosis and Pulmonary Embolism Awareness Month".

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the

table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 138) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MARCH 26, 2025

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 10 a.m., Wednesday, March 26; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, morning business be closed, and the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of Calendar No. 39, James Bishop, postcloture, and at 11 a.m., the Senate vote on confirmation of the Bishop nomination; finally, if any nominations are confirmed during Wednes-

day's session, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 9:29 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, March 26, 2025, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 25, 2025:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

MICHAEL KRATSIOS, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

JAYANTA BHATTACHARYA, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH.

MARTIN MAKARY, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE COMMISSIONER OF FOOD AND DRUGS, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING CHAIRMAN RAÚL GRIJALVA: A LEGACY OF GRACE, GRIT, AND GOOD TROUBLE

HON. SYLVIA R. GARCIA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 2025

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to honor a friend, a colleague, and a leader who we have lost—someone whose absence we feel deeply.

To me, Raúl Grijalva will always be “Mr Chairman.”

Now, to be clear, I never served on a committee with Chairman Grijalva. But you didn’t need to be in committee to feel his presence. When he spoke, people listened. When he acted, it mattered. His leadership left a mark.

For more than two decades in Congress, Raúl was a force for good. A champion for Native communities, for our environment, for the God-given right to clean water and clean air—for the future of this country. He reminded us, over and over, that our fight isn’t just about the present—it’s for the generations coming after us. For the babies, he’d say, for the ones who will inherit this earth.

He never lost sight of who he was fighting for.

Whether he was standing up for Dreamers, workers, or tribal communities, Chairman Grijalva led with humility, with heart, and with an unwavering belief in doing what’s right. He gave voice to the voiceless—and he did it with grace and grit.

I was proud to serve alongside him in the Congressional Hispanic Caucus. My thoughts are with his family, his staff, and the people of Arizona, who he served with passion and purpose.

This Wednesday, my colleagues and I will travel to Tucson to say goodbye to a man of faith, a man of good trouble, a man we loved. I will wish him peace.

May God bless him, and may he rest in peace. (Que Dios te bendiga y que descanse en paz).

CELEBRATING THE 5TH YEAR OF ICECYCLE BUFFALO

HON. TIMOTHY M. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 2025

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the incredible impact of IceCycle Buffalo, an annual fundraising event held in Buffalo, New York, where participants engage in 45-minute indoor cycling sessions on ice to raise funds for cancer research and patient care programs at Roswell Park Comprehensive Cancer Center.

This unique event brings together 13 fitness studios and approximately 1,600 riders. Participants will take part in a 45-minute cycling

class on ice, all while raising funds for crucial research and programs at Roswell Park. Now in its fifth year, the Western New York fitness community is once again coining together for cancer patients everywhere. Each pedal stroke on their bike makes participants part of something bigger—helping to shape the future of cancer care and research.

Each year, more than 49,000 patients trust Roswell Park with their cancer journeys. By supporting IceCycle Buffalo, participants are ensuring that Roswell Park researchers and clinicians can continue to innovate and bring the newest, most cutting-edge treatments and technologies to cancer patients. Roswell Park develops cancer-fighting methods that were mere hopes a decade ago. With the help of donor support through events like IceCycle Buffalo, groundbreaking advancements are being made in the way cancer is diagnosed, treated, and ultimately cured.

Mr. Speaker, Roswell Park is committed to the care of the whole person. Their work extends beyond medical treatment to include the mental, emotional, and spiritual wellness of every patient. Participants in IceCycle Buffalo help to guarantee that Roswell Park’s leading experts can continue to run quality of life programs that support every patient and caregiver who steps through their doors. Through events like IceCycle Buffalo and the dedicated efforts of everyone involved, residents in Western New York continue making incredible strides in the fight against cancer, and we are all the better for it.

COMMEMORATING THE OPENING OF THE NATIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR MUSEUM IN ARLINGTON, TEXAS

HON. ROGER WILLIAMS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 2025

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on National Medal of Honor Day to commemorate the opening of the National Medal of Honor Museum in Arlington, Texas.

This museum is a one-of-a-kind tribute to those who risked and, in many cases, sacrificed their lives to save their fellow soldiers and others.

The Medal of Honor is our Nation’s highest military decoration for valor in combat by our heroes in the armed forces, symbolizing courage, sacrifice, commitment, integrity, citizenship, and patriotism.

Future generations must learn from history, remember those who came before us, and ensure that their stories are never forgotten.

Thank you to those who have dedicated their time to telling the stories of American patriots and preserving history for all to admire.

Let us continue to be inspired by the stories of our Nation’s heroes and promise to strive for greatness in our daily lives.

May God bless our servicemembers and their families.

May God bless Texas.

And may God bless the greatest country in the history of the world, the one we love and call, the United States of America.

In God We Trust.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOSH GOTTHEIMER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 2025

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Speaker, I missed the following votes, but had I been present, I would have voted: YES on Roll Call No. 72, and YES on Roll Call No. 73.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ADRIAN SMITH

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 2025

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted: YEA on Roll Call No. 72, and YEA on Roll Call No. 73.

DOE AND USDA INTERAGENCY RESEARCH ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 2025

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1326, the “DOE and USDA Interagency Research Act” which I was proud to introduce alongside my colleague and friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 1326 is a bipartisan bill that would authorize cross-cutting and collaborative research and development between the Department of Energy and the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Together these agencies can leverage their incredible capabilities to address some of our multi-disciplinary research challenges in crop science, biofuels, carbon storage, and precision agriculture technologies.

Codifying the partnership between these agencies would be a testament to our commitment to these communities, particularly rural America, and our climate.

The Science, Space, and Technology Committee generated substantial momentum through the bipartisan CHIPS and Science Act, which included research support towards agriculture productivity improvement goals. The DOE and USDA Interagency Research Act would sustain and strengthen this momentum in its entirety, by empowering deeper collaboration between these two agencies, enabling our research and agriculture communities to fully utilize the opportunities presented by a broad range of new emerging technologies.

• This “bullet” symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

With this, I encourage all my colleagues to support this bill.

CELEBRATING THE REMARKABLE
CAREER OF OTIS T. BARKER, SR.

HON. TIMOTHY M. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 2025

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Mr. Otis T. Barker, Sr. and his remarkable career of service to the City of Buffalo as he enters into retirement after many years of dedicated work. Mr. Barker is a lifelong resident of the City of Buffalo, raised in the Kenfield/Langfield neighborhood and received his education in the Buffalo Public Schools and at the State University of New York at Fredonia.

Mr. Barker's career began as a seasonal stock clerk for the Adam, Meldrum & Anderson department store, where he worked for 14 years. After several promotions, Mr. Barker became the company's first African American male to hold the executive title of buyer in its 125 year history. Soon after, Mr. Barker was hired by the former Deputy Speaker of the New York State Assembly, Arthur O. Eve, to serve as Chief of Staff from 1996 through 2002. This experience deepened his understanding of his community and the affairs of New York State.

After the retirement of Deputy Speaker Eve, Otis Barker joined then-New York State Senator Byron W. Brown's team as Director of Community Relations. When Senator Brown became Mayor of the City of Buffalo in 2006, Mr. Barker was appointed Director of the Division for Youth, where he managed the Mayor's Summer Youth Internship Program and the Mayor's Summer Reading Program. In 2011, Mr. Barker was promoted to Deputy Commissioner of the Department of Community Services and Recreational Programming, where he managed seven divisions, including Youth Services, Senior Services, Disabled Parking Permits, and Workforce Development. Later, in 2017, Mr. Barker was appointed Commissioner of Community Services and Recreational Programming, where his leadership and dedication continued to shape the city's services for the better.

Mr. Barker is a proud father of four children—Otis Jr., Jarred, Ondréa, and Peyton, and a grandfather to three—Destiny, Olivia, and Omeir. As he retires, Mr. Barker looks forward to spending more time with his family and finally getting some well-deserved rest.

Today, as Mr. Barker retires from his decades of dedicated service, we celebrate not only his professional accomplishments but also his dedication to mentorship, his commitment to his faith, and his tireless work to better the City of Buffalo. Please join me in congratulating Mr. Otis T. Barker, Sr. on a career well spent, and wishing him well as he enters this new chapter of his life.

HONORING LLOYD HENRY'S
DEDICATION TO PUBLIC SERVICE

HON. LLOYD SMUCKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 2025

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to congratulate and recognize Lloyd Henry for his 80 years of service to the Lampeter Fire Company.

Mr. Henry joined the Lampeter Fire Company on February 16, 1945, when he was 16 years old. His entry into the fire service came during an era where fire trucks consisted of Model-T Fords and when pumpers were still new to fire departments. From 1968 to 2002 he served as Fire Chief, where his penchant for adopting new technology and training transitioned the company into modernity. Throughout his many years of leadership, the Lampeter Fire Company became synonymous with reliability.

As a state master fire instructor, Mr. Henry traveled the Commonwealth to teach others, and he even assisted in writing the curriculum for a course at Penn State University.

Even when he left his role as fire chief, Mr. Henry continued to ride on fire engines until he was 80 years old.

Mr. Henry's son, Bob, characterizes his father as having his "heart and soul . . . in the fire service." As he hits a milestone 80 years with the Lampeter Fire Company, the community and I are beyond thankful for Lloyd Henry's dedication to keeping us safe.

CELEBRATING PHYLLIS
WHEATLEY COMMUNITY CEN-
TER'S 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ILHAN OMAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 2025

Ms. OMAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Phyllis Wheatley Community Center on its 100th anniversary. For a century, this incredible institution has been a beacon of hope, opportunity, and resilience for the people of North Minneapolis.

Since its founding in 1924, the Phyllis Wheatley Community Center has stood as a testament to the power of community-driven progress. It has uplifted generations through education, social services, and advocacy—ensuring that families, children, and individuals have access to the resources they need to thrive. This legacy of empowerment, equity, and inclusion is deeply woven into the fabric of our shared history and continues to serve as an inspiration for us all.

The center, originally created during the Jim Crow era as a settlement house, began as a lifeline for Black women studying at the University of Minnesota who were barred from living in university dorms. Over time, it evolved to serve the community in many other ways, offering social services, recreational activities, and a cultural gathering space for the growing Black population in North Minneapolis.

Throughout the decades, the center has weathered challenges with determination, adapted to evolving community needs, and remained steadfast in its commitment to justice

and opportunity for all. It is a pillar of strength and a cornerstone of progress for our community.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to celebrate the Phyllis Wheatley Community Center for its 100 years of service and to recognize the leadership, staff, volunteers, and supporters who have contributed to its legacy. The center's ability to provide sanctuary, build community, and uplift generations is a true testament to the resilience and spirit of the people it serves. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Phyllis Wheatley Community Center on its remarkable achievement, and 100th anniversary.

CELEBRATING 27 YEARS OF NA-
TIONAL ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN
IN CONSTRUCTION—BUFFALO NI-
AGARA CHAPTER 388

HON. TIMOTHY M. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 2025

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize and celebrate the National Association of Women in Construction, Buffalo Niagara Chapter 388, as they reflect on their remarkable journey since being organized in September 2020. Founded by Jillian Penkin, who had been an active member of the NAWIC Greater Rochester chapter for over a decade before relocating to the Buffalo area, the chapter was quickly established with the help of twenty-five other women in the construction industry.

The National Association of Women in Construction began in 1953 as "Women in Construction of Fort Worth, TX," founded by sixteen women working in the construction sector. At a time when women were a minority in the industry, the founders sought to create a supportive community for women in a male-dominated field. The organization's success led to its national charter in 1955, officially becoming the National Association of Women in Construction.

Today, the National Association of Women in Construction has expanded to more than 115 chapters across 44 states, the District of Columbia, and Guam and continues to grow. Dedicated to professional development, education, networking, leadership training, and public service, the organization has been a strong advocate for women in the construction industry. In 2019, it awarded thousands of dollars in scholarships to deserving individuals pursuing education in construction-related fields.

Women in Construction Week aims to spotlight women as a crucial and visible force in the construction industry. It also provides a meaningful opportunity for local chapters to contribute to their communities. During Women in Construction Week, the National Association of Women in Construction's thousands of members across the country come together to raise awareness about the wide range of opportunities for women in construction and emphasize the expanding role women play in the field.

Today, as we celebrate the National Association of Women in Construction Chapter 388 for their ongoing efforts to advance women's roles in this vital field, let us continue to uphold the vision of its founders, ensuring that

the contributions and impact of women builders, professionals, and tradeswomen are acknowledged across every facet of the construction industry.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. HILLARY J. SCHOLTEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 2025

Ms. SCHOLTEN. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on March 24, 2025. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 72, and YEA on Roll Call No. 73.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF DANIEL ROVERO

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 2025

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life and legacy of an eastern Connecticut legend and public servant, my friend, Danny Rovero. Danny sadly passed away on March 5, 2025, at age 87.

Danny's life was a testament to unwavering dedication, leaving behind a legacy that will resonate for generations. His journey, marked by service, entrepreneurship, and a deep-seated love for his community, stands as a beacon for all who aspire to make a lasting difference.

Danny Rovero was more than a public figure; he was an integral part of the fabric Connecticut's northeast corner, the towns of Killingly, Putnam, and Thompson. His roles as Vice Chair of the Killingly Board of Education, State Representative for the 51st District, and Mayor of Putnam were not mere titles, but expressions of his profound commitment to the people he served. To understand Danny Rovero, one must look beyond his accomplishments and see the heart of a man who genuinely cared.

Danny served as Mayor of Putnam from 1991 to 2005, the longest tenure in the town's rich history. Under his leadership, Putnam experienced a period of significant progress and stability. He understood the unique challenges faced by small towns and worked tirelessly to ensure their voices were heard—an approach to public service he took with him to the Connecticut General Assembly on behalf of the constituents he represented in the 51st District of the Connecticut State House of Representatives, where he served from 2011 to 2019. As a State Representative he was a voice for the overlooked and a champion for the underserved. His deep understanding of the region's needs, coupled with his pragmatic approach, earned him the respect and admiration of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

Beyond his political achievements, Danny Rovero was a successful businessman and entrepreneur. For 35 years, Rovero's Amoco gasoline station stood as a testament to his entrepreneurial spirit and dedication to providing essential services to his community. His business acumen, honed through years of hard work and perseverance, provided him with a unique perspective that he brought to his public service. He understood the chal-

lenges faced by small businesses and worked to create an environment where they could thrive.

His commitment to service extended beyond his professional and political life. As a Korean War Army veteran, he served his country with honor and distinction, spending 16 months in Korea. This experience shaped his character, instilling in him a sense of duty and a deep appreciation for the sacrifices made by those who serve.

His dedication to education was a hallmark of his later years. He understood that education is the cornerstone of a strong community and worked tirelessly to ensure that every child had access to quality education. His commitment to the Killingly Board of Education exemplified this dedication. His ability to listen, to understand, and to advocate for the needs of students and teachers alike made him an invaluable member of the board, where his presence was a source of strength and stability, and his contributions will be felt for years to come.

The outpouring of tributes and remembrance following his passing reflects the deep affection and respect that the community had for Danny. Friends, colleagues, and community members shared stories of his kindness, generosity, and unwavering dedication. His ability to connect with people from all walks of life was a testament to his genuine character. On a personal note, I was privileged to work with him during my time representing his beloved corner of Connecticut. He was a model to me of a public servant who listened to the people he represented and was always honest and ethical in his actions. He had a great sense of humor and never took himself too seriously. As the Irish say, "He never put on airs".

Danny Rovero was a man of integrity and compassion. He lived his life with purpose, always striving to make a positive impact on the world around him. His legacy is not just in the buildings he helped to build or the laws he helped to pass, but in the lives he touched and the hearts he inspired. He was a mentor, a friend, and a role model. He showed us the importance of service, the power of community, and the enduring value of integrity. His life was a testament to the belief that one person can make a difference.

In remembering Danny, we also remember the woman behind the public figure. He was a loving husband to his wife of 66 years, Judith, a devoted father to Ricardo, William, Jane, and Jill; a cherished grandfather to six, and a proud great-grandfather to two. His family was the center of his world, and his love for them was unwavering.

Today, I remember Danny as a dedicated public servant, an entrepreneur, a veteran who served his country with honor, and a family man who loved unconditionally. His legacy is etched in the hearts of the people he served and served with. His impact will be felt for generations to come. His life was a testament to the power of service, the importance of community, and the enduring value of integrity.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the life and legacy of Daniel Rovero as the quiet corner of eastern Connecticut mourns his passing.

CONGRATULATING NANCY GERMANSKY ON HER RETIREMENT

HON. LOIS FRANKEL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 2025

Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate my staff member, Nancy Germansky, on her recent retirement from my office.

Nancy grew up in New York City and moved to South Florida with her late husband, Stuart, where they raised their son, Henry. Nancy started serving the constituents of South Florida in 2007 as a Constituent Services Representative for Representative Ron Klein, continued her service with Representative Ted Deutch, and joined my office as a Constituent Liaison when I was elected to Congress in 2013. Covering a wide range of issues, Nancy assisted thousands of constituents over her career. She helped Veterans get the benefits they earned, ensured seniors had access to their Medicare, assisted with IRS issues, and so much more. Her calming presence and dedication to helping others made her an amazing advocate for our office, touching the lives of so many.

While it is sad to have Nancy leave our office, I wish her a very well-deserved retirement, full of travel, relaxation, and many more years of enjoyment ahead.

CELEBRATING POLISH-HUNGARIAN FRIENDSHIP DAY

HON. TIMOTHY M. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 2025

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and celebrate Polish-Hungarian Friendship Day, observed on March 23rd, an important occasion that honors the deep rooted historical ties and enduring friendship between Poland and Hungary. This day is a tribute to the centuries-long relationship between the two nations, built on mutual support, shared values, and a commitment to independence.

The bond between Poland and Hungary dates back over a thousand years, with moments of solidarity that have shaped the history of both countries. From the 13th century, when Polish and Hungarian royalty intermarried, to the shared struggles against foreign domination and the fight for independence, the two nations have stood together in times of adversity.

In the 20th century, the friendship between Poland and Hungary was again tested during both World Wars, where the peoples of both countries supported each other in the face of oppression. One of the most pivotal moments came during the 1956 Hungarian Uprising against Soviet control, which was met with strong support from the Polish people, solidifying the bond between the nations.

Polish-Hungarian Friendship Day was officially established in 2007 as a way to celebrate and strengthen these historical and cultural ties. On this day, both countries come together to celebrate their shared heritage through cultural performances, exhibitions, diplomatic meetings, and joint commemorations.

It is a day of mutual respect and admiration, where citizens of both Poland and Hungary honor the legacy of their friendship and the importance of international unity.

As we celebrate Polish-Hungarian Friendship Day, let us reflect on the values that have brought our nations together: freedom, solidarity, and a commitment to each other's well being. May this day continue to inspire future generations to uphold the bonds of friendship and work together for a stronger, more connected world.

CELEBRATING THE 145TH ANNIVERSARY OF TRINITY AFRICAN METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 2025

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join Trinity African Methodist Episcopal Church, the historic Church in Long Branch, New Jersey as it celebrates its 145th Anniversary this year. Since its incorporation in 1880, Trinity AME has provided a center for spiritual and community development to Monmouth County residents.

In 1995, the history of Trinity AME became nationally recognized when the church was added to the National Register of Historic Places. In 2015, Reverend Dr. Devereaux, Esq. made history as the first female pastor of Trinity AME. This congregation contributes generous efforts of outreach for our local community. Every week they show up for those in need with their Weekly Food Distribution program. Annually, they distribute turkeys to over 100 families and conduct a toy drive, which reached over 1,500 children last year. In addition to these efforts, existing programs to support seniors and women in leadership reflect their commitment to empower others at every stage in life. They have truly lifted and liberated their community.

Under the leadership of Rev. Dr. Devereaux, the church has undergone several community and refurbishment projects. Thanks to their vibrant ministry, congregants have access to a new fellowship hall, an updated Handicap ramp, membership to the youth choir, and a chance to learn from the Annual Remarkable Women in Community Service Awards Program recipients. Rev. Dr. Devereaux has also made efforts to collaborate with the local mayor, myself, and other faith leaders with initiatives such as Police & Youth Unity and the creation of the Long Branch Think Tank, committed to collaborating on issues at a local level. I am pleased to join the Trinity AME Family in coining together to mark the many glorious years of faith.

Mr. Speaker, once again, please join me in celebrating Trinity African Methodist Episcopal Church as its members and supporters celebrate its 145th Anniversary. Trinity AME is truly deserving of this body's recognition.

RECOGNIZING THE 55TH WING 85TH BIRTHDAY

HON. DON BACON

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 2025

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 85th birthday of the 55th Wing, the "Fightin' Fifty-Fifth", headquartered at Offutt Air Force Base in Nebraska. This Air Force organization is home to the thousands of men and women who dedicate their lives to providing global vigilance as a vital part of America's national defense. I am proud to count myself as a member of the Fightin' Fifty-Fifth, having served four tours of duty with the Wing and had the honor of serving as its commander from 2011 to 2012.

The 55th Wing traces its lineage back to the 55th Pursuit Group which was first constituted in November of 1940 and later activated at Hamilton Field, California, in January of 1941. The 55th deployed to England in 1943 flying P-38 Lightning and P-51 Mustang fighter aircraft as part of the "Mighty" Eighth Air Force. While providing escort for allied bombing missions during World War II, the 55th Pursuit Group earned two Distinguished Unit Citations, produced 16 fighter aces, and was credited with 90 air-to-air victories.

After World War II, in 1946, the group was deactivated, only to be reactivated less than a year later as the 55th Reconnaissance Group under the Strategic Air Command. By 1950, it would be designated the 55th Strategic Reconnaissance Wing, and in 1952 it was assigned to Forbes Air Force Base in Topeka, Kansas, operating the RB-50 Stratofortress and later the RB-47E Stratojet. During the Cold War, Airmen of the 55th Wing routinely conducted high-risk and politically sensitive reconnaissance missions along the frontiers of the Soviet Union, with frequent and sometimes deadly interactions with Soviet fighter aircraft.

In August of 1966, the 55th Wing moved to Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska, where it proudly resides to this day. During the height of the Cold War, the Wing took on nuclear command and control and 24/7 airborne alert missions flying the EC-135 Looking Glass and later, the E-4 National Emergency Airborne Command Post.

The Wing pivoted again after the fall of the Soviet Union, and in 1990 deployed its RC-135 Rivet Joint aircraft to the Middle East in support of Operation Desert Shield. Within a year, they would pivot to Operation Desert Storm, followed by Operation Southern Watch and later the Global War on Terror, providing real-time information for tactical forces, theater commanders, and national decision makers in what is believed to be the longest continuous deployment for a unit in U.S. military history.

Today, the 55th Wing is the largest wing in Air Combat Command, comprised of 6 groups, 31 squadrons, and 3 detachments located worldwide. It operates 48 aircraft, including multiple variants of the RC-135 and the EC-130H and EA-37B Compass Call electronic attack aircraft. The sun truly never sets on the Fightin' Fifty-Fifth.

Over the last 85 years of war and peace, missions and aircraft have come and gone, and operating locations have changed as the needs of the nation have evolved. Throughout it all, the men and women of the 55th Wing

have never wavered in their mission to fly, fight, and win. It is my great honor to recognize their achievements and salute their history today. Once again I say, happy birthday to the men and women of the Fightin' Fifty-Fifth.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BRITTANY PETTERSEN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 2025

Ms. PETTERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I recently gave birth and am unable to travel to D.C. to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 72, and YEA on Roll Call No. 73.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. HALEY M. STEVENS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 2025

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on the Legislative Day of March 24, 2025. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 72, and YEA on Roll Call No. 73.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 2025

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, due to airline schedules, my flight was delayed. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 72, and YEA on Roll Call No. 73.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF CONGRESSWOMAN NITA LOWEY

HON. RITCHIE TORRES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 2025

Mr. TORRES of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to our dear colleague, Nita Lowey, who served as the U.S. Representative for New York's 17th Congressional District from 1989 to 2021. Congresswoman Lowey made a profound and lasting impact on this body, and her dedication to public service will be remembered for years to come. Today, we reflect on her tireless work, her trailblazing leadership, and the legacy she leaves behind.

Representative Lowey's career was defined by her unwavering commitment to advancing key issues such as healthcare, women's rights, support for Israel, combating anti-Semitism, and the well-being of her constituents. In 2019, the Congresswoman made history as the first woman to serve as the chair of the House Appropriations Committee. Through this influential position, she played a critical role in shaping and directing the federal budget, ensuring that vital programs in healthcare,

education, and infrastructure received the funding they needed to thrive. As a strong advocate for healthcare, Representative Lowey played an active role in supporting the Affordable Care Act (ACA) and worked tirelessly to secure federal funding for services that benefited underserved communities. Her advocacy also extended to women's health, where she fought for access to reproductive healthcare and made sure that healthcare was available to women in need.

Beyond her healthcare work, Congresswoman Lowey was an outspoken advocate for women's rights and gender equality. She supported the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act and pushed for policies that promoted gender equality and women in leadership. The Congresswoman was also deeply committed to global issues, particularly U.S.-Israel relations, serving as a senior member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Her leadership led to the passage of the Nita M. Lowey Middle East Partnership for Peace Act. This bill provides extraordinary funding to foster economic cooperation between Israelis and Palestinians to help build lasting peace.

Representative Nita Lowey's legacy in Congress is one of tireless service, advocacy, and leadership. Her work in securing funding for healthcare, education, foreign aid, and her unwavering support for women's rights, Israel, and the Jewish people will continue to influence the policy agenda for years to come. As we move forward in Congress, let us remember the example she set—a reminder that public service is about improving the lives of others and fighting for what is right. I offer my deepest gratitude for her decades of dedicated service. My thoughts are with her family and loved ones as we honor her memory.

COMMERCIAL REMOTE SENSING AMENDMENT ACT OF 2025

SPEECH OF

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 2025

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1325, the "Commercial Remote Sensing Amendment Act of 2025."

I would like to thank the gentleman from Oklahoma, Congressman FRANK LUCAS, who was former Chair of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology where I serve as Ranking Member, for reintroducing this legislation. I am pleased to be an original cosponsor of this bill and continue working with Congressman LUCAS with whom I collaborated on our Committee's bipartisan work.

H.R. 1325 is a no-nonsense, good government bill that amends existing statute to conform with updated regulatory guidelines. This legislation also directs reporting to Congress on commercial remote sensing licensing, which is carried out under statutory authority granted to the Department of Commerce. H.R. 1325 provides Congress with the necessary transparency to carry out ongoing oversight of the Department's implementation of its authority and regulatory responsibilities.

Ensuring that our U.S. commercial space-based remote sensing industry leads the world is not only important for our economy, it is essential for securing the power that space-

based information has for our Nation—from natural disaster assessments and responses to precision agriculture and applied uses for national security. For example, commercial remote sensing images provide an important means of shining a light on the world's actions in a way that satellites designated for national security, or the intelligence community cannot. Commercial imagery of the advancement of Russia into Ukraine is but one example.

It is not surprising that several commercial remote sensing companies are in the Bay area of Northern California where my District is located. California is an incubator of space technology, and the Bay area and Silicon Valley are drivers of information technology innovation. Coupling commercial space-based remote sensing data with analytical tools and information technology is a force multiplier that augments and enables essential decision-support products.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the House to vote "YEA" on H.R. 1325, the "Commercial Remote Sensing Amendment Act of 2025."

CELEBRATING JOHN J. FLYNN AS THE IRISHMAN OF THE YEAR BY THE AMHERST GAELIC LEAGUE

HON. TIMOTHY M. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 2025

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize John J. Flynn, who served as the 41st District Attorney of Erie County, New York. Mr. Flynn is celebrated as Irishman of the Year by the Amherst Gaelic League at their 51st Irish Appreciation Party, an honor that reflects his distinguished career and significant contributions to the community.

Mr. Flynn, a Western New York native, graduated from East Aurora High School and Bowling Green State University with a degree in Political Science. He then joined the U.S. Navy, serving as Assistant Supply Officer aboard the USS *Cleveland* (LPD-7) in San Diego, deploying to the Western Pacific and serving during the Gulf War. After his naval service, he attended the University at Buffalo School of Law, continuing his Naval Reserve duties. Upon graduating in 1995, he returned to active duty in the Navy Judge Advocate General's Corps as a Navy attorney at Pensacola Naval Air Station, Florida, and was appointed as a Special Assistant United States Attorney.

In 2001, Mr. Flynn returned to Western New York, joining the Erie County District Attorney's Office as an Assistant District Attorney and quickly rising to the Homicide Bureau. He then entered private practice, working as a personal injury attorney and lecturing at SUNY Buffalo State from 2002 to 2016. Mr. Flynn served in the Naval Reserves until his retirement in 2017 with the rank of Commander and four additional Navy and Marine Corps Commendation Medals. His public service began in 2003 with his election to the Town of Tonawanda Town Board, followed by appointments as Town Justice in 2006, acting Buffalo City Court Judge, and Town Attorney in 2010. In 2016, Mr. Flynn was elected as Erie County District Attorney, taking office on January 1, 2017, and was re-elected in 2020 for a second term.

Mr. Speaker, John J. Flynn's remarkable career and dedication to public service stand as a powerful symbol of integrity, commitment, and leadership. His tireless work as District Attorney, his service in the Navy, and his deep involvement in the community exemplify his unwavering commitment to justice and progress. Mr. Flynn's recognition as Irishman of the Year by the Amherst Gaelic League is a fitting tribute to his lifelong contributions to both his heritage and the greater community. His efforts for justice, inclusivity, and service inspire us to embrace the values of unity and leadership, working toward a brighter, more united future for everyone.

RECOGNIZING AMANDA BREWER FOR WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

HON. DON BACON

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 2025

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize for Women's History Month, Amanda Brewer, Chief Executive Officer of Habitat for Humanity of Omaha, who has the heart of service for her community. Amanda was raised in Norfolk, Nebraska by her parents Michael and Kathleen Jedlicka, graduating from Norfolk Catholic High School, where she was instilled with the values of service, compassion, and community. She is married to her husband Kelly, and they have a pre-teen daughter, Lydia.

Amanda went on to graduate from DePaul University. Still, in 1997, she felt a call to serve and address inequities in the world that she had become aware of. So, she dropped everything and moved from the corporate world in Chicago to Georgia, where she became a full-time volunteer with Habitat for Humanity International.

Returning to Nebraska in 1999, she joined Habitat for Humanity of Omaha as an associate director. Six years later, she was named CEO and has served in that role faithfully and with a dedicated vision.

Becoming the top-ranked affiliate in families served in the U.S., Habitat for Humanity of Omaha has achieved remarkable growth and impact under Amanda's leadership. The organization serves five eastern Nebraska counties, has built and renovated thousands of homes, and developed transformative programs that empower families and strengthen communities.

Amanda knows that preserving communities goes beyond simply building homes. She has provided opportunities for families to create generational wealth through innovations such as education programs for homeowners about wealth transfer and heirs' rights. She has also implemented covenants to ensure long-term affordability through property tax limits and advocacy efforts. Her vision for communities also includes pioneering affordable housing initiatives, advocating for equitable homeownership opportunities, and launching partnerships far beyond traditional boundaries.

These accomplishments are monumental but not what Amanda cherishes most: the kindness and humanity she has seen in others during her 27 years of service. She fully embraces the idea that everyone has something valuable to offer and talents to share.

Answering the call to serve is an honorable quality in a person, and Amanda's story of courage, compassion, and commitment to others is a testimony to the power one person

can have when they answer that call. Generations of families will feel the ripple effect from her work leading Habitat for Humanity Omaha. She truly reflects a life that shows when

someone shifts from receiving to giving, a world can be created where everyone has hope, equity, and opportunity to thrive.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S1809–1839

Measures Introduced: Thirty-three bills and five resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1099–1131, S.J. Res. 38, and S. Res. 135–138.

Pages S1834–36

Measures Reported:

Special Report entitled “Review of Legislative Activity during the 118th Congress”. (S. Rept. No. 119–5)

Page S1834

Measures Passed:

Deep Vein Thrombosis and Pulmonary Embolism Awareness Month: Senate agreed to S. Res. 138, supporting the goals and ideals of “Deep Vein Thrombosis and Pulmonary Embolism Awareness Month”.

Page S1839

Message from the President: Senate received the following message from the President of the United States:

Transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the issuance of an Executive Order that takes additional steps with respect to the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13692 of March 8, 2015 (Blocking Property and Suspending Entry of Certain Persons Contributing to the Situation in Venezuela); which was referred to the Committee on Finance. (PM–17)

Page S1830

Lawrence Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Paul Lawrence, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

Pages S1810–14

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of Michael Faulkender, of Maryland, to be Deputy Secretary of the Treasury.

Page S1810

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination. **Page S1810**

Bishop Nomination—Agreement: Senate resumed consideration of the nomination of James Bishop, of North Carolina, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget. **Pages S1828–29**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 52 yeas to 47 nays (Vote No. EX. 144), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Pages S1828–29**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the nomination, post-cloture, at approximately 10 a.m., on Wednesday, March 26, 2025; and that at 11 a.m., Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination. **Page S1839**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By 74 yeas to 25 nays (Vote No. EX. 139), Michael Kratsios, of South Carolina, to be Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy.

Pages S1814–15, S1839

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 73 yeas to 25 nays (Vote No. EX. 138), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Page S1814**

By 53 yeas to 47 nays (Vote No. EX. 141), Jayanta Bhattacharya, of California, to be Director of the National Institutes of Health.

Pages S1815–23, S1839

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 53 yeas to 46 nays (Vote No. EX. 140), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Page S1815**

By 56 yeas to 44 nays (Vote No. EX. 143), Martin Makary, of Virginia, to be Commissioner of Food and Drugs, Department of Health and Human Services. **Pages S1823–28, S1839**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 56 yeas to 44 nays (Vote No. EX. 142), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Page S1823**

Messages from the House:

Pages S1830–31

Measures Referred:

Page S1831

Executive Communications:	Pages S1831–34
Executive Reports of Committees:	Page S1834
Additional Cosponsors:	Pages S1836–37
Additional Statements:	Pages S1829–30
Authorities for Committees to Meet:	Pages S1838–39

Record Votes: Seven record votes were taken today. (Total—144) **Pages S1814–15, S1823, S1828–29**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 9:29 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Wednesday, March 26, 2025. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S1839.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEMS

Committee on Armed Services: Committee received a closed briefing on the Department of Defense strategy on countering unmanned aerial systems from Leigh E. Nolan, performing the duties of Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Homeland Defense and Hemispheric Affairs, Douglas A. Beck, Director, Defense Innovation Unit, General Gregory M. Guillot, USAF, Commander, United States Northern Command and North American Aerospace Defense Command, and Rear Admiral Paul C. Spedero, Jr., USN, Vice Director for Operations, Joint Staff, all of the Department of Defense.

AI CYBER CAPABILITIES

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Cybersecurity concluded open and closed hearings to examine harnessing artificial intelligence cyber capabilities, after receiving testimony from Kathleen Fisher, Director, Innovation Information Office, Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, Margaret Palmieri, Acting Director, Chief Digital and Artificial Intelligence Office, Mitch Crosswait, Deputy Director, Operational Test and Evaluation, Net-Centric, Space and Missile Defense Systems, and Lieutenant General William J. Hartman, USA, Deputy Commander, United States Cyber Command, all of the Department of Defense; Jim Mitre, RAND Global and Emerging Risks; David Ferris, Cohere; and Dan Tadross, Scale AI.

SHIPBUILDING

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Seapower concluded a hearing to examine the state of conventional surface shipbuilding, after receiving testimony from Brett A. Seidle, Acting Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development,

and Acquisition, and Vice Admiral James P. Downey, USN, Commander, Naval Sea Systems Command, Department of the Navy, both of the Department of Defense; and Shelby S. Oakley, Director, Contracting and National Security Acquisitions, Government Accountability Office.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Finance: Committee ordered favorably reported to consider the nomination of Mehmet Oz, of Pennsylvania, to be Administrator of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Frank Bisignano, of New Jersey, to be Commissioner of Social Security Administration for the term expiring January 19, 2031, after the nominee testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Reed Rubinstein, of Maryland, to be Legal Adviser, who was introduced by Senator Cruz, Mike Huckabee, of Arkansas, to be Ambassador to the State of Israel, who was introduced by Senator Boozman, and Kevin Cabrera, of Florida, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Panama, who was introduced by Senator Scott (FL), all of the Department of State, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

CENSORSHIP INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on the Constitution concluded hearings to examine the censorship industrial complex, after receiving testimony from Mollie Hemingway, The Federalist, Jonathan Turley, and Mary Anne Franks, both of The George Washington University Law School, and Gabe Rottman, Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press, all of Washington, D.C.; and Benjamin Weingarten, Essex Falls, New Jersey.

WORLDWIDE THREATS

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee concluded open and closed hearings to examine worldwide threats, after receiving testimony from Tulsi Gabbard, Director, National Intelligence; John Ratcliffe, Director, Central Intelligence Agency; Kash P. Patel, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice; Timothy D. Haugh, Director, National Security Agency/Central Security Service; and Jeffrey A. Kruse, Director, Defense Intelligence Agency, Department of Defense.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 38 public bills, H.R. 17, 2313–2349; and 8 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 21; and H. Res. 247–253 were introduced. **Pages H1271–74**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H1275–76**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H. Con. Res. 9, authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers Memorial Service and the National Honor Guard and Pipe Band Exhibition (H. Rept. 119–39); and

H.R. 1526, to amend title 28, United States Code, to limit the authority of district courts to provide injunctive relief, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 119–40). **Page H1271**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Bost to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H1223**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:52 a.m. and reconvened at 12 p.m. **Page H1229**

Library of Congress Trust Fund Board—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of the following individual on the part of the House to the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board for a five-year term: Mr. Steven L. Swig of San Francisco, California. **Page H1232**

Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of the following individual on the part of the House to the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention for a two-year term: Mr. Julian Whittington of Benton, Louisiana. **Page H1232**

Suspension—Proceedings Resumed: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure. Consideration began Monday, March 24th. IMPACT Act: H.R. 1534, to strengthen and enhance the competitiveness of American industry through the research and development of advanced technologies to improve the efficiency of cement, concrete, and asphalt production, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ yeas-and-nay vote of 350 yeas to 73 nays, Roll No. 74. **Page H1239**

Defending Education Transparency and Ending Rogue Regimes Engaging in Nefarious Transactions Act: The House considered H.R. 1048, to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to strengthen disclosure requirements relating to foreign gifts and contracts, to prohibit contracts be-

tween institutions of higher education and certain foreign entities and countries of concern. Consideration is expected to resume Thursday, March 27th. **Pages H1241–60**

Pursuant to the Rule, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Workforce now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 119–1 shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. **Pages H1247–53**

Agreed to:

Ogles amendment (No. 1 printed in H. Rept. 119–38) that includes any special administrative region or other territory within one of the covered nations referenced in the bill within the bill's definition of a "foreign country of concern"; and **Pages H1253–54**

Ogles amendment (No. 2 printed in H. Rept. 119–38) that amends the definition of 'foreign entity of concern' to include Chinese military companies identified on the list required by section 1260H of the FY2021 NDAA (colloquially referred to as the "Section 1260H list"). **Page H1254**

Proceedings Postponed:

Scott (VA) amendment (No. 3 printed in H. Rept. 119–38) that seeks to amend Section 117 to streamline foreign gift and contract reporting, aligns reporting with other federal research security compliance requirements, establishes common-sense sanctions for noncompliance and requires the Secretary of Education to conduct negotiated rulemaking to receive stakeholder feedback; **Pages H1254–57**

Self amendment (No. 4 printed in H. Rept. 119–38) that seeks to amend the threshold value at which gifts must be reported from \$50,000 to \$1; **Pages H1257–58**

Tlaib amendment (No. 5 printed in H. Rept. 119–38) that seeks to amend the definition of "Foreign Country of Concern" to include any country that is defending a case before the International Court of Justice relating to an alleged violation of the Geneva Conventions of 1949 or their Additional Protocols or the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide; and to include any country the government of which includes officials that have outstanding arrest warrants issued by the International Criminal Court; and **Pages H1258–59**

Tlaib amendment (No. 6 printed in H. Rept. 119–38) that seeks to amend the definition of "Investment of Concern" to include any entity that the

Secretary of State determines consistently, knowingly, and directly facilitates and enables state violence and repression, war and occupation, or severe violations of international law and human rights.

Pages H1259–60

H. Res. 242, the rule providing for consideration of the joint resolutions (H.J. Res. 24) and (H.J. Res. 75) and the bill (H.R. 1048) was agreed to by a recorded vote of 214 ayes to 207 noes, Roll No. 76, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 215 yeas to 208 nays, Roll No. 75.

Pages H1232–38, H1239–41

Presidential Message: Received a message from the President transmitting a notification of the issuance of an Executive Order that takes additional steps with respect to the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13692 of March 8, 2015 (Blocking Property and Suspending Entry of Certain Persons Contributing to the Situation in Venezuela)—referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed (H. Doc. 119–32).

Pages H1270–71

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appears on page H1231–32.

Quorum Calls Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes and one recorded vote developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H1239, H1240, and H1240–41.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 5:38 p.m.

Committee Meetings

THE COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION AT 50: EXAMINING THE PAST AND FUTURE OF COMMODITY MARKETS

Committee on Agriculture: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “The CFTC at 50: Examining the Past and Future of Commodity Markets”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MEMBER DAY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled “Member Day”. Testimony was heard from Representatives Griffith and Kaptur.

CAPITOL COMPLEX PUBLIC SAFETY AND SECURITY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Legislative Branch held a hearing entitled “Capitol Complex Public Safety and Security”. Testimony was

heard from J. Thomas Manger, Chief, U.S. Capitol Police.

POSTURE AND READINESS OF THE MOBILITY ENTERPRISE

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Readiness; and Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces held a joint hearing entitled “Posture and Readiness of the Mobility Enterprise”. Testimony was heard from General Randall Reed, U.S. Air Force, Commander, U.S. Transportation Command.

THE FUTURE OF WAGE LAWS: ASSESSING THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT’S EFFECTIVENESS, CHALLENGES, AND OPPORTUNITIES

Committee on Education and Workforce: Subcommittee on Workforce Protections held a hearing entitled “The Future of Wage Laws: Assessing the FLSA’s Effectiveness, Challenges, and Opportunities”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

KEEPING THE LIGHTS ON: EXAMINING THE STATE OF REGIONAL GRID RELIABILITY

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Energy held a hearing entitled “Keeping the Lights On: Examining the State of Regional Grid Reliability”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING

Committee on Ethics: Full Committee held an organizational meeting. The Committee adopted its Rules for the 119th Congress.

BEYOND SILICON VALLEY: EXPANDING ACCESS TO CAPITAL ACROSS AMERICA

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Beyond Silicon Valley: Expanding Access to Capital Across America”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

STREAMLINED AND RIGHTSIZED: CONSOLIDATING STATE DEPARTMENT ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Middle East and North Africa held a hearing entitled “Streamlined and Rightsized: Consolidating State Department Administrative Services”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

METALS, MINERALS, AND MINING: HOW THE CHINESE COMMUNIST PARTY FUELS CONFLICT AND EXPLOITATION IN AFRICA

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Africa held a hearing entitled “Metals, Minerals, and Mining: How the CCP Fuels Conflict and Exploitation

in Africa”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

PART 1: CONSEQUENCES OF FAILURE: HOW BIDEN’S POLICIES FUELED THE BORDER CRISIS

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Border Security and Enforcement held a hearing entitled “Part 1: Consequences of Failure: How Biden’s Policies Fueled the Border Crisis”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Counterterrorism and Intelligence held a markup on H.R. 1327, the “Syria Terrorism Threat Assessment Act”; H.R. 1508, the “DHS Special Events Program and Support Act”; H.R. 1736, the “Generative AI Terrorism Risk Assessment Act”; H.R. 2116, the “Law Enforcement Support and Counter Transnational Repression Act”; H.R. 2139, the “Strengthening State and Local Efforts to Counter Transnational Repression Act”; H.R. 2158, the “Countering Transnational Repression Act of 2025”; H.R. 2212, the “DHS Intelligence Rotational Assignment Program and Law Enforcement Support Act”; H.R. 2259, the “National Strategy for School Security Act of 2025”; H.R. 2261, the “Strengthening Oversight of DHS Intelligence Act”; and H.R. 2285, the “DHS Basic Training Accreditation Improvement Act of 2025”. H.R. 1327, H.R. 1508, H.R. 1736, H.R. 2116, H.R. 2139, H.R. 2158, H.R. 2212, H.R. 2259, H.R. 2261, and H.R. 2285 were forwarded to the full Committee, without amendment.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 60, the “Knife Owners’ Protection Act of 2025”; H.R. 2243, the “LEOSA Reform Act of 2025”; H.R. 2240, the “Improving Law Enforcement Officer Safety and Wellness Through Data Act of 2025”; H.R. 2255, the “Federal Law Enforcement Officer Service Weapon Purchase Act”; H.R. 2267, the “NICS Data Reporting Act”; H.R. 38, the “Constitutional Concealed Carry Reciprocity Act”; and H.R. 2184, the “Firearm Due Process Protection Act”. H.R. 60, H.R. 2243, H.R. 2240, H.R. 2255, H.R. 2267, H.R. 38, and H.R. 2184 were ordered reported, as amended.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Water, Wildlife and Fisheries held a hearing on H.R. 276, the “Gulf of America Act”; H.R. 845, the “Pet and Livestock Protection Act”; H.R. 1897, the “ESA Amendments Act”; and H.R. 1917, the

“Great Lakes Mass Marking Program Act”. Testimony was heard from Chairman Westerman, and Representatives Greene of Georgia, Boebert, and Dingell; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 1295, the “Reorganizing Government Act of 2025”; H.R. 1210, the “Protecting Taxpayers’ Wallets Act”; H.R. 2249, the “Preserving Presidential Management Authority Act”; H.R. 2174, the “Paycheck Protection Act”; H.R. 2193, the “FEHB Protection Act of 2025”; H.R. 2277, the “Federal Accountability Committee for Transparency Act”; H.R. 2056, the “District of Columbia Federal Immigration Compliance Act”; H. Res. 187, of inquiry requesting the President to transmit certain information to the House of Representatives referring to the termination, removal, placement on administrative leave, moved to another department of Federal employees and Inspectors General of agencies; and H. Res. 186, of inquiry requesting the President to transmit certain documents to the House of Representatives relating to the conflicts of interest of Elon Musk and related information. H.R. 1295, H.R. 1210, H.R. 2249, H.R. 2174, H.R. 2193, H.R. 2277, and H.R. 2056 were ordered reported, as amended.

REFORMING FEMA: BRINGING COMMON SENSE BACK TO FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management held a hearing entitled “Reforming FEMA: Bringing Common Sense Back to Federal Emergency Management”. Testimony was heard from Chris Currie, Director, Homeland Security and Justice, Government Accountability Office; Kevin Guthrie, Executive Director, Florida Division of Emergency Management; Jamie Laughter, County Manager, Transylvania County, North Carolina; and a public witness.

MISSION INCOMPLETE: STRENGTHENING THE TRANSITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM TO ENSURE A SMOOTHER TRANSITION TO CIVILIAN LIFE FOR TOMORROW’S VETERANS

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity held a hearing entitled “Mission Incomplete: Strengthening the TAP Program to Ensure a Smoother Transition to Civilian Life for Tomorrow’s Veterans”. Testimony was heard from Alex Baird, Director, Defense Support Services Center, Department of Defense; John Green, Acting Executive Director, Outreach, Transition, and Economic

Development, Department of Veterans Affairs; Regina Yount, Assistant Director, Outreach, Transition, and Economic Development, Department of Veterans Affairs; Margarita Devlin, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Operations and Management, Veterans' Employment and Training Service, Department of Labor; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Health held a markup on H.R. 217, the "CHIP IN for Veterans Act"; H.R. 1969, the "No Wrong Door for Veterans Act"; H.R. 1971, the "Veterans Supporting Prosthetics Opportunities and Recreational Therapy Act"; H.R. 1823, the "VA Budget Accountability Act"; H.R. 1107, the "Protecting Veteran Access to Telemedicine Services Act"; H.R. 1336, the "Veterans National Traumatic Brain Injury Act"; H.R. 658, to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish qualifications for the appointment of a person as a marriage and family therapist, qualified to provide clinical supervision, in the Veterans Health Administration; H.R. 1644, the "Copay Fairness for Veterans Act"; and H.R. 1860, the "Women Veterans Cancer Care Coordination Act". H.R. 217, H.R. 1971, H.R. 1107, H.R. 1644, H.R. 1860, H.R. 1823, and H.R. 658 were forwarded to the full Committee, without amendment. H.R. 1969 and H.R. 1336 were forwarded to the full Committee, as amended.

BREAKING DOWN BARRIERS: GETTING VETERANS ACCESS TO LIFESAVING CARE

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled "Breaking Down Barriers: Getting Veterans ACCESS to Lifesaving Care". Testimony was heard from Maria D. Llorente, Acting Undersecretary for Health, Office of Integrated Veterans Care, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; and public witnesses.

AMERICAN TRADE NEGOTIATION PRIORITIES

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Trade held a hearing entitled "American Trade Negotiation Priorities". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, MARCH 26, 2025

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, to hold open hearings to examine the United States Strategic Command and United States Space Command in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2026 and Future Years Defense Program; to be immediately followed by a closed session in SVC-217, 9:30 a.m., SD-106.

Subcommittee on Personnel, to hold an oversight hearing to examine the status of the Military Service Academies, 2:30 p.m., SR-222.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Brian Nesvik, of Wyoming, to be Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and Jessica Kramer, of Wisconsin, and Sean Donahue, of Florida, both to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, 10 a.m., SD-406.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings to examine Indo-Pacific alliances and burden sharing in today's geopolitical environment, 10 a.m., SD-419.

Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere, Transnational Crime, Civilian Security, Democracy, Human Rights, and Global Women's Issues, to hold hearings to examine People's Republic of China influence and the status of Taiwan's diplomatic allies in the Western Hemisphere, 2:30 p.m., SD-419.

Committee on the Judiciary: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Patrick David Davis, of Maryland, John Andrew Eisenberg, of Virginia, and Brett Shumate, of Virginia, each to be an Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, 10:15 a.m., SD-226.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to receive a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH-219.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies, oversight hearing on the National Transportation Safety Board, 9:30 a.m., 2358-A Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Intelligence and Special Operations, hearing entitled "U.S. Special Operations Forces and Command—Challenges and Resource Priorities for Fiscal Year 2026", 3:30 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade, hearing entitled "The World Wild Web: Examining Harms Online", 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Subcommittee on Financial Institutions, hearing entitled "A New Era for the CFPB: Balancing Power and Reprioritizing Consumer Protections", 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Subcommittee on Delivering on Government Efficiency, hearing entitled “Anti-American Airwaves: Accountability for the Heads of NPR and PBS”, 10 a.m., HVC–210.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Subcommittee on Environment, hearing entitled “To the Depths, and Beyond: Examining Blue Economy Technologies”, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Highways and Transit, hearing entitled “America Builds: How Trucking Supports American Communities”, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs, hearing on H.R. 647, the “Ensuring Veterans’ Final Resting Place Act of 2025”; H.R. 1039, the “Clear Communication for Veterans Claims Act”; H.R. 1228, the “Prioritizing Veterans’ Survivors Act”; H.R. 1286, the “Simplifying Forms for

Veterans Claims Act”; H.R. 1344, the “Dennis and Lois Krisfalussy Act; legislation on the Veterans’ Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2025; legislation on the Review Every Veterans Claim Act of 2025; legislation on the Veteran Appeals Transparency Act of 2025; legislation on the Improving VA Training for Military Sexual Trauma Claims Act; legislation on the Veterans Claims Education Act; legislation on the Survivors Benefits Delivery Improvement Act of 2025; and legislation on the Board of Veterans Appeals’ Attorney Retention and Backlog Reduction Act, 10:15 a.m., 360 Cannon.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Annual Worldwide Threats Hearing”, 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Full Committee, hearing entitled “Annual Worldwide Threats Hearing”, 2 p.m., HVC–304. This hearing is closed.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Wednesday, March 26

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Senate will continue consideration of the nomination of James Bishop, of North Carolina, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget, post-cloture, and vote on confirmation thereon at 11 a.m.

Following disposition of the nomination of James Bishop, Senate will vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Aaron Reitz, of Texas, to be an Assistant Attorney General. If cloture is invoked on the nomination, Senators should expect a vote on confirmation of the nomination following a period of debate.

Additional roll call votes are expected.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Wednesday, March 26

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Begin consideration of H.J. Res. 75—Providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy relating to “Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Commercial Refrigerators, Freezers, and Refrigerator Freezers”.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Bacon, Don, Nebr., E250, E251
Courtney, Joe, Conn., E249
Frankel, Lois, Fla., E249
Garcia, Sylvia R., Tex., E247
Gottheimer, Josh, N.J., E247

Kennedy, Timothy M., N.Y., E247, E248, E248, E249, E251
Lofgren, Zoe, Calif., E247, E251
Omar, Ilhan, Minn., E248
Pallone, Frank, Jr., N.J., E250
Pettersen, Brittany, Colo., E250
Scholten, Hillary J., Mich., E249

Smith, Adrian, Nebr., E247
Smucker, Lloyd, Pa., E248
Stevens, Haley M., Mich., E250
Torres, Ritchie, N.Y., E250
Webster, Daniel, Fla., E250
Williams, Roger, Tex., E247



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at www.govinfo.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087-390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are