



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 119th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 172

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JANUARY 15, 2026

No. 11

House of Representatives

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:

O Lord, our God, we pray for strength and courage.

Grant us the inner strength that comes with the serenity to accept the things we cannot change: things about our situation, about other people's personalities, and about our own flawed human nature.

Yet give us the moral courage to change the things we can: our own attitudes, our responses to people whose opinions and perspectives differ from our own, and our willingness to trust in You.

Then grant us the wisdom not only to know the difference between what is within our control and what is not, but also, in our discernment, not to be afraid; for You, Lord God, are with us. You never leave nor forsake us.

In this promise may we place our hope and live one day at a time, trusting that in Your perfect timing, You will make things right.

May we surrender our all to Your will.

In Your merciful 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 Illinois (Mr. CASTEN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

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.

the portfolio relative to the anticipated cash flow requirements of the plan, and the projected return of the portfolio relative to the funding objectives of the plan; and

“(iii) how the selected non-pecuniary factor or factors are consistent with the interests of the participants and beneficiaries in their retirement income or financial benefits under the plan.

“(C) INVESTMENT ALTERNATIVES FOR PARTICIPANT-DIRECTED INDIVIDUAL ACCOUNT PLANS.—In selecting or retaining investment options for a pension plan described in subsection (c)(1)(A), a fiduciary is not prohibited from considering, selecting, or retaining an investment option on the basis that such investment option promotes, seeks, or supports one or more non-pecuniary benefits or goals, if—

“(i) the fiduciary satisfies the requirements of paragraph (1) and subparagraphs (A) and (B) of this paragraph in selecting or retaining any such investment option; and

“(ii) such investment option is not added or retained as, or included as a component of, a default investment under subsection (c)(5) (or any other default investment alternative) if its investment objectives or goals or its principal investment strategies include, consider, or indicate the use of one or more non-pecuniary factors.

“(D) DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of this paragraph:

“(i) The term ‘pecuniary factor’ means a factor that a fiduciary prudently determines is expected to have a material effect on the risk or return of an investment based on appropriate investment horizons consistent with the plan’s investment objectives and the funding policy established pursuant to section 402(b)(1).

“(ii) The term ‘investment course of action’ means any series or program of investments or actions related to a fiduciary’s performance of the fiduciary’s investment duties, and includes the selection of an investment fund as a plan investment, or in the case of an individual account plan, a designated investment alternative under the plan.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to actions taken by a fiduciary on or after the date that is 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

DIVISION B—NO DISCRIMINATION IN MY BENEFITS

SEC. 2001. SHORT TITLE.

This division may be cited as the “No Discrimination in My Benefits Act”.

SEC. 2002. SERVICE PROVIDER SELECTION.

Section 404(a)(1) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1104(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C), by striking “and”;

(2) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(E) by selecting, monitoring, and retaining any fiduciary, counsel, employee, or service provider of the plan—

“(i) in accordance with subparagraphs (A) and (B); and

“(ii) without regard to race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.”.

DIVISION C—RETIREMENT PROXY PROTECTION

SEC. 3001. SHORT TITLE.

This division may be cited as the “Retirement Proxy Protection Act”.

SEC. 3002. EXERCISE OF SHAREHOLDER RIGHTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 404 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1104) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f) EXERCISE OF SHAREHOLDER RIGHTS.—

“(1) AUTHORITY TO EXERCISE SHAREHOLDER RIGHTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The fiduciary duty to manage plan assets that are shares of stock in-

cludes the management of shareholder rights appurtenant to those shares, including the right to vote proxies. When deciding whether to exercise a shareholder right and in exercising such right, including the voting of proxies, a fiduciary must act prudently and solely in the interests of participants and beneficiaries and for the exclusive purpose of providing benefits to participants and beneficiaries and defraying the reasonable expenses of administering the plan. The fiduciary duty to manage shareholder rights appurtenant to shares of stock does not require the voting of every proxy or the exercise of every shareholder right.

“(B) EXCEPTION.—This subsection shall not apply to voting, tender, and similar rights with respect to qualifying employer securities or securities held in an investment arrangement that is not a designated investment alternative in the event such rights are passed through pursuant to the terms of an individual account plan to participants and beneficiaries with accounts holding such securities.

“(2) REQUIREMENTS FOR EXERCISE OF SHAREHOLDER RIGHTS.—A fiduciary, when deciding whether to exercise a shareholder right and when exercising a shareholder right—

“(A) shall—

“(i) act solely in accordance with the economic interest of the plan and its participants and beneficiaries;

“(ii) consider any costs involved;

“(iii) evaluate material facts that form the basis for any particular proxy vote or exercise of shareholder rights; and

“(iv) maintain a record of any proxy vote, proxy voting activity, or other exercise of a shareholder right, including any attempt to influence management; and

“(B) shall not subordinate the interests of participants and beneficiaries in their retirement income or financial benefits under the plan to any non-pecuniary objective, or promote non-pecuniary benefits or goals unrelated to those financial interests of the plan’s participants and beneficiaries.

“(3) MONITORING.—A fiduciary shall exercise prudence and diligence in the selection and monitoring of a person, if any, selected to advise or otherwise assist with the exercise of shareholder rights, including by providing research and analysis, recommendations on exercise of proxy voting or other shareholder rights, administrative services with respect to voting proxies, and recordkeeping and reporting services.

“(4) INVESTMENT MANAGERS AND PROXY ADVISORY FIRMS.—Where the authority to vote proxies or exercise other shareholder rights has been delegated to an investment manager pursuant to section 403(a), or a proxy voting advisory firm or other person who performs advisory services as to the voting of proxies or the exercise of other shareholder rights, a responsible plan fiduciary shall prudently monitor the proxy voting activities of such investment manager or advisory firm and determine whether such activities are in compliance with paragraphs (1) and (2).

“(5) VOTING POLICIES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In deciding whether to vote a proxy pursuant to this subsection, the plan fiduciary may adopt a proxy voting policy, including a safe harbor proxy voting policy described in subparagraph (B), providing that the authority to vote a proxy shall be exercised pursuant to specific parameters designed to serve the economic interest of the plan.

“(B) SAFE HARBOR VOTING POLICY.—With respect to a decision not to vote a proxy, a fiduciary shall satisfy the fiduciary responsibilities under this subsection if such fiduciary adopts and follows a safe harbor proxy voting policy that—

“(i) limits voting resources to particular types of proposals that the fiduciary has prudently determined are substantially related to the business activities of the issuer or are expected to have a material effect on the value of the plan investment; or

“(ii) establishes that the fiduciary will refrain from voting on proposals or particular types of proposals when the assets of a plan invested in the issuer relative to the total assets of such plan are below 5 percent (or, in the event such assets are under management, when the assets under management invested in the issuer are below 5 percent of the total assets under management).

“(C) EXCEPTION.—No proxy voting policy adopted pursuant to this paragraph shall preclude a fiduciary from submitting a proxy vote when the fiduciary determines that the matter being voted on is expected to have a material economic effect on the investment performance of a plan’s portfolio (or the investment performance of assets under management in the case of an investment manager); provided, however, that in all cases compliance with a safe harbor voting policy shall be presumed to satisfy fiduciary responsibilities with respect to decisions not to vote.

“(6) REVIEW.—A fiduciary shall periodically review any policy adopted under this subsection.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply to an exercise of shareholder rights occurring on or after January 1, 2026.

DIVISION D—PROVIDING COMPLETE INFORMATION TO RETIREMENT INVESTORS

SEC. 4001. SHORT TITLE.

This division may be cited as the “Providing Complete Information to Retirement Investors Act”.

SEC. 4002. BROKERAGE WINDOW DISCLOSURES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 404(c) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1104(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(7) NOTICE REQUIREMENTS FOR BROKERAGE WINDOWS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a pension plan which provides for individual accounts and which provides a participant or beneficiary the opportunity to choose from designated investment alternatives, a participant or beneficiary shall not be treated as exercising control over assets in the account of the participant or beneficiary unless, with respect to any investment arrangement that is not a designated investment alternative, each time before such a participant or beneficiary directs an investment into, out of, or within such investment arrangement, such participant is notified of, and acknowledges, each element of the notice described under paragraph (B).

“(B) NOTICE.—The notice described under this paragraph is a four part information that is substantially similar to the following information:

“1. Your retirement plan offers designated investment alternatives prudently selected and monitored by fiduciaries for the purpose of enabling you to construct an appropriate retirement savings portfolio. In selecting and monitoring designated investment alternatives, your plan’s fiduciary considers the risk of loss and the opportunity for gain (or other return) compared with reasonably available investment alternatives.

2. The investments available through this investment arrangement are not designated investment alternatives, and have not been prudently selected and are not monitored by a plan fiduciary.

3. Depending on the investments you select through this investment arrangement, you may experience diminished returns, higher fees, and higher risk than if you select from the plan’s designated investment alternatives.

4. The following is a hypothetical illustration of the impact of return at 4 percent, 6 percent, and 8 percent on your account balance projected to age 67.

“(C) ILLUSTRATION.—The notice described under paragraph (B) shall also include a graph

displaying the projected retirement balances of such participant or beneficiary at age 67 if the account of such individual were to achieve an annual return equal to each of the following:

- “(i) 4 percent.
- “(ii) 6 percent.
- “(iii) 8 percent.”.

(b) DESIGNATED INVESTMENT ALTERNATIVE DEFINED.—Section 3 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 1002) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(46) DESIGNATED INVESTMENT ALTERNATIVE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘designated investment alternative’ means any investment alternative designated by a responsible fiduciary of an individual account plan described in subsection 404(c) into which participants and beneficiaries may direct the investment of assets held in, or contributed to, their individual accounts.

“(B) EXCEPTION.—The term ‘designated investment alternative’ does not include brokerage windows, self-directed brokerage accounts, or similar plan arrangements that enable participants and beneficiaries to select investments beyond those designated by a responsible plan fiduciary.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on January 1, 2027.

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

After 1 hour of debate, it shall be in order to consider the further amendment printed in part A of House Report 119-440, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be considered read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2988.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of H.R. 2988, the Protecting Prudent Investment of Retirement Savings Act, introduced by Representative RICK ALLEN, chairman of the Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions.

At its core, this legislation is about one simple principle: Retirement savings should be managed to protect workers’ futures and not to advance political agendas.

Over the past several years, the Biden administration pushed a rule that encouraged retirement plan fidu-

ciaries to consider environmental, social, and governance—ESG—factors, when making investment decisions. That might sound harmless, but in practice, it shifts the focus away from what retirement investing is supposed to be about: maximizing returns and minimizing risk for workers and retirees.

Americans set aside money in their 401(k)’s and pension plans to retire with dignity. They do it so that they can pay their bills, cover medical costs, and support their families. They do not invest their hard-earned savings so that Federal bureaucrats can push ideological priorities.

That is exactly the concern here. ESG investing has become a tool for advancing a broader political agenda. Instead of asking: Is this the best investment for the worker, the ESG framework often asks: Does this investment align with certain social or environmental goals?

Those goals are not what ERISA was created to promote. ERISA, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act, was established to ensure that fiduciaries act in the best interests of plan participants. It requires loyalty, prudence, and a clear focus on financial outcomes that workers rely on.

Mr. Speaker, the problem with the Biden-Harris rule is that it created permission and, in many cases, pressure for fiduciaries to prioritize ESG factors over the economic interests of participants. When that happens, retirement security is placed at risk.

ESG funds are often more costly and less transparent. In many cases, they underperform compared to traditional options. That means that workers may be paying more and getting less—less growth, less stability, and less certainty about their future.

This is not a theoretical issue. When a fiduciary chooses investments based on nonfinancial criteria, the person paying the price is not the bureaucrat in Washington or the corporate executive on a conference call. The person paying the price is the worker who depends on that retirement account to survive. That is why H.R. 2988 is needed.

Mr. Speaker, this bill restores the proper purpose of retirement investing: financial security. It makes clear that retirement plan decisions must be made based solely on economic factors—things like risk, return, liquidity, and diversification. It also addresses how fiduciaries use shareholder rights, like proxy voting.

Under current practices, some fiduciaries use the shares held in retirement plans to push political policies through proxy votes, whether or not those policies benefit the workers whose money is at stake.

H.R. 2988 stops that. It makes clear that exercising shareholder rights, including proxy votes, must be done in the economic interests of plan participants, not to advance radical political initiatives, not to appease advocacy

groups, and not to satisfy trends in the corporate boardrooms.

In addition, the bill strengthens fairness and nondiscrimination in the selection of service providers. It states clearly that race, color, religion, sex, or national origin may not be considered when selecting fiduciaries, counsel, employees, or service providers for ERISA plans. Retirement plan service providers should be chosen on performance and price, not on ideology or race-based preference.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2988 increases transparency for workers. It includes a notice requirement for defined contribution plans that explains the difference between selecting investments chosen by ERISA fiduciaries and selecting investments through a brokerage window.

□ 0910

Why does that matter? It matters because many workers do not realize that when they move money into a brokerage window, they may be stepping outside the protections provided by plan fiduciaries. This bill ensures workers are informed and can make decisions with clarity. In short, H.R. 2988 is a course correction. It protects retirees from financial experimentation. It protects workers from political interference, and it reinforces the idea that retirement plans exist for one reason: to help Americans retire with stability and security.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2988, the Protecting Prudent Investment of Retirement Savings Act. This bill is premised on the Republicans’ mistaken belief that they know best when it comes to investing workers’ retirement savings.

Under the present law, the retirement plan fiduciary is required to make prudent investment decisions in the best interests of plan participants and beneficiaries. The bill codifies two rules from the first Trump administration that impose first-of-their-kind restrictions on plan fiduciaries’ abilities to consider what are called environmental, social, and governance, or ESG, factors when making investment decisions and exercise shareholder rights.

The appropriate course of action is to permit fiduciaries to consider ESG factors so long as they don’t diminish investment returns. As we know, such factors, whether it be sea level rise or poor corporate governance, are relevant to a company’s performance. Considering whether a real estate investment will literally be underwater because of sea level rise is not ideology. It is sensible for plan fiduciaries to be permitted to consider such factors and to be able to adopt them if they don’t reduce investment returns. That is precisely what the rule from the Biden administration permitted.

Predictably, the Trump administration is walking away from that rule, and now the House is continuing to go in the wrong direction. For example, H.R. 2988 will impose unnecessary barriers to considering things like sea level rise. The supporters are making up some risk, suggesting that some of these funds may be worse than others. I think the studies have shown that they are as good or better, in fact, than others. Meanwhile, the Trump administration appears to be poised to green light what are clearly consensus-held risky investments such as cryptocurrency and put those in retirement plans. That makes no sense at all.

Finally, H.R. 2988 would undermine the worthwhile efforts to increase diversity among asset managers. There are about \$82 trillion in financial assets in retirement funds. Only 1.4 percent of those assets are managed by women or minority firms. Women and minorities, represented by two-thirds of the population, they are managing 1.4 percent of the assets.

Now, apparently that creates a problem, and the problem is: How did they get the 1.4 percent? How did the good old boys lose 1.4 percent? So they are going to change the rules to limit access to women- and minority-owned firms. This bill would needlessly undermine what little progress has been made and actually raise questions about what problem we are trying to solve.

We should be trusting our professionals bound by law, not House Republicans to make sound decisions about Americans' retirement savings.

For those reasons, I oppose the bill, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

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

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

H.R. 2988 codifies the principles in the Trump Department of Labor's 2020 rule on retirement plan ESG investing.

Under the bill, as with the 2020 Trump rule, if a fiduciary finds that an ESG factor is a financial factor, then that factor can be considered when investing and exercising shareholder rights.

Nothing in H.R. 2988 prevents a fiduciary from appropriately considering any material risk of an investment. Like the 2020 Trump rule, H.R. 2988 recognizes that ESG factors can present an economic risk or opportunity, which qualified investment professionals would appropriately treat as material economic considerations under generally accepted investment principles.

H.R. 2988 neutrally applies these principles to all investment decisions.

To suggest this bill bars a fiduciary from appropriately considering any factor that may be material to investment is blatantly false. Unlike the Biden-Harris rule, this legislation ensures neutrality and prudent decision-making by fiduciaries.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have made many claims about the supposed advantages of ESG investing.

Allow me to set the record straight. ESG funds have underperformed for years. According to Morningstar, ESG funds lagged the U.S. Market Index and the S&P 500 in 2023 and 2024. To make matters worse, ESG products charge higher fees to participants than traditional investment funds, which can significantly limit the growth of participants' retirement savings over time.

Finally, according to researchers at George Mason University, ESG funds expose workers and retirees to additional investment risk that traditional investments typically do not face. Increased costs, increased risk, and lackluster returns make for a bad cocktail.

Participants and beneficiaries of employer-sponsored retirement plans rely on the expertise of fiduciaries, who are required by law to act solely in the financial interests of participants. Weakening that expectation to advance partisan ideological objectives is wrong and hurts the safety and stability of Americans.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, in response to my friends on the other side, many Democrats want to make race and sex the most important factors in choosing ERISA retirement plan service providers. In so doing, they are advocating for blatant race and sex discrimination, which we should all strongly oppose.

Discrimination is never justified, and the use of quotas is inherently discriminatory. ERISA plan service providers must be selected using a prudent and nondiscriminatory process. That is what H.R. 2988 requires.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CASTEN).

Mr. CASTEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2988.

I am going to be honest. I cannot believe we are still engaged in this anti-capitalist doublespeak; but if my Republican colleagues are going to keep bringing bills to the floor to destroy the fabric of our market-based economy, I am going to keep standing up for it.

Let's be clear: ERISA already requires fiduciaries to act solely in the financial interests of plan participants and beneficiaries. H.R. 2988 does not strengthen that standard. It simply assumes that a handful of paternalistic legislators know more about the interests of America's businessowners than they do.

Before coming to Congress, I was a CEO of an energy company. We raised a couple hundred million dollars to build that business, and I was understandably accountable to a board appointed by those investors.

I am trying to imagine a world where I showed up at a board meeting and told the owners of the company that I

was leading that they were not allowed to ask me certain questions because, in my judgment, I had determined that their questions were nonpecuniary. That is not a world where I would have been employed for very long.

It also wouldn't have been good for our business because different investors have different time horizons. You have got short-term investors who are concerned about next year's cash flows, but then you can have long-term investors, like pension funds, endowments, and family offices, who are going to be concerned about longer term risks including, but not limited to, your governance, your environmental exposures, who you hire, what kind of liabilities you are taking on, and that is fine. That is how a functioning market works.

But H.R. 2988 prioritizes those short-term investors by creating an arbitrary distinction between pecuniary and non-pecuniary risk factors. That requires investors to ignore financially relevant information that they, in their sole discretion, believe impact long-term performance.

□ 0920

Why should we mandate ignorance? It is not the Federal Government's job to tell fiduciaries what categories of risk they can consider. Making investors dumber will only serve to drive capital out of U.S. markets, and that is not just theoretical.

In Oklahoma, public pension officials estimated that complying with a similar blacklist policy could cost them nearly \$10 million. In Arkansas, the State retirement system estimated comparable restrictions could reduce returns by \$30 million to \$40 million a year. In Indiana, an analysis found it could cost pension returns as much as \$6.4 billion over 10 years.

This legislation is not about protecting retirees. It is about protecting mediocre businesses from the vibrancy of well-informed, competitive capital markets. Maybe that satisfies some short-term, partisan political purpose, but it ain't patriotic and certainly ain't capitalism. All this will accomplish is to drive long-term investors out of U.S. equity markets.

For the retirement savings of our police officers, teachers, and firefighters, and for the preservation of U.S. capital markets and capitalism that is free of the meddlesome government intervention that Republicans seem to love, I urge a "no" vote and oppose this legislation.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN), the chairman of the Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions Subcommittee and the sponsor of this good bill.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding his time, for his tireless work on behalf of American workers, and specifically for his support of the legislation before us today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2988, the Protecting Prudent Investment of Retirement Savings Act, legislation I introduced earlier this year to ensure hardworking Americans do not have their retirement savings jeopardized by politically motivated mismanagement. What I am hearing is that, I think, this bill fixes everything that the other side has been talking about as far as free markets and capitalism.

For those listening at home, it is important to understand how we got here. In 2022, the Biden administration heavy-handedly put the retirement security of over 150 million Americans at risk by issuing a deeply flawed rule to enable retirement plan fiduciaries to consider or choose investments based on environmental, social, and governance, or ESG, factors. That is not free market. That is not capitalism.

It is proven that ESG factors often charge steeper fees, carry higher risks, have lower returns, and are well-known underperformers. That is precisely why this rule garnered bipartisan, bicameral disapproval in the form of a Congressional Review Act resolution that passed both the House and Senate.

However, the Biden-Harris administration vetoed the resolution, choosing to prioritize leftwing environmental and social issues ahead of retirees' financial security.

As chairman of the HELP Subcommittee, I remain committed to protecting the retirement savings of workers, retirees, and their families. The Protecting Prudent Investment of Retirement Savings Act would codify that retirement plan sponsors must make investment decisions solely based on economic factors and financial returns.

Additionally, the bill states that the decision to exercise a shareholder right is subject to the purchase and loyalty duties under ERISA. It states that proxies held by ERISA plans must be voted in the economic interests of the plan, not used to advance radical policies and favors to crony capitalists.

The bill declares that race, color, religion, sex, or national origin may not be taken into consideration when selecting a fiduciary, counsel, employee, or service provider of an ERISA plan.

Lastly, it implements a notice requirement on defined contribution plans, explaining the difference between choosing from investments selected by ERISA fiduciaries and choosing from investments through a brokerage window.

Mr. Speaker, I think most would agree that advancing a political agenda at the expense of retirement savings is wrong. Let's be clear: Americans invest to secure a brighter future for themselves and their families, not to bankroll Democrats' radical initiatives and pet projects and take care of their crony capitalists.

Retirement plan sponsors have a duty to prioritize financial returns, ensuring Americans' hard-earned savings

are invested in a sensible manner. The Protecting Prudent Investment of Retirement Savings Act delivers a significant win to retirees across the Nation, and I strongly urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support its passage.

I thank my staff for their diligent work on this bill. I thank Chairman WALBERG for his support throughout the committee process and Leader SCA-LISE and Speaker JOHNSON for bringing H.R. 2988 to the House floor.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. MAGAZINER).

Mr. MAGAZINER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding. I rise in opposition to this bill, which will only hurt the retirement savings of millions of Americans.

Our Republican colleagues are once again prioritizing culture wars over working people and threatening the retirement savings of nurses, teachers, police officers, and healthcare workers, who are just trying to save for their future with peace of mind.

The bill before us today injects politics into investment decisions that should be guided by sound financial judgment.

Let me be clear. Environmental, social, and governance risks are material and pecuniary, and companies that adopt thoughtful policies on these risks outperform those that don't over the long term.

If an oil company is cutting corners, and it leads to a spill that is expensive to the company, that hurts shareholders. That hurts people who are saving for retirement. That is a failure to manage an environmental risk.

If a company maintains a culture in the office that allows rampant discrimination that causes lawsuits that are expensive to the company, that is a social factor. That is a material risk.

If executive pay is structured in a way where it is not tied to shareholder performance, that is a risk.

As a former State treasurer, I know that ignoring these risks does not make them disappear.

By the way, the proxy voting process is an important way for shareholders to tell executives at companies when they think that something needs to change. They are nonbinding. What this bill would do is make it harder for shareholders to vote to put even non-binding items in front of a board to consider.

I have heard the other side say that this bill does not preclude ESG factors from being considered if they are material, but that is not true in practice. What will happen in practice is that SEC bureaucrats and political appointees will get to choose what is material and what is not.

Any time an executive, a corporate executive, doesn't like what a shareholder proposal is about, they can go to the SEC and say: "Keep this off the ballot. I don't want to see it." It will be up to those bureaucrats and politi-

cal appointees to decide what is material and what is not.

How about we trust the investors? How about we trust the people who are actually doing the work? How about we trust the plan participants, the workers, and the retirees? Anyone who has a 401(k) or an IRA will tell you that they can go on the website and pick from a range of different plans based on what they think is a good idea for them. Why don't we trust them instead of trusting bureaucrats and political appointees to make decisions for everybody else?

Understand why we are here and who this bill helps. This bill helps corporate executives who do not want to be held accountable by their own shareholders.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. MAGAZINER. Mr. Speaker, this bill helps executives who do not want to be held accountable by their own shareholders for material ESG risks.

It all comes down to time horizons, as Mr. CASTEN said. When I was State treasurer, I had 60,000 people who were relying on me for their retirement. I had people who were 90- or 100-year-old retirees, and I had first-year teachers who were 23 years old. I owed just as much of a fiduciary duty to those 23-year-olds as the 90-year-olds.

□ 0930

So long-term factors and ESG factors matter even when corporate executives who are focused on the short term don't care about them.

This bill claims to be about free markets. It is the opposite. It is taking choice away from investors and away from retirees and plan participants and putting it in the hands of bureaucrats and political appointees.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA), who is vice chair of the Financial Services Committee and extremely well-versed in being able to deal with this issue.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague from Michigan granting me a little time here. I was not planning on speaking on this. I am actually down here for an amendment, but let me clean it up.

Mr. Speaker, the hot garbage that we are hearing right now from the other side prompts me to address this. I am vice chair of the Financial Services Committee. One of our speakers earlier serves on that committee where we regularly cross swords philosophically about what the role of ESG is. Environmental, social, and governance has been a hot topic, Mr. Speaker. I can tell you that.

When he is trying to compare what we are talking about today, regarding what we are dealing with with some of the other retirement plans and publicly traded companies and what the SEC

has been doing, we are not talking apples and oranges. We are talking apples and pinecones. They might both grow on trees, but they are not anything like what the reality is.

He is talking about being a CEO. One of our colleagues was talking about being a CEO of a wind company. Mr. Speaker, that is, by definition, one of those ESG companies. When he is talking about pecuniary questions not being allowed to be asked, that is completely false. Materiality is the watchword.

What we saw under the last administration, by the way, is they blew through that legal definition which was from 1976. Thurgood Marshall is the one who developed the materiality definition by law.

They blew through that and said: Do you know what, these issues are so important to us that we are going to just set the law aside and say: No, you must have an environmental or social or governance lens with which to drive this through.

That has nothing to do with return. It has nothing to do with return. What we have seen is that the activist investors who have gotten involved, who have driven these, who have put these shareholder proposals in place and have put these requests in place, don't care about return. That isn't their goal. Their goal is social change.

What we have seen, Mr. Speaker, is over the years we have seen time and time again the cudgel of government and the cudgel of regulators being used to pound business and investment into what they think is the right place. What it has done is actually cheated those who are dependent upon the return, whether it is a firefighter or a teacher.

By the way, in CalPERS, they have actually extracted themselves from a number of these ESG programs and portfolios.

Why is that?

It is because they were having lawsuits from their own members demanding more return and less concern.

What I would just say is that the Financial Services Committee put together an ESG work group that I had the pleasure of chairing, and we came up with a report.

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HUIZENGA. I will wrap this up.

Mr. Speaker, what that report identified was that what we are seeing is materiality. By the way, material issues are legally required to be disclosed for a publicly traded company or for any of these investment folks. So nobody is trying to hide things. In fact, they are legally required to disclose any of those material issues that may affect stock price.

What we are seeing here is that the gentleman from Illinois and others have argued that all questions regard-

ing the environment or social issues are somehow material.

Mr. Speaker, it simply isn't true. We have to put the investor—that retiree, that person who is desperate for returns so that they can retire—first, not second, behind social issues that bureaucrats have decided is the primary goal.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER), who is the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding and for his leadership in opposition to this bill.

Environmental, social, and governance are factors that retirement plan fiduciaries may consider when making investments on behalf of retirement plans covered by ERISA. Factors that may fall within ESG include impact of the company's actions on climate change, working conditions, and employee safety at the company, and its management structure.

Weighing ESG factors when making investment decisions is not only more socially responsible, it is also more fiscally responsible for the type of long-term investments managed by retirement plan fiduciaries. Factors like sea level rise due to climate change, child labor violations, or track records for mistreating workers could cause unnecessary investment risks over time. Investors should be protected from those kinds of unethical management practices. That is why it should be considered a best practice for retirement plan professionals to appropriately weigh ESG factors—just weigh them.

Unfortunately, this bill would establish unnecessary barriers to retirement plan fiduciaries who want to consider these factors. This is despite the fact that even those fiduciaries who consider ESG factors are still required under ERISA to run plans solely in the best interest of participants and fiduciaries.

I filed an amendment to this bill that would permit plan fiduciaries to consider ESG factors when they make investment decisions, which aligns with the Biden administration's ESG rule that was upheld twice by Federal district courts before being abandoned by the Trump administration.

Crucially, my amendment would have also upheld core ERISA protections and explicitly ensured that fiduciaries do not sacrifice investment returns when they consider ESG factors. Unfortunately, House Republicans and House Republican leadership prevented the amendment from being approved in the committee.

Mr. Speaker, we should trust the professionals who are legally obligated to make prudent decisions on behalf of retirement plan participants, not undermine their ability to make sound investment decisions.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 2988. Once again, I thank the ranking member for his leadership.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, we are getting to a point, I think, that the old adage that everything has been said, just not everyone has said it yet. But with fear of offending that specific adage, I must respectfully, again, address the fact of the misconception that is being put forward about the Biden ESG rule as being neutral. That was, is, and always will be patently false.

The Biden-Harris ESG rule was explicitly intended to advance the left's radical climate and social agenda that harms Americans' retirement and long-term financial well-being. Even though the debate can be made about ESG issues, that is not what we want to see taking place for the best benefit of retirees.

This legislation is needed to combat the Biden rule which was issued in response to not one but two executive orders on climate change. The Biden Labor Department expressly stated that the intended effect of the rule is to loosen restrictions on fiduciaries and encourage them to consider ESG factors in their decisionmaking; to encourage them, not simply allow it, but to encourage them.

The Biden Labor Department's explanation of the rule lists ESG factors that it believes are relevant to investment performance, including impacts to climate change, corporate board composition, and workplace diversity and inclusion.

H.R. 2988 is essential to restore the neutrality of financial factor-only evaluation when investing to protect America's retirement savers.

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

□ 0940

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, this bill unnecessarily restricts the free market. It dictates what private sector fiduciaries can and cannot consider when making investment decisions that directly affect the savings and retirement savings of hardworking Americans.

For this reason and at the appropriate time, I will offer a motion to recommit this bill back to committee.

If House rules permitted, I would have offered the motion with an important amendment to this bill. My amendment would have been the text of H.R. 1357, the Susan Muffley Act.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment into the RECORD immediately prior to the motion to recommit.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. KAPTUR. H.R. 1357 is a bill that addresses a true injustice to thousands

of workers and retirees across this country, a bill to restore the Delphi salaried retirees' pensions.

For decades, the men and women who built Delphi—and they worked hard—were told that if they worked hard and kept their end of the deal, their retirement benefits would be there for them.

However, that promise was broken through no fault of their own when Delphi collapsed, leaving more than 23,000 salaried workers, including over 5,000 in Ohio, with sharply reduced or eliminated pensions. Those are the folks that I mean. This is simply wrong. It is un-American.

Mr. TURNER, Ms. TENNEY, Ms. MOORE, and I have a bipartisan bill to restore dignity, fairness, and economic security to people who earned it the hard way. They worked hard.

For too long, Delphi retirees have been asked to wait, to be patient, and to accept less than what they were promised and worked for and earned. Many are now well into their retirement years. It almost seems like a conspiracy to keep their retirement benefits away from them. They face rising healthcare costs, higher prices at the grocery store, and fixed incomes that were unjustly cut.

These are not abstract numbers. These are real people who planned their lives around commitments and promises that were made to them and then broken.

Let me remind you that when the auto rescue moved forward, corporate interests were stabilized, made whole, but working people were left behind, and that imbalance has lingered for two decades. Shame on us as a country. Shame on us and the people who allowed that to happen.

The Susan Muffley Act corrects that injustice. It directs the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation to recalculate benefits without arbitrary gaps that punished Delphi retirees alone. It is a narrowly tailored fix, but one that delivers profound relief and long-overdue justice.

This legislation is also about reaffirming a core American value: If you work hard, play by the rules, and keep your word, your company and country should keep its word to you.

These retirees did not speculate. They did not gamble. They paid into a system that was supposed to protect them. Congress has a moral obligation to fix what was broken. Too bad the market can't do it alone.

Every year of delay compounds the harm. The Susan Muffley Act will finally make these workers whole. I hope my colleagues will join me in voting for the motion to recommit.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD links to letters in opposition to H.R. 2988: One led by the Americans for Financial Reform and signed by dozens of

organizations representing labor, civil rights, environmental, and other relevant policy issues; another from the AFL-CIO; a letter from SIRES; another letter signed by the National Employment Law Project, the Economic Policy Institute, and the National Partnership for Women and Families; one letter from SEIU; and one letter from the U.S. Sustainable Investment Forum. The link is: <https://house.app.box.com/s/xpixugm5qpck14kxrc4h4u55i3to8roy>

Mr. Speaker, right now across the country, workers are struggling to pay their bills and meet basic needs, let alone save for retirement. It is incredibly hard for workers to do much on their own for retirement when, according to the Federal Reserve, many would struggle to come up with the money to finance an unexpected \$400 expense, such as a car repair or medical bill.

That being the case, it should not be controversial for retirement plan professionals to appropriately weigh environmental, social, and governance factors in their clients' best interests. H.R. 2988 would restrict the fiduciary's ability to consider all relevant factors that might affect investment decisions to the detriment of retirees.

Of course, it has been pointed out that some ESG funds do better, some do worse, just like all other categories of funds. The committee chair's opening statement suggested that ESG funds don't do as well as the S&P 500. The fact is, most funds don't do as well as the S&P 500 index funds, but the other funds are not restricted. A consideration, not a mandate, of ESG factors ought to be allowed.

They said the present law is not neutral. This law is not neutral because if you want to consider environmental possibilities and concerns or governance or other factors like that, extra paperwork is needed, and it is much more difficult to have those considered.

Mr. Speaker, the professionals ought to be able to decide what are the best investments for the retirees, not politicians. For that reason, I oppose the bill and urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

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

Let me close with this: H.R. 2988 is about keeping retirement investing focused on what matters—protecting workers and retirees.

The Biden-Harris ESG rule encouraged fiduciaries to consider political and ideological factors in retirement plans, even when that could increase risk and reduce returns. That is unacceptable.

Representative RICK ALLEN's bill restores the ERISA standard by requiring that investment decisions be based only on economic factors. It ensures proxy voting and shareholder rights are exercised solely in the financial interest of plan participants, not to push

radical policies. It bans discrimination in selecting plan fiduciaries and service providers based on race, religion, sex, or national origin. It almost sounds American in its idea. It improves transparency by requiring plans to explain the difference between fiduciary-selected investments and brokerage windows.

This bill puts retirement savers first, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate on the bill has expired.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. HUIZENGA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part A of House Report 119-440.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 4003. GAO STUDY OF BROKERAGE ACCOUNTS.

Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit a report to Congress comparing the returns generated by any investment arrangement that—

(1) is not a designated investment alternative (as defined in section 2(46) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1002(46));

(2) is subject to section 404(c)(7) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 1104(c)(7)); and

(3) is available in defined contribution plans (as defined in section 3(34) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 1002(34)) with the returns generated by other investment options available in such plans.

Page 3, line 7, insert after the item relating to section 4002 the following:

Sec. 4003. GAO study of brokerage accounts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 988, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

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

This amendment requires the Government Accountability Office, the GAO, to submit a report to Congress comparing brokerage window investments in the context of defined contribution plans.

The GAO report will compare investment returns generated through participant-controlled brokerage windows and similar arrangements with the investment returns generated by investments selected and monitored by plan fiduciaries.

What does that mean in plain English? It means basically, do you want to be involved in the decisions surrounding your investments?

Most defined contribution plans, like 401(k) plans allow participants to direct their investments from a menu of options selected by investment fiduciaries, who are the experts. Those are

the professionals who have a legal obligation to maximize return for the investor.

□ 0950

Plan fiduciaries go through an extensive selection and monitoring process, evaluating fees, risks, performance, and how each option compares to available alternatives.

If the plan fiduciary places pooled asset funds, like mutual funds, on the investment menu, the fees are almost always lower, which bolsters the fund's net return, meaning more money in the pockets of the investor.

Brokerage window participants are bypassing the investments selected by the plan's investment fiduciaries and self-selecting investments for their retirement savings.

Again, Mr. Speaker, this is about whether you want to be involved in your own retirement savings decisions. I do, by the way.

If the participant purchases a mutual fund through a brokerage window, the participant would likely be subject to the highest retail share class fee for that mutual fund. This amendment calls for the GAO to study whether the net returns generated through brokerage windows are comparable to those generated by the investments selected by plan fiduciaries.

We have had, Mr. Speaker, quite a discussion about ESG and the overarching bill. The point that I had been trying to make earlier was that materiality and return should be the watchword. It is the legal requirement, by the way, but we have seen a warping of government and the regulations surrounding it to try to pound these investments into a social circle that some, not all of us, believe is the right direction to go.

Here is what I want to do, Mr. Speaker. I want to maximize return for that firefighter, that teacher, that police officer. I want to make sure that those who traditionally have not had choice in how they are going to invest their retirement savings get some selection in that through approved funds, through fiduciary responsibilities of professionals. This is the right thing to do and the right direction to go.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this amendment appears to require GAO to submit a report to Congress that compares the returns generated through the brokerage windows with those of other investments available through retirement plans.

Brokerage windows allow plan participants to invest outside the menu of designated investment alternatives available under their plan. Such investments can include mutual funds and, in

some cases, individual stocks and bonds.

Of the amendments that were filed at Rules Committee, my Democratic colleagues and I would have preferred one from the ranking member of the Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions Subcommittee, Mr. DESAULNIER of California, to be made in order. His amendment would have fixed the fundamental flaw of division A of the bill, which simply would have ensured that plan fiduciaries would be permitted to consider ESG investments if they can be done without sacrificing investment returns.

Although I do not oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan, I do have a couple of observations about it.

First, the effect of this amendment could be accomplished by just writing a letter to GAO, along with the chair of the Education and Workforce Committee. That would be faster than sticking it on this bill and hoping the bill passes.

We may draw the conclusion that this amendment was made in order so that the Republican majority could say they have an open process on this flawed bill and avoid yet another criticism of all of their closed rules.

With respect to the substance of the amendment, I am concerned that it needlessly pits two things that are not in conflict, that is, brokerage windows and the plan's designated investments.

My colleagues know, in 2021, the ERISA Advisory Council examined brokerage windows. They noted that fewer than one-third of the retirement plans even offer a brokerage window, and roughly 2 percent of plan participants with access to one actually choose it. When you look at the average brokerage window account, it exceeded over \$300,000, which is far greater than what many Americans have in their total retirement funds.

While few people are using the brokerage windows, the ones that do may be interested in exploring funds or stocks that are not affected by their plan. Of those mutual funds that are offered, some may be ESG-themed.

If that is the concern of my colleagues, and if they are banking on the GAO to produce a report that shows ESG-themed funds offered in a brokerage account will underperform, they may be disappointed because researchers at New York University noted that "empirical studies and meta-analyses consistently demonstrate a positive relationship between ESG integration and financial performance."

GAO itself has already examined this issue in the past and stated: "The vast majority, 88 percent, of the scenarios in studies we reviewed . . . reported finding a neutral or positive relationship between the use of ESG information in investment management and financial returns."

Finally, the gentleman's amendment must be considered alongside the House Republicans' efforts to decimate GAO's

budget. Last summer, House Republicans proposed cutting the GAO budget by 50 percent. Fortunately, that was restored in the final version, but it is curious that the House Republicans now want to give the GAO more work after they were so intent on cutting its budget.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether it makes much difference whether it passes or not, but I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I will close with this. I appreciate where the gentleman is coming from. This has been a long debate regarding some of these issues surrounding what I believe is the core issue. I believe the core issue, Mr. Speaker, is that it is time for us to put retirees first, not second, in investment decisions.

The gentleman was talking about it in ESG funds. I have no problem with the existence of an ESG fund. If someone, for whatever personal reason, decides that they want to invest in a fund that does not have holdings in oil or in pharmaceuticals or something along those lines, that is quite all right, but, Mr. Speaker, it has to be voluntary. It has to be voluntary.

It is okay to invest in that ESG fund, but it is not okay, Mr. Speaker, to force someone into that ESG fund who is then going to suffer for that decision because of a lack of return.

The gentleman cited one study, and I am actually familiar with the study. I can show you five studies for every one that is opposed to this notion that ESG funds are more expensive and have a lower return. At the end of the day, it needs to be about choice for those retirees and their opportunity.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA).

The question is on the amendment.

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

Mr. WALBERG. 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 amendment will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Motion to recommit H.R. 2988, if offered; and

Passage of H.R. 2988, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 395, nays 22, not voting 14, as follows:

	[Roll No. 29] YEAS—395
Adams	Auchincloss
Aderholt	Babin
Aguilar	Bacon
Alford	Balderson
Allen	Balint
Amo	Barr
Amodei (NV)	Barragán
Ansari	Barrett
Arrington	Baumgartner
	Bean (FL)
	Beatty
	Begich
	Bell
	Bentz
	Bera
	Bergman
	Beyer
	Bice

Biggs (AZ)	Frost	Luttrell	Scott, David	Subramanyam	Vasquez
Biggs (SC)	Fry	Lynch	Self	Suozzi	Veasey
Bilirakis	Fulcher	Mackenzie	Sessions	Sykes	Velázquez
Bishop	Garamendi	Magaziner	Sewell	Takano	Vindman
Boebert	Garbarino	Malliotakis	Sherman	Taylor	Wagner
Bonamici	Garcia (CA)	Maloy	Shreve	Tenney	Walberg
Bost	Garcia (IL)	Mann	Simon	Thanedar	Walkinshaw
Boyle (PA)	Garcia (TX)	Mannion	Simpson	Thompson (CA)	Wasserman
Brecheen	Gill (TX)	Massie	Smith (MO)	Thompson (MS)	Schultz
Bresnahan	Gillen	Mast	Smith (NE)	Thompson (PA)	Waters
Brown	Gimenez	Matsui	Smith (NJ)	Tiffany	Watson Coleman
Brownley	Golden (ME)	McBath	Smith (WA)	Timmons	Weber (TX)
Buchanan	Goldman (TX)	McCaul	Smucker	Titus	Webster (FL)
Budzinski	Gonzales, Tony	McClain	Sorensen	Tokuda	Westerman
Burchett	Gonzalez, V.	McClain Delaney	Soto	Tonko	Whitesides
Burlison	Gooden	McClellan	Spartz	Torres (CA)	Wied
Bynum	Goodlander	McClintock	Stansbury	Torres (NY)	Williams (GA)
Calvert	Gosar	McCullum	Stanton	Trahan	Williams (TX)
Cammack	Gottheimer	McCormick	Stauber	Tran	Williams (TX)
Carbajal	Graves	McDonald Rivet	Stefanik	Turner (OH)	Wilson (FL)
Carey	Gray	McDowell	Steil	Underwood	Wilson (SC)
Carson	Green, Al (TX)	McGuire	Stevens	Valadao	Wittman
Carter (GA)	Griffith	McIver	Strickland	Van Drew	Yakym
Carter (LA)	Grijalva	Meeks	Strong	Van Duyn	Zinke
Carter (TX)	Grothman	Menendez	Stutzman	Van Epps	
Case	Guest	Meng			
Cherifilus-	Guthrie	Messmer			
McCormick	Hageman	Meuser			
Chu	Hamadeh (AZ)	Mfume			
Ciscomani	Harder (CA)	Miller (IL)			
Cisneros	Haridopolos	Miller (OH)			
Clarke (NY)	Harrigan	Miller (WV)			
Cleaver	Harris (MD)	Miller-Meeks			
Cline	Harris (NC)	Mills			
Cloud	Harshbarger	Min			
Clyburn	Hayes	Moelenaar			
Clyde	Hern (OK)	Moore (AL)			
Cohen	Higgins (LA)	Moore (NC)			
Cole	Hill (AR)	Moore (UT)			
Collins	Himes	Moore (WI)			
Comer	Hinson	Moore (WV)			
Conaway	Horsford	Moran			
Correa	Houchin	Morelle			
Costa	Houlahan	Morrison			
Courtney	Hoyer	Moskowitz			
Craig	Hudson	Mrvan			
Crane	Huizinga	Mullin			
Crank	Hurd (CO)	Nadler			
Crawford	Issa	Neal			
Crenshaw	Ivey	Neguse			
Crockett	Jack	Newhouse			
Crow	Jackson (TX)	Nunn (IA)			
Cuellar	Jacobs	Obernolte			
Davids (KS)	James	Ogles			
Davidson	Jayapal	Olszewski			
Davis (IL)	Jeffries	Onder			
Davis (NC)	Johnson (GA)	Owens			
De La Cruz	Johnson (LA)	Pallone			
Dean (PA)	Johnson (SD)	Palmer			
DeGette	Johnson (TX)	Panetta			
DeLauro	Jordan	Pappas			
DelBene	Joyce (OH)	Patronis			
Deluzio	Joyce (PA)	Pelosi			
DeSaulnier	Kamlager-Dove	Perez			
DesJarlais	Kaptur	Perry			
Dexter	Kean	Peters			
Diaz-Balart	Keating	Petterson			
Dingell	Kelly (IL)	Pluiger			
Doggett	Kelly (MS)	Pingree			
Donalds	Kelly (PA)	Pocan			
Downing	Kennedy (NY)	Pou			
Dunn (FL)	Kennedy (UT)	Pressley			
Edwards	Khanna	Quigley			
Ellzey	Kiggans (VA)	Raskin			
Emmer	Kiley (CA)	Reschenthaler			
Espaillat	Kim	Riley (NY)			
Estes	Knott	Rivas			
Evans (CO)	Krishnamoorthi	Rogers (AL)			
Evans (PA)	Kustoff	Rogers (KY)			
Ezell	LaHood	Rose			
Fallon	LaLota	Ross			
Fedorchak	Landsman	Rouzer			
Feenstra	Langworthy	Roy			
Fields	Larsen (WA)	Ruiz			
Figures	Larson (CT)	Rulli			
Fine	Latimer	Rutherford			
Finstad	Latta	Ryan			
Fischbach	Lawler	Salazar			
Fitzgerald	Lee (FL)	Salazar			
Fitzpatrick	Lee (NV)	Salinas			
Fleischmann	Leger Fernandez	Sánchez			
Flood	Letlow	Scalise			
Fong	Levin	Schakowsky			
Foster	Liccardo	Schmidt			
Foushee	Lieu	Schneider			
Foxx	Lofgren	Scholten			
Frankel, Lois	Loudermilk	Schrader			
Franklin, Scott	Lucas	Schweikert			
Friedman	Luna	Scott (VA)			
		Scott, Austin			

SEC. 5002. GUARANTEED BENEFIT CALCULATION FOR CERTAIN PLANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) INCREASE TO FULL VESTED PLAN BENEFIT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of determining what benefits are guaranteed under section 4022 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (in this section referred to as “ERISA”) with respect to an eligible participant or beneficiary under a covered plan specified in paragraph (4) in connection with the termination of such plan, the amount of monthly benefits shall be equal to the full vested plan benefit with respect to the participant.

(B) NO EFFECT ON PREVIOUS DETERMINATIONS.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to change the allocation of assets and recoveries under sections 4044(a) and 4022(c) of ERISA as previously determined by the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation (in the section referred to as the “corporation”) for the covered plans specified in paragraph (4), and the corporation’s applicable rules, practices, and policies on benefits payable in terminated single-employer plans shall, except as otherwise provided in this section, continue to apply with respect to such covered plans.

(2) RECALCULATION OF CERTAIN BENEFITS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In any case in which the amount of monthly benefits with respect to an eligible participant or beneficiary described in paragraph (1) was calculated prior to the date of enactment of this Act, the corporation shall recalculate such amount pursuant to paragraph (1), and shall adjust any subsequent payments of such monthly benefits accordingly, as soon as practicable after such date.

(B) LUMP-SUM PAYMENTS OF PAST-DUE BENEFITS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the corporation, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Labor, shall make a lump-sum payment to each eligible participant or beneficiary whose guaranteed benefits are recalculated under subparagraph (A) in an amount equal to—

(i) in the case of an eligible participant, the excess of—

(I) the total of the full vested plan benefits of the participant for all months for which such guaranteed benefits were paid prior to such recalculation, over

(II) the sum of any applicable payments made to the eligible participant; and

(ii) in the case of an eligible beneficiary, the sum of—

(I) the amount that would be determined under clause (i) with respect to the participant of which the eligible beneficiary is a beneficiary if such participant were still in pay status; plus

(II) the excess of—

(aa) the total of the full vested plan benefits of the eligible beneficiary for all months for which such guaranteed benefits were paid prior to such recalculation, over

(bb) the sum of any applicable payments made to the eligible beneficiary. Notwithstanding the previous sentence, the corporation shall increase each lump-sum payment made under this subparagraph to account for foregone interest in an amount determined by the corporation designed to reflect a 6 percent annual interest rate on each past-due amount attributable to the underpayment of guaranteed benefits for each month prior to such recalculation.

(C) ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANTS AND BENEFICIARIES.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, an eligible participant or beneficiary is a participant or beneficiary who—

(I) as of the date of the enactment of this Act, is in pay status under a covered plan or

DIVISION E—SUSAN MUFFLEY ACT**SEC. 5001. SHORT TITLE.**

This division may be cited as the “Susan Muffley Act of 2025”.

is eligible for future payments under such plan;

(II) has received or will receive applicable payments in connection with such plan (within the meaning of clause (ii)) that does not exceed the full vested plan benefits of such participant or beneficiary; and

(III) is not covered by the 1999 agreements between General Motors and various unions providing a top-up benefit to certain hourly employees who were transferred from the General Motors Hourly-Rate Employees Pension Plan to the Delphi Hourly-Rate Employees Pension Plan.

(ii) APPLICABLE PAYMENTS.—For purposes of this paragraph, applicable payments to a participant or beneficiary in connection with a plan consist of the following:

(I) Payments under the plan equal to the normal benefit guarantee of the participant or beneficiary.

(II) Payments to the participant or beneficiary made pursuant to section 4022(c) or otherwise received from the corporation in connection with the termination of the plan.

(3) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

(A) FULL VESTED PLAN BENEFIT.—The term “full vested plan benefit” means the amount of monthly benefits that would be guaranteed under section 4022 of ERISA as of the date of plan termination with respect to an eligible participant or beneficiary if such section were applied without regard to the phase-in limit in subsection (b)(1) of such Act and the maximum guaranteed benefit limitation in subsection (b)(3) of such Act (including the accrued-at-normal limitation).

(B) NORMAL BENEFIT GUARANTEE.—The term “normal benefit guarantee” means the amount of monthly benefits guaranteed under such section with respect to an eligible participant or beneficiary without regard to this Act.

(4) COVERED PLANS.—The covered plans specified in this paragraph are the following:

(A) The Delphi Hourly-Rate Employees Pension Plan.

(B) The Delphi Retirement Program for Salaried Employees.

(C) The PHI Non-Bargaining Retirement Plan.

(D) The ASEC Manufacturing Retirement Program.

(E) The PHI Bargaining Retirement Plan.

(F) The Delphi Mechatronic Systems Retirement Program.

(5) TREATMENT OF PBGC DETERMINATIONS.—Any determination made by the corporation under this section concerning a recalculation of benefits or lump-sum payment of past-due benefits shall be subject to administrative review by the corporation. Any new determination made by the corporation under this section shall be governed by the same administrative review process as any other benefit determination by the corporation.

(b) TRUST FUND FOR PAYMENT OF INCREASED BENEFITS.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a trust fund to be known as the “Delphi Full Vested Plan Benefit Trust Fund” (hereafter in this subsection referred to as the “Fund”), consisting of such amounts as may be appropriated or credited to the Fund as provided in this section.

(2) FUNDING.—There is appropriated from the general fund such amounts as are necessary for the costs of the payment of the portion of monthly benefits guaranteed to a participant or beneficiary pursuant to subsection (a) and for necessary administrative and operating expenses of the corporation relating to such payment. The Fund shall be credited with amounts from time to time as

the Secretary of the Treasury, in conjunction with the Director of the corporation, determines appropriate, from the general fund of the Treasury.

(3) EXPENDITURES FROM FUND.—Amounts in the Fund shall be available for the payment of the portion of monthly benefits guaranteed to a participant or beneficiary pursuant to subsection (a) and for necessary administrative and operating expenses of the corporation relating to such payment.

(c) REGULATIONS.—The corporation, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Labor, may issue such regulations as necessary to carry out this section.

(d) TAX TREATMENT OF LUMP-SUM PAYMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Unless the taxpayer elects (at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may provide) to have this paragraph not apply with respect to any lump-sum payment under subsection (a)(2)(B), the amount of such payment shall be included in the taxpayer’s gross income ratably over the 3-taxable-year period beginning with the taxable year in which such payment is received.

(2) SPECIAL RULES RELATED TO DEATH.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If the taxpayer dies before the end of the 3-taxable-year period described in paragraph (1), any amount to which paragraph (1) applies which has not been included in gross income for a taxable year ending before the taxable year in which such death occurs shall be included in gross income for such taxable year.

(B) SPECIAL ELECTION FOR SURVIVING SPOUSES OF ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANTS.—If—

(i) a taxpayer with respect to whom paragraph (1) applies dies,

(ii) such taxpayer is an eligible participant,

(iii) the surviving spouse of such eligible participant is entitled to a survivor benefit from the corporation with respect to such eligible participant, and

(iv) such surviving spouse elects (at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may provide) the application of this subparagraph, subparagraph (A) shall not apply and any amount which would have (but for such taxpayer’s death) been included in the gross income of such taxpayer under paragraph (1) for any taxable year beginning after the date of such death shall be included in the gross income of such surviving spouse for the taxable year of such surviving spouse ending with or within such taxable year of the taxpayer.

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 noes appeared to have it.

Ms. KAPTUR. 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 206, nays 210, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 30]

YEAS—206

Adams	Barragán	Bonamici
Aguilar	Beatty	Boyle (PA)
Amo	Bell	Brown
Ansari	Bera	Brownley
Auchincloss	Beyer	Budzinski
Balint	Bishop	Bynum

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

NAYS—210

Aderholt	Cline	Flood
Alford	Cloud	Fong
Allen	Clyde	Foxx
Amodei (NV)	Cole	Franklin, Scott
Arrington	Collins	Fry
Babin	Comer	Fulcher
Bacon	Crane	Garbarino
Balderson	Crank	Gill (TX)
Barr	Crawford	Gimenez
Barrett	Crenshaw	Goldman (TX)
Baumgartner	Davidson	Gonzales, Tony
Bean (FL)	De La Cruz	Gooden
Begich	DesJarlais	Gosar
Benzt	Diaz-Balart	Graves
Bergman	Donalds	Griffith
Bice	Downing	Grothman
Biggs (AZ)	Dunn (FL)	Guest
Biggs (SC)	Edwards	Guthrie
Bilirakis	Ellzey	Hageman
Boebert	Emmer	Hamadeh (AZ)
Bost	Estes	Haridopolos
Brecheen	Evans (CO)	Harrigan
Bresnahan	Ezell	Harris (MD)
Buchanan	Fallon	Harris (NC)
Burlison	Fedorchak	Harshbarger
Burchett	Feenstra	Hern (OK)
Calvert	Fine	Higgins (LA)
Cammack	Finstad	Hill (AR)
Carey	Fischbach	Hinson
Carter (GA)	Fitzgerald	Houchin
Carter (TX)	Fitzpatrick	Hudson
Ciscomani	Fleischmann	Huizenga

NOT VOTING—15

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE (1)

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

□ 1036

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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 205, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 31]

YEAS—213

Aderholt	Brecheen	Crenshaw	Cisneros	Constance
Alford	Bresnahan	Cuellar	Clark (MA)	Gotheimer
Allen	Buchanan	Davidson	Clarke (NY)	Green, Al
Amodei (NV)	Burchett	De La Cruz	Cleaver	Grijalva
Arrington	Burlison	DesJarlais	Clyburn	Harder (CA)
Babin	Calvert	Diaz-Balart	Cohen	Hayes
Bacon	Cammack	Donalds	Conaway	Horsford
Balderson	Carey	Downing	Correa	Houlihan
Barr	Carson	Dunn (FL)	Costa	Hoyer
Barrett	Carter (GA)	Edwards	Courtney	Hoyle (OR)
Baumgartner	Carter (TX)	Ellzey	Craig	Huffman
Bean (FL)	Ciscomani	Emmer	Crockett	Ivey
Begich	Cline	Estes	Crow	Jackson (D)
Bentz	Cloud	Evans (CO)	Davids (KS)	Jacobs
Bergman	Clyde	Ezell	Davis (IL)	Jayapal
Bice	Cole	Fallon	Davis (NC)	Jeffries
Biggs (AZ)	Collins	Fedorchak	Dean (PA)	Johnson (G)
Biggs (SC)	Comer	Feeenstra	DeGette	Johnson (T)
Bilirakis	Crane	Fine	DeLauro	Kamlager-De
Boebert	Crank	Finstad	DelBene	Kaptur
Bost	Crawford	Fischbach	Deluzio	Keating

NAYS—205

DeSaumier	Kelly (IL)
Dexter	Kennedy (NY)
Dingell	Khanna
Doggett	Krishnamoorthi
Elfreth	Landsman
Escobar	Larsen (WA)
Espaiatl	Larson (CT)
Evans (PA)	Latimer
Fields	Lee (NV)
Figures	Lee (PA)
Fletcher	Leger Fernandez
Foster	Levin
Foushee	Liccardo
Frankel, Lois	Lieu
Friedman	Lofgren
Frost	Lynch
Garamendi	Magaziner
Garcia (CA)	Mannion
Garcia (IL)	Matsui
Garcia (TX)	McBath
Gillen	McBride
Golden (ME)	McClain Delaney
Goldman (NY)	McClellan
Gomez	McCollum
Gonzalez, V.	McDonald Rivet
Goodlander	McGarvey
Gottheimer	McGovern
Green, Al (TX)	McIver
Grijalva	Meeks
Harder (CA)	Menendez
Hayes	Meng
Himes	Mfume
Horsford	Min
Houlahan	Moore (WI)
Hoyer	Morelle
Hoyle (OR)	Morrison
Huffman	Moskowitz
Ivey	Mrvan
Jackson (IL)	Mullin
Jacobs	Nadler
Jayapal	Neal
Jeffries	Neguse
Johnson (GA)	Ocasio-Cortez
Johnson (TX)	Olszewski
Kamlager-Dove	Omar
Kaptur	Pallone
Keating	Panetta

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY, JANUARY 16, 2026; AND ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, JANUARY 16, 2026, TO TUESDAY, JANUARY 20, 2026

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 3 p.m. tomorrow, and further when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at noon on Tuesday, January 20, 2026, 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

CELEBRATING PASTORS TODD
AND KELLY HUDNALL 20 YEARS
OF MINISTRY

(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 celebrate the 20 years of ministry of Pastors Todd and Kelly Hudnall of Colorado Springs Radiant Church. Pastor Todd's compelling expository preaching of the Bible has strengthened Radiant Church as well as the broader Pikes Peak region.

The Hudnalls have raised their children in our community, and we admire their testimony of a Christ-honoring home. I thank the Hudnalls for courageously applying Bible teaching to

every sphere of life, including public issues of concern.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me in congratulating Pastors Todd and Kelly Hudnall for their 20 years of ministry, and here is to the next 20.

WILSON PREP FOOTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

(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, in a thrilling finish, Wilson Prep claimed the 2025 North Carolina High School Athletic Association's 1A Football State championship by defeating Robbinsville 9–8.

With just 25 seconds left on the clock and down by 2 points, never having attempted a field goal all season, Ethan Nelson got the call. He got sent and successfully kicked a 28-yard field goal winning the game.

Such a remarkable victory marked the Tigers' first State championship title.

Senior quarterback and linebacker Travon Usher was the MVP pick.

Congratulations to Coach Phil Dickens and the entire Tiger football team. I thank the coach for living by Jeremiah 29:11, drawing inspiration from the Scripture he keeps in his desk and allowing me to tell his story—the Tiger story—to the American people.

RECOGNIZING PENNSYLVANIA STATE WRESTLING

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Penn State University wrestling team which set a new NCAA record on Saturday.

The Nittany Lions won 78 consecutive dual matches. This record surpasses the NCAA Division II record previously held by St. Cloud State.

The Nittany Lions' current winning streak began in February 2020 when they defeated the University of Maryland. Since 2020, the team has won five consecutive Big Ten regular season titles, three Big Ten championships, and four NCAA championships.

This past weekend marked the team's first Big Ten conference match of the 2025–2026 season. The Nittany Lions won 46–0, performing in front of a sellout crowd of more than 6,000 fans.

The team broke the NCAA Division I record in December, which had been held by Oklahoma State University since 1951. The Nittany Lions are led by Coach Cael Sanderson, who has been with the team since 2009.

Mr. Speaker, congratulations to the Penn State wrestling team on this historic achievement.

ICE ATROCITIES

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

Mr. McGARVEY. Mr. Speaker, today I speak out of grave concern for my neighbors in Louisville, in Minneapolis, across the country, and for my colleagues here in Washington who somehow continue to excuse, dismiss, and ignore the atrocities that ICE exhibits each day.

Mr. Speaker, do not look away. Watch as people in the freest country on Earth get dragged from their cars down the street by masked men. Watch as parents are pinned to the ground in the pick-up line outside their kids' schools. Watch as Renee Nicole Good, a 37-year-old mother of three, is killed in front of her wife.

Watch, because looking away will not absolve you from the violence and atrocities made possible when you voted to hand over taxpayer money to fund this government's campaign of terror.

Mr. Speaker, every single day you look away from what this President is doing is another day that our neighbors face unimaginable cruelty at the hands of their own government.

Mr. Speaker, do not look away.

HONORING THE LIFE OF SAM CORYELL

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

Mr. BURLISON. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the life of a remarkable constituent and dedicated Missourian, Sam Coryell, whose impact on Springfield and southwest Missouri will be remembered for generations.

Sam started his career as a teacher, serving for 30 years as a college music professor at Evangel University before focusing his talents on entrepreneurship. In 1988 Sam cofounded TLC Properties, helping oversee the development and management of thousands of residential units across southwest Missouri. What began as a local venture grew into a family of businesses rooted in service, integrity, and community that created homes and opportunity for countless families in Missouri's Seventh District.

Those who knew Sam described him as a visionary leader who believed in helping others, always doing the right thing, and serving the community. His personality and flair will be missed, but his impact will be felt for generations.

While he is welcomed into the glory and presence of our Lord and Savior, we who remain get to benefit from the amazing and lasting legacy that he leaves behind.

May you rest in peace, Sam. We look forward to our reunion in Heaven.

□ 1050

FSGG FEDERAL DEFENDERS FUNDING

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

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to applaud the House passage of full funding for the Federal Defender Services. This is an issue I have worked on for years. It affects the overall operation of the Federal criminal justice system, and it continues to be nonpartisan.

Defendants have a constitutional right to counsel in criminal cases, and for indigent defendants, counsel is appointed from the Federal Defender Service. If there aren't enough Federal defenders, justice could be delayed. Panel attorneys can be hired, but from the panel they could be more expensive.

In fiscal year 2024, there was an inadvertent budgeting error that resulted in initial funding levels that were at least \$100 million less than what the program needed. As a result of underfunding, Federal Defender Services began fiscal year 2026 significantly in the red. We just fixed that.

I thank Chair COLE, Ranking Member DELAURO, Chair JOYCE, and Ranking Member HOYER for leading this issue in the House. I urge my Senate colleagues to quickly advance this legislation because it is in everyone's interests to have an efficient, reliable, and fair criminal justice system.

MILITARY ACADEMY NOMINATIONS

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

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize nine students from Indiana's Third District that I have nominated to attend our Nation's military academies: Christian Touzard from Spencerville; Samantha Aselage from Huntertown; Oliver Werling from New Haven; Luke Wonderham from Monroeville; and Allison Heine, Jacob Levitt, Jacob Farrell, Jonah Haines, and Hayden Oberlin, all from Fort Wayne.

Our service academies breed the best of the best, where strong leadership and impeccable fortitude are forged in service to our Nation.

Throughout our Nation's history, America has been a shining example to the world for our commitment to democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law.

As we celebrate America's 250th anniversary this year, I commend these students for choosing to defend these values foundational to our national identity.

I am truly grateful to see that such patriotism and dedication to service thrives in the next generation.

These nine individuals have already demonstrated excellence, and I know

they will continue to make our country and State proud.

ICE OPERATIONS

(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 call out President Trump for abusing his power, acting in secrecy, and threatening our safety, all while failing to address the rising costs in America.

Trump is deploying ICE to our neighborhoods to terrorize our immigrant communities. His operations rely on brutal tactics, avoiding deescalation and due process against U.S. citizens. Although the administration claims it is only targeting undocumented criminals who pose a threat, we know that is an outright lie.

At every turn, the administration erodes any trust it has ever had with the public. That became even clearer when Secretary Noem signed an order barring Members of Congress from conducting oversight of ICE facilities without 7 days' notice.

I visited an ICE facility in Tacoma, Washington. I did provide that 7 days' notice, even though I was not legally required to do so, and yet I was still denied access to meet with my constituents due to so-called scheduling issues.

This is not transparency. This is an attempt to control access, suppress oversight, and manipulate the narrative.

Instead of terrorizing our communities, Trump needs to get back to the real work of solving the affordability crisis.

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

HONORING SHERIFF WESLEY DOOLITTLE

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

Mr. LUTTRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the law enforcement officers in my district, specifically in Montgomery County. I thank Constable Chris Jones and his deputies and actually to honor the Montgomery County Sheriff, Wesley Doolittle, whose extraordinary service exemplifies the best of law enforcement in Texas' Eighth Congressional District.

Just last year, shortly after his election, Sheriff Doolittle personally disarmed an individual during a road rage incident. His acts are absolutely what defines service, character, and fearlessness in law enforcement.

Sheriff Doolittle has led by example to protect our communities for decades. His hands-on approach and unwavering commitment to public safety has made Texas' Eighth Congressional District a safe place to live, work, and raise a family.

Our community, State, and Congress continue to be thankful for Sheriff Doolittle's service.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO VICTIMS

(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, on June 22, 2020, while serving as St. Louis County prosecutor, we were notified of a crime scene at a local restaurant by homicide detectives. Myself and our outreach director at the time, Captain Clay Farmer, responded to that scene to support the investigation that shortly after would be issued by our office.

What I witnessed at this scene still haunts me to this very day. I had intended this to be more celebratory to honor posthumously the great Demetrius Johnson and the legendary St. Louis American photographer Wiley Price on his retirement, and I will in the near future. In light of the conviction secured in this case yesterday, my thoughts are with the family of Kimberly Pelton and my friends, Lakeshia Finch and Arlydia Bufford.

Arlydia is a remarkable young woman, full of energy, and she beat me in UNO. Lakeshia, who has documented her heroic recovery from this atrocity, exemplifies courage, resiliency, and an unrelenting determination.

These three victims are our St. Louis stars.

HONORING GERALD ZEEK

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

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of an incredible American, a devoted patriot, and a pillar of the DeBary community in Florida's Seventh District, Mr. Gerald Zeek, who peacefully passed away on January 5, 2026, at the remarkable age of 96.

Gerald's life was defined by the quintessential American values of hard work, service, and family. Born on Halloween in 1929, he learned the value of a dollar early, taking his first job baling hay for just 25 cents an hour. That work ethic stayed with him throughout his entire life.

Following the Second World War, Gerald answered the call of duty and joined the United States Navy, completing an honorable tour of service, but his commitment to our Nation's defense didn't end there. He went on to dedicate 34 years of his life to Picatinny Arsenal, ensuring that freedom and servicemembers had the tools that they needed to defend this Nation.

In the 1980s, Gerald and his beloved wife, June, moved to DeBary, Florida. He was a man who appreciated the simple and the classic, often found working on his 1929 Ford Model A, a car as enduring and reliable as the man himself.

Above all, Gerald was a man of profound devotion. He was a husband to June for over 75 years, a testament to a love and loyalty that is rare to find in this world today. He was a father to his sons, Dave and Dan; and a grandfather to Christopher, Jeffrey, Deanna, Dave; and great-grandfather to eight grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I have a personal connection to this family's legacy of service. Gerald's own grandson Dave, who is with me today, is currently serving as my U.S. Army War Fellow, carrying forward the torch of excellence and patriotism that his grandfather lit nearly a century ago as a command sergeant major who has proudly served in our Joint Special Operations Command, 75th Ranger Regiment, and other units.

Gerald Zeek was an honorable, compassionate, and hardworking man. He was a great father, a great husband, and a great American. From one soldier to another, I want to take a moment to salute him and his lifetime of service.

May his memory be a blessing to his family and an inspiration to our district.

Airborne.

□ 1100

CHAMPIONS OF THE WEEK: DAVE EWERS, MARK HARPER, DOMINIC BAGNOLI

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

Mrs. SYKES. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to recognize Akron Fire Department Lieutenant Dave Ewers, retired Akron Firefighter Mark Harper, and Lynx EMS worker Dominic Bagnoli as Ohio's 13th Congressional District champions of the week.

Late last year, a man went into cardiac arrest at a roller skating rink in Jackson Township, Ohio. While not on the job and simply enjoying the rink, Lieutenant Ewers, retired Firefighter Harper, and Mr. Bagnoli leapt into action, giving the man CPR and other lifesaving support until Jackson Township EMS arrived.

Due to their quick response and effective CPR, the man made a full recovery and even started skating again this past weekend.

The three were recognized this week by Jackson Township with the EMS Excellence Award for their quick response during the incident.

Lieutenant Ewers and retired Firefighter Harper, both avid skaters themselves, said they have come to know a lot of the regulars at the roller rink, including the man who went into cardiac arrest. They said their fellow skaters are like family, so they were glad to be able to help one of their own.

Again, I extend my sincere gratitude to Akron Fire Department Lieutenant Dave Ewers, retired Akron Firefighter Mark Harper, and Lynx EMS worker

Dominic Bagnoli for their heroic actions and for stepping in to help a neighbor in need. They are just one more reason as to why Ohio's 13th Congressional District is the Birthplace of Champions.

CONGRATULATING 2006 IOLA FILLIES ON DON BAIN HALL OF FAME INDUCTION

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

Mr. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago this spring, there was a Cinderella moment in southeast Kansas. The Iola High School girls' basketball team, known as the Fillies, won the 2006 Kansas State High School Activities Association Class 4A State basketball championship. This came on top of a remarkable 24-2 season.

As a Kansas State senator at the time, I had the privilege of sponsoring a resolution in our State legislature to commend the team's win and to host the team at the Kansas State House to see the resolution's unanimous adoption.

A week ago, on the 20th anniversary, the community in Iola came together and inducted that 2006 team into the Iola High School's Don Bain Hall of Fame. Believe me, Mr. Speaker, the community has not forgotten what they accomplished.

The auditorium was packed. Former classmates and teachers came home to join in the celebration. Back in 2006, the student members of this outstanding basketball team received statewide recognition for their fine sportsmanship and athletic accomplishments. At the Hall of Fame induction last week, the team was also recognized for the ongoing camaraderie and success of its members in the years since.

As I said in the Kansas State House back in 2006, the team did an outstanding job of representing Allen County and southeast Kansas in the State tournament. I am very proud of their achievements, and I am honored to say in the United States Capitol today, 20 years later, I continue to be very proud of this team, the young women who composed it, and the community who supported it.

Congratulations, Fillies.

HONORING THE LIFE OF BETTY REID SOSKIN

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Betty Reid Soskin, who used all 104 years of her life to the fullest.

Betty lived in the East Bay since 1927, when her family moved from New Orleans. As a young woman during World War II, Betty worked as a ship-

yard clerk for the all-Black auxiliary lodge of the segregated Boilermakers Union.

In 1945, she and her husband founded one of the first Black-owned music stores, which remained open until 2019.

Over the years, she has worked with many elected officials, State senators, and assembly members.

In the early 2000s, she became involved in the plans for opening the Rosie the Riveter WWII/Home Front National Historical Park. This led to her later career as a park ranger, which she began in 2007 at the age of 85.

Betty led talks explaining the importance of the park in memorializing the contributions of women and African Americans working in the war industries supporting the U.S. effort at the home front.

Betty used her experiences and observations as a Black woman to bring light to the untold stories of African Americans during World War II and underscored the racism experienced by her and countless other women of color.

Through Betty's hard work and storytelling, she has touched the lives of thousands of park visitors and millions of Americans. It was just 2 months ago that she and I were together at one of the premier facilities, the Mare Island Dry Docks, where she was able to, once again, call upon all of us.

Mr. Speaker, our thoughts and prayers are with Betty's family. From all of us, I thank Betty for her tireless service and dedication to the community. We will deeply miss her.

CELEBRATING AKA FOUNDERS' DAY

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

Ms. SEWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with great pride and profound gratitude to celebrate Founders' Day 2026 for Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Incorporated, the first Greek letter organization established for African-American college-educated women.

For 118 years, Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority has been a beacon of scholarship, sisterhood, and service, lighting the way for generations of women who dared to lead and uplift their communities.

As proud members of Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, we stand on the shoulders of visionary founders, who believed that excellence and service were not just aspirations but obligations. From advancing educational equity to promoting economic empowerment and civic engagement, the women of AKA continue to answer the call to serve with grace, compassion, and unwavering commitment.

Today, we honor our legacy, a 118-year legacy that has shaped leaders in every field and strengthened communities across this Nation. May we continue to carry forward our mission with purpose and pride.

Happy Founders' Day 2026 to my beloved Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Incorporated. Let us continue to be of service to all mankind.

UNITED STATES NATURALIZES 850,000 PEOPLE EVERY YEAR

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

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, immigration is in the news again, and I don't feel the Republicans have done a good enough job of explaining what is going on here.

During the Biden administration—people are going to argue—somewhere between 8 million and 10 million people were allowed in this country who were not coming here legally.

Obviously, if we are going to have immigration laws, in the future, we have to make it clear that people who broke the laws in the past are not allowed in the country.

What is going on is that we have riots in Minnesota, and important Democratic officials who are saying something is wrong here.

Let us not forget: Every year in this country, 850,000 people are naturalized. They are sworn in as new citizens. We are at an all-time record of the number of foreign-born people in this country. The United States has nothing to apologize for about the number of people being allowed in this country, as we try to remove people.

Right now, in Minnesota, the Governor and mayor aren't even in favor of ICE removing criminals, and we should be removing other people who came here.

In any event, remember in America, we naturalize 850,000 people every year.

□ 1110

CONSTITUENT OF THE WEEK ALEXANDRA VAKOS

(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, I rise today to congratulate Alexandra Vakos on being named the 2025 Distinguished Assistant of the Year in a medium-sized office by the Virginia Association of Commonwealth's Attorneys.

Each year, this award honors just three prosecutors across the Commonwealth. Alexandra was selected from approximately 1,000 prosecutors who were qualified. She stood out because of her outstanding trial accomplishments and contributions to the Virginia Association of Commonwealth's Attorneys.

She played a pivotal role in establishing a regional behavioral health docket in the Fredericksburg area. This initiative helps connect individuals with serious mental health illness and substance abuse disorders to treatment and support through evidence-based practices and judicial oversight.

As her Representative in Congress, I am grateful for her commitment to justice and strengthening our community. That is why I am proud to name her Constituent of the Week.

CELEBRATING SCOUTING AMERICA

(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, there is a dynamic energy going on in my Westchester backyard in the world of scouting in the village of Port Chester. It deserves our attention and appreciation. Boy Scout Troop 400 and Troop 420 are growing in membership and service.

Under the tremendous leadership of Modesto “Moe” Acevedo, the young men and women of this community have flocked to involvement like never before.

Based at the Port Chester Carver Center, home to many other worthwhile efforts, Troop 400 serves boys and Troop 420 serves girls. This is a recent change in Scouting America policies. They are reaching kids growing up in an urban village, who are now learning the joys of outdoor life such as camping and hiking, expanding their sense of citizenship with merit badges in a host of disciplines that make for better adults and better citizens.

The troops draw from the heavily Hispanic youth of Port Chester and have developed incredible numbers of qualified Eagle Scouts who have taken their oath to Eagle and completed worthwhile Eagle Scout projects that benefit the community.

I have attended five separate Eagle Scout Courts of Honor to see five outstanding young people in the last year alone make their first mark on responsible leadership. Moe assures me there are more on the way.

From the floor of the House of Representatives, we salute Moe Acevedo, his team of Scoutmasters, supportive parents, and community leaders in Port Chester that have shown Troop 400 and Troop 420 to be a sign that scouting is thriving in the 21st century.

DENOUNCING IMMUNIZATION STANCE OF ROBERT F. KENNEDY, JR.

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

Ms. DEXTER. Mr. Speaker, last week RFK, Jr., upended the childhood immunization schedule, reducing the number of universally recommended vaccines without substantive input from relevant medical experts. One of the vaccines RFK, Jr., downgraded was the flu vaccine.

The science is clear. This decision will hurt our children, our elderly, and our families. Science doesn't care about our feelings. Science doesn't care

about our politics. Science is built on data, evidence, and facts.

RFK, Jr., seems to think if he ignores the science, it will simply go away. It won't. His decision will mean fewer kids get vaccinated against preventable diseases. More children will get sick, and more children will have morbidity and mortality as a result.

It is shameful. RFK, Jr., is absolutely unfit and should resign. Let's give our kids the healthy future they deserve.

DENOUNCING CANCELLATION OF LONG BEACH PUBLIC LIBRARY SEED PROGRAM

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

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, the Trump administration continues to take away access to STEM education from students across the country, including hundreds of middle school students in my district.

For years, the Long Beach Public Library's Youth SEED program delivered hundreds of workshops in science, technology, engineering, and math to students in Long Beach, California.

Educators, mentors, and community partners in these programs spark students' curiosity and help them build real-world skills. It is a place where students dream of developing the next cure or the latest cutting-edge technology.

These funding cuts mean less investments in American innovation, less opportunities for kids to pursue STEM careers, and less investment in the next generation.

Don't cut programs like SEED. Expand them so every child has a fair chance to thrive and excel.

GREENLAND IS NOT FOR SALE

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

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Speaker, you know you have lost in 2026 when Republicans in the United States House of Representatives are openly talking about impeaching the President of the United States if he invades Greenland, as one was quoted today in the press.

Let us be clear. Mr. President, Greenland is not for sale. Greenland is not for war. Greenland is not to be invaded. Greenland is for the Greenlandic people and our NATO allies, and we in the House of Representatives stand with our allies.

You have been duly warned, Mr. President. The American people want the Epstein files, not Greenland. If you violate the law and one of our longest standing allyships on the planet, there will be consequences. It is long overdue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from en-

gaging in personalities toward the President and address their comments to the Chair.

HONORING LIFE OF MATEO CAMARILLO

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

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Mateo Camarillo, a great trailblazer and leader in San Diego, who passed away recently.

Mateo was born in 1941 in Tijuana and immigrated to the United States as a child. As a fierce advocate for social justice and civil rights, Mateo put community at the heart of everything he did.

He was the force behind many incredible organizations and efforts that changed San Diego for the better. Mateo began organizing and helped create Casa Familiar and the San Ysidro Health Center. He fought to expand bilingual access in public institutions. He also served as the executive director of The Chicano Federation.

In addition to his public service, he was a very successful entrepreneur and educator. Despite his many accomplishments, his family—his family—was his pride and joy.

Mateo was once asked what his biggest motivation was for his work. He said it was helping immigrant communities reach for the American Dream of equal opportunity for all. He did more than that. He did great things. May Mateo rest in peace. A job well done.

HONORING MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

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

Ms. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, in 1968, 75 percent of Americans disapproved of Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Today is his birthday.

The FBI called him the most dangerous Negro in America. They wiretapped his home and his office. They sent him a letter, suggesting that he should take his own life. King kept walking.

One year before Memphis, at Riverside Church, he said what cost him resources and allies. He said: “The greatest purveyor of violence in the world today is my own government.” He said: “A nation that continues year after year to spend more money on military defense than on programs of social uplift is approaching spiritual death.”

Then he built the Poor People's Campaign. Black, White, and Brown came together, demanding that Congress address poverty in the richest Nation on this Earth.

This is the King that we must remember, not the safe icon but the dangerous peacemaker. He wrote: “I refuse to accept despair as the final response to the ambiguities of history.”

As we honor his legacy, let us refuse what he refused. Let us walk where he walked: Toward justice, toward the oughtness that forever confronts us.

□ 1120

WHERE DO YOU STAND

(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.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise today on this, the birth date of Dr. Martin Luther King, a man so great in the eyes of this country that we honor his birthday as a holiday, but it is more than a holiday. It is an opportunity for us to do some introspection, to examine some of the many things that are occurring within our country that should be addressed in a King-like fashion.

Dr. King had something that many other intellectuals of his time did not have. He was an intellectual. He had something that many of the persons who did speak up did not have; he had something called courage.

Many of the great intellectuals could expose and expound on some of the great issues of the time, but they didn't have the courage to take a stand, as Dr. King did, to go out into the public—into the streets, if you will—with protest—peaceful protest—to bring about a change in this country, and he did bring about a change.

So today, on his birthday, I want to honor Dr. King by speaking from one of his quotes. He had many quotes that are quite quotable, to be quite honest. It is difficult to single out just a few, but today I will mention a couple. But there is one that I will focus on, the third one. He, of course, is known for having said: "Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere."

Injustice in Minnesota is a threat to justice in every other State in the Union.

He didn't say that about Minnesota, but he was giving us the words to help us understand that what is happening in Minnesota, if it is an injustice, it can happen in your State. It can happen in Texas, my State. "Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere." I think that is probably one of his most-quoted quotes.

But then he also had one that is not quoted too often. This one is one that people don't like to associate with Dr. King because it speaks to his militancy, in a sense, but it also speaks to things that people don't want us to do. We have a State that has as its motto Live Free or Die.

Well, it is all right for a State to have that, but Dr. King's quote was: "A man who hasn't found something worth dying for isn't fit to live."

A man, a person, who has not found something worth dying for isn't fit to live. Very few people will cite Dr. King

for having said this. By the way, I paraphrase a lot of what I am saying in terms of his quotes.

"A man who hasn't found something worth dying for isn't fit to live."

But the one that I would like to quote today and say much about is his quote that deals with the ultimate measure. "The ultimate measure of a man . . ." is the way he put it, but I will be paraphrasing.

The ultimate measure—the ultimate measure of the person is not where the person stands in times of comfort—comfort, when all of your bills are paid and you are living the high life—not where the person stands in times of comfort and convenience—when everything is at your fingertips. You have at your fingertips all of the luxuries of life, all of the things that make life worth living.

The ultimate measure is not where the person stands in times of comfort and convenience, but, rather, where do you stand in times of challenge—challenge, when you have a reckless, ruthless, lawless President who is breaching the Constitution, who is doing things that we never expected to see in our lifetimes. Where do you stand when you have a President who is doing things within and without the country that we did not anticipate?

Dr. King says that the ultimate measure of the person is not where you stand in times of comfort and convenience, but where do you stand in times of challenge and controversy—controversy because what he is doing is being justified by many people who stand in the corridors of power. What he is doing is being justified by members of the clergy, who ordinarily would take the righteous stand. Where do you stand?

"The ultimate measure of a man. . . . Where do you stand in times of challenge and controversy?

Let's talk about this. Where do you stand when the President of the United States has replaced Congress with corporate America; when the President of the United States will consult corporate America before he consults Congress; and when the President of the United States goes into another country, Venezuela, bombs this country, and consults with corporate America but does not consult with the Congress of the United States of America? Where do you stand?

Well, here is where the Senate has taken a position. Here is where the Senate stands. Let's first read what the Senate has in S.J. Res. 90. This is a resolution brought before the Senate and has been voted on but was voted down.

Let's examine briefly an excerpt from the resolution.

The resolution reads: "A joint resolution to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities within or against Venezuela that have not been authorized by Congress."

Remember, this is the President, who consulted with corporate America but not the Congress of the United States

of America. The Senate has this resolution, S.J. Res. 90.

It continues in the Findings. "Congress makes the following findings." I will read a portion of one.

This is what Congress finds. This is the United States Senate: "Congress has the sole power to declare war under Article I, Section 8, Clause 11 of the United States Constitution."

Congress, the sole power to declare war.

It goes on to say: "Congress has not yet declared war upon Venezuela or any person or organization within Venezuela"

Mr. Speaker, Congress not having declared war, a President who has declared that he visited with corporate America before taking kinetic activity in Venezuela, where do we stand?

Well, the Members of the Senate, 50 of them, stood with this resolution. I would stand with them. I stand with them now, 50 of them who stood for this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, 50 Members were antithetical to the resolution. When this occurs, the Vice President of the United States has a vote.

The Vice President of the United States voted with those who were antithetical to this resolution, S.J. Res. 90. You can research and pull up the entirety of it, and I beg that you would.

So where do you stand when the Senate of the United States of America cannot reclaim its power to declare war? And we ought to do it while we can. We are losing it.

□ 1130

The ultimate measure of the United States Senate—what is the ultimate measure of it when it has the opportunity to reclaim its power to declare war and it doesn't?

We are finding ourselves now with the National Guard being sent into various cities around the country, various States, without a request from the Governors, without a request from the mayors, without a request from the officials who are in a position to make that request, without a request from the people, we the people not making that request. I know that we the people don't make the request; the Governor makes the request. But the point is we the people put the Governor in place.

So we the people are not making the request by and through our official agent, Governors, but the President has decided he would do this. And he always concocts some fallacious, some fictitious means by which this should be done, and he does it. And, unfortunately, we have to ask: Where do the courts stand?

Some of the courts are yielding to the President's pressure. He has threatened judges. Where do we stand when the President is threatening judges? Where do we stand when the President has decided that there is no separation of powers, that he can determine when a judge is right or wrong and if that judge is wrong, that judge should be

impeached? Where do we stand when the Senate holds a hearing to discuss the impeachment of judges who differ with the President of the United States of America? It has been done. I saw it myself. Where do we stand?

Where do we stand when, after the President has sent the National Guard into various places, more turmoil has been committed as a result of the Guard being there than was being committed before they arrived? The President is the person who is creating the turmoil so that he can then say: I am justified in sending the National Guard.

Where do we stand when a woman seated in her vehicle, a woman, Ms. Renee Nicole Good, seated in her vehicle when she is approached by a member of the constabulary in a rather aggressive way—and I am being kind, because with that aggression was an insufficient amount of profanity, more than sufficient. It was really insufficient, not necessary, profanity.

Now, do we expect the constabulary to approach people and in this process swear at them, or do we expect them to be respectful, be respectful even when the person that the member of the constabulary is approaching is disrespectful? That is our job. We are to be respectful, notwithstanding the disrespect we have to suffer.

I was a judge. I remember having a man come before me in court and said some very unkind things with profanity. I could have held him in contempt. All I had to do was say: Mr. Bailiff, take this man over to a certain area and hold him until I finish the docket. I have to have a further discussion with him.

I could have held him in contempt, but I had heard enough of that case to know that he was right about the facts in the case; he was wrong in how he expressed himself. I never held that man in contempt. I had the black robe on. I had the power.

How you use power determines whether you are a person who should possess power, whether you are the person that should be armed with lethality such that you can change a person's family's history and remove a person from existence.

Where do we stand when officers approach a person such as Ms. Good was situated and when Ms. Good says to this person: Dude, in a sense, I am not mad at you. I am not mad at you. To the person approaching aggressively: I am not mad at you. And as she is saying these things—it has been said that these were her last words—another officer comes across, near her, in front of her, and this officer with a video camera has his weapon just with him. This officer, as she turns away, shoots her and then, as she is passing by, shoots again.

I assume the first shot hit her. I don't know whether it did or didn't. That is my assumption, so I am saying that. But we do know this: There were additional shots fired as she passed by

through her window—the window was not up; it was not elevated—through her window. We do know that she died. We do know because we have seen it.

Now, you can justify this if you would like, but you can't justify the Justice Department concluding that it would not cooperate with the local authorities with the investigation, not if you want transparency. Where do we stand when the Justice Department refuses to be transparent after we see what appears to be an injustice to many people? I am one of them. I believe that the killing of Ms. Renee Nicole Good was a grave, gross injustice. Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere. So where do we stand when this is happening? Where do we stand? Sent in armed persons, and they have now taken a life in a way that is quite questionable.

Well, where do we stand when the President now is saying that he is declaring martial law? Well, he is not declaring it currently. He is saying that he may have to, talking about martial law. He talked about that some time ago. Actually now he is talking about the Insurrection Act, the Insurrection Act. He is talking about the Insurrection Act. He has spoken of martial law on other occasions long ago, a while ago, but now the Insurrection Act. So that means he is going to send in the military, if he does it, and then the next thing after that could be martial law.

So are we going to just stand by and witness the President replace Congress with corporate America, decide that he will send in the National Guard, send it in to cities across the country without a request from the Governor of the State? When he decides that he is going to talk about now the Insurrection Act as his next tool, National Guard already in, using the Insurrection Act, bring in the military, the only thing left is martial law. He hasn't said that he will resort to martial law at this time, but I want to say this: I have been trying to warn you. I have been trying to warn the American people that this President is moving us toward a dictatorship. I was among the very first, if not the first, to say publicly that this was an authoritarian, among the first to say it. It is difficult to be a part of the avant-garde when you are trying to warn powerful people about something that is taking place.

□ 1140

I have been trying to warn you. I say it is difficult because Voltaire was right. It is dangerous to be right in affairs where established men are wrong. It is dangerous to be right. It is dangerous to be right when the establishment in this country refuses to acknowledge what is taking place.

Thank God for people associated with free speech for people. Thank God for the impeach and removal coalition, people who are willing to be a part of the avant-garde, who are willing to take the proper stand when they see

democracy at risk, when they see the President absolutely disregarding the separation of powers, absolutely disregarding the fact that the judiciary has the authority to render opinions about circumstances that have been brought before the judiciary.

There are some people who are standing up. I am proud to say that, here in the Congress of the United States of America, there are people who are taking a stand against this President's unconstitutional behavior. They are taking a stand.

I am proud to tell you that many Articles of Impeachment have been filed since the first was filed. Many have been filed, and I am on every one of them.

December 9, a stand was taken. Articles of Impeachment were filed. I am on those articles.

December 10, a stand was taken. Articles of Impeachment were filed. I am on those articles.

January 14, a stand was taken. I am on these Articles of Impeachment.

I do not require people to stand with me when I take a stand, because I sincerely believe, as I have said here at this microphone many times, on some issues it is better to stand alone than not stand at all. I don't lead by telling people you have to follow me. No, I am an example. If you think I am a good example, then you can embrace the example.

I am not out whipping people for votes. I am not going to demand that people do something that I think is appropriate. I lead by example, and I try to be a good example. I am not always a good example, so no one should claim that I claim perfection because I do not.

I do claim this: On these issues related to the Constitution, I refuse to stand by and see what is happening in my country as it devolves into what I perceive as a dictatorship. I refuse to stand by and see that and say nothing.

The truest and the ultimate measure of the person is not where you stand in times of comfort and convenience when you have all of these things happening that I have cited, but where do you stand in times of challenge and controversy when these things are happening—not when all is right with the world, but where you stand in times of challenge and controversy.

Do you stand with the President who is behaving in an unlawful fashion as it relates to the Constitution, or do you stand with the Constitution of the United States of America?

This is where we Members of Congress now have to make a decision. Are we going to stand with the reckless, ruthless, lawless President, or are we going to stand with the Constitution of the United States of America?

I am proud to tell you that when we filed the last Articles of Impeachment—and I have filed many. I plan to file more, just for edification purposes. I will say more about that at a later time.

When the last Articles of Impeachment were filed, it was H. Res. 939. With these Articles of Impeachment, there was a vote. I believe that we ought to take a stand. We ought to take a stand. These are times of challenge and controversy. We were elected to take a stand in times of challenge and controversy.

Yes, I know that it can put my career at risk. There are people trying to get me out of office, and they are doing a pretty good job. I never know what my next day will bring.

I do know this: I will have my record show that I fought all the way out. I didn't come to stay forever, but I did come to make a difference while here on the great issues of our time.

Where do we stand? On H. Res. 939, 140 persons voted for H. Res. 939, 140 Members of Congress, not one from the other side of the aisle—140, Members who hold high positions. I am not calling anybody out.

As a result, we have identified all of them in this document. This is my copy. But all 140 Members who voted for H. Res. 939 will receive a similar copy, and their names are all listed. Each person's name is going to be highlighted one time, and that one time will be the time that we will acknowledge this person as being in the document by highlighting the name. That will be given to that person. Each person will have his or her name highlighted on the page when no other names are highlighted but that one person's.

It is important now for me to read a bit from H. Res. 939. It reads: "Impeaching Donald John Trump, President of the United States, for high crimes and misdemeanors."

I have to pause a minute and say this. The President said just recently that "they will find a reason to impeach me." Mr. President, we don't have to find a reason. You are giving reasons. You are providing reasons on a daily basis almost. I said "almost."

On a daily basis, you are providing reasons for people to file Articles of Impeachment against you. The question is not whether the reasons are there. You are providing them. The question is, Mr. President, will we have the courage to bring you to justice?

This is the bar of justice for you, Mr. President. You will be brought before this bar of justice, the House of Representatives, where impeachment is the indictment that will bring you to justice.

So, it reads: "Impeaching Donald John Trump, President of the United States, for high crimes and misdemeanors."

It goes on to read: "Resolved, That Donald John Trump, President of the United States, is an abuser of Presidential power who, if left in office, will continue to promote the incitement of violence"—and he has a done a job—I almost said "a good job," but I hate to use "good" in this context. He has "engender[ed] invidious hate,

undermine[d] our democracy, and dissolve[d] our Republic, that he is impeached for high crimes and misdemeanors, and that the following Articles of Impeachment be exhibited to the United States Senate."

They were first exhibited to the House. The House took a vote. One hundred forty persons voted for the impeachment. We had another 47, I believe, who chose to vote "present."

For these 140, I have the courage to present to you this document in this fine piece of cover that has a very soft texture to it. We will present this to you. I want to read what it says above the patriotic 140.

□ 1150

It reads: Patriotism means to stand.

Where do you stand in times of challenging controversy? Remember Dr. King.

Patriotism means to stand by the country in times of challenging controversy.

That is what patriotism means: Stand by the country. Patriotism means to stand by the country. It does not mean to stand by the President.

Patriotism means to stand by the country. It does not mean to stand by the President.

Dr. King, today we honor your profound words in the ultimate measure of the man. As it was said at that time, the ultimate measure of the person is not where the person stands in times of comfort and convenience but where does a person stand in times of challenge and controversy.

The answer is from Theodore Roosevelt. I am a bipartisan guy. The answer is: Patriotism means to stand by the country. It does not mean to stand by the President.

This is Dr. King's birthday. I thought it most appropriate to pay tribute to the 140 patriotic Americans who took a stand.

For those who have concluded that there will not be impeachment: You are wrong.

It is the only solution available to prevent the next Donald Trump, the next would-be, from assuming the position that this Donald Trump has taken and imposed the kinds of horrific atrocities on society that this Donald Trump is imposing.

We need to impeach right here and send it over to the Senate. The Senate would have a trial. Impeach, convict—conviction takes place in the Senate—and remove. The Senate has the power to do this. This is the solution.

I understand that the network television programs, for the most part—there are some exceptions, but for the most part, they stand with Donald Trump. Donald Trump does not want to be impeached. He as much as said so, and the networks don't want him impeached. They have said so. I have listened to many persons associated with the networks, and they said so. They don't want to see impeachment.

I differ with them. By the way, when you differ with them, they won't let

you say that. This is a free-speech country when people will allow you to speak broadly on their networks. So they are not going to let you do that. You won't see me on CNN. You won't see me on MSNBC, but you will hear from me here as long as I am allowed to speak because I just believe in speaking truth about power, not just speak truth to power, but speak truth about power.

Speak truth to power, you say: Power, there is a problem. Let's solve it.

Speak truth about power, you say: Power, there is a problem, and you are it.

That is just as I did from that seat right over to my right when the President was up at that podium and I told him he didn't have a mandate to cut Medicaid, Medicare, and Social Security.

The networks are a status quo institution for the most part. They want to maintain things as they are. I am not a status quo Representative. I want to see change, positive change, change that can make a difference in the lives of people.

I tell you this, Mr. Speaker, if we don't speak up, stand up, and meet the ultimate measure of the person that Dr. King calls to our attention, it may be too late at some point within the next 3 years for us to do so. Because this President is showing us that he intends to become a dictator. To a certain extent, he is already, to a limited extent, a dictator.

So we have to take back our power to declare war while we can before it is too late. We have got to take back the authority in the Constitution to have a separation of powers while we can before it is too late. We have got to stand up to this President.

Dr. King, that is what you would have us do. I believe you would have us take a stand.

I believe that Dr. King would not sit silently by and witness what has taken place now and do it without taking a stand.

Not everybody has to take a stand to impeach. Some people decided that they would peacefully protest. I am a peaceful protester. I will stand by people who peacefully protest. I will not stand by people who do not peacefully protest. If you introduce violence, then you just lost me. I am not with you. It doesn't matter who you are, I am not with you.

The ultimate measure of the person in times of challenge and controversy is with the Constitution of the United States of America. That is where I am, and that is where I stand. I assure you as I stand here, I want you to know, Mr. Speaker, that we who believe that Dr. King should be commemorated ought to commemorate his life respectfully.

There is nothing wrong with commemorating his life by engaging in peaceful protest. There is nothing wrong with commemorating his life by

standing on the authority vested in the Constitution of the United States of America which is imparted to us. The words are without us they just become words. We give meaning to the Constitution.

So there is nothing wrong with taking that stand. Stand on the Constitution of the United States of America. Dr. King, I know that is what you would have us do.

That is what I encourage others to do.

I assure you, Dr. King, I am going to bring additional Articles of Impeachment to a vote on the floor of the House of Representatives.

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

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

□ 1200

MISGUIDED POLICY IN CALIFORNIA

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

Mr. KILEY of California. Mr. Speaker, every so often there comes along a policy so misguided, so self-destructive, so just utterly stupid that it has catastrophic consequences before it is even adopted.

Such is the case with the newly proposed wealth tax in the State of California, a proposal that is the height of folly, the height of insanity. The proposal would seize the assets, 5 percent of the net worth of citizens of our State who are purported to have a net worth over a billion dollars. Of course, that will simply be the first line that is drawn, with inevitably lower net worth levels ensnared in the future.

This measure, which would be adopted this November and put into effect next year, has a peculiar provision in it stating that it would apply even to people who are no longer residents of the State at the time of its enactment. It would apply to anyone who was a resident of California up until January 1 of this year, even though it doesn't take effect until January 1 of next year.

Those who would be affected by it got word that this is coming. Guess what they did? They made sure that they were not here as of January 1 of this year. For example, Larry Page and Sergey Brin, the founders of Google, have relocated from California because one analysis suggests that under this proposal the government could seize \$60 billion from each of them.

There are reports now that already \$1 trillion in net worth has exited California simply in anticipation of this policy being adopted. They simply can't take the risk. One person with

knowledge of the affected individuals said that 80 to 90 percent of them either will leave the State or have left already, not to mention those who don't quite meet that threshold but know that they will be next, who have already left or are looking at an exit strategy.

The consequences of this growing exodus cannot be overstated when it comes to the future of our State. Number one, with all of these high-net-worth individuals leaving, they are, of course, taking all of the taxes that they pay with them, so the State Treasury no longer receives anything.

Now, obviously, this is a drain on the Treasury. It would be in any State, but in particular in California because of the unusual extent to which our State relies on the highest earners.

In some years, our State budget, our State income tax revenue gets 50 percent of its total revenues from the top 1 percent of earners. When you see those people leaving the State, it means that the house of cards that is our State's finances will come tumbling down.

We also should note the impact this is going to have on the startup community in California, which is so central to our State's identity, vitality, and economic prosperity and so central to what has made California such a vital part of the American economy and such a driving force in progress all around the world.

However, because this proposal would seize liquid assets, would demand 5 percent of an individual's net worth even though they are assessing assets of all kinds, what that would mean for a startup that has a very high paper value—based simply upon the way that startups receive their valuation, for example, based upon a multiple of an initial seed investment—then essentially you would have startups that would be forced to liquefy their assets or would simply not be able to pay this bill. Therefore, it would no longer be viable to be a startup in California. The entire ecosystem would cease to function as it does now.

It is worth mentioning, by the way, that this exodus has been an ongoing phenomenon in California. It is not just limited to those who are of a high net worth. For the sixth straight year, U-Haul has just ranked California as number one in the country in outbound U-Haul rentals, in people leaving the State. It is usually not the wealthiest people. It is people who simply can't afford to get by in California because of the inordinately high cost of living.

This proposed wealth tax would take this trend to an entirely new level in a way that would make it so California is a failed State, is no longer viable as a political entity. That is why we need to make sure that this provision does not pass. In addition, importantly, we need to make sure that the unconstitutional scheme whereby former residents would be ensnared is not allowed to even begin to be executed.

That is why I am working on legislation here in the House of Representatives, Federal legislation to preempt that provision, which I believe is unconstitutional under the Commerce Clause, but we need to have express preemption in law to make sure that at the very least people do not feel the need to leave in anticipation of this measure or a future such measure passing.

Now that we have discussed this absolutely insane proposal, I want to take a closer look at the California State budget as it now stands because this last week we got an announcement from the Governor that the State will be spending \$348.9 billion in the coming fiscal year.

Now, notably, that is a massive increase over what the State spent just last year, and it is nearly double what the budget was when Gavin Newsom became Governor in 2019. At the time Newsom was sworn in, our State budget was \$197.5 billion, already quite high. During his tenure, he has increased the budget to \$348.9 billion, in the process putting the State's finances in dire straits.

A columnist for the San Francisco Chronicle noted that Newsom's gift to his successor is a \$22 billion deficit. The State's nonpartisan legislative analyst came out with an absolutely scathing report, calling the State's financial situation and the Governor's budget "alarming." The report raised "serious concerns about the State's fiscal sustainability" and noted that the Governor's budget does not materially address those concerns.

This, by the way, isn't even to mention the massive around \$1 trillion shortfall when it comes to funding the State's long-term liabilities, the unfunded liabilities that we have in the State.

Let's just look at this increase in the size of the budget. Remember, this wealth tax is being offered on the premise that we need even more revenue. Over the course of this Governor's tenure, California's budget has grown by 75.7 percent.

Now, you might say, well, maybe that is what other States are doing, too. Surely, other States have increased their budget. However, they have not increased their budget nearly as much as California has.

Florida, for example, has a \$78.6 billion budget. That is compared to \$349 billion in California. Over that same period, Florida's budget grew by 56 percent, Ohio's budget grew by 36 percent.

You might say, well, those are red States, what about comparing California to other blue States? Well, Massachusetts' budget grew by 44 percent, New York's budget grew by 37 percent, while California's budget grew by 75.7 percent during that time period.

Now, you might say, okay, we are spending more, but surely the people of California are getting something worthwhile in return for this massive increase in tax revenue, this massive

increase in public expenditures. Surely, we are seeing major gains in the achievement of our students in schools. Surely, we have gotten beautiful new roads and transit systems. Surely, we are seeing the cost of living go down and the quality of life go up.

However, no, quite the opposite has happened. Infrastructure in California remains among the worst in the country. Our roads are routinely rated among the three worst roads in terms of their condition anywhere in the country. We pay the highest gas taxes, yet drive over the deepest potholes.

Despite tens of billions of dollars more being spent every year on education, educational achievement in California has flatlined, and we continue to have some of the most glaring achievement gaps of any State in the country.

Meanwhile, the cost of living in California is the highest anywhere in the United States. We have the highest taxes. We have the highest cost of housing of any State other than Hawaii. We have the highest gas prices. We have the highest electricity prices, including the highest increase in electricity prices during Newsom's tenure as Governor compared to any other State. We are among the top two or three in the country when it comes to water bills. In every single dimension of affordability, California is the Nation's least affordable State.

□ 1210

Mr. Speaker, the Governor has utterly failed to justify asking our citizens to pay even more when they receive a historically, unfathomably low return on that investment. The fact is, the people of California continue to sacrifice more and more and get less and less in return.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will examine one of the reasons why that is the case. I will take a moment today to look at the vast waste, fraud, and abuse that exists in the State of California and the proposal that I am working on to bring the full scale, extent, and breadth of it to light so that we can work to address it using every tool that we have here at the Federal level and to compel changes at the State level.

This is the simple reality: Every single time there has been any sort of independent audit of a program in California, the results have been the same. There has been mind-boggling waste and fraud identified, and the causality has been identified as unbelievable negligence and neglect on the part of the State, its agencies, and its government.

I will list just a few examples. During the COVID years, California had, at a bare minimum, \$32.6 billion in unemployment fraud through our EDD agency. A State audit that I initially requested, as a member of the legislature, and that Governor Newsom initially killed, found that the State spent \$24 billion on homelessness over

a 5-year span and failed to track the actual uses of those funds or whether they made any measurable improvement on the homelessness problem in our State. By the way, they didn't. The homeless population increased by some 50,000 individuals.

We have already seen charges brought in both San Francisco and Florida when it comes to fraud in relation to the expenditure of funds that were earmarked for homelessness. We have also seen convictions in Orange County in connection, for example, with workers' compensation fraud.

The State auditor also just came out with a scathing high-risk audit identifying the agencies in California that qualify as high risk, meaning they exhibit a serious risk of waste, fraud, abuse, or mismanagement, and have failed to take corrective steps.

The number of these high-risk agencies is now at an all-time high. It has doubled during the course of Governor Newsom's tenure. Among the findings were error rates when it comes to food assistance benefits that could cost a loss of \$2.5 billion in Federal funds.

Billions more are at risk of being lost or are being lost through improper Medi-Cal determinations and through ongoing EDD fraud, which continues at staggering levels even after the \$32.6 billion lost during the COVID years.

The audit also found that California has missed six straight financial reporting deadlines, putting the State's very credit rating at risk. Then, of course, there is the matter of the high-speed rail, which was supposed to be completed, a full, functioning, high-speed rail line from San Francisco to Los Angeles in 2020, 6 years ago. Yet, here we are in 2026, \$18 billion spent. The overall cost is now projected to be \$128 billion, and literally nothing has been built. No track has been laid, and not a single passenger has ridden this nonexistent train, which raises the question: Where has all of this money gone?

Even an audit during the Biden administration from President Biden's Health and Human Services agency found that California improperly claimed \$52.7 million in Medicaid reimbursement for noncitizens, which, of course, raises many questions about how pervasive these improper payments might be in our Medi-Cal system more broadly.

Mr. Speaker, this is just a snapshot into certain programs in the State of California. What we need is a comprehensive review to see just how staggering the problem is, just how many tens of billions of dollars our citizens are losing. Maybe that would be a better way to give Californians a higher return on their investments.

Rather than increasing the budget to \$349 billion, rather than imposing an absolutely ruinous wealth tax that will give our State government the unprecedented authority to simply confiscate the assets of anyone they choose, maybe it would be better to make it so

California is no longer the fraud capital of the United States.

HONORING AN EXTRAORDINARY AMERICAN,
RICHARD "DICK" BURBINE

Mr. KILEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an extraordinary American, a man whose life story reflects the very best of our Nation's character, courage, and commitment to service. Richard "Dick" Burbine represents a generation that answered history's call with quiet resolve and uncommon bravery.

Dick Burbine was born on January 9, 1926, in Melrose, Massachusetts. Like so many young Americans of his time, his life was forever changed by the events of World War II.

In the wake of the attack on Pearl Harbor, while most teenagers were still in high school, Dick Burbine chose service. At just 16 years old, he enlisted in the United States Merchant Marine, trained at Gallops Island in Boston Harbor, and soon found himself at sea, supporting Allied operations in both the Atlantic and Pacific theaters.

One of the most defining chapters of his service came aboard the Liberty ship SS *Henry Bacon*. Dick served during the infamous Murmansk Run, an Arctic supply route widely regarded as one of the most dangerous missions of the war. Sailors faced brutal weather, freezing seas, and constant enemy attack, all to ensure vital supplies reached those fighting tyranny.

On February 23, 1945, tragedy struck when the *Henry Bacon* was attacked by enemy aircraft in the Barents Sea and ultimately sank. Dick Burbine was only 18 years old when he was thrown into icy, subzero waters. What he did next defines heroism.

At great personal risk, he righted a capsized lifeboat, pulled fellow sailors to safety, and helped rescue Norwegian women and children who were fleeing the war. Despite the loss of 28 crewmembers, every one of the 19 Norwegian refugees survived, making this a powerful testament to the courage and selflessness of Dick Burbine and his shipmates.

His service did not end with World War II. Dick continued to serve during the early Cold War and later enlisted in the United States Marine Corps. During the Korean war, he served with distinction as a helicopter mechanic and crew chief, eventually earning the rank of staff sergeant.

After leaving the military, Dick Burbine remained dedicated to protecting others. He served in law enforcement with the Contra Costa Sheriff's Department, the Danville Constable's Office, and the University of California Police Department at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory. In 1987, he retired as a sergeant and watch commander, concluding yet another chapter of public service.

Even in retirement, Dick did not step away from giving back. He volunteered with the U.S. Forest Service in the Bridgeport Ranger District, helping maintain campgrounds for the benefit of residents and visitors alike.

Remarkably, even as he approaches his 100th birthday, he continues to harvest and donate firewood each winter to neighbors in need, quiet acts of kindness that say as much about his character as any medal ever could.

His legacy of service lives on through his family, including his son, Joseph, who also served in the United States Marine Corps and in law enforcement.

On January 9, 2026, just a few days ago, Richard “Dick” Burbine celebrated his centennial birthday, 100 years defined by courage under fire, unwavering devotion to country, and a lifelong commitment to community.

On behalf of a grateful nation and with deep respect and admiration, we thank Dick Burbine for his heroic military service, his distinguished public safety career, and his enduring example of what it means to serve others. It is an honor to represent exemplary individuals like Dick Burbine in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I offer our heartfelt congratulations and best wishes as he reaches this remarkable milestone. We say, simply and sincerely, thank you.

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

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 269.—An act to improve coordination between Federal and State agencies and the Do Not Pay working system.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KILEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, January 16, 2026, at 3 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-2674. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation, and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Application for Presidential Permit Authorizing the Construction, Connection, Operation, and Maintenance of Facilities for Transmission of Electric Energy at International Boundaries [DOE-HQ-2025-0011] (RIN: 1901-AB68) received January 9, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-2675. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation, and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Clean Energy for New Federal Buildings and Major Renovations of Federal Buildings; Stay [EERE-2010-BT-STD-0031] (RIN: 1904-AB96) received January 9, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec.

251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-2676. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation, and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's rescission of policy statement — Rescission of Policy Statement on Export Commencement Deadlines in Authorizations To Export Natural Gas to Non-Free Trade Agreement Countries received January 9, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-2677. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation, and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards and Test Procedures for Certain Consumer Products and Commercial Equipment; Corrections [EERE-2023-BT-CE-0001] received January 9, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-2678. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation, and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Final Withdrawal of Determination of Miscellaneous Gas Products as a Covered Consumer Product [EERE-2025-BT-DET-0002] (RIN: 1904-AF70) received January 9, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-2679. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation, and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's direct final rule — Collection of Information Under the Energy Supply and Environmental Coordination Act of 1974 [EERE-2025-OT-0033] (RIN: 1904-AG04) received January 9, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-2680. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation, and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's direct final rule — Rescinding Obsolete Transfer of Proceedings Regulations [DOE-HQ-2025-0018] (RIN: 1990-AA53) received January 9, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-2681. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation, and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's direct final rule — Rescinding New Construction Requirements Related to Nondiscrimination in Federally Assisted Programs or Activities [DOE-HQ-2025-0015] (RIN: 1903-AA24) received January 9, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-2682. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation, and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Repeal of the Definition of Showerhead [EERE-2025-BT-DET-0005] (RIN: 1904-AF75) received January 9, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-2683. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation, and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedure for Central Air Conditioners and Heat Pumps [EERE-2022-BT-TP-0028] (RIN: 1904-

AF49) received January 9, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-2684. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation, and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Standards for Manufactured Housing [EERE-2009-BT-BC-0021] (RIN: 1904-AF73) received January 9, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-2685. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation, and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's direct final rule — Rescinding Regulations Related to Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Sex in Education Programs or Activities Receiving Federal Financial Assistance [DOE-HQ-2025-0025] (RIN: 1903-AA22) received January 9, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-2686. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation, and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's direct final rule — Rescinding Regulations Related to Nondiscrimination in Federally Assisted Programs or Activities (General Provisions) [DOE-HQ-2025-0024] (RIN: 1903-AA20) received January 9, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-2687. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation, and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's direct final rule — Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Sex in Sports Programs Arising Out of Federal Financial Assistance [DOE-HQ-2025-0016] (RIN: 1903-AA25) received January 9, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-2688. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation, and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's direct final rule — Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Sex in Sports Programs Arising Out of Federal Financial Assistance [DOE-HQ-2025-0016] (RIN: 1903-AA25) received January 9, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-2689. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation, and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's direct final rule — Rescinding Regulations for Loans for Minority Business Enterprises Seeking DOE Contracts and Assistance [DOE-HQ-2025-0014] (RIN: 1903-AA23) received January 9, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-2690. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation, and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's direct final rule — Rescinding Obsolete Financial Assistance Rules [DOE-HQ-2025-0017] (RIN: 1991-AC20) received January 9, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-2691. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation, and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's direct final rule — Procedures for Acquisition of Petroleum for the Strategic Petroleum Reserve [DOE-HQ-2025-0009] (RIN: 1901-AB66) received

January 9, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-2692. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation, and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's direct final rule — Revisions to the Office of Hearings and Appeals Procedural Regulations [DOE-HQ-2025-0013] (RIN: 1910-AA57) received January 9, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-2693. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation, and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — Energy Dominance Financing Amendments [DOE-HQ-2025-0174] (RIN: 1901-AB72) received January 9, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-2694. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation, and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's direct final rule — Amending the Administrative Procedures With Respect to the Import and Export of Natural Gas [DOE-HQ-2025-0010] (RIN: 1901-AB67) received January 9, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-2695. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation, and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — Implementing Voluntary Agreements Under the Defense Production Act [DOE-HQ-2025-0175] (RIN: 1901-AB73) received January 9, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-2696. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation, and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's direct final rule — Revisions to the Office of Hearings and Appeals Procedural Regulations for the DOE Contractor Employee Protection Program [DOE-HQ-2025-0012] (RIN: 1910-AA56) received January 9, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-2697. A letter from the Acting Branch Supervisor, Regulatory Management Branch, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Pyriofenone; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2024-0239; FRL-13069-01-OCSPP] received January 13, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-2698. A letter from the Agency Branch Supervisor, Regulatory Management Branch, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Permethrin; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2024-0201; FRL-13107-01-OCSPP] received January 13, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-2699. A letter from the Acting Branch Supervisor, Regulatory Management Branch, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — New Source Performance Standards Review for Stationary Combustion Turbines and Stationary Gas Turbines [EPA-HQ-OAR-2024-0419; FRL-11542-02-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AW21) received January 13, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-2700. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation, and

Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — Revision of National Environmental Policy Act Implementing Procedures [DOE-HQ-2025-0026] (RIN: 1990-AA52) received January 9, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-2701. A letter from the Director, Regulations and Disclosure Law Division, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Extension of Import Restrictions on Archaeological Material of Costa Rica [CBP Dec.: 26-03] (RIN: 1685-AA40) received January 13, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EC-2702. A letter from the Director, Regulations and Disclosure Law Division, U.S. Customs and Boarder Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Extension of Import Restrictions Imposed on Categories of Archaeological Material of Italy [CBP Dec.: 26-01] (RIN: 1685-AA37) received January 18, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EC-2703. A letter from the Director, Regulations and Disclosure Law Division, U.S. Customs and Boarder Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Extension of Import Restrictions on Categories of Archaeological and Ethnological Material From Morocco [CBP Dec.: 26-02] (RIN: 1685-AA39) received January 13, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. Hill of Arkansas: Committee On Financial Services. H.R. 5577. A bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 to reauthorize the National Flood Insurance Program; with an amendment (Rept. 119-456). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HILL of Arkansas: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 6644. A bill a bill to increase the supply of housing in America, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 119-457, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs discharged from further consideration. H.R. 6644 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 Mr. MACKENZIE:

H.R. 7082. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to provide for greater flexibility in the Federal programs supporting the planning and implementation of charter schools; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 7083. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements in the process of the Department of Veterans Affairs for making payments to automobile sellers for automobiles purchased for certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PFLUGER (for himself, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. MANN, and Mr. EDWARDS):

H.R. 7084. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, with respect to the types of vessels that may enter or operate in navigable waters of the United States or transfer cargo in any port or place under the jurisdiction of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HUIZENGA:

H.R. 7085. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to repeal certain disclosure requirements related to conflict minerals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CISCOMANI (for himself and Mr. BISHOP):

H.R. 7086. A bill to support the creation and implementation of State policies, as well as the expansion of existing State policies, for improving the quality and affordability of charter school facilities and to authorize the provision of technical assistance to support the growth and expansion of high-quality charter schools; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself and Ms. SEWELL):

H.R. 7087. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow for deductions for transfers from estates or gifts to certain cemeteries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AMO (for himself, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. HOYER, Mr. KEATING, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Ms. HOYLE of Oregon, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. MCBRIDE, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. SCANLON, and Mr. SWALWELL):

H.R. 7088. A bill to prohibit actions or expenditure of funds to purchase a North Atlantic Treaty Organization member country or NATO-protected territory; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. AMO (for himself, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. COHEN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 7089. A bill to prohibit National Park System entrance fee waivers commemorating the birthday of a sitting President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BACON (for himself, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. FONG, Mr. HURD of Colorado, Mr. EZELL, Mr. BABIN, Ms. KING-HINDS, and Mr. CARBAJAL):

H.R. 7090. A bill to designate the portion of Interstate Route 680 in Omaha, Nebraska, as the "Hal Daub Freeway"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BERGMAN (for himself and Mr. CORREA):

H.R. 7091. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish an investigational research and extended access treatment program utilizing innovative treatments and emerging therapies to address conditions with unmet medical needs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CARTER of Louisiana (for himself, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. MOYLAN, and Mr. MACKENZIE):

H.R. 7092. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to require local educational agencies to include mental health and suicide prevention information on student identification cards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas (for herself and Mr. MACKENZIE):

H.R. 7093. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a charitable deduction for the contribution of the use of certain property by community learning centers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself, Mr. BACON, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mr. KEAN, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. QUIGLEY):

H.R. 7094. A bill to prohibit United States persons from providing petroleum equipment or services in the energy sector of the Russian Federation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself, Mr. BACON, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. McCORMICK, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H.R. 7095. A bill to amend the Ending Importation of Russian Oil Act to provide for a prohibition on importation of energy products produced at refineries outside the Russian Federation; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, 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. ESTES (for himself and Mr. HARDER of California):

H.R. 7096. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to ensure appropriate approval for certain skilled nursing facility and nursing facility nursing aide training and competency evaluation programs under the Medicare and Medicaid program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FEENSTRA (for himself and Mr. HUNT):

H.R. 7097. A bill to prohibit international wire transfers by public assistance recipients, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas:

H.R. 7098. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize the deployment and assistance of CBP relating to investigations of certain violent acts, shootings, and mass killings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. GOODLANDER (for herself, Mr. VAN DREW, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. KEAN, and Ms. McDONALD RIVET):

H.R. 7099. A bill to increase access to higher education and center-based Head Start programs by providing public transit grants; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GOTTHEIMER (for himself and Mr. VALADAO):

H.R. 7100. A bill to direct the Attorney General to establish a task force on anti-

Sikh hate and discrimination; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRIJALVA (for herself, Ms. ANSARI, Ms. BALINT, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CISNEROS, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. ELFRETH, Mrs. FOUSH, Mr. GARCIA of California, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LICCIARDI, Mr. MANNION, Mr. OLSZEWSKI, Ms. POU, Ms. RANDALL, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Ms. RIVAS, Ms. ROSS, Ms. SIMON, Mr. STANTON, Mr. THANEDAR, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. TONKO, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, and Mr. FROST):

H.R. 7101. A bill to require that an individual elected to fill a vacancy in the House of Representatives pursuant to a special election shall be provided an opportunity to have the oath of office administered and seated as a member of that body not later than five legislative days after the day that the results of the special election are certified, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HAMADEH of Arizona:

H.R. 7102. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to require Federal civilian career employees to pass a citizenship test as a condition of employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. HAMADEH of Arizona:

H.R. 7103. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide greater opportunities for veterans to pursue education programs involving emerging technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. HARSHBARGER:

H.R. 7104. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to allow disabled individuals with incurable terminal illnesses listed on the Compassionate Allowance list to receive disability insurance benefits without a waiting period, to prohibit concurrent receipt of disability insurance benefits and unemployment insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUNT:

H.R. 7105. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide authority to suspend entry and immigration benefits during a declared invasion at the southern border of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia (for herself and Mrs. DINGELL):

H.R. 7106. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to streamline care delivery in skilled nursing facilities and nursing facilities under the Medicare and Medicaid programs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LAWLER:

H.R. 7107. A bill to require the Inspector General of the Department of Housing and Urban Development to provide a report to the Congress on the non-compliance of the New York City Housing Authority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LAWLER:

H.R. 7108. A bill to improve public housing agency accountability; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. LEE of Nevada (for herself and Mr. STAUBER):

H.R. 7109. A bill to allow nonprofit child care providers to participate in certain loan programs of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania (for herself, Ms. NORTON, Ms. TLAIB, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. THANEDAR, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. EVANS of Pennsylvania, Ms. BONAMICI, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mrs. FOUSH, and Mr. GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 7110. A bill to require agencies that use, fund, or oversee algorithms to have an office of civil rights focused on bias, discrimination, and other harms of algorithms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LIEU (for himself and Mr. WEBER of Texas):

H.R. 7111. A bill to require the Bureau of Prisons to submit to Congress an annual summary report of disaster damage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS:

H.R. 7112. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out efforts to inform veterans of their rights with regards to the receipt of health care, benefits, and services furnished under provisions of law administered by the Secretary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 7113. A bill to redesignate the Congressional Budget Office as the "China Budget Office"; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. MOORE of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. EZELL, Mr. NEHLS, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. RUTHERFORD):

H.R. 7114. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to authorize awards for the arrest or conviction of individuals that deliberately target law enforcement officials with acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE of West Virginia (for himself, Mr. RULLI, Mrs. HINSON, Mr. GOLDMAN of Texas, and Mr. MOORE of Alabama):

H.R. 7115. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish Jumpstart Programs for saving for apprenticeship and trade occupation training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NORCROSS (for himself and Mr. KEAN):

H.R. 7116. A bill to establish programs to reduce rates of sepsis; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. OLSZEWSKI (for himself and Mr. MOYLAN):

H.R. 7117. A bill to increase rates of college completion and reduce college costs by accelerating time to degree, aligning secondary and postsecondary education, and improving postsecondary credit transfer; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. CAREY, Ms. HOULAHAN, and Ms. SALAZAR):

H.R. 7118. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to clarify that whole genome and whole exome sequencing for children with certain medical needs is covered under the Medicaid program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. RAMIREZ (for herself, Mr. MAGAZINER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. NORTON, Mr. THANEDAR, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Ms. ELFRETH, Ms. CROCKETT, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Ms. SEWELL, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mrs. FOUSHEE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. NEGUSE, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 7119. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require a policy on use of force and deescalation by law enforcement officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia:

H.R. 7120. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to establish a disability benefit offset for Purple Heart recipients, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHREVE (for himself and Mr. HARRIGAN):

H.R. 7121. A bill to prohibit the download or use of a Chinese application on any Federal Government device; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. STEUBE (for himself, Mr. SOTO, and Mr. DONALDS):

H.R. 7122. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to specify that a food shall be considered misbranded if the value of nutrients on its labeling deviates by more than 5 percent of the value specified on such labeling, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. THANEDAR:

H.R. 7123. A bill to abolish U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Homeland Security, 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. THOMPSON of Mississippi (for himself, Mr. CORREA, Mr. THANEDAR, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. MENG, and Mr. ESPAILLAT):

H.R. 7124. A bill to prohibit the use of facial recognition mobile phone applications outside ports of entry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. TLAIB (for herself, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. EVANS of Pennsylvania, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Mrs. GRIJALVA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Mrs. MCIVER, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OMAR, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Ms. SIMON, Ms. STANSBURY, and Ms. VELAZQUEZ):

H.R. 7125. A bill to prohibit charging for access to certain camera video footage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WITTMAN (for himself and Mr. MOOLENAAR):

H.R. 7126. A bill to establish a Strategic Resilience Reserve of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KHANNA (for himself and Mr. BACON):

H. Con. Res. 70. Concurrent resolution affirming the partnership between the United

States and Denmark and Greenland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. BONAMICI (for herself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. BISHOP, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. STEVENS, and Mr. MORELLE):

H. Res. 1002. A resolution recognizing the value of the Older Americans Act of 1965 nutrition program in addressing hunger, malnutrition, and isolation, and improving the health and quality of life for millions of our Nation's seniors each year; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Mr. BEYER:

H. Res. 1003. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that corporations should commit to utilizing the benefits of women in boards of directors and other senior management positions; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Ms. BROWN (for herself, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. IVEY, Mr. FIGURES, Ms. ANSARI, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Mr. TONKO, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Ms. NORTON, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. MULLIN, Ms. TLAIB, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Ms. STRICKLAND, Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. MRVAN, Mr. FROST, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. TITUS, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. MENG, Ms. SIMON, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mrs. SYKES, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. BYNUM, Mrs. MCCLAIN DELANEY, and Mr. LANDSMAN):

H. Res. 1004. A resolution honoring Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., by celebrating diversity, promoting tolerance, and condemning hate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KHANNA:

H. Res. 1005. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that creators and digital workers, as a distinct and growing class of small businesses and independent economic contributors, deserve fair treatment, transparency, and economic opportunity in the modern platform-based economy; to the Committee on Education and Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. Res. 1006. A resolution removing the Director of the Congressional Budget Office; to the Committee on the Budget.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. MACKENZIE:
H.R. 7082.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 7083.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. PFLUGER:

H.R. 7084.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. HUIZENGA:

H.R. 7085.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Mr. CISCOMANI:

H.R. 7086.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. MORAN:

H.R. 7087.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. AMO:

H.R. 7088.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I

By Mr. AMO:

H.R. 7089.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I

By Mr. BACON:

H.R. 7090.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. BERGMAN:

H.R. 7091.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CARTER of Louisiana:

H.R. 7092.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

General Welfare Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 1), and the Necessary and Proper Clause (Art 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 18)

By Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas:

H.R. 7093.

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 Mr. DOGGETT:

H.R. 7094.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DOGGETT:

H.R. 7095.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ESTES:

H.R. 7096.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. FEENSTRA:

H.R. 7097.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas:

H.R. 7098.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. GOODLANDER:

H.R. 7099.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. GOTTHEIMER:

H.R. 7100.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 7101.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 \$1 and §8

By Mr. HAMADEH of Arizona:

H.R. 7102.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. HAMADEH of Arizona:

H.R. 7103.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 12 of the U.S. Constitution:

‘To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years.’

Article I, Section 8, Clause 13 of the U.S. Constitution:

‘To provide and maintain a Navy.’

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution:

‘To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.’

By Mrs. HARSHBARGER:

H.R. 7104.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I; Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. HUNT:

H.R. 7105.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Sec. 8 and Sec. 9

By Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia:

H.R. 7106.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One Section Eight of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LAWLER:

H.R. 7107.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. LAWLER:

H.R. 7108.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. LEE of Nevada:

H.R. 7109.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 provides Congress with the power to “lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises”

By Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7110.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Fourteenth Amendment, Section 5 provides Congress the power “to enforce” the

substantive guarantees of the amendment, including the Due Process and Equal Protection Clauses, by enacting “appropriate legislation.” The Supreme Court has recognized that, under Section 5, Congress may both proscribe unconstitutional conduct, as well as enact legislation that remedies and deters violations of rights guaranteed under the Fourteenth Amendment. See Nev. Dep’t of Human Res. v. Hibbs, 538 U.S. 721, 728 (2003).

By Mr. LIEU:

H.R. 7111.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS:

H.R. 7112.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution: “to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.”

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 7113.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Mr. MOORE of North Carolina:

H.R. 7114.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the U.S. constitution.

By Mr. MOORE of West Virginia:

H.R. 7115.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1

By Mr. NORCROSS:

H.R. 7116.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1, Sec. 8, Cl. 18)

By Mr. OLSZEWSKI:

H.R. 7117.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. PETERS:

H.R. 7118.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. RAMIREZ:

H.R. 7119.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia:

H.R. 7120.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Mr. SHREVE:

H.R. 7121.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the US Constitution.

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 7122.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. THANEDAR:

H.R. 7123.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Clause 18 of Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 7124.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8

By Ms. TLAIB:

H.R. 7125.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. WITTMAN:

H.R. 7126.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to provide for protection of critical minerals supply chains and rare earth elements as enacted this legislation is pursuant to clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 41: Mr. HURD of Colorado.

H.R. 479: Mr. STUTZMAN.

H.R. 485: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 539: Mr. CRAWFORD and Mrs. BIGGS of South Carolina.

H.R. 722: Mr. TIMMONS.

H.R. 1065: Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 1189: Mr. MACKENZIE.

H.R. 1207: Mr. McCORMICK.

H.R. 1329: Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 1330: Mrs. FLETCHER and Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE.

H.R. 1496: Mr. CARSON.

H.R. 1522: Mr. TRAN.

H.R. 1583: Mr. CAREY.

H.R. 1700: Mr. KENNEDY of New York.

H.R. 1810: Ms. DELAURIO.

H.R. 2189: Mr. MOORE of North Carolina.

H.R. 2231: Mr. HORSFORD.

H.R. 2672: Mr. HURD of Colorado.

H.R. 2727: Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 2784: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 2821: Ms. JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 2928: Mr. LIEU.

H.R. 3206: Mr. STEUBE.

H.R. 3243: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 3562: Mr. GOODEN and Mrs. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 3602: Mr. McGOVERN.

H.R. 3757: Mrs. MCBAH.

H.R. 4099: Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 4146: Mr. HERN of Oklahoma.

H.R. 4242: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 4294: Ms. MALOY.

H.R. 4351: Mr. GUEST.

H.R. 4406: Mr. MFUME.

H.R. 4445: Mr. BACON and Mr. HARDER of California.

H.R. 4504: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 4667: Mr. TORRES of New York.

H.R. 4792: Ms. NORTON and Mr. OBERNOLTE.

H.R. 4849: Ms. CROCKETT.

H.R. 5018: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 5106: Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 5309: Ms. BYNUM.

H.R. 5519: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 5545: Ms. LOFGREN and Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 5722: Mr. HARIDOPOLOS.

H.R. 5828: Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia.

H.R. 5944: Ms. McCOLLUM.

H.R. 5973: Ms. McCOLLUM.

H.R. 6011: Mr. MOSKOWITZ.

H.R. 6249: Mr. MOSKOWITZ.

H.R. 6318: Ms. JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 6392: Mr. EVANS of Colorado.

H.R. 6423: Mr. SUBRAMANYAM.

H.R. 6469: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 6601: Mr. MOSKOWITZ.

H.R. 6644: Mr. SESSIONS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. ROSE, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. STEIL, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. MEUSER, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mrs. KIM, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. GARBARINO, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mr. LAWLER, Ms. GARCIA of

Texas, Ms. DE LA CRUZ, Ms. PETTERSEN, Mr. NUNN of Iowa, Mr. FIELDS, Ms. SALAZAR, Ms. BYNUM, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. LICCARDO, Mr. HARIDOPOLOS, Mr. MOSKOWITZ, and Mr. MOORE of North Carolina.
H.R. 6684: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 6731: Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 6766: Ms. SEWELL and Ms. BARRAGÁN.
H.R. 6854: Mr. DONALDS.
H.R. 6867: Ms. JAYAPAL.
H.R. 6931: Mr. CISCOMANI.
H.R. 6959: Ms. BOEBERT.
H.R. 6972: Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 7016: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. TRAN, Mr. MFUME, and Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 7038: Mrs. TRAHAN and Mr. GARCIA of California.
H.R. 7040: Mr. CLINE.
H.R. 7046: Mr. FROST.
H.R. 7051: Mr. MESSMER.
H.R. 7074: Mr. FULCHER, Mr. KENNEDY of Utah, Mr. OBERNOLTE, and Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia.
H.R. 7077: Mr. MOSKOWITZ.
H. Con. Res. 68: Mr. FIELDS.
H. Res. 100: Ms. HOYLE of Oregon.
H. Res. 935: Mr. GREEN of Texas.
H. Res. 990: Mr. CARSON.
H. Res. 993: Ms. LEE of Florida, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BACON, Mrs.

LUNA, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. FONG, Mr. SUBRAMANYAM, Mr. STEIL, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. FEENSTRA, Mrs. HOCHIN, Mr. ALFORD, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. EZELL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. COLE, and Mr. LUCAS.

H. Res. 996: Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. CORREA.

H. Res. 998: Mr. GUEST, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia.

H. Res. 1001: Mr. SUBRAMANYAM and Mr. GOLDMAN of New York.