



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 119th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 171

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, DECEMBER 12, 2025

No. 210

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, December 15, 2025, at 3 p.m.

House of Representatives

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 12, 2025

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

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

Receive us into Your presence, O God, and accept our offerings of praise and the intentions of our hearts, for we come before You just as we are, with deep desires to serve You faithfully in this place where what we do has impact on our communities and our country, on our neighbors as well as on this Nation.

With our eyes on You, may we be disinclined to assume that it is our success, our influence, or our efforts that will matter at the end of the day.

Rather, help us to see that when we live the lives You have called us to, when we are obedient to Your law, when we demonstrate Your compassion, when we humble ourselves to Your divine plan, our work should reveal Your impact on each of us and Your power over this world.

God, You so love us that You, knowing both our strengths and weaknesses, our character and our quirks, nonetheless, You not only receive us, You use us to do the work of Your kingdom even here.

Enable us, then, to be good and faithful servants that we may share in Your eternal joy.

It is in the strength of Your name we pray.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. 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. Will the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. DAVIS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

IMPORTANCE OF NDAA PASSAGE

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

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to recognize the importance of the House's passage of the 2026 National Defense Authorization Act earlier this week.

The 2026 NDAA codifies critical provisions of President Trump's peace through strength agenda, including au-

thorizing full funding for the Sentinel ICBM program. The Sentinel program is set to provide essential upgrades to the land-based component of our nuclear triad.

I thank the airmen, the security forces, the missileers, everyone at Malmstrom Air Force Base in Great Falls, Montana, for their continued hard work on the initial planning and construction phases of this project.

Nuclear deterrence is the bedrock of our national security. As China and Russia rapidly expand their arsenals and modernize their missile capabilities, we cannot fall behind.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on continuing congressional support for Sentinel as this program progresses.

THANKING MACKENZIE SCOTT

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to note the extraordinary act of patriotism of one of our fellow citizens. I rise today to thank MacKenzie Scott, formerly the wife of Jeff Bezos, for donating \$50 million to Bowie State University, the largest single contribution in the school's history.

Bowie State University is not only Maryland's oldest HBCU; it is one of our State's finest higher education institutions, period.

MacKenzie Scott's generous gift will help make Bowie State University even more affordable and support the

□ 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.

H5813

groundbreaking research its students produce every day.

With her historic donations to Bowie State University, Morgan State University, and the University of Maryland Eastern Shore, MacKenzie has proven herself to be an honorary Marylander, an American who cares about investing in our future, an American who understands the critical importance of education in our State, in our Nation, and for our kids and for our future. I thank MacKenzie Scott.

HEALTHCARE AND AFFORDABILITY

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

Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I began this week in my district at Penn State Abington's new Collegiate Recovery Program with students in recovery for drug or alcohol addiction or who have been affected by others with addiction.

It is a place for students to be in community with each other and with professors and experts in addiction and recovery. How I wish every school and every family would have such an opportunity.

What are we doing here in D.C.? The President and Republicans in Congress are ripping the hope of recovery away for so many, slashing and shuttering SAMHSA, the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration.

Their big, beautiful bill gutted nearly \$1 trillion from Medicaid. In my State, 100,000 people through Medicaid have access to treatment and to recovery. That is in jeopardy.

In 19 days, ACA tax credits will expire, spiking premiums overnight. Mr. Speaker, 30,000 Pennsylvanians have already dropped coverage. By the end of January, it is estimated by my Governor that 150,000 will be without insurance.

The students I met with are so young. They have people and resources on their side. I have such hope for them. We should want the same for everyone.

WE DON'T NEED ANOTHER REGIME-CHANGE WAR

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

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to sound the alarm on the military buildup in the Caribbean, edging us closer to a regime-change war in Venezuela.

The Trump administration has sent the USS *Gerald R. Ford* aircraft carrier, our largest aircraft carrier. Mr. Speaker, 10 percent of our Navy is in the Caribbean, including destroyers and submarines.

We have got 15,000 troops in Florida and Puerto Rico, including marines

who are ready for amphibious landings, and we have F-35s and B-52s flying across the Caribbean and Venezuelan airspace.

After Iraq, after Libya, after 20 years in Afghanistan, after Yemen, we do not need another regime-change war. It is time for the American people to oppose a regime-change war in Venezuela.

PUTTING UP POINTS ON THE SCOREBOARD

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

Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, here is the scoreboard. It seems the game of mid-decade redistricting is still ongoing. I commend Indiana for recognizing that this isn't good for democracy, and it is not good for our country.

It is wrong for Democrats and it is wrong for Republicans to draw maps mid-decade for the sole purpose of putting up points on the scoreboard, which is why I introduced the RESET Act and call on Congress to pass it. Congress must restore electoral stability to enhance trust.

With elections every other year, imagine assemblies across the country waiting to see the results, only to redraw the congressional districts to run up the points. The people deserve better. The people deserve their voices to be heard. We must put our constituents first. Stop the political gamesmanship and bring this redistricting madness to an end.

CONGRATULATING SOUTH SIDE HIGH SCHOOL GIRLS' VOLLEYBALL TEAM

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

Ms. GILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with great pride to congratulate South Side High School's girls' volleyball team on winning the New York State Class A girls' volleyball championship.

On behalf of Nassau County and New York's Fourth Congressional District, I want to take this opportunity to commend and celebrate these young athletes for their dedication, their teamwork, and their perseverance.

This year's championship marks South Side's second State title in program history and its first since 1993, a testament to the strong foundation built by players and coaches over many, many years.

I congratulate the Cyclones on their remarkable victory. They have made Rockville Centre and New York's Fourth Congressional District very proud.

□ 0910

APPOINTMENT OF INDIVIDUALS TO THE COMMISSION TO STUDY THE POTENTIAL TRANSFER OF THE WEITZMAN NATIONAL MUSEUM OF AMERICAN JEWISH HISTORY TO THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MOORE of Utah). The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to section 2(b)(2) of the Commission to Study the Potential Transfer of the Weitzman National Museum of American Jewish History to the Smithsonian Institution Act (Public Law 118-144), and the order of the House of January 3, 2025, of the following individuals on the part of the House to the Commission to Study the Potential Transfer of the Weitzman National Museum of American Jewish History to the Smithsonian Institution:

Mr. Paul Packer, Boca Raton, Florida

Mr. Michael Goldfarb, McLean, Virginia

IMPROVING INTERAGENCY COORDINATION FOR PIPELINE REVIEWS ACT

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 936, I call up the bill (H.R. 3668) to promote interagency coordination for reviewing certain authorizations under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas). Pursuant to House Resolution 936, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3668

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 "Improving Interagency Coordination for Pipeline Reviews Act".

SEC. 2. PROMOTING INTERAGENCY COORDINATION FOR REVIEW OF NATURAL GAS PIPELINES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COMMISSION.—The term "Commission" means the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

(2) FEDERAL AUTHORIZATION.—The term "Federal authorization" has the meaning given that term in section 15(a) of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717n(a)).

(3) NEPA REVIEW.—The term "NEPA review" means the process of reviewing a proposed Federal action under section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332).

(4) PROJECT-RELATED NEPA REVIEW.—The term "project-related NEPA review" means any NEPA review required to be conducted with respect to the issuance of an authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act.

(b) COMMISSION NEPA REVIEW RESPONSIBILITIES.—In acting as the lead agency under section 15(b)(1) of the Natural Gas Act for

the purposes of complying with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) with respect to an authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act, the Commission shall, in accordance with this section and other applicable Federal law—

(1) be the only lead agency;

(2) coordinate as early as practicable with each agency designated as a participating agency under subsection (d)(3) to ensure that the Commission develops information in conducting its project-related NEPA review that is usable by the participating agency in considering an aspect of an application for a Federal authorization for which the agency is responsible; and

(3) take such actions as are necessary and proper to facilitate the expeditious resolution of its project-related NEPA review.

(c) **DEFERENCE TO COMMISSION.**—In making a decision with respect to a Federal authorization required with respect to an application for authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act, each agency shall give deference, to the maximum extent authorized by law, to the scope of the project-related NEPA review that the Commission determines to be appropriate.

(d) **PARTICIPATING AGENCIES.**—

(1) **IDENTIFICATION.**—The Commission shall identify, not later than 30 days after the Commission receives an application for an authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act, any Federal or State agency, local government, or Indian Tribe that may issue a Federal authorization or is required by Federal law to consult with the Commission in conjunction with the issuance of a Federal authorization required for such authorization or certificate.

(2) **INVITATION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 45 days after the Commission receives an application for an authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act, the Commission shall invite any agency identified under paragraph (1) to participate in the review process for the applicable Federal authorization.

(B) **DEADLINE.**—An invitation issued under subparagraph (A) shall establish a deadline by which a response to the invitation shall be submitted to the Commission, which may be extended by the Commission for good cause.

(3) **DESIGNATION AS PARTICIPATING AGENCIES.**—Not later than 60 days after the Commission receives an application for an authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act, the Commission shall designate an agency identified under paragraph (1) as a participating agency with respect to an application for authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act unless the agency informs the Commission, in writing, by the deadline established pursuant to paragraph (2)(B), that the agency—

(A) has no jurisdiction or authority with respect to the applicable Federal authorization;

(B) has no special expertise or information relevant to any project-related NEPA review; or

(C) does not intend to submit comments for the record for the project-related NEPA review conducted by the Commission.

(4) **EFFECT OF NON-DESIGNATION.**—

(A) **EFFECT ON AGENCY.**—Any agency that is not designated as a participating agency under paragraph (3) with respect to an application for an authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act may not request or conduct a NEPA review that is supplemental to the project-related NEPA review conducted by the Commission, unless the agency—

(i) demonstrates that such review is legally necessary for the agency to carry out responsibilities in considering an aspect of an application for a Federal authorization; and

(ii) requires information that could not have been obtained during the project-related NEPA review conducted by the Commission.

(B) **COMMENTS; RECORD.**—The Commission shall not, with respect to an agency that is not designated as a participating agency under paragraph (3) with respect to an application for an authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act—

(i) consider any comments or other information submitted by such agency for the project-related NEPA review conducted by the Commission; or

(ii) include any such comments or other information in the record for such project-related NEPA review.

(e) **WATER QUALITY IMPACTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding section 401 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1341), an applicant for a Federal authorization shall not be required to provide a certification under such section with respect to the Federal authorization.

(2) **COORDINATION.**—With respect to any NEPA review for a Federal authorization to conduct an activity that will directly result in a discharge into the navigable waters (within the meaning of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act), the Commission shall identify as an agency under subsection (d)(1) the State in which the discharge originates or will originate, or, if appropriate, the interstate water pollution control agency having jurisdiction over the navigable waters at the point where the discharge originates or will originate.

(3) **PROPOSED CONDITIONS.**—A State or interstate agency designated as a participating agency pursuant to paragraph (2) may propose to the Commission terms or conditions for inclusion in an authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act that the State or interstate agency determines are necessary to ensure that any activity described in paragraph (2) conducted pursuant to such authorization or certification will comply with the applicable provisions of sections 301, 302, 303, 306, and 307 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

(4) **COMMISSION CONSIDERATION OF CONDITIONS.**—The Commission may include a term or condition in an authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act proposed by a State or interstate agency under paragraph (3) only if the Commission finds that the term or condition is necessary to ensure that any activity described in paragraph (2) conducted pursuant to such authorization or certification will comply with the applicable provisions of sections 301, 302, 303, 306, and 307 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

(f) **SCHEDULE.**—

(1) **DEADLINE FOR FEDERAL AUTHORIZATIONS.**—A deadline for a Federal authorization required with respect to an application for authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public con-

venience and necessity under section 7 of such Act set by the Commission under section 15(c)(1) of such Act shall be not later than 90 days after the Commission completes its project-related NEPA review, unless an applicable schedule is otherwise established by Federal law.

(2) **CONCURRENT REVIEWS.**—Each Federal and State agency—

(A) that may consider an application for a Federal authorization required with respect to an application for authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act shall formulate and implement a plan for administrative, policy, and procedural mechanisms to enable the agency to ensure completion of Federal authorizations in compliance with schedules established by the Commission under section 15(c)(1) of such Act; and

(B) in considering an aspect of an application for a Federal authorization required with respect to an application for authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act, shall—

(i) formulate and implement a plan to enable the agency to comply with the schedule established by the Commission under section 15(c)(1) of such Act;

(ii) carry out the obligations of that agency under applicable law concurrently, and in conjunction with, the project-related NEPA review conducted by the Commission, and in compliance with the schedule established by the Commission under section 15(c)(1) of such Act, unless the agency notifies the Commission in writing that doing so would impair the ability of the agency to conduct needed analysis or otherwise carry out such obligations;

(iii) transmit to the Commission a statement—

(I) acknowledging receipt of the schedule established by the Commission under section 15(c)(1) of the Natural Gas Act; and

(II) setting forth the plan formulated under clause (i) of this subparagraph;

(iv) not later than 30 days after the agency receives such application for a Federal authorization, transmit to the applicant a notice—

(I) indicating whether such application is ready for processing; and

(II) if such application is not ready for processing, that includes a comprehensive description of the information needed for the agency to determine that the application is ready for processing;

(v) determine that such application for a Federal authorization is ready for processing for purposes of clause (iv) if such application is sufficiently complete for the purposes of commencing consideration, regardless of whether supplemental information is necessary to enable the agency to complete the consideration required by law with respect to such application; and

(vi) not less often than once every 90 days, transmit to the Commission a report describing the progress made in considering such application for a Federal authorization.

(3) **FAILURE TO MEET DEADLINE.**—If a Federal or State agency, including the Commission, fails to meet a deadline for a Federal authorization set forth in the schedule established by the Commission under section 15(c)(1) of the Natural Gas Act, not later than 5 days after such deadline, the head of the relevant Federal agency (including, in the case of a failure by a State agency, the Federal agency overseeing the delegated authority) shall notify Congress and the Commission of such failure and set forth a recommended implementation plan to ensure completion of the action to which such deadline applied.

(g) CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATIONS FOR FEDERAL AUTHORIZATION.—

(1) ISSUE IDENTIFICATION AND RESOLUTION.—

(A) IDENTIFICATION.—Federal and State agencies that may consider an aspect of an application for a Federal authorization shall identify, as early as possible, any issues of concern that may delay or prevent an agency from working with the Commission to resolve such issues and granting such authorization.

(B) ISSUE RESOLUTION.—The Commission may forward any issue of concern identified under subparagraph (A) to the heads of the relevant agencies (including, in the case of an issue of concern that is a failure by a State agency, the Federal agency overseeing the delegated authority, if applicable) for resolution.

(2) REMOTE SURVEYS.—If a Federal or State agency considering an aspect of an application for a Federal authorization requires the person applying for such authorization to submit data, the agency shall consider any such data gathered by aerial or other remote means that the person submits. The agency may grant a conditional approval for the Federal authorization based on data gathered by aerial or remote means, conditioned on the verification of such data by subsequent onsite inspection.

(3) APPLICATION PROCESSING.—The Commission, and Federal and State agencies, may allow a person applying for a Federal authorization to fund a third-party contractor to assist in reviewing the application for such authorization.

(h) ACCOUNTABILITY, TRANSPARENCY, EFFICIENCY.—For an application for an authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act that requires multiple Federal authorizations, the Commission, with input from any Federal or State agency considering an aspect of the application, shall track and make available to the public on the Commission's website information related to the actions required to complete the Federal authorizations. Such information shall include the following:

(1) The schedule established by the Commission under section 15(c)(1) of the Natural Gas Act.

(2) A list of all the actions required by each applicable agency to complete permitting, reviews, and other actions necessary to obtain a final decision on the application.

(3) The expected completion date for each such action.

(4) A point of contact at the agency responsible for each such action.

(5) In the event that an action is still pending as of the expected date of completion, a brief explanation of the reasons for the delay.

(i) PIPELINE SECURITY.—In considering an application for an authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act or a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of such Act, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission shall consult with the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration regarding the applicant's compliance with security guidance and best practice recommendations of the Administration regarding pipeline infrastructure security, pipeline cybersecurity, pipeline personnel security, and other pipeline security measures.

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

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA) and the gentleman from New

Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 3668.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, our Nation is at the crossroads when it comes to powering our future. This pivotal moment will shape our economic trajectory, national security, and global competitiveness.

After years of modest growth in electricity consumption, the next 5 years could see upwards of 128 gigawatts of new demand. The vast majority of this demand growth will require new, base-load, dispatchable power, and natural gas will fill that gap.

Unfortunately, the build-out of interstate natural gas pipeline infrastructure has faced significant challenges. Approvals are often delayed due to a lack of coordination, pure inaction, or outright obstruction by States and relevant Federal agencies.

Section 401 of the Clean Water Act has turned into a procedural chokepoint with varying application and drawn-out State reviews, undermining otherwise federally authorized projects.

This has resulted in energy shortages in certain areas of the country, exposing consumers to high prices and our grid to increased vulnerability.

In fact, a recent study estimated that pipeline blockades have already driven average natural gas prices up by 160 percent in major demand centers. This doesn't have to be the case.

Activist States like New York have used their delegated authority under section 401 to repeatedly kill interstate natural gas pipeline projects. These Clean Water Act denials haven't been because of legitimate water quality impact concern. The basis of these blockades has been in the name of radical climate agendas, ignoring what is best for consumers, grid reliability, and economic growth.

During the 2013 to 2021 time period, several pipeline projects were canceled, leading to a pipeline capacity growth of only 26 percent. Meanwhile, natural gas demand increased by 49 percent. This trend will be compounded if there are not statutory reforms.

H.R. 3668 would strengthen the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's, FERC, lead agency role and further define the process for participating agencies.

Additionally, under this legislation, instead of having to obtain a section 401 certification from a State through its EPA-delegated authority, FERC

would incorporate this water quality review into its existing National Environmental Policy Act, NEPA, review, including any terms or conditions proposed by States that are required for compliance with the underlying statute.

Opponents argue that this legislation will gut the Clean Water Act. However, this legislation doesn't even amend the Clean Water Act. It maintains statutory protections of legitimate water quality concerns.

FERC already analyzes water quality impacts as part of the NEPA process, imposes mitigation measures as needed, and is equipped to respond to raised concerns as part of the review process.

Again, nothing in this legislation alters the environmental review of these projects. Expanding natural gas pipeline capacity is estimated to save Americans \$76 billion by 2040.

Without statutory reforms to section 401 of the Clean Water Act, these savings will not be realized, our Nation will not be able to compete with China in the intelligence race, and our electric grid will experience serious vulnerabilities.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 3668. This bill is an outright assault on our Nation's environmental laws. It completely strips States of their ability to enforce clean water laws when it comes to pipelines.

I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that I was surprised when I first saw this provision in the bill. I thought Republicans were the party of States' rights, so surely they wouldn't take away a State's right to enforce their laws and have a voice in the pipeline siting process.

Democrats offered an amendment at our committee markup that would have struck this provision, and Republicans voted against it.

Here we are. Republicans are on the House floor pushing forward legislation that actively and intentionally sells out States' rights. Much like their promise to lower prices, I guess that was also just an empty campaign slogan.

Their bill goes even further than that. It also makes the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, or FERC, responsible for enforcing the Clean Water Act for pipelines. Now, there is just one problem with that, and that is that FERC has no idea how to do that.

At an Energy and Commerce Committee hearing in April, we heard from FERC that they do not currently have the staff expertise or resources to execute this bill properly.

This bill is also a bad solution in search of a nonexistent problem. FERC confirmed for us that they have not even seen issues with State clean water permits for pipelines. As usual, Republicans simply do not care about the facts.

The language surrounding the Clean Water Act is not the only defect with this bill. Despite claiming that the bill aims to improve interagency coordination for pipeline permits and authorizations, the bill actually discourages it by pitting agencies against each other.

□ 0920

Instead of letting FERC work collaboratively with other agencies, as the process does now, this bill makes FERC the adversary of other agencies by forcing it to breathe down every other agency's neck and make decisions on whether to exclude other agencies from the review process entirely. That is simply not an efficient or collaborative process, in my opinion.

I also want to take a moment to note that while Republicans are obsessed with destroying our public health and environmental laws in order to speed up the construction of more pipelines, they have failed to pass basic laws to ensure that those pipelines are safe.

The authorization for pipeline safety activities at the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, or PHMSA, expired about 2 years ago. At no point in the last 2 years have Republicans put a bill on the floor that would reauthorize pipeline safety activities. I guess they don't care about that either.

Instead, they have allowed the Trump administration to run roughshod over the very concept of safety, repealing numerous rules designed to protect our communities and workers, and even withdrawing the rule that was required by law that President Trump himself signed.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, and other energy bills we considered this week out of the Committee on Energy and Commerce are not a serious attempt at a permitting package. I know the Republicans keep saying that this is permitting reform. That is absolutely not true. They do absolutely nothing to make it easier to expand or improve our power grid, despite this being a time when our grid reliability is a growing threat.

For years, Democrats have been clear: A permitting package is impossible without reforms to the way we build transmission lines that transport electricity across the country. None of these bills addresses that either.

Instead, we have a slate of bills that cut corners for fossil fuel infrastructure, abolish States' rights to have a role in the pipeline process, and serve absolutely no one, except the worst corporate polluters, all while the Trump administration blocks and cancels new clean energy projects across the country.

Mr. Speaker, these bills basically double down on failed Republican energy policies that have already driven up energy bills on American families and pollution in just the 10 months since Trump took office.

The President promised to cut Americans' power bills in half. Instead, he

and Republicans are causing them to soar with their backward policies and their war on cheaper clean energy.

Electricity prices are up 13 percent nationwide, and Trump calls the issue of affordability a hoax. That is how out of touch the President is, and the Republicans continue to blindly follow him down the path.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON).

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, my bill, H.R. 3668, would guarantee we protect the environment, ensure we protect public health, and lower energy costs by speeding up energy projects through much-needed reforms to the permitting of interstate natural gas pipelines.

The development of interstate pipelines currently faces significant regulatory and statutory hurdles. In fact, in 2024, we produced less than half the pipeline miles we built just 5 years ago.

Our regulatory and statutory permitting process must both protect the environment and reflect the urgency and importance of the projected growth in natural gas demand.

Despite the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission being granted increased authority under the Energy Policy Act of 2005, pipeline project approvals are consistently delayed because of a lack of coordination between the numerous agencies involved in the permitting process.

My bill would make this process more efficient by bringing stakeholders, including agencies, to the table so concerns can be identified early in the process. From there, agencies participating in the permitting process would perform important environmental reviews while complying with schedules established by FERC.

H.R. 3668 would also improve the water quality review process by moving that responsibility from the States to FERC.

For the past decade, a few States, especially in the Northeast, have used this federally delegated section 401 authority to obstruct interstate projects. These States have stood outside the FERC-led National Environmental Policy Act process and used their section 401 authority as a one-State veto of a multistate project of national significance. This has been detrimental to the development of critical pipeline infrastructure.

I want to be clear: My bill would continue the safeguards of the environment. We have some of the strongest environmental laws on the planet. This legislation protects those laws while expediting critical energy infrastructure.

We want to fuel our Nation forward. If we want to lower costs for consumers, win the AI race against China, and strengthen our position as an energy superpower, it is critical that we have a regulatory and statutory proc-

ess in place that allows us to build infrastructure in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me say I have great respect for the sponsor of this bill, the gentleman from North Carolina, but I can't believe that he raised the issue of electricity prices in the context of this bill.

The bottom line is that electricity prices are up 13 percent nationwide just since President Trump took office—I already mentioned that—and natural gas prices are up 8 percent nationwide since a year ago, 14 percent in my home State of New Jersey, in part due to increased exports of liquefied natural gas. Both of these figures are vastly outpacing inflation, which is already sky high, thanks to the President's tariffs and the healthcare and housing crisis.

Let there be no mistake that Republicans and President Trump own this affordability crisis, and affordability isn't, as the President said, a Democratic scam. It is an issue that is impacting hundreds of millions of American families that, each week, are struggling to make ends meet.

Energy affordability is especially critical. Eighty million Americans are struggling to pay their utility bills. Republicans refuse to do anything about it, and this bill is only going to make it worse.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the Republicans have made this whole situation with electricity prices so much worse. The big, ugly bill that they passed this summer will raise electricity prices by over 61 percent over the next decade, thanks to its attacks on clean energy. The President's pursuit of unlimited LNG exports would increase natural gas costs by over 50 percent, and that is on top of the thousands of dollars that the President's tariffs have already cost American families.

The Republicans have no plan to address the affordability crisis. American families are forced to pay the price, and this bill is only going to make it worse.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, just to point out some things here, when you are talking about changes in electricity prices over the last 20 years, it is important to look at this chart. This is from the EIA. If you look at the top 12—and as the gentleman from North Carolina pointed out about his legislation, especially in New England, the States up there, look at what has happened here. Look at California, Hawaii, Maine, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Rhode Island in the top six. We can see these prices going up. Round up the top 12, and Vermont, New Hampshire, New York, and New Jersey are also in there. What is happening is why we have to

have this legislation. When States are pushing back on trying to get the pipelines in and pushing for just one type of energy source, it is hurting their people.

We know that because, earlier this year, there was an article that came out that the New England Governors were all complaining that their citizens were going to pay 40 percent more for utility prices this fall. Why is that? It is right here. This is why this legislation is needed.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER), the vice chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Gosh, Mr. Speaker, fairy tales begin "once upon a time." You know how those begin. We are hearing one today right here in our very presence, saying that somehow the One Big Beautiful Bill Act has caused this problem.

Mr. Speaker, the plain and simple fact is that America's population is growing, our economy is growing, and natural gas already provides more than 40 percent of the electricity Americans rely on every day.

□ 0930

Mr. Speaker, during the time period of 2013 to 2021, several pipeline projects were canceled, leading to a pipeline capacity growth of only 26 percent. Let that sink in. Meanwhile, natural gas demand has increased by 49 percent. Do that math.

This trend will be compounded if there are not statutory reforms. It is absolutely dishonest to try to blame LNG for this. America can't run without energy, Mr. Speaker. Like it or not, a lot of that energy comes from natural gas.

Listen to this. When we stopped building pipelines between 2013 and 2021, over 25 million homes were put at risk. That is exactly what H.R. 3668 fixes. This bill clarifies that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission is the leading agency for coordinating the environmental review process for interstate natural gas pipelines. It requires other Federal and State agencies to align their reviews with FERC's timeline.

It is written with a clear objective, reducing delays and approving coordination. Did I mention that gas has really needed to be given to a lot more American households?

Here is what we are going to do. We have already seen what happens when we don't build. Again, pipeline cancellations put over 25 million, with an m, homes at risk. Do the math. With the average 3.15 people in that household, that is nearly 79 million, with an m, 79 million people affected. Mr. Speaker, that doesn't even account for higher prices or the hit to our energy security or the actual possibility that our energy security will be severely damaged.

Mr. Speaker, if we want reliable power and lower costs, we have got to

stop telling fairy tales, and we have got to start doing. That is exactly what my friend and colleague, Congressman HUDSON's, bill does. I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. LATTA for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3668, the Improving Interagency Coordination for Pipeline Reviews Act offered by Chairman HUDSON.

My Energy and Commerce Committee colleagues and I have been hard at work this year, crafting common-sense legislative solutions to improve our burdensome Federal permitting process. The bill before us today is just one example.

Due to unclear review processes and a lack of coordination amongst government agencies, pipeline infrastructure approvals in this country have been significantly delayed in many cases, often resulting in insufficient infrastructure to transport our clean natural gas.

The result is an electric grid that is less reliable and increased utility prices for hardworking Americans. While natural gas demand is expected to reach an all-time high, accounting for more than 40 percent of electric generation in the U.S. next year, this is clearly a pressing issue that must be addressed immediately. H.R. 3668 is the answer.

This legislation bolsters FERC's rule as the lead agency in the natural gas pipeline review process, empowering them to oversee communication between agencies and streamline pipeline reviews and approvals so Americans can access the energy they need on a daily basis.

Mr. Speaker, the build-out of interstate natural gas pipeline infrastructure is essential to ensuring domestic energy can be transported efficiently and meet growing electricity demands. H.R. 3668 should be an easy "yes" vote for Members on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LANDSMAN), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. LANDSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, it is simple. The bill weakens States' rights and their ability to manage clean water. It essentially says: Look, we will send these pipelines through our communities and through our States. We don't want to hear anything from these communities. We don't want them to raise objections, even if it is around the quality of water and the quality of air.

It is also true that it doesn't fundamentally address the larger issue, or a big issue, of the rising costs of energy and the impact that the global trade

wars that this administration has pursued has had on the rising costs of utility bills.

For this reason, at the appropriate time, I will offer a motion to recommit this bill back to committee. If the House rules had permitted, I would have offered an amendment to this bill, requiring the Department of Energy to tell the American people in a report how this administration's illegal tariffs, these trade wars, have raised prices on electricity and gas.

The Joint Economic Committee estimates that families have already paid \$1,200 more this year because of the tariffs. The tariffs and the trade wars have jacked up prices, and that includes energy prices. We need accountability. The American people deserve to know how much this is costing them so that they can push on us to end these trade wars and the high cost of living, including energy costs.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the text of this amendment immediately prior to the vote on the motion to recommit.

Mr. SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in voting for the motion to recommit.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BALDERSON).

Mr. BALDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Improving Interagency Coordination for Pipeline Reviews Act. This legislation will bring much-needed reforms to the Federal permitting process.

Natural gas has become the foundation of America's energy mix, accounting for almost 40 percent of our total energy production and 43 percent of electricity generation.

The shale revolution has ushered in a new era of American energy independence and revitalized communities in Ohio and across the Appalachian region as they tap into the vast natural gas reserves beneath our feet.

In order to move this energy from the well pad to the customer, we need modern and reliable infrastructure. Far and away, the best way to transport natural gas from point A to B is by pipeline. It is safer, more efficient, and cheaper, and further reducing costs for consumers.

Because of the outdated regulations, a lack of coordination, and political obstruction, critical pipelines that provide reliable and affordable energy for our constituents have been delayed or blocked altogether.

The truth is America's power demand is surging. To meet this challenge and power the future, we need pipelines. This legislation streamlines regulatory oversight, establishes clear timelines for environmental reviews, and helps lower costs for American families by unleashing our full energy potential.

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

Mr. Speaker, I once again rise in strong opposition to this bill. I have to say that I keep hearing from my Republican colleagues about permitting reform. In fact, they have been calling this permitting week here in the House.

The reality is they are not interested in any kind of permitting reform unless it involves streamlining the ability to eliminate barriers for fossil fuels, for gas pipelines, for example.

□ 0940

They have no interest in dealing with permitting reform in general that, perhaps, would help bring clean sources of energy to the public. I would like to have more opportunities for clean energy and for renewables, and we can certainly work on permitting reform in that regard. However, the President doesn't want that. The President says that there shouldn't be any windmills, there shouldn't be any solar panels, and there shouldn't be any renewables at all. The only thing he wants to do is go back to fossil fuels: oil, gas, and coal.

When I hear about permitting reform on the other side, I kind of laugh. That is because we could be working together with Republicans on proposals that would lower the costs of energy and unleash domestic clean energy. Permitting reform, in an effort to eliminate barriers to clean energy, could be on the table, but they don't want to do that.

Instead of proposals to make things better, Republicans are offering bills that would discriminate against clean energy, would mandate old and expensive coal plants to stay online long past their retirement date, and this bill, which would strip States of their ability to enforce their clean water laws on gas pipelines.

Instead of doing what I would consider the hard work to find a bipartisan path forward, Republicans are simply giving up. I think this is incredibly damaging to the House as an institution. Republicans could have worked hand in hand with Democrats here and in the Senate, and we could have then all worked together to find a path forward. Instead, bullied into submission by President Trump and the MAGAs, Republicans are moving bills with no Democratic support, and they are cutting the House entirely out of any discussions with regard to any permitting reform. It is just a shame.

Instead of discussing this bill that essentially pollutes our waters, we should be discussing legislation that would make it easier to plan, permit, and pay for an expansion of the power grid. A lot of that could be based on clean energy. Instead of discussing this legislation, we should be discussing ways to reinstate the billions in grants and loans that were approved by Congress that the Trump administration illegally cut off during the Republican shutdown.

Instead of discussing this awful bill today, we could be discussing proposals

to grant certainty to energy developers so the President can't just arbitrarily cancel a wind or a solar project just because he doesn't like the way it looks, which is what he says all the time.

There is a lot that we could be doing with regard to trying to bring more energy to market, including clean energy, but we are not doing those things. Instead, we are here discussing a partisan Republican bill that strips States of their rights and is going nowhere.

That is just the way it is, I guess. It is unbelievable.

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

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Dakota (Mrs. Fedorchak), who is the at-large Representative.

Mrs. FEDORCHAK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3668, the Improving Interagency Coordination for Pipeline Reviews Act.

The truth is, interstate natural gas pipelines are what keep our lights on, our showers hot, and prices reasonable.

To the gentleman from New Jersey's point, interstate pipelines also have provided the largest decrease in emissions in our country, and they have made it possible to deliver by backing up all of the renewables that are on the system.

Mr. Speaker, overnight lows this weekend in my State of North Dakota are forecasted to be 20 degrees below zero. Having heat provided by natural gas is literally the difference between comfort and chaos, and, yes, between life and death in States like mine.

If we want affordable and dependable energy in our country, then we must build the infrastructure that delivers it. However, too often these projects are delayed or blocked by a Federal permitting process that is far too inconsistent. When one State can derail an interstate pipeline, then entire regions pay the price. We have already seen this time and time again in the Northeast. In the Northeast, shortages have already threatened reliability and driven prices through the roof.

This bill brings long-overdue accountability and coordination to the Federal permitting process for interstate natural gas pipelines. It strengthens FERC's lead role, requires State and Federal partners to follow clear timelines, and requires reviews to take place concurrently, not in endless succession. Moreover, it still preserves every requirement under the Clean Water Act.

This bill modernizes the permitting process so we can build the pipelines that keep energy affordable, so we can build the pipelines that power our economy, and so can build the pipelines that strengthen America's energy security.

Mr. Speaker, did I mention that we can build the pipelines that keep energy available and affordable for Americans?

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, once again, I rise in strong opposition to this bill. I heard what the previous speaker said, and this rehashes the same thing that we discussed with some of the bills that were voted on yesterday, which is this notion that somehow fossil fuels are reliable and renewables are not.

There are reliability problems with every form of energy, but what we need to do is to say that we are going to do all of the above. In other words, we are not going to just say, as the Republicans want, we are only using fossil fuels: oil, gas, and coal. There are problems with reliability with those.

We need to have everything, all of the above. Republicans keep saying that they are for all of the above, but the President and Republicans continually say: No renewables, no wind, no solar, and other forms of renewables.

This idea that somehow one form of energy is more reliable than another is simply not the case.

However, that is not what I want to talk about as I close, Mr. Speaker. I want you to understand and my colleagues to understand how concerned I am about pipeline safety which, of course, they simply ignore.

I mentioned this earlier, but one of the things that really disturbs me about this bill is that Republicans are pushing to remove environmental safeguards for gas pipelines at the same time they are refusing to act on vitally important pipeline safety legislation.

Authorization for PHMSA, the pipeline safety statute that we have, expired over 2 years ago on September 30, 2023. Since then, Republicans haven't moved a single bill on pipeline safety to the floor of the House. They simply have not. It is certainly not because everything is going well with pipeline safety. DOGE devastated PHMSA's pipeline safety office in the Department of Energy.

Energy Transfer, a pipeline company and key ally of President Trump, is attempting to declare pipeline safety enforcement unconstitutional in the courts. This spring, pipeline safety enforcement actions dropped to a new low. It is just a disaster over at the Department of Energy. There is nobody doing anything about pipeline safety.

Democrats wondered if this was an oversight by Republicans. Surely they would want to ensure that pipelines are safe before making it easier to build more of them. Mr. Speaker, my colleague Ranking Member CASTOR filed an amendment to this bill that would have prohibited this bill from taking effect until Congress reauthorized the pipeline safety bill.

Unfortunately, Republicans blocked it from coming to the floor. Apparently, they are happy to talk about removing environmental protections for gas pipelines, but are still, I would think, ashamed to talk about how they are letting vital safety provisions expire.

Congress cannot guarantee the safety of pipelines if the folks who are supposed to be policing them are no longer on the beat. My point is that they keep talking about permitting reform, but they don't work with us on that. They keep saying that they want all kinds of energy, but they cut off any possibility of clean energy with renewables. Then they say that we don't need to have any kind of restrictions whatsoever or investigation to review when we site pipelines, but at the same time they gut and refuse to do anything about pipeline safety in general.

Again, Mr. Speaker, this bill is a threat to our safety, and it is a threat to the environment. I urge my colleagues to oppose it, and I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. Speaker, natural gas is the most affordable and reliable energy solution. Also, if it comes from the United States, then it is clean. An expanded pipeline capacity is critical to lowering costs for American families and businesses.

We have had hearings on pipeline safety this past summer.

For too long, States have used section 401 authority as a one-State veto of multistate projects with national significance.

Again, the facts speak for themselves. Mr. Speaker, if you want to look at the top 12, it is New England, New Jersey, and New York. If you want, Mr. Speaker, ask these people who live there, or ask their Governors, their State legislators, or their regulators why their prices are so high.

□ 0950

It is simple. It is because, again, these States have used that veto.

As global natural gas demand is projected to continue to grow for decades to come, investment in pipeline projects will be of utmost importance for keeping prices low for our Nation and to keep it secure.

In the 1970s, when we had an oil embargo across this country when the Arabs cut us off, we were told we had no energy in this country. What has happened? If you put the right laws in place and have the regulations that follow and turn the entrepreneurs and innovators loose in this country, we are number one in the world—number one in the world. We produce more natural gas. It is the cleanest.

This is what we are looking at. We had a hearing early this year with our RTOs and ISOs that regulate across the energy grid out there. They told us all the same thing. We have to produce more energy in this country, not less, and at the same time, we better not be taking any generation offline.

Right now, we are scheduled to take 115 gigawatts of power offline in this country. Our adversaries in Communist China are doing what? They are outproducing us. We are projected to need 170 gigawatts on top of that.

It is time that people wake up. We have an all-of-the-above policy in this country. Republicans brought it forth in 2008. In 2008, we said that we are not going to pick the winners and losers, and that is important. When the Federal Government wants to go out there and pick the winners and losers, this country is going to lose.

H.R. 3668 is the solution. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON) for his leadership, and I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill.

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

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 936, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. LANDSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Landsman of Ohio moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3668 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

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

Mr. Landsman moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3668 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 3. CONDITION.

This Act shall not take effect until the date on which the Secretary of Energy publishes a report detailing how tariffs imposed after January 20, 2025, on imported goods have increased the prices of electricity and natural gas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit H.R. 3668 will be followed by a 5-minute vote on:

Passage of H.R. 3668; if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 194, nays 204, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 333]

YEAS—194

Adams	Ansari	Barragán
Aguilar	Auchincloss	Beatty
Amo	Balint	Bell

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

NAYS—204

Alford	Comer	Gonzales, Tony
Allen	Crane	Gooden
Amodei (NV)	Crank	Gosar
Babin	Crawford	Graves
Bacon	Davidson	Greene (GA)
Baird	De La Cruz	Griffith
Balderson	DesJarlais	Grothman
Barr	Diaz-Balart	Guest
Barrett	Downing	Guthrie
Baumgartner	Dunn (FL)	Hageman
Bean (FL)	Edwards	Hamadeh (AZ)
Begich	Ellzey	Haridopolos
Bentz	Emmer	Harrigan
Bergman	Estes	Harris (MD)
Biggs (AZ)	Evans (CO)	Harris (NC)
Biggs (SC)	Ezell	Harshbarger
Boebert	Fallon	Hern (OK)
Bost	Fedorchak	Higgins (LA)
Brecheen	Feenstra	Hill (AR)
Bresnahan	Fine	Hinson
Buchanan	Finstad	Houchin
Burchett	Fischbach	Hudson
Burlison	Fitzgerald	Huizenga
Calvert	Fitzpatrick	Hunt
Cammack	Fleischmann	Hurd (CO)
Carey	Flood	Issa
Carter (GA)	Fong	Jack
Carter (TX)	Fox	Jackson (TX)
Ciscomani	Fox	James
Cline	Franklin, Scott	Johnson (SD)
Cloud	Fry	Joyce (OH)
Clyde	Fulcher	Joyce (PA)
Cole	Garbarino	Kean
Collins	Gill (TX)	Kelly (MS)
	Goldman (TX)	

Kelly (PA) Miller (OH) Shreve
Kennedy (UT) Miller (WV) Simpson
Kiggans (VA) Miller-Meeks Smith (MO)
Kiley (CA) Mills Smith (NE)
Kim Moolenaar Smith (NJ)
Knott Moore (AL) Smucker
Kustoff Moore (NC) Spartz
LaHood Moore (WV) Stauber
LaLota Moran Stefanik
LaMalfa Murphy Steil
Langworthy Nehls Steube
Latta Newhouse Stutzman
Lawler Norman Taylor
Lee (FL) Nunn (IA) Tenney
Letlow Obernolte Thompson (PA)
Loudermilk Ogles Tiffany
Lucas Onder Timmons
Luna Owens Turner (OH)
Luttrell Palmer Valadao
Mackenzie Patronis Van Drew
Malliotakis Perry Van Duynes
Maloy Pfluger Van Epps
Mann Reschenthaler Van Orden
Massie Rogers (AL) Wagner
Mast Rogers (KY) Walberg
McCauley Rose Weber (TX)
McClain Rouzer Webster (FL)
McClintock Rulli Westernman
McCormick Salazar Wied
McDowell Schmidt Williams (TX)
McGuire Schweikert Wilson (SC)
Messmer Scott, Austin Wittman
Meuser Self Yakym
Miller (IL) Sessions Zinke

NOT VOTING—34

Aderholt Figures Ramirez
Arrington Garcia (TX) Roy
Bice Gimenez Rutherford
Bilirakis Himes Sánchez
Boyle (PA) Johnson (GA)
Casar Jordan
Clarke (NY) Mace
Clyburn Mfume
Correa Moore (UT)
Crenshaw Moulton
Crockett Mullin
Donalds Nadler

□ 1024

Messrs. McCORMICK, DOWNING, PATRONIS, and PFLUGER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. POU, Messrs. DAVIS of Illinois, BEYER, and GREEN of Texas changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 333.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 213, nays 184, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 334]

YEAS—213

Alford Bean (FL) Burchett
Allen Begich Burlison
Amodei (NV) Bentz Calvert
Arrington Bergman Cammack
Babin Biggs (AZ) Carey
Bacon Biggs (SC) Carter (GA)
Baird Boebert Carter (TX)
Balderson Bost Ciscomani
Barr Brecheen Cline
Barrett Bresnahan Cloud
Baumgartner Buchanan Clyde

Cole Collins
Collins Comer
Costa Crane
Crank Crawford
Crenshaw Cuellar
Davidson Davis (NC)
De La Cruz Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA) Reschenthaler
Kean Rogers (AL)
Downing Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA) Kennedy (UT)
Kiggans (VA) Kiggle
Kiley (CA) Kim
Kim Knott
Kustoff LaHood
LaLota LaMalfa
LaMalfa Langworthy
Latta Lawler
Lee (FL) Letlow
Loudermilk Lucas
Luna Luna
Luttrell Mackenzie
Mackenzie Maloy
Maloy Mann
Mann Mast
McCauley
McClain
McClintock
McCormick
McDowell
McGuire
Messmer
Meuser
Miller (IL) Mullin
Mullin Nadler

Adams Dean (PA)
Agullar DeLauro
Amo DelBene
Ansari Deluzio
Auchincloss DeSaunier
Balint Dexter
Barragán Dingell
Beatty Doggett
Bell Elfrehth
Bera Escobar
Beyer Espallat
Bishop Evans (PA)
Bonamici Fields
Brown Fitzpatrick
Brownley Fletcher
Budzinski Foster
Bynum Foushee
Carbajal Frankel, Lois
Carson Friedman
Carter (LA) Frost
Case Garamendi
Casten Garcia (CA)
Castor (FL) Garcia (IL)
Castro (TX) Gillen
Cherfilus-Goldman (NY)
McCormick Gomez
Chu Goodlander
Cisneros Gottheimer
Clark (MA) Green, Al (TX)
Cleaver Grijalva
Cohen Harder (CA)
Conaway Hayes
Courtney Houlahan
Craig Hoyer
Crow Hoyle (OR)
Davids (KS) Huffman
Davis (IL) Ivey

NAYS—184

Newhouse
Norman
Nunn (IA)
Obernolte
Ogles
Onder
Owens
Palmer
Patronis
Perez
Perry
Pfluger
Reschenthaler
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rouzer
Roy
Rulli
Salazar
Scalise
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Self
Sessions
Shreve
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stutzman
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner (OH)
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duynes
Van Epps
Van Orden
Wagner
Walberg
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westernman
Wied
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Yakym
Zinke

Menendez
Meng
Min
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Morrison
Mrvan
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Ocasio-Cortez
Olzewski
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pelosi
Peters
Pettersen
Pingree
Pocan
Pou
Pressley
Quigley
Randall

NOT VOTING—36

Aderholt Garcia (TX)
Bice Gimenez
Bilirakis Harris (MD)
Boyle (PA) Himes
Casar Horsford
Clarke (NY) Huizenga
Clyburn Johnson (GA)
Correa Jordan
Crockett Kamlager-Dove
DeGette Mace
Donalds Mfume
Figures Moskowicz

□ 1033

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. CROCKETT. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 333 and NAY on Roll Call No. 334.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent and unable to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 333 and YEA on Roll Call No. 334.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, due to illness, I was unable to vote during the vote series. Had I been able to vote, I would have voted YEA on the Motion to Recommit H.R. 3668 and NAY on H.R. 3668, Improving Interagency Coordination for Pipeline Reviews Act.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. BICE. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to attend votes today. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 333 and YEA on Roll Call No. 334.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I was necessarily absent and missed the following votes on the House floor. Had I been present, I would have voted accordingly: YEA on Roll Call No. 333, Motion to Recommit on H.R. 3668, and YEA on Roll Call No. 334, Passage of H.R. 3668, Improving Interagency Coordination for Pipeline Reviews Act.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present today. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 333 and NAY on Roll Call No. 334.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I missed votes due to a personal matter. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 333 and NAY on Roll Call No. 334.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. RAMIREZ. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 333 and NAY on Roll Call No. 334.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from the House during today's two roll call votes. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 333 and YEA on Roll Call No. 334.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER
AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 740

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I hereby remove my name as cosponsor of H.R. 740.

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

CELEBRATING DR. WILLIAM STEWART
MITCHELL III's 100th BIRTHDAY

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

Mr. BEAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate a milestone that truly brings a smile. This week, Dr. William Stewart Mitchell III of Fleming Island, Florida, marks his 100th birthday, a century defined by faith, family, and devoted service to our Nation.

Dr. Mitchell graduated valedictorian of Hamilton County High School before entering the Navy in 1943. Recognizing his talent, the Navy placed him in the B-12 program at Emory University, where he again graduated valedictorian from dental school. He went on to serve with the 1st Marine Division at Camp Lejeune, providing essential care as a naval officer in the Dental Corps. His distinguished career spanned sea service, Active Duty, Reserve Duty, and retiring as a lieutenant commander.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Mitchell has built a legacy of excellence and dedication to others. Today, I honor him as he celebrates 100 years on this planet, and I recognize a life that has given this Nation countless reasons to smile. It is a privilege to share his story with this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, I wish Dr. Mitchell a happy birthday.

RECOGNIZING WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
WOMEN'S SOCCER TEAM

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

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the Washington University women's soccer team, who just secured their second-straight Division III national championship. These student-athletes reflect the best of St. Louis.

What they achieved this season didn't happen by accident. It came from years of work, a culture of accountability, and a shared belief that

success in the classroom and success in competition strengthen each other.

St. Louis is proud of them, and WashU is proud of them. Their run reminds us that our city grows stronger when we invest in our young people.

I congratulate the players, coaching staff, and entire community. I will admit, a lot of us are already looking forward to the three-peat next year.

RECOGNIZING PIONEER HIGH
SCHOOL FOOTBALL TEAM

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

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the Pioneer High School football team. The Pioneer Panthers had an incredible season and a well-deserved visit to the 1A State Championship finals.

While the end of this football season wasn't what the Pioneer team really had hoped for, each and every one of the football players on this team should be proud of the hard work that allowed them to reach the State championship. Their dedication in every game is an inspiration to their school and community.

I also thank the parents, teachers, staff, and coaches for all of their contributions and support throughout this football season.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the Pioneer Panthers on reaching the IHSAA 1A Football State Championship. I know they will continue to deliver great successes on and off the football field in the years to come.

□ 1040

HONORING 13TH ANNIVERSARY OF
SANDY HOOK SHOOTING

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

Mrs. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as this Sunday marks the 13th anniversary of the shooting at Sandy Hook Elementary School in Newtown, Connecticut. On December 14, 2012, a senseless act of gun violence claimed the lives of 20 innocent children and 6 selfless educators.

This day continues to be one of grave reflection and sadness for the people of Connecticut. There are no words to describe the heartbreak I felt on that day. After all these years, the hurt is still raw, and I still feel that same heaviness.

Communities across the State and the Nation remember the stories of those children in that kindergarten class. We honor their memories and reaffirm a shared commitment to end the epidemic of gun violence.

Mr. Speaker, today we remember, reflect, and honor the lives of those we lost and hold the Newtown and Sandy Hook community up in prayer.

CELEBRATING 50TH ANNIVERSARY
OF HI-TEST LABORATORIES

(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 recognize the 50th anniversary of a great company in my district.

Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago, Bill Yancey founded HI-TEST Laboratories to test naval equipment and ships to make sure they can survive shock and vibration.

Using machines and explosives, HI-TEST has tested everything from the smallest electronic component to entire completed ships, which requires 40,000 pounds of explosives.

HI-TEST ensures that our sailors and marines are kept safe and that our ships can continue to fight. They have a facility which is the biggest and best in the entire world, and their all-American crew of engineers and craftsmen are the best in the world, as well.

Mr. Speaker, located in the Fifth District of Virginia, this company, still owned by Bill and operated by his family, keeps America in the fight on the sea.

HEALTHCARE CRISIS IN NORTH
CAROLINA

(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, we have reached the precipice of a full-blown healthcare crisis in North Carolina and this country. ACA tax credits are only weeks away from expiring. Unless Congress acts, an estimated 157,000 North Carolinians will lose their coverage.

This week, I led my North Carolina colleagues in demanding actions from Speaker JOHNSON. What is his strategy? Where is the plan?

I am the proud cosponsor of a bipartisan solution to this crisis, but Speaker JOHNSON refuses to put any bill on the floor for a vote. Next week is our last legislative week of the year and our last chance to preserve access to lifesaving care for our constituents.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of North Carolina, I am pleading with my Republican colleagues to join Democrats in saving healthcare for millions of Americans.

CELEBRATING 125TH
ANNIVERSARY OF GREAT DANE

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 125th anniversary of Great Dane. The company began in 1900 as the Savannah Blowpipe Company in Savannah, Georgia.

What began as a blowpipe company turned into a steel products company,

helping shape the transportation industry with trailers: flatbeds, refrigerated, and dry freight. Since then, the company has been expanding past its hostess city roots to 11 different plants across America, employing 4,000 people.

In the 1940s, the company revolutionized food distribution by circulating air over ice blocks to keep things fresh.

In World War II, the company was honored with the Army-Navy Excellence Award for making military-grade trailers to support troops in Europe.

Then 9 years ago, a state-of-the-art research and development lab opened for the company in Savannah.

Mr. Speaker, let us celebrate this extraordinary company whose legacy of innovation, endurance, and excellence continues to shape the world of transportation and inspire future generations.

FUNCTIONING IN THE FACE OF AN AFFORDABILITY CRISIS

(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, I rise today because American utility prices are going up and those currently in charge of this country are doing nothing about it. My constituents are looking at monthly bills that have increased by 19 percent, and that is not affordability-plus-plus-plus.

Rather than looking for bipartisan solutions to make energy more affordable, this majority and the Trump administration continue to fixate on putting young people back in coal mines and opening Alaska to oil and gas drilling. There is no set correlation between more drilling and lower consumer prices.

We must act now to fix our outdated electric grid to bring more renewable energy sources online. This will make us less reliant on natural gas prices that fluctuate.

This week, the majority brought bills before this House, claiming to save Americans money on utility bills. These bills did nothing to update our electric grid, interconnect clean energy projects, or combat the Trump administration's attacks on clean energy permitting.

Mr. Speaker, while we waste our time on this legislation, I continue to hear from constituents worried about being able to afford their next utility bill. This is not how Congress should function in the face of an affordability crisis, and this crisis is real.

CELEBRATING NATIONAL GUARD'S 389th BIRTHDAY

(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, Saturday is the National Guard's 389th birthday. Nearly four

centuries ago, the National Guard was founded in the Massachusetts Bay Colony. Since then, the National Guard has exemplified the spirit of citizen soldiers. These are ordinary men and women who answer the call to serve their community and country at a moment's notice.

From the footprints that mark the snows of Valley Forge to the sandy beaches at Normandy, from the skies above Vietnam to the deserts of the Persian Gulf, the National Guard has been there for America every step of the way. For 389 years, these men and women have represented America's best.

Mr. Speaker, today we honor the men and women who have worn the uniform of the National Guard, past and present. We salute their sacrifice, their courage, and unwavering dedication to serving the American people through war and peace, disaster and recovery, and every moment in between.

Happy birthday to the National Guard.

HONORING THE LIFE OF CANDIS KING

(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, today I rise to honor the life of Miss Candis King. Candis was a lifelong resident of Prince William County and the beloved daughter of my friend, Delegate Candi Mundon King, and Deputy Sheriff Joshua King.

Candis was known for her kindness and creativity and the ability to brighten every room. She left a lasting impact on her peers, teachers, and community. Tragically, Candis passed away from complications of sickle cell disease. We need to invest more in medical research, expand access to care, and raise greater national attention to this serious disease.

I extend my deepest condolences to Delegate King, Deputy Sheriff King, and their entire family. Their strength in the face of unimaginable loss is truly inspiring.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the life of Miss Candis King who was only 15 years old when she passed. Though her time was far too short, her legacy of joy, creativity, and resilience will endure.

WELCOMING SWIRE COCA-COLA TO COLORADO SPRINGS

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

Mr. CRANK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome the Swire Coca-Cola manufacturing plant to Colorado Springs. This week, the company announced a 620,000-square-foot facility at Peak Innovation Park near the Colorado Springs airport. This is an in-

vestment of \$475 million and will create at least 170 jobs. It will modernize production for more than 230 beverage options across 60 well-known Coca-Cola brands.

I also congratulate the Colorado Springs Chamber of Commerce for bringing this economic boost to the Pikes Peak region. This news shows once again that Colorado Springs is becoming an economic titan of the West and a destination for global brands.

Mr. Speaker, I am personally very excited for easier access to my favorite drink, Diet Coke, right in my hometown.

□ 1050

CONGRATULATING MARYJO MCCLOSKEY

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

Ms. SALINAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize George Fox University Women's Golf Head Coach MaryJo McCloskey.

In 2006, Coach MJ helped found the women's golf program at George Fox, and since then, she has coached hundreds of talented student-athletes.

During her time coaching, she has put together an inspiring track record. She is an 8-time NCAA Division III West Region Coach of the Year, a 10-time Northwest Conference Coach of the Year, and has an NCAA National Championship under her belt.

In addition to coaching her award winning team, she recently published a book titled "When Girls Win," which delves into the personal challenges Coach MJ has faced as a woman in a male-dominated field while illustrating how people like you and me can build a winning mindset.

MaryJo has been a fixture at George Fox University, and her hard work and determination led her to be one of two inductees to the Women's Golf Coaches Association's Hall of Fame.

Oregon's Sixth Congressional District is extremely proud of what Coach MJ has achieved. Her tremendous honor is not only a testament to the investment she has made in herself, but also to her family, her community, and, most importantly, to her team.

I congratulate Coach MJ.

RECOGNIZING EMMA HALL

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize my friend, Ms. Emma Hall, my deputy chief of staff and the first and only communications director since the beginning of my journey here to D.C.

Emma has served in my office and the constituents of Utah's Fourth Congressional District for nearly 5 years.

During this time, I have come to rely on her sharp instincts, her keen attention to detail, and her unwavering commitment to keeping my constituents back home informed of the day-to-day effort here in Washington.

It is often said in Congress that if we do not communicate what we are doing, then folks back home will assume that we are doing nothing. With relentless consistency, every bill, letter, hearing, and townhall meeting has been communicated with my constituents with professionalism, clarity, and, if I may say, refinement. Ms. Hall is meticulously organized, with tasks completed weeks ahead of schedule. Nothing is left to the last minute.

She is the heart and soul of our team. No birthday is forgotten without a card, cake, and celebration.

Over these last 5 years, her leadership and thoughtfulness have helped in the effort to make our team feel like a family. For that, Emma will always remain a member of Team Owens.

Mr. Speaker, our entire team will miss Emma. We wish her the very best in her new endeavor.

IMMIGRATION

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

Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today out of deep concern for the direction of our Nation. Immigration policies restricting green card holders, banning asylum seekers from 19 Third World countries, cutting their worker visas, and terminating TPS will have dire economic consequences.

Immigrants have sustained America's economy for generations, and in my home State of Florida, they make up over 30 percent of our workforce and contribute more than \$170 billion in spending power.

Many industries, such as construction, agriculture, hospital, and healthcare, are already suffering severe worker shortages.

Ending TPS for nearly one-half million Haitians and Venezuelans will devastate these sectors, and the blanket ban on 19 countries will block the students, nurses, entrepreneurs, and scientists and drive American innovation to a stagnation. It blocks the next Einstein and the next Carnegie.

We need strategic policies that are workforce-driven, create merit-based pathways, and expanded skills training for Americans to meet this moment.

Mr. Speaker, I urge this Chamber to support an immigration system that strengthens American families, businesses, and economy.

HONORING LIEUTENANT SARAH MCCARTHY

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

Mr. ONDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Lieutenant Sarah McCarthy, who recently passed in the line of duty while serving the St. Charles County Ambulance District. As a former physician, I know firsthand the dedication and compassion required of those who answer the call in our emergency medical services, and Sarah lived that calling for 23 years.

Her final act of generosity as an organ donor reminds us, once again, of her deep commitment to saving lives, even in her final moments. Throughout her service, she cared for thousands of patients, contributed proudly to the St. Charles County Honor Guard, and played an important role in the STARS program supporting children with special medical needs.

Her colleagues remember her as someone who never hesitated to step forward for those in need. Lieutenant McCarthy embodied the very best of her profession, and she will be deeply missed.

IMPEACHING SECRETARY PETE HEGSETH

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

Mr. THANEDAR. Mr. Speaker, this week, I introduced articles to impeach Secretary Pete Hegseth for murder and conspiracy to murder and reckless and unlawful mishandling of classified information.

From issuing orders to kill everybody onboard a small boat with no evidence of any wrongdoing to launching a follow-up strike to finish off survivors barely clinging onto life, his actions are not just reprehensible but illegal as well.

He also put the lives of our own troops in danger by leaking classified war plans in an unauthorized Signal chat. Former military attorneys have come out and asserted that his actions have risen to the level of war crimes.

Mr. Hegseth must resign from his position or be impeached by this House.

HONORING RETIRED SCHUYLER COUNTY SHERIFF WILLIAM E. YESSMAN, JR.

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

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and extraordinary service of retired Schuyler County Sheriff William E. Yessman, Jr., whose passing on November 29 is deeply felt across the community that he faithfully served for more than three decades.

Sheriff Yessman began his service to our Nation in the United States Coast Guard, demonstrating the duty, discipline, and integrity that would define his long career in law enforcement.

He joined the Schuyler County Sheriff's Office in 1985. Over 36 years, he

rose through the ranks to ultimately serve as the elected sheriff.

More than the top law enforcement officer, he was a mentor who shaped the careers of countless officers and strengthened the department that he loved so much. His steady guidance, professionalism, and deep commitment to public safety have left an indelible mark on the entire community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the House join me in honoring Sheriff Yessman for his lifetime of exemplary service and in extending our deepest condolences to his wife, Anne; his son, Sergeant Andrew Yessman; and the entire Yessman family.

MINNEAPOLIS FIRST ALL-NATIVE FIRE CREW

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

Ms. OMAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Minneapolis Fire Department for the historic assembly of their first all-Native fire crew.

Manned by Captain Michael Graves, fire motor operator Jessie Strong, and firefighters Johnny Crow and Bobby Headbird, the new crew operates Engine 10 out of Fire House Number 6 in Minneapolis.

The four firefighters share one goal: to build trust between the department and the communities it serves.

Beyond responding to fire and emergency medical calls across south Minneapolis, the crew makes a diligent effort to attend community events and ensure young kids see their identities represented in public service.

I am incredibly grateful for the work they do to keep our city safe and inspire future generations to give back to their communities.

□ 1100

MANDATES MAKE HEALTHCARE UNAFFORDABLE

(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, affordability is the buzzword of late. It is also the keyword in the Affordable Care Act, which kicked in well over a decade ago.

Where are we at now? We are about to run into a cliff here at the end of this month because it isn't affordable, and it can't be paid for by conventional means. Instead, we have to pay for it with borrowed money.

What makes things unaffordable to begin with in the medical industry? Mandates make things unaffordable, whether it is mandates on hospitals, mandates on doctors, or mandates on any aspect of the cost of equipment. Again, energy is a big part of everything just to run our buildings, just to run offices, just to run clinics.

Mandates are saddled upon our hospitals. For example, in my home State of California, earthquake mandates go back three decades, where hospitals that are in perfectly good shape that are in non-earthquake zones have to be replaced. Millions and millions need to be spent for them to be brought up to code.

They change the rules in the middle of the game. You are building or remodeling a hospital, and they approve a plan. At the end of the plan, at the end of the construction, they make you change the plan and request you to replace brand-new equipment. They are making it unaffordable with mandates and rules that are not conducive toward delivering healthcare.

HONORING MAYOR KATHY SHEEHAN

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the exceptional service of Mayor Kathy Sheehan as she prepares to retire at the end of this year after three impactful terms leading the city of Albany.

Since taking office as Albany's 75th and first female mayor, Mayor Sheehan has been a tireless advocate for equity, opportunity, and responsive government, giving every neighborhood and every resident a chance to shape the city's future.

Mayor Sheehan's steadfast leadership has ensured that key Federal and local investments were put to work effectively, lifting up families, strengthening local businesses, improving transportation, and preserving the vibrancy and character that make Albany such a special place.

It has been one of the greatest honors of my service in Congress to support her passionate efforts to build a stronger, fairer, and, yes, more resilient city.

On behalf of the entire 20th Congressional District, I offer my heartfelt congratulations to Mayor Sheehan on a well-earned retirement. While she may be stepping away from city hall, I know her leadership, her principles, and her example will continue to guide and inspire Albany for many years to come.

A'JA WILSON NAMED TIME'S 2025 ATHLETE OF THE YEAR

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

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, just check out this picture. This fabulous woman is A'ja Wilson, who was named Time's 2025 Athlete of the Year.

A'ja became the first player in either the WNBA or the NBA to win a championship, claim the scoring title, and be named Finals MVP, league MVP, and Defensive Player of the Year all in one season.

A'ja's impact was pivotal as the Las Vegas Aces won a record 16 straight games at the end of the regular season and then swept the finals to capture their third championship in 4 years.

Beyond those statistics, A'ja continues to elevate the sport. She inspires young girls, and she uses her platform to advance equity and empowerment across women's basketball.

We all want to be like A'ja: beautiful, smart, talented, and kind. I congratulate A'ja. We are so, so proud of her in Las Vegas District One.

FUNDING MANUFACTURING EXTENSION PARTNERSHIP OFFICES

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to sound the alarm across Ohio. The Trump administration has recklessly frozen all of Ohio's Manufacturing Extension Partnership offices—I repeat, Manufacturing Extension Partnership offices.

Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle have worked hard to grow manufacturing jobs in America, in the places we represent, to recover from the four decades of outsourcing of U.S. production.

I am really shocked at what they have done. This impulsive decision is a direct blow to family-owned businesses and American entrepreneurs competing against Communist China, Mexico, and every other low-wage haven in the world.

This decision delays critical upgrades, injects uncertainty into local production lines, undermines new jobs being created, and undermines every worker this Nation depends upon.

The Department of Commerce should release and restore these job-creating dollars immediately. Congress voted for them. They should be expended.

If the Trump administration can send \$40 billion off to Argentina to buy foreign beef that hurts Ohio cattlemen, they ought to restore this support to boost U.S. factories, companies, and new jobs here at home.

This is simply unbelievable.

By the way, the U.S. Commerce Department Secretary is a Wall Street magnate. He doesn't understand what it takes to create manufacturing jobs in this country.

DISMANTLING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION IS NOT REFORM

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

Ms. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind us what this Nation used to do to its children.

Before 1975, this country locked up 200,000 disabled children in institutions. We shut the schoolhouse door on children who were deaf, blind, or dif-

ferent in any way that we deemed inconvenient.

Then, parents, advocates, and attorneys fought, and they won. We passed laws on this floor that said every child in this Nation belongs, and we created the Office of Civil Rights in the Department of Education to enforce those promises in real time and to investigate complaints.

Earlier this year, employees in this office were fired. They were dismissed. Now, over 25,000 families are waiting for justice on their complaints.

The Trump administration just requested that some of these attorneys temporarily come back to work this week to clean up the mess that the administration caused, but students and their families have already paid the price.

The dismantling of the Department of Education is not reform. This is the resurrection of abandonment. Children deserve protection, not pathology.

PROTECTING CHILDREN ONLINE

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

Mrs. McCLAIN DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address an issue which unites all of us: protecting our youth and protecting almost every-one online.

This week, Australia implemented a social media ban for kids under 16. While I don't suggest the U.S. mirror Australia or EU regs exactly, it demonstrates global pushback on Big Tech's unregulated impact on our privacy, safety, and well-being, particularly for our children.

For too long, these companies have operated powerful systems with little oversight and no guardrails, with an aim to prioritize profits over our health and safety.

Before I came to Congress, I worked as a comms attorney and nonprofit advocate for Common Sense Media, advocating on these issues.

It is this lifework that compelled me to join Representative KENNEDY of Utah in introducing the bipartisan Algorithm Accountability Act. Platforms must begin to be held accountable for designing, testing, and operating platforms safely and to be responsible for foreseeable injuries or harm to its users, particularly to children.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan and much-needed legislation.

□ 1110

LIBERTY AND JUSTICE FOR ALL

(Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, Mr. GREEN of Texas was recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.)

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, and still I rise, a proud, liberated Democrat, unbought, unbossed, and unafraid.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I believe in the Pledge of Allegiance.

I am known to wear this tie that has what I consider to be a meaning that expresses much of what the pledge is all about. There are many people who have said to me that the tie is old, that it appears to be soiled and stained, but it is my favorite tie. It is a tie that I will never surrender. It is a tie that means something to me because it stands for something.

It stands for the Pledge of Allegiance. More appropriately, it stands for some specific words within that pledge. Those words are: "Liberty and justice for all."

"Liberty and justice for all."

I do pledge allegiance to liberty and justice for all, and I rise today to thank the courageous persons who, on just yesterday, took a stand for liberty and justice for all.

I rise to thank the 140 persons who, on yesterday, voted to support H. Res. 939, House Resolution 939. This resolution, H. Res. 939, impeaching Donald John Trump, President of the United States, for high crimes and misdemeanors.

I rise to thank the 140 persons who supported this resolution.

I rise to thank the 47 persons who did not oppose what we were doing but chose to simply say: I will vote "present."

That was a significant vote, as well. I rise to thank them.

All of these persons had the courage to say to Donald John Trump: Things are changing in this country. You are likely to face a vote of 218 more persons who would vote to have you impeached.

I rise to thank them for their courage, but I also rise with my cane in hand to thank two people. I want to thank John Bonifaz. John Bonifaz. John Bonifaz. Constitutional scholar, John Bonifaz.

There are many constitutional scholars in this country. Let me harken back just a moment to make this point perspicuously clear.

There were many people who understood what invidious discrimination was, known as segregation but, in fact, was racism. There were many who knew what it was. They understood it. They could articulate it well. They were great orators, but they had something that set them apart from Dr. King. It was a lack of courage.

Dr. King was set apart from the intellectuals and great orators of his time because he had courage. It was his courage that allowed him to go to Birmingham and, from the Birmingham jail, to write a letter that explained why the movement existed and why it was so important.

It was courage.

John Bonifaz, constitutional scholar par excellence. John Bonifaz has something that many of the constitutional scholars just don't have. They are brilliant. They can elucidate and explain to you the Federalist Papers in great

detail. They can tell you why you shouldn't or why you should do something, but they don't have the courage of John Bonifaz—the courage to speak not only truth to power. You can speak truth to power by simply saying: Power, there is a problem, and we need to address it.

John will speak truth about power, which means you go to power, and you say: Power, there is a problem, and you are it. You are it.

John Bonifaz has that kind of power. John Bonifaz has that kind of courage.

John Bonifaz, I thank you for what you have done to help me move impeachment to the floor of the House of Representatives for a vote. I want history to know who you were. I want people to know that you left big tracks—big tracks—in the sands of time. I want people to know that you came from one direction and that you proceeded to another, a righteous direction. I want people to know who you are.

I want people to know who Jessica Denson is, who is the mother and founder of the Removal Coalition; who believes that impeachment, conviction, and removal is part of the process, but it is also the solution.

Jessica Denson is a courageous woman—a courageous woman who has a voice that is sometimes amazing to me in terms of how she so clearly articulates the issues of our time.

I want people to know that she had the courage to be there when we were in front of the Lincoln Memorial—to be there—to be the key, the cornerstone, of the movement that caused us to get to the Lincoln Memorial, which she was there to support but also to push for impeachment, conviction, and removal. She is truly one of the great patriots of our time.

I thank you for your courage.

I also want to thank the millions of people now who are associating themselves with this courage of Bonifaz; with this courage of Denson; with this courage of the 140 who, on yesterday, voted to support H. Res. 939; with this courage of the 47 who also took a position that I appreciate greatly.

There is courage. I have to mention courage because these things don't happen simply because you want them to. It is not easy to do what we did yesterday. It is not. There are all sorts of forces, crosscurrents, winds, and all sorts of energy pushing back: Don't do it.

Let me pause for a moment and say this: Those who are antithetical to my views like to say that I—AL GREEN has gone rogue. It was in the papers today. AL GREEN is coming before Congress, and he has his cane, and he is just waving his cane.

That is what they say. They would have me become a person who is just another person from some dark place who doesn't know what he is talking about, so they talk about waving my cane.

Yes, I am waving my cane, and I am pointing it straight at all of you who

are antithetical to righteousness, antithetical to what we did yesterday in bringing these Articles of Impeachment to a vote. I am pointing my cane at you.

I am pointing at those people who are a part of the news media who will bring me up and say things about me but won't allow me to respond to them. You know who you are. But, as I was saying, I want people to know about this courage and the pushback and the antithetical forces. I want people to know about it, and I want people to know that I understand what happened yesterday.

It was comparable to what happened at the Edmund Pettus Bridge. Yesterday was a seminal moment in time. It was comparable to what happened. It was comparable to what happened when John Lewis explained it to me. What many people never discuss is the fact that there were many people who thought that you shouldn't go to the Edmund Pettus Bridge; it is too dangerous.

If you go to the Edmund Pettus Bridge, you could be hurt. You know what the constabulary will do. There were people who warned them, admonished them, pleaded with some of them, saying: Those people will hurt you. These people are inspired by hate. There are some evil people among them.

□ 1120

It was courage, however, that said: Go on to the Edmund Pettus Bridge, go on to the Edmund Pettus Bridge.

Not only did they go, but when they reached that crest, they could see a point where the constabulary was there, some on horseback, and they knew at that point that some of those people who admonished them were right, but they marched on. They did not allow fear to prevent them from doing a righteous thing, even when they knew the consequences could be harmful.

I keep saying it, and I will say it until I make my transition. John Lewis told me that he thought he was going to die on that bridge, but he marched on. Yesterday, in spite of a lot of admonitions, people marched on. People marched on, and they took a courageous vote: a vote that is going to be marked as a seminal moment in time, a vote that will have an impact on the rest of time because it sent a message to a reckless, ruthless, lawless President indicating that your time in office as a reckless, ruthless, lawless President, your days are numbered.

No one wants to see you harmed physically, that is not the case. But there are people who do not believe that you should serve out this term of office given your behavior in office. There are people who believe that you ought to be impeached, you ought to be convicted, and you ought to be removed.

I am one of the people. I am one of the people. We, the people of the removal movement, believe that you, sir,

should be an example of what a righteous government will do when a person who would subvert the Constitution has slithered his way into office.

You, sir, should be the example. You, sir, by your behavior, by your actions, by your words, by your deeds, you, sir, should not hold the title President of the United States of America, and you should be removed.

I know that there are some who would want to wait, well, he will leave office in a couple years, and after he leaves office in a couple of years, we will get back to our normal lives. Not the case. This man is having a long-term impact on American society. Not the case.

There are others who want to mimic him. There are many Trumps—not many in terms of numbers, although I could argue that there are large numbers, but there are many in terms of being smaller now who would like to enlarge their persona, enlarge their image, enlarge their reach, enlarge their power, many Trumps who want to be another Donald Trump. They are out there, and we need to do something to let people know that when you behave as he has behaved, justice will be served.

Yesterday, the sword of justice swung across the House of Representatives, and it left its indelible mark. People know now that we mean business. Yes, we mean business.

To the millions of people who have joined the impeach, convict, and removal coalition, I thank you for being there. I especially thank the persons who were on The Mall at the Lincoln Memorial.

Now, I would like to respond to the question, if I haven't already: Why are you doing this, AL GREEN? That really is not the question.

The question really is: Why wouldn't I do it? Why wouldn't I do it, when I have in my hand language that motivates me to do it?

Let me read what I bear in my hand. It says here Dick Cheney's statement. For further edification, that would be Vice President Dick Cheney. This is his statement on Donald Trump's statement, talking about Donald Trump. This is something that NPR published September 6, 2024, per Vice President Dick Cheney.

By the way, he was a Republican. I need not say it, but I think that it adds to what I am about to say. I am a Democrat. I think we were in different places politically, but when it comes to the country, we are in the same place. We were in the same place then, and we are in the same place now.

Here is what he said: "In our Nation's 248-year history, there has never been an individual who is a greater threat" to American democracy—correction—"a greater threat to our Republic than Donald Trump."

Let me repeat it. "In our Nation's 248-year history, there has never been an individual who is a greater threat to our Republic than Donald Trump."

Then, he goes on to inspire because he says: "As citizens, we each have a duty"—I would add the word "responsibility." "We each have a duty to put country above partisanship to defend our Constitution," to put our country above partisanship and defend our Constitution.

Those words inspire me. I believe that he is right. We have to put country above partisanship. We have got to defend the Constitution. That means defend liberty and justice for all, not in the Constitution, but it is symbolic of what the Constitution represents. It means, defend your Fifth Amendment rights, right to due process, 14th Amendment also, defend your right to free speech, defend your right to say that members of the military don't have to follow illegal orders. In fact, they must not follow illegal orders. That is what he is talking about. That is the Constitution. That is what comes out of the Constitution, although it may not be explicated with this kind of specificity within the Constitution, but that is it. You have got a right to say it. Don't follow illegal orders. That is a mandate. It is not something that is optional. You have got a right to say it. And you have got a right to say it without having someone indicate that you somehow have done something wrong and that you somehow ought to be hanged.

Now, I will say more about that in just a moment. I have much to say about that, but before I say it, I want to say this: If you, any one of you, if I, if I threaten the President of the United States of America, I have got a punishment here in my hand, if you are convicted under 18 U.S.C. Section 871 of threatening the President of the United States, you can suffer consequences including up to 5 years in a Federal prison, fines of \$250,000, a permanent felony record, possible restrictions on future employment, firearm ownership, and other rights.

□ 1130

Now, if I or anyone of you should indicate in some way that the President ought to somehow receive a death sentence, or if I or one of you should indicate that the President ought to be hanged, I guarantee you this President would have you arrested. I guarantee you, you would be incarcerated. I guarantee you, because you can indict a ham sandwich, they say, you would be indicted. I guarantee you, you would go to trial.

If you do something that is considered threatening, if you say—here is a good word: If you say the President ought to receive death, be punishable by death, or if you say that he ought to be hanged—as the President has said here when he posted a third-party's post indicating, "hang them, Washington would," indicating here that their behavior was "seditious behavior, punishable by death."

Now I am talking about the person who did the right thing, the righteous

thing, the lawful thing of saying to people in the military: Don't follow illegal orders. They found themselves, not the President but themselves, being suspect. The President who has threatened execution, some people don't want him impeached.

Now, there are some who do, but they have various reasons for why they can't take the stand. They can't say it. Well, I can. For all of you who want to say it and can't say it, I am saying it for you. I am saying he should have been impeached. I am saying that if ever there was a President in the history of the United States of America who should be impeached, it is Donald John Trump for what he said. He should be impeached.

Now, there are people who will say that you do know that he went over to FOX News, that he slithered his way over there and after being there, he indicated that he didn't intend for anybody to be killed. Maybe not in those exact words, but he didn't intend. He didn't intend for that to be the case.

Do you really think that if I said the President ought to be hanged that I could go over to FOX—well, FOX wouldn't allow me to say it, but some news source—and say, oh, no. Forgive me. I made a mistake. It was a slip of my tongue. No. This President would not allow it. He would consider this a threat. I would be facing a fine. I would be facing going to prison, but the President is with impunity, saving what happened yesterday, with impunity making threats against judges, making threats against Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, for those who say, well, that is just Congress and they are just judges, let me tell you how it impacts your life.

If you go before one of the judges that the President has threatened and you believe that the President's threats can make a difference, will you question the judgment of the judge? He puts the judiciary in question, the judgments. When he can intimidate judges to the extent that you think judges are acting because of the President's actions that he has taken against the judge.

This is bigger than you are as a person. It is about all of us as people. Threatening the judiciary, threatening the independence of the judiciary, not respecting the separation of powers, it impacts you and me.

We all can be judged at some point. We want to believe that the judge is going to be objective, that he is not going to be subjected, that he is not going to or she is not going to subject her most precious judicious thoughts to the whims of a President who is reckless, ruthless, and lawless. That is what you want to believe.

Okay. Well, maybe that takes care of the judges, Congressman GREEN, but what about Members of Congress? He is just threatening them.

Remember, we had a Member of Congress who was wounded. There was an

attempt to assassinate her. There were innocent bystanders there with her who were harmed, deadly. It is about all of us. It is about when we are out in the public. It is about some person taking to heart what the President said when he said "death," when he said "hang them." It is about all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I have no regrets for what I have done. Zero. I would challenge anyone to come and stand over here or here and stand with me. I challenge you to come and stand and point out why I shouldn't have done what I have done, or we shouldn't have done what we have done, meaning those who were part of the removal coalition.

Come. I challenge you. Let's talk before the world, any one of you. I am proud of what I have done. I would do it again.

I want you to know that in doing this we are putting the country above some people. We are. Because it is the country that contains all of the people. All of the people are more important than some one or two, 10 people maybe, maybe 23. More important than 23 people. It is the country we are trying to save.

Well, how do you save the country without having control of the House of Representatives, AL?

By showing the country that what is happening to this country is going to cause us to dissolve into something that we have been fighting. We are already at the point of having a person who is maybe less than a dictator but an authoritarian, we are getting close.

When the President controls one side of the aisle that has a majority, the Republicans in the House, when a President controls one side of the aisle called Republicans in the Senate, when a President has stacked the Supreme Court of the United States—yes, he stacked the deck—and gets rulings that people never thought the Supreme Court would render, all that is left is impeachment. That is all that is left.

There are those who would say, well, let's just wait. Why don't we wait. They told Dr. King to wait. One of the things that Dr. King said in response to this notion that we must wait was: "The time is always right to do what is right."

Now, I say to you what we did yesterday was not only right, it was righteous because everything in those articles is true. It is righteous, and we don't have constitutional scholars coming out and saying, well, it really doesn't comply with Federalist number whatever. That is not the argument.

The argument is this is not the time. I differ. The time, as Dr. King put it, is always right to do what is right.

Now, Dr. King didn't expect everybody to do what was right when he was doing it. I don't expect everybody who believes that what we are doing is right but won't do it themselves to do what is right with us.

I understand, but what I don't want you to do, and I beg that you not do, is assault the people who are standing up for you in clever language.

□ 1140

Don't do that. Don't assault us. We may fight back, but don't do that. I have bigger things to do. I am not going to say ugly things.

My point is this is bigger than any one of us in this Congress. It is bigger than the Congress, the House and the Senate together, and the judiciary. This is about the country. What kind of country will he leave when he leaves office? That is what we are dealing with.

My friends across the aisle are very much aware of how he is encroaching upon the separation of powers, the judiciary, how he is threatening the Supreme Court, and threatening judges with abusive, vituperative language. When you are threatening one judge, you are threatening them all. Let's not kid ourselves. He is doing it.

I am going to share this with you. I know who this President is. I want to make sure that you understand that I am going to a different topic in sharing with you who he is. I want to tell you who he is because, in telling you who he is, I will be going to a different topic. I made my point about impeachment, but I want to tell you who he is, because I have seen him before. I know him.

This is a different topic now because there is more to be said about this President than what was said in the Articles of Impeachment. I want to say that more has to be said at this time about who he is that wasn't in the Articles of Impeachment. To say that, I am going to move to another podium. I am going to move to another podium, so give me just a moment as I move to another podium.

And still I rise, Mr. Speaker, and I rise now to explain to the world who Donald John Trump is. I have seen him before. I have seen his cousins. I have seen his relatives. I am going to tell you who he is.

I saw him on June 11, 1963, when he stood in the schoolhouse door. He was George Wallace. I saw him when he fought desegregation in this country. I saw him. He metamorphoses. He changes. He is a shape-shifter. He changes his makeup, his appearance.

Now, there are those who are going to take that literally and say, gosh, he thinks that Donald Trump was George Wallace, but there are other people who understand that I am saying: George Wallace was a forerunner of Donald Trump.

I saw him. I know who he is. He wasn't Wallace, but he is, in a sense, his cousin. He was George Wallace's cousin. He is a relative, not because of ethnicity, not because of race, but because of behavior. They are related in terms of their behavior.

I know he is. I saw him in 1964, when he was Lester Maddox. He had an ax handle, and he used his ax handle to threaten people of color. I saw him with that ax handle when he wouldn't allow Black people into his restaurant.

I know who he is. I saw his cousin, Milton Friedman, Nobel laureate, who,

after the Brown v. Board of Education decision was rendered, he went public and said let's use vouchers to maintain segregation. That is another way of saying let's use vouchers to maintain racism, because that is what segregation was. It was racism.

I know who he is because I have read about him and what he did on May 18, 1896, in Plessy v. Ferguson, the case that allowed invidious segregation to bloom and blossom and permeate society.

I know who he is. Some of you don't know. You have not had a chance to review his history as I have. I know his cousins. I know his relatives.

I know who he is because I have read about what his relatives did on March 6, 1857, in Dred Scott v. Sandford, when they concluded, this Chief Justice, that a Black person had no rights that a White person had to respect.

I know who he is. I know the people who were there before him to pave the way for him to do what he is doing now. I know him, and because I know him, I have to fight him. I know what he did in my lifetime.

He didn't have a personal hand in what happened, but when I say he did, I am talking about the people who have made it possible for him to do what he is doing now.

Let's just say I know what they did so that FOX News and some of the many others who are antithetical to hearing the truth—maybe they won't obliterate the truth to the extent that they are perfectly capable of doing.

Here is what I know: I know what happened in my lifetime when I had to go to the back door to get my food. I remember when I had to drink from a filthy colored water fountain when there was a pristine White water fountain right next to me. I know. I lived it.

I remember how I had to sit in the back of the bus, and if there weren't enough seats for Anglos—we called them White people. I don't like the term. But when there weren't enough seats for Anglos, then I had to move. I know. I know what is going on. I see it.

Well, you say, that is not happening right now. No, but we are headed in that direction. I don't want to return to that past where I was a suspect simply because of the color of my skin. I was a suspect.

We are now at a point in this country, to tie this together, where there are people who are suspects because of the way they look, just as I was a suspect because of the way I looked. If you are Latino in the United States of America, given the behavior of the king's men—that would be President Trump—you are a suspect. You are a suspect, and the king's men can show up with a mask, faces covered, collect you—that is a very kind way of saying it—put you in some vehicle, and then storm away to some distant place and lock you up. Relatives don't know where you are—no due process.

I know. I know who you are. I know where you are going. I know what you

want to do. I have suffered what you would return to if you could. I know. Yes, I see how you have decided that you, and you alone, determine what the law is in this country. You, and you alone, will decide whether a person should be locked up or released, unlike what the Constitution requires. I know who you are.

□ 1150

Mr. Speaker, I know who you are. I understand that there is an attempt to roll back the clock. People of color are becoming suspect in this country. You can be African American; you can be Asian; you can be Latino; we are moving toward your being suspect.

There are people of good will of all colors who are going to fight this. I pray that we will succeed. There are people of good will who are White and who are standing with us.

It is easy to see, if you care to look, at how the President has now said: Yes, I said there were s-hole countries. Yes, I said it.

The President is now saying in South Africa there is genocide. We will bring in the White South Africans. If you are from one of the 19 countries—actually it is 18—predominated by people of color, we will put a hold on you.

There is no one so blind as he who won't see, not he who can't, but he who chooses not to see. I know who he is. I know what he has done to lay the foundation, not him personally, but the many who came before him and who know how to use hate as a weapon to change society. That is what he is doing. He is using hate.

He is using beneficial bigotry.

How does beneficial bigotry work, AL GREEN?

Here is how it works. You go to someone who is a principled person, someone who has been fighting for liberty and justice for all. You do them a favor. In exchange for that favor, you only require one thing: Loyalty. Just give me your loyalty. Give me your loyalty in the future.

The thing that he has done can sometimes be of benefit to the person. Most of the time it is. It can also be detrimental to some other people. He uses beneficial bigotry.

It is beneficial bigotry that he has used against the Palestinians. It is beneficial bigotry to say they should be obliterated and to say that the Palestinians don't deserve a country. He has used it to do all that he can to eliminate the possibility of a two-state solution. That plan that he has is nothing more than a land grab.

I know who he is. I see what he is doing. Others do, too. They just don't have the ability to stand in the well of the House of Representatives and say it. I am saying it. Yes, he is a beneficial bigot.

Then those who benefit from his bigotry are loyal to him. These are people who would never allow a person to do such a thing if he hadn't done favors for them. They would speak out and

speak up against his bigotry. They don't because he has done favors.

Those who are part of the evangelical movement see what is happening to the country. They have an opportunity to preach on Sunday all of the righteousness, and then on Monday they benefit from the bigotry. As a result, righteousness becomes secondary to the loyalty that they pledged because he did something for them.

I say to my dear friends in this part of my message today that I am not going to relent. There are some who would have me go away. There are some who have already indicated—there was a news story out today about how I will be defeated at the next election and I will just become part of a bygone history. They have already prognosticated my defeat and called me a rogue.

Friends, all of this may happen. I will say this. It won't change my opinion, and it won't change who I am. I believe in this flag. I believe in liberty and justice for all. I don't support beneficial bigotry. I don't support people who would desecrate what the flag really means as it relates to the Constitution.

Those are not the last Articles of Impeachment that will be brought to the floor. H. Res. 939 is not the last to be brought to the floor for a vote to remove Donald John Trump from office.

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

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

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, DECEMBER 12, 2025, TO MONDAY, DECEMBER 15, 2025

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon Monday next for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

BRINGING AMERICA BACK TO ITS ROOTS

(Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, Mr. ROY of Texas was recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.)

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, it was great to have had the chance last night to be at the White House with the President, his Cabinet, and my colleagues.

Obviously, we celebrated the Christmas season and our collective belief that this season is particularly important for the American people in recognition of who we are as a people in a Judeo-Christian society and celebrating the birth of our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ.

It is not just a holiday for white lights and garland and making merry.

It is a holiday that serves as the center of who we are as a people.

As the Speaker knows, sitting there in the Speaker's chair under "In God We Trust," it is that collective faith that we have in the Lord Almighty and our collective belief in his Son that has served as the core of the strength of this country from its founding. I will talk about two things today that are related to that.

One is a policy issue. That issue is the ability of the American people to get healthcare and care for one another. The other is defending our Judeo-Christian heritage in Western civilization from the onslaught of those who wish to push the Islamification of our country into the forefront.

Mr. Speaker, I will start on the point of the healthcare policy because I think it goes to the central problem we face as a people right now. A lot of folks are talking about "affordability." It has become the political hot-button buzzword. It is affordability.

This is being driven intentionally by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle because they have got virtually nothing to run on. They made a choice to shut the government down in order to set up a fight and to try to elevate the issue of healthcare because they believe they can win on it politically.

Mr. Speaker, I want everyone to think about that for a minute. They shut down the government because they want to politicize the issue of healthcare and not actually work to solve the problem.

□ 1200

Republicans, in my view, have avoided the issue of healthcare out of political fear historically. I believe that this Republican Congress, this Republican House and Senate, and this Republican-led White House have the opportunity today to transform healthcare for the American people so that it can be affordable, so that they can have choice and they can go to the doctor of their choice, and to empower doctors and patients, not insurance bureaucrats and government bureaucrats.

I want to repeat that again because I am going to engage in a colloquy and yield to my friend from Missouri in a moment on this important topic.

Right now, the average American family is getting crushed and is unable to afford healthcare because Democrats broke our healthcare system.

I want to be very clear: Democrats knowingly chose to break the American healthcare system 15 years ago. We told the world what would happen, and it has come true.

American families and the businesses that employ most of them are spending about \$25,000 a year for insurance premiums that give them fewer options and restricts them on what they can do, gives them higher copays, higher deductibles, and fundamentally makes it impossible for them to have actual care.

I go back to my point about In God We Trust and celebrating the Christmas season. As Christians, we are called to take care of those less fortunate than we are. We are called to help those who need help. That is why so many of our hospitals historically were nonprofits built up from faith-centered institutions. That is why so many hospitals are Saint Fill-in-the-Blank Hospital. It is because Christians came together to say that we should care for those who need help, but then came in government.

In all of its infinite wisdom, government came in and regulated healthcare, restricted our options and socialized the payments.

Now what is the result?

It is an impossibility of the average American family to be able to actually get healthcare from the doctor of their choice. It is the inability for them to go get insurance that will give them comfort that if the cancer that I got in 2011 hits them, that they will be able to go get care because they can't afford it. They can't afford it because we have broken it. We didn't break it, Democrats broke it.

Right now, Republicans have a choice: Go along with Democrats to continue to socialize healthcare, continue to enrich insurance companies and continue to take away options from the American people or we can stand up for healthcare freedom and stand up for the ability of an average American family to be able to go to the doctor of their choice, get insurance, and go on health-sharing ministries such as Medishare and be able to defray costs, rather than having constrained, regulated, no-option, expensive health management by bureaucrats.

That is what we have.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, there is this big debate right now about so-called subsidies. I want to be very clear about what we are talking about. We are talking about COVID-era pandemic cash that was thrown out into our economy in this case for some plus-ups for some subsidies for the broken ObamaCare system.

Now we are 5 years removed from COVID, and my Democrat colleagues are trying to say that if we don't extend those subsidies that somehow we are denying people healthcare. That is just flat false. It is a lie.

The fact is, ObamaCare remains in place. Its subsidy structure remains in place for better or worse, and those subsidies that they are talking about would literally go into the pockets of insurance companies whose profits have gone up 1,000-plus percent over the last decade.

It is an insurance enrichment scheme.

My Democratic colleagues broke healthcare, and now they are down here saying: We must give more money to insurance companies.

That is what they are saying.

Any Republican who goes along with that needs to answer for doing the same thing.

Why would we give more money to the insurance companies that saddled up with government to enrich themselves rather than help the American people?

Mr. Speaker, 85 percent of all Affordable Care Act revenue insurers received comes from the Federal taxpayers. Mr. Speaker, 85 percent of all the revenue, I should say, that the insurers receive are coming from the Federal taxpayers. Insurers received at least \$35 billion in Federal subsidies in 2024 for people who didn't use their plan a single time. Mr. Speaker, \$35 billion went into the pockets of insurance companies for people who didn't even use their plan.

I want to say this, and then I am going to yield to my friend from Missouri: We have solutions. When people say that Republicans don't have a plan, it is false. We put out plans. We have put out solutions. We have solutions.

We believe in expanding people's access to care by empowering them with the same tax treatment, equal tax treatment, the corporations get. Individuals should get the same tax deductions and tax breaks to be able to have healthcare.

Mr. Speaker, we believe in expanded health savings accounts that you can use for direct primary care to go to a doctor, have that doctor's cell phone number, have a relationship with that doctor and not be put into some complicated scheme where you have to get approval for somebody who is in network or not in network and who may or may not be within 100 miles of your house.

We want the American people to be empowered. We want them to be able to go defray costs and share costs in health-sharing ministries and Medishare and all these different organizations that are, frankly, the last lifeboat that people have right now for access to care.

We want to allow providers to own hospitals rather than be restricted from being able to do that so that the corporate, monolithic hospitals are not the only option.

We want 1,000 flowers to bloom and for people to have the freedom option.

Guess what, Mr. Speaker?

You can leave ObamaCare, the Affordable Care Act, structure all in place. Leave it all sitting there, but just provide the American family with a freedom option. Allow them to have choice.

Shouldn't that be our right as Americans?

People talk about a right to healthcare. What they are really saying with that is that government should be providing healthcare rather than the individual, the family being able to have the right to get the care of their choice.

What on Earth kind of freedom do you have in a country where you literally can't go get healthcare and you are prohibited from it?

The government has stopped us from exercising our freedom.

We have plans. What we don't have is the backbone and the willpower to stand up and deliver.

I say: Do it now.

I say: Stand up and fight for healthcare freedom now.

I am tired of it. I don't want another election. I don't want another: Don't worry, we will do it next time. I want to do it now because too many people are suffering at the hands of a bureaucracy and the tyranny of government-run health management rather than the ability to get care.

The current situation with respect to healthcare exists entirely by record of vote and a record of policies because my Democrat colleagues put forward policies that the American people are having to live under today.

They broke the healthcare system.

My Democratic colleagues are proposing an insurance company enrichment scheme. Literally they are printing money in the Treasury and giving it to insurance companies.

Their solution for healthcare is enriching insurance companies. Our solution for healthcare is empowering doctors. Our solution for healthcare is empowering people. Our solution for healthcare is spreading costs out among people who want to help each other out in the American way.

It is why I started talking about Christmas.

The question for Republicans is: If not now, then when?

When are we going to stand up and deliver for the American people?

That basic right—I will say it—right to access healthcare of our choice without government interfering, without government regulating, and without government stealing our ability to care for our own families and loved ones in our community.

□ 1210

I know the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BURLISON) feels the same way. He has done incredible work on this subject. We are aligned, I think almost entirely, on the opportunity for Republicans to lead, the opportunity for Republicans to stand up and deliver for the American people on healthcare freedom for every American. Every American should be able to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BURLISON).

Mr. BURLISON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding, and I thank him for his passion and leadership on this topic and many others.

Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to address one of the most urgent issues facing the American family today, which is healthcare affordability. Under the Biden administration, inflation surged to levels that we haven't seen in decades, in generations, and healthcare costs rose right along with it, driving premiums, deductibles.

Out-of-pocket expenses became higher and higher for families across this country. Whether you are in an employer-sponsored plan or an individual

market, it doesn't matter. The entire thing has been destroyed by the Democratic Party and their schemes.

For years, Washington has told the American people that if we just spend more, if we just mandate more, if we just regulate more, then healthcare will somehow become cheaper. It will become simpler and more humane. That promise clearly has failed in a spectacular way. We are watching it fail and go down in flames as we speak.

The Affordable Care Act was sold as a solution. It has locked families instead into a system where premiums keep rising and deductibles keep climbing, networks shrink, and patients are left with coverage that they can't even use and bills that they can't even predict. There is no transparency in the costs of the healthcare that they are receiving.

Let's be honest about where we are right now. Healthcare now consumes one-fifth of our entire economy. Hospital prices have risen three times faster than the awful inflation that we have been experiencing as a mean.

Insurance premiums have soared, yet patients still struggle to see their doctor. They still wait weeks, if not months, for an appointment. They still face surprise bills even when they follow all the rules.

This didn't happen by accident. Washington inflated the demand with subsidies and mandates while simultaneously choking off the supply through regulation, licensing barriers, and protection of entrenched interests. When government pours taxpayer dollars into a system that restricts competition, prices rise, efficiency collapses, and accountability disappears.

Through it all, the one group that was systematically excluded from decisionmaking is the patients themselves. That is the fundamental flaw of this current system. Americans are not allowed to control their own healthcare dollars. Instead, those dollars are routed through insurers, employers, and Federal agencies that never feel the pain of the cost and never face the consequences or have to deal with the time restraints.

Mr. Speaker, when you don't control the money, you don't control the choices. Contrary to the claim that, as my colleague from Texas has mentioned, we don't have any ideas, that is not at all the case. There have been multiple bills that have been sponsored year after year by thought leaders like the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY), yet they haven't come to the floor for a vote. They haven't been given ample opportunity.

I am glad to see that now there is an appetite for this discussion because this House is already filled with serious, actionable reforms that give Americans real options beyond ObamaCare.

I recently cosigned a letter by Representative BIGGS that highlighted 14 distinct healthcare reform bills that are out there, all of which present

much better, more affordable solutions than the current disaster that we are facing with ObamaCare.

That is why I am promoting a new framework that is called MAHA, Make America Healthy Again, a patient-centered alternative that restores choice, transparency, and affordability without expanding government control or forcing anyone to give up their current coverage.

MAHA is built on two simple ideas.

First, MAHA accounts are modern, flexible, tax-free health accounts that put individuals and families back in charge of their healthcare spending. In essence, this is following through on the things that our President has truthed. Stop giving the money to the insurance companies. Give the money to the people.

These accounts allow for Americans to save and spend their own money on the care that they actually choose, the insurance premiums that they want to pay, the direct primary care, long-term care, and wellness expenses like healthy food and fitness. Imagine encouraging Americans to take their pretax dollars and go buy the healthy food that will sustain their families.

The unused funds roll over. Contributions will grow tax-free within these accounts. Families can even help a neighbor in need through direct, tax-advantaged charitable support.

This isn't about micromanagement from Washington. It is about restoring personal responsibility and real purchasing power.

The second part of MAHA is the insurance, which will be a new, affordable insurance option that is paired with these accounts that emphasize transparency, competition, and catastrophic protection, rather than all the bloated mandates.

These plans eliminate unnecessary requirements that have been proven to fail and drive up costs in ObamaCare. It will cap excessive provider pricing, expand access to telehealth and workforce reforms, and guarantee coverage without annual or lifetime limits.

Together, the MAHA accounts and MAHA insurance offer something that the Affordable Care Act never did: a real alternative.

Let's be clear: This does not force anyone to abandon their current coverage. If you like the crappy ACA ObamaCare plan that you currently have, you can keep it, but Americans deserve another option, one that treats them like an adult, not line items in a Federal spreadsheet.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are tired of being told that confusion is inevitable, that high costs are unavoidable, and that Washington knows better than they do. They are tired of a system that protects insurers, institutions, and lobbyists while families struggle to make ends meet.

Give the people control over their healthcare dollars. It is not a radical concept. It is how markets work. It is how innovation happens. It is how costs come down.

The choice is simple. We can continue doubling down on a failing system that promises coverage but little care, or we can offer Americans a new path, one grounded in freedom, responsibility, and trust in the people that we serve.

I want to make this very clear, Mr. Speaker: The American people don't want Republicans to do half measures or to tinker around the edges. They don't want excuses. They want leadership, and they want bold action. They want politicians to stop writing blank checks for a broken system and finally deliver the kind of transformative healthcare solutions that this country and these people deserve. Anything less borders on political malfeasance.

I thank my colleague from Texas for allowing me this time to speak.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I know my friend from Missouri needs to head home, but before he heads out, I would ask him a couple of quick questions in colloquy.

For the average viewer out there who can't necessarily follow all this, if we distill this down simply, no matter what you call it, no matter how you define it, what we are simply proposing is that individual families, individuals, be able to get the same tax benefit as currently corporations get when they are putting their dollars into a Blue Cross, Aetna, or some other insurance plan, right?

Mr. BURLISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BURLISON. Right.

Mr. ROY. Because of a broken system created by wage controls post-World War II, instead of employers only being able to get the tax break when they give dollars to pay Blue Cross to provide some sort of plans and then you have to then further subsidize that—so maybe your employer puts in \$1,800 and you put in \$900, in total, it is costing \$2,700 a month.

□ 1220

Instead, we are saying: Look, get the same tax break, employer, but put it into a massively expanded, tax-free account, where you are able to use it for insurance, real insurance, that you can go get, a catastrophic coverage and/or direct primary care, all sorts of plans out there where you have a doctor who says: Look, for \$100 a month, you can call me. I am at your call. I will do this kind of service.

Another option is health sharing, whether it is secular or faith-based, where you have, oh, wait a minute, I don't need catastrophic insurance for this problem. It is a broken leg, but I don't have \$5,000 for the emergency room visit and all the care and whatnot, so you share and defray that cost across people often in a faith-based organization, but sometimes secular.

Isn't that the engine of what we are talking about?

Mr. BURLISON. Absolutely. Any kind of reform that we are looking at,

if it doesn't include that as the core engine, we are not getting anywhere.

Mr. ROY. Then, would it not require us to simply say that you can leave ObamaCare in place? That can sit there and keep doing what it is doing, but we are going to give people this option, so employers can put it in there.

If you are self-employed, you can get the same tax break. It is all equal tax treatment. Nobody is treated differently. We would have a product over here that would allow for true catastrophic insurance, right—not regulated, not all sorts of complications, not telling you what you can do, not do, but a risk-based product that says: Hi, I am a healthy 24-year-old. I would like to just know that, if I am in a bad accident or if I get cancer, that I will be able to have care. I will pay \$100 a month for that risk assessment, and the insurance companies can figure all that out, or \$200 a month, but not \$2,000 a month.

Isn't that what we are talking about?

Mr. BURLISON. Absolutely. I mean, when you give the choice back to the people, suddenly the doctors are going to start paying attention, as well.

Mr. ROY. Correct.

Mr. BURLISON. They are going to—when people ask, what does this cost? They are going to have to answer for it right then and there.

If they can't answer for it, guess what? When you have the choice, you can walk away. You can go to the next doctor. You can go down the street until people start providing the pricing. That will force transparency.

Mr. ROY. The last point, to that point, when our Republican colleagues, in particular, and other colleagues talk about all these things—we need transparency, we need association health plans—I support that. I support transparency, right? We need to fix some particular technical thing with our existing plans, right? Whatever these little solutions are—PBMs, right? There are all these—oh, we are going to do something on PBMs. Well, sometimes, that works. Sometimes, it doesn't. Will any of that be transformative?

Mr. BURLISON. No.

Mr. ROY. What will be transformative is giving individuals and patients the power to deploy the dollars in a tax-advantaged way, in a marketplace where they can go get the options that are best for them.

Mr. BURLISON. Yes.

Mr. ROY. Correct?

Mr. BURLISON. Correct. In fact, the swampy thing to do and what you would expect this town to normally do is to tinker with those things—

Mr. ROY. Right.

Mr. BURLISON.—and do what the conventional thought is before. Let's tinker with PBMs. Let's tinker with this account.

Mr. ROY. Right.

Mr. BURLISON. Right? The end result will be less choice for patients and higher costs. Even with PBMs, it will raise premiums.

Mr. ROY. Right. If you have an F-250 pickup, right, and you have a crappy, little engine in there that doesn't work, but you add four-wheel drive and leather seats, and you do all this stuff to make it a nice truck, but it has a lawnmower engine in it, would it work? Would it be effective?

Mr. BURLISON. No.

Mr. ROY. That is what we are talking about. That is what Republicans do. They have fallen into the trap of saying: Please give me the leather seats on the F-250, or I really want the four-wheel drive, or I really want a good bed liner and bed cover, and, oh, give me all the options and music and speakers and, oh, it looks great, great running boards, but you have a frigging lawnmower engine. The truck is useless.

We have to actually transform healthcare, and we have the opportunity to do it with proposals like yours, like mine, like a number of proposals that our colleagues have. The question is: Will we have the willpower to do what the President has laid out—

Mr. BURLISON. Yes.

Mr. ROY.—which is to stop subsidizing insurance companies, stop enriching insurance bureaucrats, and empower the American people?

Mr. BURLISON. Absolutely.

Mr. ROY. I thank the gentleman for his time.

Mr. BURLISON. Thank you for your leadership.

Mr. ROY. I wish him safe travel back to Missouri, and hopefully, next week, we can get busy saving the American people from a broken healthcare system.

AMERICA UNDER ATTACK FROM WITHIN

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I am going to take a few minutes in the time that I have remaining to talk about another issue that is critical to the State of Texas and this entire country.

That is the fact that America, Texas, and Western civilization are under attack from within. The cheap labor lobby, leftwing NGOs, radical progressive Democrats, Marxists, globalist organizations, and the United Nations have mobilized a coordinated effort to subvert our security and immigration system to harm the American people.

Particularly concerning is the threat posed by Islamists who are spreading sharia law into Texas, who are advancing throughout the country, and who have a stated goal of undermining American life, not assimilating into it.

This is a political movement, well funded, targeted at the American people, Western civilization, our rule of law, and the Constitution.

We should not be allowing more people into this country who are adherent to sharia law, period. The Muslim Brotherhood's own motto is: "Allah is our objective. The Prophet is our leader. Koran is our law. Jihad is our way. Dying in the way of Allah is our highest hope."

Meanwhile, Europe has fallen. London and Paris are mere shells of their former strong selves. You watch vet-

erans who fought to defend the United Kingdom in World War II. Those still alive tear up and cry, wondering what it was that they fought for when they watch the radical extension of Islam into the streets of London and throughout the United Kingdom.

In France, a majority of young French Muslims put sharia above their own national laws, and more than a third have sympathy for Islamification. French officials have warned President Macron that Islamists are infiltrating France's republican institutions and are a threat to national cohesion. The authors of the report to Macron identified the Federation of Muslims in France, FMF, as the main French emanation of the historic Muslim Brotherhood, which was founded 100 years ago to promote a return to core Islamic values.

They said that the FMF controlled 139 places of worship in France and a further 68 affiliated—in all, around 7 percent of the total. The organization ran some 280 associations.

Mr. Speaker, 7 out of 10 French voters would back a ban on the Islamic veil in public because of what is happening in France.

In the United Kingdom, Muslims are increasingly turning to Britain's sharia courts, which are not part of the U.K. law and operate as informal bodies. The number of sharia courts in Britain has grown to 85 since they first began operating in the country in 1982.

Polls have found that 41 percent of the British public believe that Muslim immigrants have had a negative impact on the United Kingdom. Nearly half think that Muslim women are pressured into wearing a hijab. Almost a third think that Islam promotes violence.

Parallel legal systems are not keys to a thriving society. There must be one rule of law for all the people.

All the way back in 1991—a lot of people won't know this—the Muslim Brotherhood issued a memorandum about North America, detailing a plan for the "enablement of Islam in North America," establishing an effective and stable Islamic movement led by the Muslim Brotherhood, which adopts Muslims' causes domestically and globally and works to expand the observant Muslim base. It was a coordinated and specific effort to advance Islam into the United States.

□ 1230

Our Founders did not envision a Nation that remotely resembled today's Muslim world and the radical elements of sharia. America was founded as a nation grounded in a distinctly Judeo-Christian history and understanding of human nature.

It was Great Britain that led the ending of slavery.

John Adams said: "One great advantage of the Christian religion is that it brings the great principle of the law of nature and nations . . . to the knowledge, belief, and veneration of the whole people."

Thomas Jefferson and John Adams hinted at the incompatibility of America's Republican virtues with the values of Muslim nations after meeting with the Islamic Ambassador about the Barbary States' inclination to make war upon nations that did them no wrong after they were informed it was a requirement of the Koran.

In Jefferson's papers in 1786, he wrote: "We took the liberty to make some inquiries concerning the ground of their pretensions to make war upon nations who had done them no injury, and observed that we considered all mankind as our friends who had done us no wrong, nor given us any provocation."

"The Ambassador answered us that it was founded on the laws of their prophet, that it was written in their Koran, that all nations who should not have acknowledged their authority were sinners, that it was their right and duty to make war upon them wherever they could be found and, to make slaves of all they could take as prisoners, and that every Musselman"—Muslim—"who should be slain in battle was sure to go to paradise." That is Jefferson, 1786.

Our Founders knew that sharia law was not consistent with Western civilization and our values. Sharia law is a problem that is growing throughout the United States and certainly growing in Texas. My home State bore the brunt of a 4-year mass migration invasion under the previous administration, but there has been a quieter one of Islamists leveraging our immigration system and corporate interests to extend and use diversity visas, chain migration, and H-1B visas to flood our country with people who don't believe in it and have no intention of assimilating into it.

A new Muslim community in Texas, not even a few days old, with a 150,000-square-foot Muslim community center, was opened in Houston, called EPIC City. It is in Plano, outside of Dallas-Fort Worth and it has raised all sorts of questions about their intentions to create an effectively Muslim-only community where sharia law no doubt would and will be practiced. Now they have renamed it The Meadow rather than the East Plano Islamic Center. They continue to develop and grow it even as there are almost 300 mosques in Texas and more mosques being built in Texas every day than any other State in the Union.

Meanwhile, let's look at what is going on in the United States broadly. Our Nation's foreign-born population has reached 51.9 million people, comprising some 16 percent of our population. We are at the highest levels of percentage in our history. The last time we had a similar level of foreign-born population, in roughly 1920, we froze immigration. Largely for about 40 or 50 years we froze it, and then it has been exploding over the last 50 years.

I have introduced legislation called the PAUSE Act to pause immigration

and to pause it until we get our hands around all of the problems that are currently plaguing our immigration system: the abuse of birthright citizenship, to have profit-centered ways to create American citizens, by people coming here, coming across the Rio Grande, having children, making citizens that then can use American resources, our hospitals, our schools, our legal system, our welfare.

We continue to allow a broken visa system to have extended family members be brought into the United States expansively and purposefully. The H-1B program has been exploited and abused now for years and must be abolished or massively reformed.

We obviously still have a very badly broken border that is only currently being held in check by a President and by leadership in the administration who are devoted to doing it, that are empowered to do it. However, all of the ways in which Biden-Mayorkas and that entire administration allowed our border to be wide open and have 10 million people flood our country, all of those things still remain in place statutorily.

Congress could fix it. We haven't. The House passed legislation 2 years ago—what it was called in that Congress was H.R. 2—to meaningfully change the law so that it can't be exploited to endanger the people. We have not brought that back up again this year. We should. We should codify these changes. Our priorities matter. The results of this are stark.

Thanksgiving week we saw what happened with the West Virginia National Guard servicemembers, Specialist Sarah Beckstrom, who was 20 years old, and Staff Sergeant Andrew Wolfe, 24. They were savagely ambushed and shot blocks away from the White House. Specialist Beckstrom tragically lost her life. The attacker, Rahmanullah Lakanwal, an Afghan national who was imported through the Biden-Mayorkas illegal Operation Allies Welcome parole program, drove from Washington State to carry out this diabolical act in our Nation's Capital.

According to DHS, over 5,000 Afghans brought to the United States through Operation Allies Welcome had either national security or public safety concerns.

We are importing people who want to undermine and destroy our country, and both sides of the aisle have been guilty of this. This is not a debatable reality. It is literally occurring.

For us to survive, we have to act. We need to pass the PAUSE Act. We need to pause immigration. We need to pass legislation like the bill that I introduced to preserve a sharia-free America that would prohibit the entry of people that are known to be adherent to sharia law, which is deeply in conflict with our values and our laws.

We should take away the tax status of CAIR and other radical organizations with ties to terrorists and a vast

network of well-funded organizations, using American tax dollars, United Nations' funds, wealthy donors, George Soros funding, foreign funding, nation-states all pouring into organizations, NGOs driving this agenda, the Marxist-Islamist red-green alliance that wants to destroy America as we know it. I introduced legislation to take away CAIR's tax status.

Why are we giving them tax breaks to try to destroy America?

That brings me to the final point which I was alluding to before on H.R. 2, that is legislation designed to codify effectively what President Trump is doing: to stop the abuse of parole, to stop the abuse of asylum, to stop the abuse of catch and release, to stop all of the abusive ways in which an exploited border can undermine our security and endanger us.

□ 1240

We cannot rely on the administration to do it. Congress needs to act. Congress needs to codify it. Congress needs to change it. States and State leaders need to stand up and use the legislation that we did pass in January to enable suit against the Federal Government when they failed to secure the border that we included in the Laken Riley Act because States can no longer be beholden to a Federal Government that refuses to secure the border.

We have a reprieve under President Trump. That reprieve will no doubt one day come to an end, and States must be empowered and have leaders who are willing to stand up and fight.

States need to challenge things like *Plyler v. Doe*, the Supreme Court ruling that said that we must have taxpayer funding going to pay for the education of illegal alien children. If you want to choose to do it, that is for you to decide. We should not be forced to use taxpayer dollars to do that. We should challenge that Supreme Court ruling. We should stand up to defend our country.

The fact is you can't win a war that you are not willing to recognize exists. It is undeniably true after the election of the mayor in New York, Mamdani, with what is going on in Dearborn, with what is going on in Minneapolis, with what we are seeing happen in Texas, in Dallas and Houston, what we saw unfold in London and Paris, that there is an attack on the Western way of life. We must stand up and defend it if we are going to be able to pass down a country to our kids and grandkids.

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

CALIFORNIA IS THE EXACT OPPOSITE OF A MODEL OF EFFICIENCY

(Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, Mr. KILEY of California was recognized for 30 minutes.)

Mr. KILEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to make a statement

about efficiency in government because there was a statement from the Governor of my State that many of us found quite surprising where he recently said that long before there was DOGE, California was already streamlining government to be more efficient, responsive, and accountable. Apparently, California being a model of efficiency, in the Governor's view.

This came as a surprise to many of us because, in the course of just 5 years during Governor Newsom's tenure, the State budget increased by \$124 billion. That is over a 50 percent increase in spending without really any measurable improvement in government performance when you look at California ranking first in the Nation in homelessness, poverty, unemployment, having some of the worst roads, and some of the worst achievement gaps in our schools.

I will highlight just a few examples that I think are particularly revealing when it comes to the low quality of government service that citizens of California are receiving and also, to some extent, the lessons that we can draw from here at the Federal level where I think continuing to improve the quality of government service, giving taxpayers a higher return on their tax dollars remains a vital imperative.

Remember, the Governor said that California is a model of efficiency. His exact words: "California is already streamlining government to be more efficient, responsive, and accountable."

Apparently, this includes a \$128 billion bullet train that still shows no signs of coming into existence. Now, that is the estimated total cost. The amount that has already been spent is somewhere in the neighborhood of \$16 billion, \$17 billion, but we are now 18 years into this thing and not a single bit of track has been laid despite all of this massive spending. The New York Times has estimated that the project isn't even on track to be finished this century.

Another example is that the State auditor in California found that the State spent \$24 billion to combat homelessness and completely lost track of the money. They couldn't say where it went. They couldn't say what impact it had on outcomes. There were no metrics.

During the time that this spending occurred, homelessness in California absolutely skyrocketed to the extent that the State has about half of the total unsheltered homeless in the entire country.

The State also squandered \$32 billion at a minimum on unemployment fraud. What is going on in Minnesota is small potatoes compared to what we witnessed in California during the COVID years where the State failed to take basic fraud protection measures that other States had taken, and as a result, fraudsters were easily able to purloin the State Treasury and use those billions to fund further criminal activities.

Now, I say that there are lessons for the Federal Government because during the last administration, the labor secretary in California most responsible for that entire fiasco was actually nominated to be the Secretary of Labor here in Washington, D.C., although never confirmed by the Senate, so to some extent the lesson was learned.

We have recent reports just in the last couple weeks that this \$650 million 911 system that the State has been charging Californians on their phone bill for, for several years now, is being scraped entirely because the technology doesn't work. They spent \$650 million building this so-called next generation 911 system—and our system does very much need to be updated—but because the State couldn't manage to get the technology right, it is all going to waste. Those funds will never be recovered and our 911 system remains antiquated as a result. Bear in mind, Sacramento is a stone's throw from Silicon Valley where the technology that is required here is fairly rudimentary in terms of what is needed.

I would just mention one final example which is the California State Capitol itself. Our Governor has had a lot to say about certain renovations going on at the White House, yet the California State legislature approved several years ago a \$1.2 billion renovation of the State capitol itself.

I voted against that measure, by the way, but now the cost of that seems to have ballooned and we don't know even by how much because the State is refusing to say. Despite the persistent efforts of local journalists to get an answer and other legislators as to how much this project is costing our taxpayers, they won't even say how much. However, we have gotten some hints of some of the measures that the project leaders have taken such as shipping stones to Italy in order to be treated and refined. It does not seem that this particular project is exactly a model of efficiency either.

Mr. Speaker, I bring these examples up to highlight the need for reform in my home State, to reorient the way our government works toward a paradigm of citizen service, because we see corruption and incompetence and special interests and a whole host of other agendas that stand in the way of the use of tax dollars to actually serve our citizens. Indeed, California is the exact opposite of a model of efficiency as we sacrifice the most and get the least in return.

I will continue to do everything I can to change that paradigm in California as well as to find ways to learn from it and to reorient our Federal Government toward a model of citizen service and efficiency, as well.

□ 1250

LEGISLATION TO STOP INSIDER TRADING

Mr. KILEY of California. Mr. Speaker, this week, I signed a discharge petition to stop insider trading, to ban

stock trading by Members of Congress. I have been a cosponsor of this measure offered by my colleague from Florida, ANNA PAULINA LUNA. We have gotten a number of bipartisan cosponsors for it, yet the bill has not moved. It has not been brought to the floor by House leadership.

I have signed this discharge petition, which is a legislative mechanism by which the Members of the House can bring a bill directly to the floor without the blessing of leadership. I have not been particularly inclined to sign these petitions in my first couple of years here in the House, but I have come to the view that they have become more necessary given the House's somewhat diminished role in recent months in terms of actually driving policy forward.

I have also signed a couple of other petitions related to the healthcare reforms that we are seeking to advance. I was particularly concerned when I heard the Speaker himself suggest that he might try to stop discharge petitions from happening altogether, which would be a terrible idea. It would mean that the House is no longer truly a majoritarian institution.

Affirming the value of discharge petitions and bringing to the floor a bill to ban trading by Members of Congress are both important steps toward restoring trust in this institution. Let's face it, Congress is not held in particularly high esteem by the American public right now. I have seen recent polls showing that Congress' approval rating is around 15 percent. In many ways, that reputation is well deserved.

This is a simple measure that we can take that would at least restore a little bit of trust and be a step in the direction of good government. I am hoping that it will continue to get the requisite signatures, short of leadership agreeing to bring it to the floor, and then we can get it passed and signed into law.

ADVOCATING TO END REDISTRICTING WAR

Mr. KILEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise again today to advocate for an end to the redistricting war that has been cascading across the country.

I have introduced legislation that would say we should not have mid-decade redistricting. It should not be done in any State. I opposed what happened in Texas to re-gerrymander that State in the middle of the decade, and I opposed what happened in California. I opposed the efforts that are afoot as well in other States, and I applaud the decision by the Indiana State Senate to not move forward with a mid-decade gerrymander in a fairly overwhelming vote yesterday.

The fact is that gerrymandering is an affront to representative government and democracy. What we are seeing right now runs against the desires of Members of this body on both sides of the aisle and certainly runs contrary to what is in the interest of the country.

I have called upon the leadership in the House for months to bring this bill

to the floor or to otherwise reach an armistice in this redistricting war. I believe it was a failure of leadership, frankly, on both sides, to allow this to happen.

As I warned months ago, the whole thing is basically turning out to be a wash. If you look at the various election forecasters, they say, yes, you are probably not going to see either side really gain much.

All of this effort, all of this money, all of this political capital spent redrawing maps, upending the districts of dozens of our Members on both sides of the aisle, and to what end? Nothing good is coming from it.

Maybe if the Speaker—and I cannot let the minority leader off the hook either because he has been actively involved in these efforts—had been more focused on, let's say, healthcare policy than trying to redraw district maps, we wouldn't be in a position where we are now 3 weeks away from Americans seeing a massive increase in healthcare costs.

I am again calling for my bill to ban mid-decade redistricting to be brought to the floor for a vote. I am also working on legislation to end gerrymandering in this country, once and for all, by ensuring each State has an independent commission, much like the one that we had in California until recently. I think if we can take that step to end gerrymandering, to have fair maps across the country, then it will restore power where it belongs, and that is to the voters themselves.

NEED FOR HIGHER-PERFORMING SCHOOLS

Mr. KILEY of California. Mr. Speaker, as chair of the House Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, which covers K-12 education, I like to have the opportunity to go and visit high-performing schools, to see the lessons that we could learn.

This morning, I had the chance to visit a KIPP school, the Knowledge is Power Program here in Washington, D.C. There are 20 KIPP schools in D.C. There are many, many more all across the country, including many in California.

This is a truly high-performing charter school network that tends to enroll students who are below the poverty level, that operates in underserved communities, and that has outstanding results by any measure—by student test scores, by graduation rates, by the number of students who go to college.

They really have just been knocking it out of the park for years, much like Success Academy, which operates in New York City. I had the chance to visit one of their campuses a couple of months ago. If they were considered their own school district, they would literally be the highest performing district in the State of New York.

These examples of success are, unfortunately, not the norm when it comes to public education in America today and, in particular, in my State of California. The latest Nation's Report Card

showed that student achievement is at an all-time low in this country. We have not bounced back to even where we were prior to the COVID years. We continue to fall behind our peer nations in terms of the level of achievement for our students.

In California, in particular, we have seen, over the course of the last several years, almost \$40 billion more that is now spent on an annual basis on education. What do we have to show for it? UC San Diego, which is a pretty high-ranking school, recently came out and said that their incoming students are not prepared to do basic math, even the most basic math. They have now had to put one out of every eight students into remedial math courses. They have had to expand the remedial courses they offer to make them even more remedial.

That is the result of a State like California that has done everything possible to quash high-performing charter schools, like the ones I just mentioned, Success Academy and KIPP, and instead support and prop up a failing education model: the idea that you are assigned to one school in your ZIP Code, whether it is good or bad, whether it teaches students to read and do math or not.

In the subcommittee that I have the honor to chair, we have been focusing on both the problems and potential solutions for public education in America. I think there is a great deal to learn from schools like KIPP and Success Academy, which set high expectations for students, teach literacy and numeracy the way that it is supposed to be taught, have high levels and expectations for their teachers and help prepare them as they need to be prepared when it comes to professional development, and focus like a laser on student achievement, engaging parents, and everything that comes with giving students access to a quality education.

Schools like these show that every child in this country can indeed succeed, and we need to make it a matter of great urgency to make sure that every child in America has that opportunity.

□ 1300

ASSURING TIMELY REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE

Mr. KILEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I will be introducing in the House the Right to Representation Act, a measure that has become necessary in order to assure that districts in this country are not denied representation here in the House.

We recently had a period of time in which a newly elected Member of the House from Arizona was not seated as a Member for week after week for what I believe was a record period of time. This was despite the fact that she had won her election, the election had been certified, and the district was going without representation until she was seated.

The House of Representatives was not here during that time, which was itself a big problem. The House canceled its sessions for 6 weeks on end while the government was shut down. Nevertheless, this Member, Mrs. GRIJALVA from Arizona, could have been sworn in during what is called a pro forma session.

I think that this is simply wrong. I think it is wrong she had to wait over a month, I believe, after she should have been sworn in to actually have the opportunity to begin representing her constituents.

I don't want to see anything like this happen again, regardless of which party controls the House and regardless of which party the Member who is waiting to be sworn in represents.

My bill is very simple. It would simply say that after an individual has prevailed in a special election, then they have the right to be sworn in on the next legislative day, whether that is a pro forma session or a regular session.

I think this is a commonsense measure and will ensure that what we just saw with the Representative from Arizona doesn't happen in this Chamber again.

CONGRATULATING CHIEF BRIAN ESTES

Mr. KILEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Chief Brian Estes of the CAL FIRE Nevada Yuba Placer Unit and the Placer County Fire Department. He is retiring at the end of this year after an exceptional career of over 35 years in the fire service.

In 1991, Chief Estes graduated at the top of his class from the Butte Fire Academy, launching him into a long and successful career. He began working as a firefighter at a station in San Diego County.

Mr. Speaker, 4 years later, he joined the CAL FIRE helicopter crew in Tuolumne County, where he stayed for another 4 years. During this timeframe, he held various leadership positions, such as CWN manager and military helicopter manager. He coordinated with the California National Guard as a military liaison officer.

In 1988, Brian Estes was promoted to fire apparatus engineer and was assigned to the Amador/El Dorado Unit. Brian climbed the ladder and was promoted through the ranks, becoming captain in 2000 and being promoted to battalion chief in 2005.

In the coming years, Chief Estes responded to some of California's most challenging fires, joining deployments and leading 14 Type I incidents across California as Type I incident commander.

Brian Estes continued to be promoted, and he served as assistant chief of operations, deputy chief of operations, and then, finally, as unit chief for the Nevada Yuba Placer Unit and fire chief of the Placer County Fire Department.

He had the honor of leading over 450 personnel and overseeing a budget of

over \$100 million across 1.7 million acres of State Responsibility Area.

As Placer County Fire Chief, Chief Estes oversaw municipal services across 1,000 square miles and served over 70,000 residents, protecting \$80 billion in assets.

In these capacities, he has been an outstanding force in protecting the quality of life in our region by leading the front line of defense against the all-too-common California wildfires.

Chief Estes is widely respected for his exceptional leadership skills and unwavering commitment to collaboration. Under his guidance, his units operate with greater strength, efficiency, and purpose, reflecting his ability to maximize their potential and bring out the best in those he leads.

A lifelong public servant, Chief Estes is truly a pillar of our community. He is defined by his consistent and active engagement and his deep dedication to those he serves, going above and beyond the regular call of duty.

It has really been a privilege to work alongside Chief Estes throughout my time in office. It is an honor to represent someone held in such high esteem by his friends, family, colleagues, and community.

Therefore, on behalf of the United States House of Representatives and California's Third Congressional District, I wish Chief Estes a happy retirement and thank him for his many years of service.

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

ISSUES OF THE DAY

(Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, Mr. GROTHMAN of Wisconsin was recognized for 30 minutes.)

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, as we adjourn for the weekend, I would like to address three issues which affect Americans, these are issues I don't think have been discussed quite as much as we ought to.

The first issue concerns this transgender situation. We spend a lot of time talking about guys in girls' sports. This is a problem that ought to be dealt with. I think it polls very well.

Of even more significant concern is that of our out of control psychiatric profession treating this as a genetic problem in which people should have to have surgeries to deal with this.

They have surgeries on young people, people as young as 16 or 15 or 14 years old. These are surgeries that will affect them for the rest of their lives. Just as bad, they give puberty blockers to these young people, not knowing what the long-term effects will be.

Recently, new information that should have come as a surprise to no one—but perhaps will come as a surprise to the mainstream media—a new study came out showing that the number of young adults identifying as transgender plunged by nearly ½ half in 2 years. It exposed what a lot of us

knew all along. It was largely a social contagion. It was not a genetic disease that required surgeries or permanently changing people's lives.

As I pointed out before, this does not only affect the people themselves who may have puberty blockers and surgeries but it affects the parents. It affects the parents who will never have grandchildren because their children were roped into this by the liberal news media, by the liberal psychiatric and psychological associations, and by hospitals who made money off of this deal.

I am really afraid this is something, since it is a nationwide problem, that should be dealt with in Congress—and I think it will be dealt with soon—in which we begin to refuse this sort of treatment and, even more, refuse these surgeries to people under the age of 21.

Can we honestly say that we would advise someone who is 20 or 19 years old to have surgery, permanently altering their body for the rest of their life? Think how our ideas on life have changed. Think how our opinions on life have changed between when we were 18 or 19 or 20 years old and when we are 45 or 50 years old.

The know-it-alls in the psychiatric and psychological profession are encouraging people to have surgeries. They are giving people puberty blockers. I am afraid the U.S. Congress will have to step forward and say “no.”

I hope our leadership team in the near future puts something forward that says—and it really should be greater than that. A person can't be a Congressman until age 25—it should at least go to age 21. We need to put an end to this and stand up to the psychiatric and psychological associations. That is one issue I think we ought to deal with.

Mr. Speaker, I will now deal with another issue, and this kind of deals with Social Security. Right now, there are older people who make the mistake of retiring and getting Social Security. All of a sudden, they would like to go back to work and make more money, but they are unable to.

Earlier this session we played around with the Social Security trust fund in which—or at the end of the last session in which way too many people voted for giving more Social Security dollars to some governmental employees; it was about \$24 billion a year.

Rather than encouraging more people to retire, if our leadership team wants to encourage more people to work, which we should, we should increase the amount of money that a senior can make before their Social Security is taken away.

Right now, if a person makes more than \$19,500 a year in Social Security, when they get to that point, the government begins to take away a person's Social Security check. Right now, we are in the business of trying to discourage people from working if they are 68 or 69 or 70.

□ 1310

Let's pass the Senior Independence Act which increases that amount from

\$19,500 to \$30,000 so that the older people who need a little bit more money can earn it. Even more, it is good for people to work. If these older people want to get out of the house and get a little more social stimulation by working, then they are not penalized for doing so.

I strongly encourage our leadership team. I realize that they will say that it will encourage more people to retire early and might cost the government a little bit of money, but we had plenty of money to give people who were retired to encourage people to retire last January.

Let's encourage and free up older people and let them work a little bit more.

Of course, we have a labor shortage problem. It will also be good for our economy as we see a few more people going to work, maybe working 30 hours a week instead of working 20 hours a week. As I said, we want to boost our economy a little. There are so many businesses who so desperately looking for some more labor, particularly the retail outlets out there and there are some factories, as well. We are particularly finding now that we are kicking people out of this country who are here illegally and were working, it would be great to have more 60 to 69-year-olds working. I hope our leadership will find a way to pass the Senior Independence Act and allow seniors to make \$30,000 a year.

Now, the third issue I want to deal with comes under 14(c), which is the provision which allows people who are having some physical problems, spina bifida, Down syndrome, and other problems, sometimes paraplegics, to work.

Given the current situation, in order to make it financially viable to have them work, they have to work for under minimum wage. Nobody ever forces people to do this, but they do it to earn a little additional money. Most of these people are on SSI. They don't need the money to pay the mortgage or pay the rent, but they would like to have a little bit more money to buy some of their own clothes, perhaps buy gifts for parents, what have you.

There are really misguided people out there who are trying to get rid of 14(c) certificates, and, in essence, make it against the law to pay somebody \$4 or \$5 or \$6 to work because of problems that are out there. I have right now formed a caucus called the Congressional Disability Employment Caucus, which is dedicated to the preservation of the 14(c) program. It will provide a little bit of structure to the effort to continue to allow people with differing abilities to have the freedom to work for a little bit smaller amount.

I think it is just horrible that some people want to take away this freedom. I believe in counties in which this freedom has been taken away. What happens is people who, right now, are working for \$4 or \$5 an hour wind up in what they call day services, and they sit around and watch television or

maybe they are taken on a trip somewhere, but they miss out on the enjoyment of work. They miss out on being like their siblings in which they are able to work today and some, to a degree, support themselves.

I think it is just tragic when this is done and they are deprived of the freedom to work. I will encourage all of my colleagues to track down 14(c) employers in their district and see how meaningful it is for these people with differing abilities to be able to work and to be able to earn their own money.

It is not just an economic decision, it is a social decision, as well. One of the things that scares parents or guardians who are dealing with people in this situation is: What is going to happen to them when the parents are gone? Are they going to have any friends? Are they going to have any social structure?

Moreover, even more than people in other jobs, the social structure provided by people and employers that use 14(c) certificates does provide these folks with friends. We all to a certain extent socialize with the people we work with, but especially for these people, it is important to have friends outside their immediate family.

When you begin to shut down these employers, Mr. Speaker, you are depriving these people of the friendships that they will form in employers who give 14(c).

First of all, I beg my colleagues—we all like to get reelected—I beg my colleagues to tour facilities with 14(c) certificates, and see how happy the people are who work there. See how important both economically as well as socially it is for these folks to have the freedom to work in these facilities. I hope Congress stands up to the freedom haters who want to deny these folks the ability to work in a little bit different setting that they want to do.

There are three issues that I ask Congress to take up and consider. I want Congress to pass whatever legislation is necessary to make sure we always protect the 14(c) certificates. I ask Congress to take up raising the amount of money a senior can make before we take away their Social Security, both for the good of the overall economy, as well as the financial and social health and social assistance of our senior citizens.

Finally, I ask Congress to do something to make sure these out-of-control, lack of commonsense psychologists, psychiatrists are not able to give puberty blockers or surgeries on people under the age of 21.

As I said, we should ban it, even above that age. I have certainly sat and heard people talk about how they regret their surgeries. It seems in our society when it comes down to drinking and when it comes down to smoking, age 21 is the limit in which we allow people to do more. If any of my colleagues would want to introduce an amendment to age 25, our forefathers didn't feel we were qualified to be Con-

gressmen until we were age 25, I would be happy to go for an age 25 limit, as well. I would like to be debating that in conference next week.

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

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT ON THE INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2026, SUBMITTED BY MR. CRAWFORD, CHAIRMAN OF THE HOUSE PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The following is the Explanatory Statement to accompany the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2026 ("the Act"), which has been included as Division F of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2026. The Explanatory Statement reflects the result of negotiations between the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence (together, "the Committees"). The Explanatory Statement shall have the same effect with respect to the implementation of the Act as if it were a joint explanatory statement of a conference committee.

The classified nature of U.S. Intelligence activities prevents the Committees from publicly disclosing many details concerning their final decisions regarding funding levels and policy direction. Therefore, the Committees have prepared a classified annex—referred to here and within the annex itself as "the Agreement"—that contains a classified Schedule of Authorizations and describes in detail the scope and intent of the Committees' actions.

The Agreement authorizes the Intelligence Community to obligate and expend funds as requested in the President's budget and as modified by the classified Schedule of Authorizations, subject to applicable reprogramming procedures.

The classified Schedule of Authorizations is incorporated into the Act pursuant to Section 6102 of the Act. It has the status of law. The Agreement supplements and adds detail to clarify the authorization levels found in the Act and in the classified Schedule of Authorizations.

This Explanatory Statement incorporates by reference, and the Executive Branch shall comply with, all direction contained in the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence Report to accompany the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2026 (S. Rept. 119-51) and in the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence Report to accompany the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2026 (H. Rept. 119-389). The Agreement supersedes all classified direction in the classified annexes to accompany S. Rept. 119-51 and H. Rept. 119-389 related to programs and activities authorized by the Schedule of Authorizations.

The Executive Branch is further directed as follows:

Counterintelligence Support for Department of the Treasury Networks and Systems

The Committees direct that the head of the Office of Counterintelligence of the Office of Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of the Treasury shall implement policies and procedures that ensure counterintelligence support to all entities of the Department of the Treasury responsible for safeguarding networks and systems and for coordinating between counterintelligence threat mitigation activities and cyber network and system defense efforts. The Committees further direct that, not later than

270 days after the date of enactment of the Act, the head of the Office of Counterintelligence shall submit a report to the Committees on the status of the implementation of such policies.

Report on Director's Initiatives Group

The Committees direct that, not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of the Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall provide to the Committees a briefing on personnel matters of the Director's Initiatives Group, which shall include: (1) a list of personnel of such group, from the date of the creation of the group; and (2) funding sources for personnel of such group.

Report on Secure Mobile Communications Systems Used To Transmit Classified Information

The Committees direct that, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the Act, each Intelligence Community program head shall submit to the Committees a report on the secure mobile communications systems used for transmission of classified information (excluding systems used for purposes of clandestine or covert communications) and available to employees and officers of the Intelligence Community. The report should include the following information: (1) the name, description, and date of purchase or development of each system; (2) the number of employees using each system; (3) the cost of development and operations of each system; (4) a list of the capabilities and the level of classification of each system; (5) identification of any existing service agreements with other elements of the Intelligence Community for use of a system; and (6) identification, description, and deployment timeline of any secure mobile communications systems that are in development. For purposes of this report, the term "mobile communications systems" means any portable wireless telecommunications equipment utilized for the transmission or reception of classified information.

Ukraine Lessons Learned Working Group

Section 6413 of the Fiscal Year 2025 Intelligence Authorization Act (P.L. 118-159) required the Director of National Intelligence and the Secretary of Defense to jointly establish a working group to identify and share lessons learned from the Ukraine conflict in order to strengthen United States national security. Despite the critical importance of this mandate, the Committees note with concern that the working group has not been established and that the Intelligence Community has been unresponsive to repeated congressional inquiries on this matter.

The Committees recognize that various efforts are underway across the Executive Branch that may support the objectives envisioned for the working group. However, the Committees underscore the importance of adhering to statutory requirements and ensuring that lessons from Russia's invasion of Ukraine are systematically identified, coordinated, and applied.

Accordingly, the Committees direct the Director of National Intelligence and the Secretary of Defense to stand up the Ukraine Lessons Learned Working Group, in compliance with the law, not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of the Act, and to provide a joint briefing to the Committees on the status, scope, and initial findings of the working group not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of the Act.

Department of State Information Technology Management

The Committees continue to be concerned with the management of the Department of State's information technology networks and believe the existing management structure for the networks may no longer meet

the requirements to support a global diplomatic presence. The Committees therefore direct the Assistant Secretary of State for Intelligence and Research, in coordination with any other bureau or office the Assistant Secretary determines appropriate, to explore optimized reorganization of management of the entirety of the Department's information technology networks and to provide a briefing to the Committees, not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Act, on potential concepts of realignment.

Artificial Intelligence Development and Usage by Intelligence Community

Section 6602 of the Act requires the Chief Information Officer of the Intelligence Community to identify commonly used artificial intelligence systems or functions that have the greatest potential for re-use without significant modification by Intelligence Community elements. The Committees direct that, in identifying such systems, the Chief Information Officer of the Intelligence Community shall, in addition to coordinating with the Chief Artificial Intelligence Officer of the Intelligence Community, coordinate with such officials of the Department of Defense, as identified by the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence and Security, for any systems used by an Intelligence Community element of the Department of Defense.

Section 6602 also requires the head of each Intelligence Community element to track and evaluate the performance of procured and element-developed artificial intelligence. The Committees are of the view that tracking and evaluating should at a minimum include—

1. Documenting, to the extent information is readily available, the provenance of data used to train, fine-tune, or operate the artificial intelligence system, such as included in industry standard Model Cards to the extent practicable.

2. Conducting ongoing testing and evaluation on artificial intelligence system performance, the effectiveness of vendor artificial intelligence offerings, and associated risk management measures, including by testing in real-world conditions.

3. The stipulation of conditions for retraining or decommissioning artificial intelligence capabilities.

4. Requiring sufficient post-award monitoring and evaluation for effectiveness of the artificial intelligence system in achieving documented mission outcomes, where appropriate in the context of the product or service acquired.

Study on Threats Posed by Unmanned Aerial Systems At or Near the Land and Maritime Borders of the United States

The Committees are concerned that hundreds of encounters with unmanned aircraft systems (UAS) are annually recorded at or near the land and maritime borders of the United States, which present a vulnerability in national security. With the proliferation of affordable drones, a wide range of groups, including malign actors, have sought to make use of this capability. It is critical that the U.S. Government has full situational awareness of the threats these systems pose to U.S. military personnel, other Federal personnel, and civilians.

The Committees therefore direct that, not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Act, the Director of National Intelligence, in coordination with the Undersecretary for Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of Homeland Security and the heads of any other elements of the Intelligence Community the Director considers appropriate, shall submit to the Committees a study on the threat posed by UAS at or near the land and maritime borders of the United States.

The study shall include the following:

1. An identification of the malign actors operating UAS at or near the borders, including malign actors who cross such borders.

2. The information collected by operators of UAS at or near the borders, and a description of how such data is used by malign actors.

3. The tactics, techniques, and procedures used by malign actors operating UAS at or near the borders, including how such actors acquire, modify, and utilize UAS to conduct malicious activities, including attacks, surveillance, conveyance of contraband, and other forms of threats.

4. A description of how a threat is identified and assessed at or near the borders, including a description of the capabilities of the United States Government to detect and identify UAS operated by, or on behalf of, malign actors.

5. The adequacy of United States technology used to detect, identify, track, monitor, and mitigate threats posed by UAS operated by malign actors at or near the borders.

6. The guidance, policies, and procedures that address the privacy, civil rights, and civil liberties of persons who lawfully operate UAS at or near the borders.

7. Current authorities of the United States Government to counter the use of UAS by malign actors at or near the borders, including an accounting of the delineated responsibilities of Federal agencies to counter, contain, trace, or defeat unmanned aircraft systems at or near the borders.

Counterintelligence Threats to United States Civil and Commercial Space Interests

The Committees are concerned with counterintelligence threats to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) and commercial spaceports. Therefore, the Committees direct that, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the Act, the Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), shall submit to the Committees an assessment of the counterintelligence vulnerabilities of NASA, if any.

The assessment shall include the following:

1. An assessment of the vulnerability of the security practices and facilities of NASA to efforts by nation-state and non-nation-state actors to acquire United States space technology.

2. An assessment of the counterintelligence threat posed to NASA centers by nationals of the Russian Federation and the People's Republic of China.

3. Recommendations for how NASA can mitigate any counterintelligence gaps identified under paragraphs (1) and (2).

4. A description of efforts by NASA to respond to the efforts of nation-state and non-nation-state actors to illicitly acquire United States satellites and related items as described in reports submitted by the Director of National Intelligence pursuant to section 1261 (e) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (P.L. 112-239), along with an evaluation of the effectiveness of these efforts.

Further, the Committees direct that, not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of the Act the head of the Counterintelligence Division of the FBI, in coordination with the head of the Office of Private Sector of the FBI, and in coordination with the Office of Commercial Space Transportation within the Department of Transportation, shall develop an assessment of the counterintelligence risks, if any, to commercial spaceports and distribute the assessment to each FBI field office in an area of responsibility which includes a federally-licensed

commercial spaceport and the leadership of each federally-licensed commercial spaceport, in coordination with the Office of Commercial Space Transportation.

Protection of Classified Information Related to Budget Functions

The Committees remain concerned with protecting classified information used in the Intelligence Community's budget-related activities. Therefore, the Committees direct that, not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Act, the Director of National Intelligence, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall submit to the Committees a study, with a classified annex, outlining the feasibility of and cost associated with the department or agency of (1) the Secretary of Treasury; (2) the Director of the Office of Management and Budget; (3) each head of an element of the Intelligence Community; or (4) any other head of a department or agency of the Federal Government carrying out a function specified below, using secure systems that meet the requirements to protect classified information, including with respect to the location at which the system is located or accessed, to carry out any of the following activities:

1. Formulating, developing, and submitting the budget of the department or agency (including the budget justification materials submitted to Congress) under the National Intelligence Program;

2. Apportioning, allotting, and issuing warrants for the disbursement of, and obligating and expending funds under the National Intelligence Program; and

3. Carrying out Federal financial management service functions or related activities of the Intelligence Community.

Evaluation of Training Data Pertaining to Artificial Intelligence Systems

It is the sense of the Committees that the Intelligence Community should seek to evaluate training data, methods of labeling data, and model weights pertaining to artificial intelligence systems being considered for use, procurement, or adoption by an element of the Intelligence Community to enable such element to make informed decisions regarding the fitness and reliability of the system and that each element of the Intelligence Community should, to the greatest extent practicable, avoid use of any publicly available artificial intelligence model found to contain information on United States persons that has been obtained unlawfully by the vendor of the model.

Annual Survey of Analytic Objectivity Among Officers and Employees of Elements of the Intelligence Community

Section 6305 requires the head of certain elements of the Intelligence Community to conduct a survey of analytic objectivity among officers and employees of such element who are involved in the production of intelligence products. The Committees direct the head of each element to submit to the Committees a report on the findings of the most recently completed survey.

Plan To Enhance Intelligence Community Counternarcotics Collaboration with Mexico

Section 6717 requires each element of the Intelligence Community, not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of the Act, to submit to the Director of National Intelligence a report on that element's relationship with the Government of Mexico, if any, as it relates to counternarcotics collaboration, coordination, and cooperation, including a strategy to enhance such cooperation and recommendations regarding the resources required to effectively implement that strategy. The Committees direct each

element head to simultaneously submit to the Committees the same report submitted to the Director, along with any recommendations or requests for changes in authorities or resources to effectuate the element's strategy.

Efforts by Director of Office of Intelligence and Counterintelligence at Department of Energy to Mitigate Counterintelligence Risks

The Committees are concerned by the counterintelligence risks posed by Department of Energy employees' travel to certain countries. Therefore, the Committees direct the Director of the Office of Intelligence and Counterintelligence at the Department of Energy to develop and implement mechanisms for all personnel of the Department to (1) report to the Office any personal or official travel to a "country of risk," as defined by section 6432 of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2025 (P.L. 118-159), or to any other country the Director considers appropriate prior to beginning such travel; (2) at the request of personnel of the Office, receive briefings with respect to travel to such country prior to beginning such travel; and (3) at the request of personnel of the Office, participate in debriefings after travel to such country.

Notification of Material Changes to Policies or Procedures Governing Terrorist Watchlist and Transnational Organized Crime Watchlist

Section 6522 requires the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to submit to the appropriate congressional committees notice of any material change to a policy or procedure relating to the terrorist watchlist or the transnational organized crime watchlist within 30 days of the date on which the material change takes effect. This section separately requires the Director, within 30 days of a request by an appropriate congressional committee, to submit to that committee all watchlisting guidance in effect as of the date of the request that applies to or governs the use of the terrorist watchlist or the transnational organized crime watchlist. The Committees emphasize that the term "material change to a policy or procedure relating to the terrorist watchlist or the transnational organized crime watchlist" includes any change to the watchlisting guidance itself.

National Security Harm Prevented by Prepublication Review

The Committees direct the Director of National Intelligence, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, the Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency, and the Assistant Secretary of State for Intelligence and Research to each submit to the Committees, not later than April 30, 2026, a report that describes the five items most harmful to United States national security identified within the last five years by such element during prepublication review, as determined by the head of such element or their designee.

Reforms to Inactive Security Clearances

Section 6310 of the Act directs the Director of National Intelligence to review and evaluate whether former Intelligence Community personnel who departed federal service within the past five years and previously held a security clearance could retain access to classified information if they continue to meet applicable standards. The section also requires the Director to assess the feasibility and advisability of applying continuous vetting to inactive clearances and to report the findings to the appropriate congressional committees within 120 days of the date of enactment of the Act. Section 1626 of the Fiscal Year 2026 National Defense Authorization Act contains a similar requirement for the

Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence and Security, in coordination with the Director of National Intelligence, to review the feasibility and advisability of extending the period during which former Department of Defense personnel may maintain an inactive security clearance. The Committees strongly support these complementary efforts and direct the Director of National Intelligence and the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence and Security to closely coordinate their reviews to ensure consistency, share findings as appropriate, and avoid duplication.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 356.—An act to extend the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000.

S. 2283.—An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 201 West Oklahoma Avenue in Guthrie, Oklahoma, as the "Oscar J. Upham Post Office".

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday next, December 15, 2025, at noon, 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-2368. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, AGC-010, 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.: 31637; Amdt. No.: 4194] (RIN: 2120-AA65) received December 5, 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-2369. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, AGC-010, 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.: 31636; Amdt. No.: 4193] received December 5, 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-2370. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, AGC-010, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2025-0912; Project Identifier MCAI-2024-00571-T; Amendment 39-23178; AD 2025-22-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 5, 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-2371. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, AGC-010, FAA, De-

partment of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Textron Aviation Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2025-3424; Project Identifier AD-2025-01362-A; Amendment 39-23164; AD 2025-20-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 5, 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-2372. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, AGC-010, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2025-4002; Project Identifier AD-2025-01671-T; Amendment 39-23193; AD 2025-23-51] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 5, 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-2373. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, AGC-010, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; MHI RJ Aviation ULC (Type Certificate Previously Held by Bombardier, Inc.) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2025-3995; Project Identifier MCAI-2025-01653-T; Amendment 39-23180; AD 2025-22-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 5, 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-2374. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, AGC-010, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Polskie Zakłady Lotnicze Sp. z o.o. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2025-3994; Project Identifier MCAI-2025-01607-A; Amendment 39-23179; AD 2025-21-51] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 5, 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-2375. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, AGC-010, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31633; Amdt. No.: 588] (RIN: 2120-AA63) received December 5, 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-2376. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, AGC-010, 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.: 31632; Amdt. No.: 4190] (RIN: 2120-AA65) received December 5, 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-2377. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, AGC-010, 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.: 31631; Amdt. No.: 4189] (RIN: 2120-AA65) received December 5, 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-2378. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, AGC-010, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2025-3431; Project Identifier MCAI-2025-01291-R; Amendment 39-23170; AD 2025-20-17]

(RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 5, 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-2379. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, AGC-010, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Continental Aerospace Technologies GmbH Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2025-3432; Project Identifier MCAI-2024-00743-E; Amendment 39-23171; AD 2025-20-18] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 5, 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-2380. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, AGC-010, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Cameron Balloons Ltd. Fuel Cylinders [Docket No.: FAA-2025-3433; Project Identifier MCAI-2025-01302-Q; Amendment 39-23173; AD 2025-21-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 5, 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. H.R. 3962. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize the National Estuary Program, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 119-400). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRAVES: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 4183. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Federal Maritime Commission for fiscal years 2026 through 2029, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 119-401). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas: Committee on Small Business. H.R. 3496. A bill to amend the Small Business Act for microloan eligibility for the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 119-402). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas: Committee on Small Business. H.R. 5764. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to require small business development centers to assist small business concerns with the use of artificial intelligence, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 119-403). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas: Committee on Small Business. H.R. 5788. A bill to amend title V of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to require an annual portfolio risk analysis of loans guaranteed under such title, and for other purposes (Rept. 119-404). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas: Committee on Small Business. H.R. 5784. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to help small business concerns critically evaluate artificial intelligence tools, and for other purposes (Rept. 119-405). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas: Committee on Small Business. H.R. 5763. A bill to amend

the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to modify the criteria for loans for plant acquisition, construction, conversion or expansion, and for other purposes (Rept. 119-406). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. JORDAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4638. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide that an alien who has been convicted of harming animals used in law enforcement is inadmissible and deportable, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 119-407). 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. BROWNLEY (for herself, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. CASTEN, and Ms. TOKUDA):

H.R. 6684. A bill to provide grants to reduce the amount of food waste, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FINSTAD (for himself, Mr. CAREY, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 6685. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish an exception for multiemployer plan participants to the requirements for automatic enrollment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 6686. A bill to amend section 262 of the Museum and Library Services Act to authorize the Director of the Institute of Museum and Library Services to award grants to institutions of higher education for courses that use only publicly available digital resources for required reading assignments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Mrs. HARSHBARGER (for herself, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. PERRY):

H.R. 6687. A bill to require manufacturers of motor vehicles to provide motor vehicle owners with access to and use of motor vehicle data of motor vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. HARSHBARGER (for herself, Mr. OBERNOLTE, Mr. VASQUEZ, and Mrs. TORRES of California):

H.R. 6688. A bill to require the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration to establish guidelines for advanced driver assistance systems calibration, modifications, and tolerances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HORSFORD (for himself and Mr. CISNEROS):

H.R. 6689. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Defense from awarding contracts to entities of which certain current Government employees are officers or owners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. KING-HINDS (for herself and Mr. MOYLAN):

H.R. 6690. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to increase the payment limit under Medicaid for the Northern Mariana Islands; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MAST:

H.R. 6691. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide that the transportation of goods from a port of entry and another place within the same State as such port does not constitute interstate transportation, and for other purposes; to the Com-

mittee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 6692. A bill to reduce the pay of Members of Congress in the case of a lapse in appropriations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MOORE of North Carolina (for himself and Mr. EDWARDS):

H.R. 6693. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to establish expedited permitting procedures for post-natural disaster recovery activities, incorporating interagency coordination and best management practices to ensure timely rebuilding while protecting endangered species, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MORELLE:

H.R. 6694. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 130 North Winton Road in Rochester, New York, as the "Lieutenant James N. Lyons Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. OGLES (for himself and Mr. DONALDS):

H.R. 6695. A bill to clarify United States policy with respect to limitations on the domestic dissemination of program material about the United States that was prepared or disseminated by the United States Agency for Global Media or its component networks; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PANETTA (for himself and Mr. KUSTOFF):

H.R. 6696. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Critical Minerals Security Alliance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, Natural Resources, Energy and Commerce, Armed Services, and 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. SCHRIER (for herself, Mr. VAN DREW, and Ms. BONAMICI):

H.R. 6697. A bill to amend the Emergency Food Assistance Act of 1983 to provide additional agricultural products for distribution by emergency feeding organizations; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SELF:

H.R. 6698. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Board of Veterans' Appeals to include in its annual report an identification of the factors contributing to untimely disposition and remand of appeals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SOTO:

H.R. 6699. A bill to direct the Federal Communications Commission to establish a program to make grants to certain radio stations experiencing harmful interference, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. STANSBURY (for herself, Ms. BONAMICI, and Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas):

H.R. 6700. A bill to establish the Presidential Management Fellows Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. STANTON (for himself and Mr. LAWLER):

H.R. 6701. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to provide for emergency relief for repair or reconstruction of infrastructure

damaged by extreme heat, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 6702. A bill to require the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration to conduct a study and develop a public education program on micromobility technologies, high speed personal transportation devices, and certain road users, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. ROSS (for herself, Mr. VEASEY, and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY):

H.J. Res. 134. A joint resolution terminating the national emergency declared to impose duties on articles imported from India; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ (for herself, Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. FRIEDMAN, Mr. CORREA, Ms. RIVAS, Mr. HORSFORD, and Ms. STANSBURY):

H. Res. 949. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the first Saturday in May as "National Lowrider Day"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida (for herself, Mr. SOTO, and Mr. FROST):

H. Res. 950. A resolution commemorating the 25th anniversary of the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. BROWNLEY:

H.R. 6684.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. FINSTAD:

H.R. 6685.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 6686.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. HARSHBARGER:

H.R. 6687.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution

By Mrs. HARSHBARGER:

H.R. 6688.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 and clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. HORSFORD:

H.R. 6689.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the Constitution

By Ms. KING-HINDS:

H.R. 6690.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. MAST:

H.R. 6691.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. Art. 1, Sec. 8, Clause 18

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 6692.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 2 of Section 5 of Article 1 of the Constitution: "Each House may determine the Rules of its Proceedings"

Clause 1 of Section 6 of Article 1 of the Constitution: "The Senators and Representatives shall receive a Compensation for their Services, to be ascertained by Law, and paid out of the Treasury of the United States."

Section 1 of Amendment 27 to the Constitution: "No law, varying the compensation for the services of the Senators and Representatives, shall take effect, until an election of Representatives shall have intervened."

By Mr. MOORE of North Carolina:

H.R. 6693.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1

By Mr. MORELLE:

H.R. 6694.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. OGLES:

H.R. 6695.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PANETTA:

H.R. 6696.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Ms. SCHRIER:

H.R. 6697.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SELF:

H.R. 6698.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. SOTO:

H.R. 6699.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution.

By Ms. STANSBURY:

H.R. 6700.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. STANTON:

H.R. 6701.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 6702.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. ROSS:

H.J. Res. 134.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 1 (Taxing and Spending Clause)

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 116: Mrs. MILLER of Illinois.

H.R. 349: Mr. LANDSMAN.

H.R. 1010: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 1094: Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 1269: Mr. CISNEROS.

H.R. 1521: Ms. BYNUM.

H.R. 1564: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1616: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1657: Mr. CISNEROS.

H.R. 1667: Ms. SIMON.

H.R. 1783: Mr. CISNEROS.

H.R. 1869: Mr. RILEY of New York.

H.R. 2004: Mr. OBERNOLTE, Mr. SOTO, and Ms. BUDZINSKI.

H.R. 2253: Mr. OLSZEWSKI and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 2311: Ms. McDONALD RIVET.

H.R. 2528: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 2660: Mr. MAGAZINER.

H.R. 2661: Mr. RILEY of New York.

H.R. 2729: Mr. ALFORD.

H.R. 2741: Ms. BYNUM.

H.R. 2784: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 2849: Mr. CISNEROS.

H.R. 2853: Mr. MRVAN and Mrs. HARSHBARGER.

H.R. 2902: Mr. OLSZEWSKI.

H.R. 3070: Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 3071: Mr. CISNEROS.

H.R. 3497: Mr. STEIL.

H.R. 3505: Mr. WALKINSHAW.

H.R. 3694: Mr. CLINE.

H.R. 3699: Mr. ESTES, Mr. VAN ORDEN, and Ms. LETLOW.

H.R. 3743: Ms. BUDZINSKI.

H.R. 3866: Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 3892: Mr. OLSZEWSKI.

H.R. 4032: Mr. ALFORD.

H.R. 4093: Ms. MALLIOTAKIS.

H.R. 4201: Mr. NEHLS.

H.R. 4309: Mr. WALKINSHAW.

H.R. 4351: Ms. McDONALD RIVET.

H.R. 4443: Mr. CISNEROS.

H.R. 4477: Ms. McDONALD RIVET.

H.R. 4582: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. TENNEY, Ms. BYNUM, and Mr. WALKINSHAW.

H.R. 4583: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. TENNEY, Ms. BYNUM, and Mr. WALKINSHAW.

H.R. 4594: Ms. McDONALD RIVET.

H.R. 4796: Mr. GOLDEN of Maine.

H.R. 4821: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 4917: Ms. POU.

H.R. 4966: Mr. CISNEROS.

H.R. 5052: Mrs. KIM.

H.R. 5106: Mr. CLINE.

H.R. 5221: Ms. SCHRIER.

H.R. 5327: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 5357: Mr. BELL.

H.R. 5434: Mr. DOGGETT and Ms. SCHA-KOWSKY.

H.R. 5486: Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. FOUSHEE, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Mr. LATIMER, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. DEXTER, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. CROW, Ms. PEREZ, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. FROST, and Mrs. TRAHAN.

H.R. 5490: Mr. BAUMGARTNER.

H.R. 5509: Ms. BONAMICI, Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. CASTRO of Texas.

H.R. 5519: Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 6100: Mr. LANGWORTHY and Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 6172: Ms. STRICKLAND, Ms. JAYAPAL, and Ms. JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 6225: Mr. NEHLS.

H.R. 6322: Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 6345: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 6501: Mr. HURD of Colorado.

H.R. 6521: Mr. CARTER of Louisiana.

H.R. 6538: Mr. GOLDMAN of Texas.

H.R. 6553: Mr. MEUSER, Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, and Mr. MOORE of North Carolina.

H.R. 6554: Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas.

H.R. 6564: Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 6567: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.

H.R. 6597: Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWNLEY, and Ms. BROWN.

H.R. 6603: Mr. LATIMER, Ms. BROWN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mr. KENNEDY of New York.

H.J. Res. 12: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
 H. Con. Res. 64: Mrs. FOUSHEE.
 H. Con. Res. 65: Mrs. GRIJALVA.
 H. Res. 227: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.
 H. Res. 229: Mrs. HARSHBARGER.
 H. Res. 858: Mrs. HARSHBARGER.
 H. Res. 948: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.

DELETION OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 740: Mr. FIELDS.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XV, the following discharge petitions were filed:

Petition 12, December 10, 2025, by Mr. FITZPATRICK on House Resolution 486, was signed by the following Members: Mr. Fitzpatrick, Mr. Golden of Maine, Mr. Lawler, Mr. Bresnahan, Mr. Mackenzie, Mr. Kiley of California, Mr. Suozzi, Mr. Bacon, Mr. LaLota, Mr. Valadao, Ms. Greene of

Georgia, Mr. Davis of North Carolina, Mr. Van Drew, Mrs. Kiggans of Virginia, Ms. Perez, Mr. Vicente Gonzalez of Texas, Ms. Goodlander, Mr. Peters, Mr. Courtney, Ms. Houlahan, Mr. Magaziner, Mr. Liccardo, Ms. Davids of Kansas, and Ms. Salazar.

Petition 13, December 10, 2025, by Mr. GOTTHEIMER on House Resolution 910, was signed by the following Members: Mr. Gottheimer, Mr. Lawler, Mr. Valadao, Mrs. Kiggans of Virginia, Mr. Mackenzie, Mr. Fitzpatrick, Mr. Suozzi, Mr. LaLota, Mr. Kiley of California, Mr. Van Drew, Mr. Bresnahan, Mr. Peters, Ms. Scholten, Ms. Goodlander, Mr. Vicente Gonzalez of Texas, Mr. Gray, Mr. Golden of Maine, Mr. Landsman, Mr. Bacon, Mr. Soto, Mrs. Foushee, Mr. Case, Mr. Moskowitz, Mr. Cuellar, Mr. Panetta, Ms. Lee of Nevada, Mr. Pappas, Mr. Davis of North Carolina, Mr. Carbajal, Mr. Costa, Ms. Greene of Georgia, Mr. Riley of New York, Ms. Perez, Mr. Figures, Mr. Bell, Mr. Courtney, Ms. Houlahan, Mr. Liccardo, and Mr. Min.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS— ADDITIONS AND WITHDRAWALS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 7 by Mr. MEEKS on House Resolution 462: Ms. Salinas, Mr. Carson, and Mrs. Trahan.

Petition 8 by Mr. MEEKS on House Resolution 518: Ms. Tlaib.

Petition 11 by Mrs. LUNA on House Resolution 725: Ms. Jayapal, Mr. Sorensen, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Khanna, Mr. Magaziner, Mr. Kiley of California, Mr. Mills, Mr. Riley of New York, Mr. Pocan, Ms. Wilson of Florida, Mr. Lynch, Ms. Omar, Mr. Keating, Mr. Krishnamoorthi, Ms. Tlaib, Mr. Neguse, Mr. Levin, Ms. Goodlander, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Ms. Ocasio-Cortez, Mr. Bresnahan, Mr. Subramanyam, Mr. Deluzio, Ms. Greene of Georgia, Mr. Johnson of Georgia, Mr. Van Drew, Ms. DeGette, Mr. Goldman of New York, Ms. Ansari, Mr. Garcia of California, Mrs. Ramirez, Mr. Crow, Mr. Larson of Connecticut, Mr. Soto, Mrs. Foushee, Mr. Norcross, Mr. Beyer, Ms. Balint, Ms. Escobar, Mr. Casar, Ms. Stansbury, Ms. Tokuda, Ms. Pettersen, Ms. Friedman, and Mr. Vasquez.