



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 170

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 2024

No. 166

House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 9, 2024, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with time equally allocated between the parties and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m.

PENN STATE WRESTLERS ENGAGING IN THEIR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOYCE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, throughout American history, leaders of various faiths have impactfully tended the needs of believers while simultaneously participating in political movements relating to significant issues, such as equality, the right to vote, and the sanctity of human life.

The roles of leader and political organizer never have been mutually exclusive.

I was reminded of this duality in roles, by choice of the individual, during a recent conversation with a constituent. In short, the constituent informed me that the onstage appearance of current and former Penn State wrestlers at President Trump's rally at Penn State was drawing unneeded criticism. Just as religious leaders can be both devoted advocates of their ministry and passionate champions of their causes, the Penn State wrestlers are

most certainly entitled by our Constitution to be both representatives of their athletic program and citizens who are actively engaged in the electoral process.

The Nittany Lion wrestling program is renowned, not only for producing national championship teams, but for developing wrestlers who have dominated their sport on the collegiate level and then represented our country in international competitions as recently as the Olympic Games in Paris this past summer.

Our Nation prides itself on the inclusive nature of our political process. It is wrong to advocate for engaged citizenry on one hand while selectively choosing citizens who can participate and who cannot on the other hand.

According to recent reports, voter turnouts among people ages 18–29 was a mere 42 percent overall in the most recent Presidential election. That figure, that 42 percent, is at least 10 percent lower than the turnout of the same group 4 years prior in the 2020 Presidential election.

Mindful of that decline, the Penn State wrestlers, particularly those who are still pursuing their degrees, should be applauded for embracing one of our most cherished freedoms: the right to vote.

Competing as a wrestler does not preclude an individual from expressing political viewpoints, despite criticism that might or might not be of a partisan nature.

As a proud Penn State alumnus, I witnessed firsthand the wrestlers exercising their First Amendment right to free speech and encouraging all Americans to cast their ballot. Our great Nation needs the wisdom, enthusiasm, and talents of people across generations to overcome the challenges that were the focus of our most recent election. It is fair to say that the generation with the most at stake is the youngest generation. It is their leader-

ship that should be encouraged. It is their perspective that must be considered. It is their voice that must be heard.

For the benefit and for the enrichment of all Americans, I congratulate these young wrestlers for exercising their constitutional rights, and I personally thank them for their commitment to engaging in our political process.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE HAVE SPOKEN

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, for the past 4 years, the Biden-Harris administration has failed the American people.

Under President Biden's watch, our adversaries have been emboldened, inflation has skyrocketed, and our borders have been left unsecured.

With these crises, we have seen Americans be put in danger. We recognize that the Biden-Harris administration had no answers. They had no solutions on how to keep us safe, and now the American people have spoken.

When voters were asked if they were better off now compared to 4 years ago, they resoundingly said no. That is why in January, President Donald J. Trump will return to the Oval Office.

Under President Trump's leadership, we will, once again, lower energy prices by utilizing the energy sources that are under the feet of my constituents in Pennsylvania.

Under President Trump's leadership, we will secure our southern border and put a stop to the flow of deadly drugs like fentanyl that have taken far too many American lives.

Under President Donald J. Trump, our Nation will, once again, return to a policy of peace through strength that has helped to keep our Nation safe and the American people free.

□ 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.

H5917

HONORING THE DILIGENT SERVICE OF KEVIN GRANEY, PRESIDENT OF GENERAL DYNAMICS ELECTRIC BOAT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FONG). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the diligent and honorable service of the president of General Dynamics Electric Boat, Mr. Kevin Graney of Stonington, Connecticut.

On December 1, in a couple weeks, Kevin is slated to retire from his eventful and impactful 5-year term as the shipyard lead for the United States Navy's submarine force, and it is more than fitting that this Chamber take a moment to recognize his extraordinary service to our Nation.

A native of Cheektowaga, New York, Kevin's career spans nearly 40 years of service to the Navy's shipbuilding enterprise. His intelligence, patriotism, and leadership qualities stood out at an early age, foreshadowing a promising career as a naval officer.

Upon graduating high school, he attended State University of New York Maritime College, earning a bachelor's degree in marine engineering and nuclear science, which would serve him well as a submariner and instructor at the Naval Nuclear Power Training Unit in Ballston Spa, New York.

Following a distinguished career at sea, Kevin began his shipbuilding career at General Dynamics Electric Boat in 1995 as a senior engineer working on critical power components for the *Virginia*-class submarine program.

Following his assignment at Electric Boat, he moved to Newport News Shipbuilding in Virginia to design the reactor plant for the next-generation aircraft carrier, the CVN-78 program. He then moved overseas and managed Electric Boat engineers to assist our allies in the U.K. as they built their British Astute-class nuclear submarine program. Eventually, he returned to Electric Boat and began his last term over the last 5 years in 2019 as CEO of the shipyard.

During his time, the 120-year-old EB shipyard experienced a massive generational transformation with new and improved infrastructure, increased hiring, and new operations to dramatically improve performance and efficiency in the submarine industrial base.

In 2023, Electric Boat hired nearly 5,400 new workers, the biggest number in its history, even surpassing its growth in World War II and the Cold War. The total workforce today now exceeds 23,000, and they are still hiring today.

If that was not challenging enough, 5 months into Kevin's ascension to president, the shipyard was confronted with the global COVID pandemic. It is hard to visualize how difficult it is to manage an airborne pathogen in a shipyard, particularly a submarine shipyard where, again, the quarters are so tight.

Nonetheless, they kept the shipyard open. They did not close for a single day during the pandemic, and that is because Kevin Graney overcame this crisis and skillfully managed operations to continue as a critical industry in our Nation's security.

After performance across the shipyard and the nationwide industrial base was stabilized, it was then faced with increased rates of retirement of senior workers and a corresponding reduction in the supervisory trade workforce.

Since then, Kevin has spearheaded recovery efforts that have transformed the shipyard in just a short time. A few months ago, he signed a 5-year Metal Trades collective bargaining agreement with the Metal Trades Council, which represents machinists, electricians, carpenters, teamsters, and boilermakers that increased their pay by 25 percent, retaining their pension and health benefits at the same time.

Next to me is the USS *Iowa*, the 24th *Virginia*-class submarine, which was delivered to the Navy a couple of weeks ago. As I stand here today, it is undergoing sea trials and will be commissioned to the U.S. Navy in a few months or so.

Mr. Speaker, as ranking member and chair of the House Armed Services' Seapower and Projection Forces Subcommittee and the Congressman representing EB's facility in Groton, Connecticut, I have had a front-row seat to Kevin's tenure. It was not an easy time.

Through it all, though, he maintained a steady level of confidence from his peers and overcame adversities that were not anticipated at the start of his tenure.

I haven't even talked about the AUKUS security agreement, which last December this Congress voted to sell three *Virginia*-class nuclear-powered submarines to our great ally, Australia, the first time in history our country has ever made that commitment.

He has built the foundation, and it will be incredibly difficult to replace him, but we welcome the next president of Electric Boat, Mark Rayha, who I am sure will continue in Kevin's steps.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Kevin as he enters this new era of retirement with his wife, Cheryl, and his daughter, Katherine. I ask that my colleagues in the House, and particularly those who serve on the House Armed Services Committee along with me, join me in recognizing his life of service to the Navy and the United States by submitting his legacy into the permanence of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE TRUMP MANDATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the people spoke and Donald

Trump and J.D. VANCE achieved the most historic political comeback in American history, while also naming extraordinary patriots to his cabinet: ELISE STEFANIK as U.S. Ambassador to the U.N., Tom Homan as the border czar, MARCO RUBIO as Secretary of State, Kristi Noem as Homeland Security Secretary, MIKE WALTZ as National Security Advisor, LEE ZELDIN as Environmental Protection Agency Administrator, Governor Mike Huckabee as U.S. Ambassador to Jerusalem, and the extraordinary Susie Wiles as Chief of Staff, working with the deputy chief of staff for policy, Stephen Miller.

The Trump mandate is a recognition of his policy achievements, which I submitted to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 21, 2021, pages E60-E62, and achievements to the First Lady, Melania Trump, on January 21, 2021, pages E52-E53.

As chairman of the Middle East, North Africa, and Central Asia Subcommittee and chairman of the Helsinki Commission, I especially appreciate Donald Trump, who will achieve peace through strength.

Without equivocation, he stood with Israel Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, clearly stating Iran must not secure a nuclear weapon, threatening our Arab allies from Kuwait to UAE to Bahrain, Qatar, and Saudi Arabia, along with NATO member Türkiye.

Trump stood with Ukraine against war criminal Putin, supplying Volodymyr Zelenskyy Javelin missiles, placing troops in Poland, and stopping the Nord Stream 2 pipeline, which financed Putin's murderous atrocities.

Trump stood with Taiwan, supplying defensive weapons to deter the Chinese Communist Party from an invasion threatening the Korean and Japanese shipping lanes, along with the shipping capabilities of our great ally, India.

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

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

Holy and eternal God, we come before You, humbled by the mercy You have shown us in these last days and months. From Your throne, You have borne witness to our less than loving behavior, our harsh rhetoric of the election season, and our insatiable desire to ensure that the balance of power tips in our favor.

Remind us again that the mellifluous words, the most convincing arguments are but a noisy gong or a clanging cymbal if they are not grounded in love.

Even if our certitude and sureness, our knowledge and conviction are enough to move mountains, if we do not love both our neighbor and our adversary, all our success amounts to nothing.

Teach us again how to be patient and kind, neither envious nor boastful, arrogant or rude. Wherever we stand, may we not insist things go our way, nor hold a grudge when they don't.

In Your truth, show us how to bear all things, believe all things, hope all things, and endure all things; and, above all, to strive to be bearers of the greatest of all things: love.

In Your merciful name we pray.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

VACATING ORDER OF THE HOUSE
OF NOVEMBER 5, 2024

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the order of the House of November 5, 2024, regarding H.R. 82 be vacated.

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

There was no objection.

EXPLANATION REGARDING
VACATING OF ORDER

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

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I rose to vacate the order of the House of November 5 because, having reviewed the Speaker's announced policies, the decision in the Chair should have been to not entertain the motion to table on that day.

CONGRATULATING DR. VICTOR
AMBROS

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor my constituent, Dr. Victor Ambros of the University of Massachusetts Chan Medical School, on being awarded the Nobel Prize for his work on microRNA.

He shares this tremendous distinction with Gary Ruvkun of Harvard Medical School. I am proud to be from Massachusetts today.

Mr. Speaker, decades ago, scientists discovered that our genes, the tiny strands of DNA that make us who we are, are translated into another compound called RNA, which helps make sure our cells function.

Thanks to the laureates' work, we now know that tiny pieces of RNA called microRNA can actually do things all by themselves, speeding up or slowing down important cellular functions.

Their work has opened up unprecedented new research opportunities when it comes to all kinds of things, including cancer treatment. Thanks to this work, we have learned more about how we become who we are.

I speak for Worcester, for Massachusetts, for the United States, and the world when I say thank you to Dr. Ambros for his contributions to our understanding of how we become who we are.

ACHIEVEMENTS OF SPEAKER
JOHNSON

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, congratulations to Speaker MIKE JOHNSON for his achievements of the passage of critical legislation in the House and his leadership in maintaining the Republican majority.

"We flipped blue seats red . . . and we kept this majority," said the Speaker today on the Capitol steps with the proven leaders STEVE SCALISE, TOM EMMER, and RICHARD HUDSON.

The Speaker heard from the American people and has given them voice and change that Americans deserve.

Families have suffered high prices for everyday items, dangerously open borders, and national security in jeopardy. Speaker JOHNSON has pledged: "We are going to raise the America First banner over this place."

I was grateful in July to be with the Speaker in Milwaukee to lead the ap-

plause for his statement of being a Reaganite for peace through strength. In October at Lake Como, Italy, I was there as he represented America so well. Last month at Mar-a-Lago, I was grateful to be present as he confirmed the Trump-Johnson partnership.

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

PUBLIC SERVANTS DESERVE
THEIR EARNED BENEFITS

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 82, the Social Security Fairness Act.

People in western New York and across the country rely on Social Security to meet their basic needs and live well. This bipartisan legislation fixes loopholes that unjustifiably cut benefits for millions of Social Security recipients.

The Social Security Fairness Act repeals the Windfall Elimination Provision and the Government Pension Offset, existing provisions of the Social Security Act that slash Social Security for millions of public workers.

Dedicated public servants—teachers, firefighters, postal workers, police officers, and their spouses or widows—are unfairly seeing Social Security cuts because of these loopholes. This is a slap in the face to the people who have given so much to our communities.

All Americans deserve the benefits they worked so hard to earn, and this bill delivers on this promise but especially those who have dedicated their lives to public service.

I urge my colleagues to pass this legislation swiftly and deliver for our fellow Americans.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1600

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MORAN) at 4 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings

today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

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

EQUAL TREATMENT OF PUBLIC SERVANTS ACT OF 2023

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5342) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to replace the windfall elimination provision with a formula equalizing benefits for certain individuals with noncovered employment, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5342

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Equal Treatment of Public Servants Act of 2023”.

SEC. 2. REPLACEMENT OF THE WINDFALL ELIMINATION PROVISION WITH A FORMULA EQUALIZING BENEFITS FOR CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS WITH NONCOVERED EMPLOYMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 215(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 415(a)) is amended by inserting after paragraph (7) the following:

“(8)(A) In the case of an individual whose primary insurance amount would be computed under paragraph (1) of this subsection—

“(i) who first becomes eligible for an old-age or disability insurance benefit after 2067,

“(ii) who subsequently becomes entitled to such benefit, and

“(iii) who has earnings derived from noncovered service performed in a year after 1977,

the primary insurance amount of such individual shall be the amount computed or recomputed under this paragraph.

“(B) The primary insurance amount of an individual described in subparagraph (A), as computed or recomputed under this paragraph, shall be the product derived by multiplying—

“(i) the individual’s primary insurance amount, as determined under paragraph (1) of this subsection and subparagraph (C) of this paragraph, by

“(ii) a fraction—

“(I) the numerator of which is the individual’s average indexed monthly earnings (determined without regard to subparagraph (C)), and

“(II) the denominator of which is an amount equal to the individual’s average indexed monthly earnings (as determined under subparagraph (C)), rounded, if not a multiple of \$0.10, to the next lower multiple of \$0.10.

“(C)(i) For purposes of determining an individual’s primary insurance amount pursuant to clauses (i) and (ii)(II) of subparagraph (B), the individual’s average indexed monthly earnings shall be determined by treating all recorded noncovered earnings (as defined in clause (ii)(I) derived by the individual from noncovered service performed in each year after 1977 as ‘wages’ (as defined in section 209 for purposes of this title), which shall be treated as included in the individual’s adjusted total covered earnings (as defined in clause (ii)(II) for such calendar year together with amounts consisting of ‘wages’

(as so defined without regard to this subparagraph) paid during such calendar year and self-employment income (as defined in section 211(b)) for taxable years ending with or during such calendar year.

“(ii) For purposes of this subparagraph:

“(I) The term ‘recorded noncovered earnings’ means earnings derived from noncovered service (other than noncovered service as a member of a uniformed service (as defined in section 210(m)) for which satisfactory evidence is determined by the Commissioner to be available in the records of the Commissioner.

“(II) The term ‘adjusted total covered earnings’ means, in connection with an individual for any calendar year, the sum of the wages paid to the individual during such calendar year (as adjusted under subsection (b)(3)) plus the self-employment income derived by the individual during any taxable year ending with or during such calendar year (as adjusted under subsection (b)(3)).

“(iii) The Commissioner of Social Security shall provide by regulation or other public guidance for methods for determining whether satisfactory evidence is available in the records of the Commissioner for earnings for noncovered service (other than noncovered service as a member of a uniformed service (as defined in section 210(m))) to be treated as recorded noncovered earnings. Such methods shall provide for reliance on earnings information which is provided to the Commissioner by employers and which, as determined by the Commissioner, constitute a reasonable basis for treatment of earnings for noncovered service as recorded noncovered earnings. In making determinations under this clause, the Commissioner shall also take into account any documentary or other evidence of earnings derived from noncovered service by an individual which is provided by the individual to the Commissioner and which the Commissioner considers appropriate as a reasonable basis for treatment of such earnings as recorded noncovered earnings.

“(D) Upon the death of an individual whose primary insurance amount is computed or recomputed under this paragraph, such primary insurance amount shall be computed or recomputed under paragraph (1) of this subsection.

“(E) In the case of any individual whose primary insurance amount would be computed under this paragraph who first becomes entitled after 1985 to a monthly periodic payment made by a foreign employer or foreign country that is based in whole or in part upon noncovered service, the primary insurance amount of such individual shall be computed or recomputed under paragraph (7) or paragraph (1), as applicable, for months beginning with the first month of the individual’s initial entitlement to such monthly periodic payment.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 215(a)(7)(A) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 415(a)(7)(A)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i)—

(A) by striking “after 1985” and inserting “after 1985 and before 2068”; and

(B) by striking “or” at the end;

(2) in clause (ii)—

(A) by striking “after 1985” each place it appears and inserting “after 1985 and before 2068”; and

(B) by adding “or” at the end;

(3) by inserting after clause (ii) the following:

“(iii) is an individual described in paragraph (8)(E),”; and

(4) by striking “hereafter in this paragraph and in subsection (d)(3)” and inserting “in this paragraph, paragraphs (8) and (9), and subsection (d)(3)”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect

to monthly insurance benefits payable on or after January 1, 2025.

SEC. 3. BENEFIT CALCULATION DURING TRANSITION PERIOD.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 215(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 415(a)), as amended by section 2, is further amended by inserting after paragraph (8) the following:

“(9) In the case of an individual whose primary insurance amount would be computed under paragraph (1) of this subsection—

“(A) who first becomes eligible for an old-age or disability insurance benefit after 2024 and before 2068,

“(B) who subsequently becomes entitled to such benefit, and

“(C) who has earnings derived from noncovered service performed in a year after 1977,

the primary insurance amount of such individual shall be the higher of the amount computed or recomputed under paragraph (7) without regard to this paragraph or the amount that would be computed or recomputed under paragraph (8) if the individual were an individual described in subparagraph (A) of such paragraph.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 215(a)(7)(A) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 415(a)(7)(A)), as amended by section 2(b), is further amended by striking “shall be computed or recomputed” and inserting “shall, subject to paragraph (9), be computed or recomputed”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to monthly insurance benefits payable on or after January 1, 2025.

SEC. 4. ADDITIONAL MONTHLY PAYMENT FOR INDIVIDUALS WHOSE BENEFIT AMOUNT IS REDUCED BY THE WINDFALL ELIMINATION PROVISION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 215(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 415(a)), as amended by sections 2 and 3, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(10)(A) For any month beginning at least 270 days after the date of enactment of the Equal Treatment of Public Servants Act of 2023, the Commissioner of Social Security shall, subject to subparagraphs (C) and (D), make an additional monthly payment of \$100 to each individual who is an eligible individual for such month, and an additional monthly payment of \$50 to each individual (other than an eligible individual) who is entitled to a benefit under section 202 for such month on the basis of the wages and self-employment income of such eligible individual.

“(B) For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘eligible individual’ for a month means an individual who—

“(i)(I) first becomes eligible for an old-age or disability insurance benefit under this title before 2025, or

“(II) is an individual described in paragraph (8)(E), and

“(ii) is entitled to an old-age or disability insurance benefit under this title for such month based on a primary insurance amount that was computed or recomputed under paragraph (7) (and not subsequently recomputed under any other paragraph of this subsection).

“(C) In any case in which this title provides that no monthly benefit under section 202 or 223 shall be paid to an individual for a month, no additional monthly payment shall be paid to the individual for such month. This subparagraph shall not apply in the case of an individual whose monthly benefit under section 202 or 223 is reduced, regardless of the amount of the reduction, based on the individual’s receipt of other income or benefits for such month or the application of section 203(a) or due to the adjustment or recovery of an overpayment under section 204.

“(D)(i) An individual is not entitled to receive more than one additional monthly payment for a month under this paragraph.

“(ii) An eligible individual who is entitled to a benefit under section 202 on the basis of the wages and self-employment income of another eligible individual for a month shall receive an additional monthly payment under this paragraph in the amount of \$100 for such month.

“(E) Except for purposes of adjustment or recovery of an overpayment under section 204, an additional monthly payment under this paragraph shall not be subject to any reduction or deduction under this title.

“(F) Whenever benefit amounts under this title are increased by any percentage effective with any month as a result of a determination made under subsection (i), each of the dollar amounts in subparagraph (A) shall be increased by the same percentage for months beginning with such month.”

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to monthly insurance benefits payable for months beginning at least 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5. REPORTING OF NONCOVERED EARNINGS ON SOCIAL SECURITY ACCOUNT STATEMENTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 1143(a)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320b-13(a)(2)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) through (E) as subparagraphs (C) through (F); and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

“(B) the amount of earnings derived by the eligible individual from service performed after 1977 which did not constitute employment (as defined in section 210), not including service as a member of a uniformed service (as defined in section 210(m)), as shown by the records of the Commissioner at the date of the request;”

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to Social Security account statements issued on or after January 1, 2025.

SEC. 6. STUDY ON PARTNERING WITH STATE AND LOCAL PENSION SYSTEMS.

(a) **STUDY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commissioner of Social Security shall study and test the administrative feasibility of partnering with State and local pension systems, or other governmental entities, to improve the collection and sharing of information relating to State and local noncovered pensions.

(2) **COORDINATION WITH STATE AND LOCAL PENSION SYSTEMS.**—In conducting the study described in paragraph (1), the Commissioner shall coordinate with State and local pension systems that reflect the diversity of systems and individual experiences to explore the development of automated data exchange agreements that facilitate reporting of information relating to noncovered pensions.

(b) **REPORT.**—The Commissioner of Social Security shall conclude the study described in subsection (a) not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of this Act. As soon as possible after conclusion of the study and not later than 4½ years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commissioner shall submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate a report on the results of the study. Such report shall include the following:

(1) A discussion of how the automated data exchange agreements could be implemented to cover noncovered pensions nationally, including the range of implementation timelines across State and local pension systems, or with other governmental entities.

(2) An analysis of the barriers to developing automated data exchange agreements and lessons learned that can help address these barriers.

(3) A description of alternative methods for obtaining information related to noncovered pensions, and an analysis of the barriers to obtaining noncovered pension data through such methods.

(4) An explanation of how coverage information is obtained by the Social Security Administration when an individual purchases service credits to apply to a new covered or noncovered pension after moving from another covered or noncovered pension within the State or in another State.

(5) An estimate of the total amount, as of the date of the enactment of this Act, of noncovered pensions not reported to the Social Security Administration as a result of noncompliance with voluntary reporting policies.

(c) **STATE AND LOCAL PENSION INFORMATION TO BE REQUESTED BY THE COMMISSIONER.**—Section 202 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 402) is amended by inserting after subsection (1) the following:

“(m) **STATE AND LOCAL PENSION INFORMATION TO BE REQUESTED BY THE COMMISSIONER.**—

“(1) The Commissioner may partner with States to request information, including the information specified in paragraph (2), with respect to any designated distribution (as defined in section 3405(e)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) from an employer deferred compensation plan (as defined in section 3405(e)(5) of such Code) of the State (or political subdivision thereof) to a participant of such plan in any case in which any portion of such participant’s earnings for service under such plan did not constitute ‘employment’ as defined in section 210 for purposes of this title.

“(2) The information specified in this paragraph is the following:

“(A) The name and Social Security account number of the participant receiving the designated distribution.

“(B) The dollar amount of the designated distribution and the date paid.

“(C) The date on which the participant initially became eligible for a designated distribution under the plan and, if different, the date of payment of the initial designated distribution.

“(D) The dates of each period of service under the plan that did not constitute ‘employment’ as defined in section 210 for purposes of this title, and the dates of any other period of service under the plan.”

(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section—

(1) the term “noncovered pension” means a pension any part of which is based on noncovered service (within the meaning of section 215(a)(7) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 415(a)(7))); and

(2) the term “covered pension” means any other pension.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. **ARRINGTON**) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. **LARSON**) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. **ARRINGTON**. 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 this bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, we have a great injustice that has persisted now for four decades. Some of our hardest working fellow Americans who are public servants in certain States where they have non-Social Security covered employment—or to say it this way, where they have teacher retirement systems separate from Social Security, or firefighter retirement systems separate from Social Security—have what is called a windfall elimination provision in the Social Security law, which has shortchanged roughly 2 million hard-working public servants.

Some people are still getting a windfall, but the vast majority are not getting what they earned and what they put into the Social Security system. So my colleague, Representative **JOHN LARSON**, who I serve with on the Committee on Ways and Means, and who I consider a dear friend and someone who I know is very passionate about fixing Social Security’s insolvency, which looms large over the next 10 years, this is but one element of what is not working in Social Security for our retirees and Social Security recipients.

To solve this inequity and injustice, some of my colleagues have decided they would just repeal the windfall elimination provision altogether. That sounds good, but it is going to cost \$192 billion to do that. We shouldn’t be constrained by cost to do the right thing, but to repeal the windfall elimination provision would go back to pre-1983 when we had a windfall to certain Americans in the same States where they had independent retirement systems, and we were spending more money for certain retirees than they put into the Social Security system.

There was a great discrepancy and inequity between these individuals in these States and the vast majority of the tens of millions of other retirees across the country. So you had a teacher or a firefighter in certain States, like Texas, pre-1983 getting a windfall, large sums of money, over similarly situated people in other States. Firefighters and teachers are doing the same work, making roughly the same amount of money, but getting less benefits.

What we should do is fix the inadequacy of the windfall elimination provision that was oversimplified and did not use the data that we have today and make sure that people are paid what they are owed in terms of their benefits, but not revert back to pre-windfall elimination provision, where we were spending tens of billions of dollars more than we needed to according to what people put in it.

Why does that matter? Because we should have a system of fairness for every public servant in every State, every retiree who fits that definition. It is also because if we start just throwing money at this and allowing windfall payments to certain retirees, we are going to accelerate the insolvency of the Social Security trust fund.

One outside expert says that we will accelerate that if we go to H.R. 82 and just pull the plug on the windfall elimination provision, as opposed to fixing it and getting it right. We will accelerate it by 6 months.

We should be responsible in how we do this. We should consider retirees in every State, and we should also consider future retirees because what we do and how we solve problems doesn't just impact the people who have been shortchanged, and we need to deal with that, but we will impact future retirees, as well.

I am simply asking my colleagues to do the right thing, address this inequity with WEP and our public servants, but do it the right way so that we don't compromise the integrity and the fiscal responsibility of managing the trust fund and put these public servants now once again at odds with the vast majority of public servants who are retired.

Mr. Speaker, that is a mouthful, by the way. This is a complex issue, but what is not complicated is people who have been shortchanged need to get the money that they rightfully are owed by their government. I can start there and say that Democratic and Republican colleagues alike agree on that, but my bill will do it in a fiscally responsible way.

I think this H.R. 82 is well-intended, but it is going to accelerate the bankruptcy of Social Security. That is not good for anybody, current or future retirees.

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

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I start by acknowledging my good friend and colleague, and I thank him. I think his heart is in the right place.

Let me say, having worked on this issue for a number of years, to have a Social Security, and in this case a portion of it, come to the floor, albeit under suspension and not through regular order, Mr. Speaker, is a step in the right direction, but the American people have to be outraged by the fact that it has been over 50 years since Congress has adjusted Social Security. By that, I mean enhanced Social Security for its recipients. Imagine that.

Do you think a few things have happened since Richard Nixon was President of the United States? Do you think a few things have happened, especially as we live in this post-COVID and now inflationary period?

It impacts over 70 million of our fellow Americans. This provision that my colleague and good friend is talking about, WEP, is minuscule in terms of comparing that to individuals. As well intended as I believe he is, this doesn't straighten out the problem. In our bill, the Social Security 2100 Act, we repeal WEP and GPO, and we pay for it. That is the responsible thing that Congress has to do on behalf of the American people.

Here are the facts: 70 million Americans rely on Social Security, and it is the Nation's number one antipoverty program for the elderly and the number one antipoverty program for children. More veterans rely on Social Security for disability than they do the VA.

Congress has done nothing to help these individuals out. Add to that, Mr. Speaker, the fact that 10,000 baby boomers a day become eligible for Social Security.

What we need to do today, and in both of these bills that are coming before us, are steps forward, but we need to come together as a Congress and vote to fix Social Security in a manner that doesn't hurt or cut benefits for individuals who haven't seen a benefit enhancement in more than 50 years. We come here today and say here is a crumb, but even in the form of this crumb, this proposal will cut benefits for hardworking, everyday Americans.

I respect my colleague, and I do believe that his heart is in the right place, but Congress—both sides—have responsibility here, but perhaps now there is an opportunity for us to act—perhaps the fact that even under suspension, not regular order with public hearings where viewers get to see and actually hear from expert witnesses and get to hear both the fiscal side of what needs to be paid for but also the benefits side in terms of what has not been done.

Imagine, my dear friend knows this, 5 million of our fellow Americans—and they are in Texas and Connecticut—get below poverty-level checks from their government. So it is great that you have a proposal for WEP, but 5 million people currently on Social Security get below poverty-level checks from the wealthiest Nation in the world and from a country that has had a program in place, but Congress hasn't acted in over 50 years. Most of the 5 million are women, and most of them are women of color.

There are more than 33 million who the only benefit that they have, the only thing that keeps them out of poverty, is Social Security, and Congress hasn't acted since 1971. These people will be hurt by this proposal.

Benefit cuts in a time of inflation? Ask your constituents back home, Mr. Speaker, whether or not they can afford this cut.

□ 1615

Now, here is the other irony. Here we have one of the great economic development plans ever instituted by the United States Congress; That is right, an economic development plan, Social Security. How so?

Every district, on average, has about 143,000 Social Security recipients. Every district, monthly, receives on average \$200 million in cash coming into their district.

In fact, for my dear friend and colleague here, \$222 million comes into his district on a monthly basis. He has

more than 95,000 retirees, 9,000 children who get money from Social Security, 10,000 widows, 4,800 spouses, and 14,000 disabled.

Congress has done nothing. These cuts will take place because Congress hasn't stepped up and said we need to fund this program, not cut it. Some say back in 1983 they did do something. Yeah, what they did is they raised the age, another great proposal on the other side. For every year you raise the age, that is a 7 percent cut in benefits. Let's raise the age to age 70, the Republican Study Committee says, and what does that do? It cuts benefits by 21 percent.

Aren't you glad you worked hard and invested and put your money aside so that you could find out that, yeah, what we are going to do is raise the age so you work longer, and as you are living longer, we expect that you will get less in retirement, not more. It makes no sense whatsoever.

We need to come together as a Congress and vote to enhance the Nation's number one antipoverty program for the elderly and for our children.

I respect the good intentions that people have, but as they say, the road to hell oftentimes is paved with good intentions. In this case, though, let's not talk about the parties. There is a lot of blame to go around here. How about we focus on the people, the American people, who we take an oath of office and swear to serve.

Staring this Congress in the face is over 50 years of inaction and 70 million people who are impacted by this in what is the Nation's number one antipoverty program for the elderly and for our children.

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

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

My friend mentioned my seniors in west Texas. Let me tell you what they sent me here to do. They sent me here to be an advocate for them, to ensure that we have fair and just laws, to fix what is broken about Social Security but do it in a way that we don't accelerate what will be an automatic cut in less than 10 years.

By repealing the windfall that existed before 1983, you are saying you are okay with taxpayers just spending more money than they should, more money than what has been earned and owed to the seniors, and in a way that creates a vast and tremendous discrepancy and inequity between 2 million people in several States as opposed to almost 60 million across the country.

How unfair and how nearsighted and narrow-minded can we be not to consider the fact that we will have a bankrupt system and that we have future seniors who can't bank on their retirement because we want to go back to prewindfall? It doesn't make sense, Mr. Speaker.

The Democrats had control of this place from top to bottom from 2020 to

2022, and they didn't fix it. Republicans had control when I was a freshman in 2017. Let me tell the world: They didn't fix it. The only way we are going to fix it is if we come together. I agree with Mr. LARSON that there are broader provisions to look at and the system as a whole to address going forward.

You mentioned benefits. That is a great place to do it, but to suggest that we are going to go back prewindfall elimination provision and have a \$2,500 additional cut in 2033 because we are not doing it the right way and responsible way and equitable way because we now have the data, I just think is egregiously irresponsible for all parties involved, including our children, who don't have much of a say in this, even though they own the deferred tax on all of these programs that are bankrupt, including Medicare.

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

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5342, the Equal Treatment of Public Servants Act, which my friend from Texas introduced, which was modeled or introduced similarly to a bill that our fellow Texan, Kevin Brady, introduced, because it is a responsible piece of legislation designed to address a problem head-on.

Here is the problem. Everybody at home watching this needs to understand the joke. We are playing with house money yet again. We are playing with funny money. We are pretending and lying to the American people that the Social Security funds that are extracted from their checks are sitting in a lockbox, sitting in an account for them. It is not. That is a lie.

The money is taken out of your check now, and that money is then given to those people who are retiring now, those who have retired. That is the truth. It is a tax.

What happened here was we messed up because we are government. We mess up almost every single second. Government messed up, and now we are trying to fix the mess up.

In this case, my friend from Texas has introduced a bill that responsibly fixes the mess up. It actually tries to go in and say if you are a firefighter, if you are a cop, if you are a teacher and you have got the situation where you have got another job and that Social Security was taken out of your check but you are not getting the benefit of that because you have a pension, this proportional model, which is \$25 billion, according to the Social Security Administration, would responsibly address it.

Now, I wish it was paid for. We don't pay for anything in this town. \$25 billion at least addresses it responsibly.

What has happened, this legislation that we are voting on—the gentleman is correct—under suspension of the rules, without going to the Rules Committee, I disagree with that. It should not be being done under suspension. The reason it is being done under suspension is because a majority of people

in this body discharged another bill, H.R. 82, which would spend \$200 billion over 10 years to reinstate the windfall, to basically take money away from Social Security and make it be bankrupt 6 months earlier. That is what this town does.

My friend from Texas is trying to prevent that. We had to engage in political rulemaking warfare on the floor of the House, which we addressed today to try to fix it and put the genie back in the bottle, to guarantee that we would at least get a vote on this good bill instead of the disaster that is a \$200 billion hole in the deficit that will bankrupt Social Security at least 6 months earlier, according to the Social Security Administration.

I thank my friend from Texas. I rise in support of it. We should not have to do this. This should have gone through the Rules Committee. We should have amended the bill. We should have a debate about it. We should pay for it. Instead, we are doing the same crap we always do. I support this bill.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, this will be budget neutral over 75 years for the trust fund, according to the actuaries, and I thank Mr. ROY for his comments.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I have to say I do agree with Mr. ROY's last statement that what we needed to do was go through regular order and what we need is to pay for it. That is the responsible thing to do, is to pay for it.

We have a plan to not only repeal WEP and GPO but pay for it. Yes, I heard people refer to the Brady-Neal proposal, but Ranking Member NEAL has a plan also to deal with WEP that is fair and makes sense and is something that we should be embracing and including and is paid for. That is the big issue today. It is not that people's hearts aren't in the right place, and I think the gentleman from Texas understands this.

All of us are Americans. The President of the United States, Mr. Biden, has made a proposal. The incoming President, Mr. Trump, has made a proposal also. He has made a proposal to cut taxes for people on Social Security. We have that proposal in our bill, except we pay for it. That is the responsible thing to do.

What has been irresponsible is Congress not debating this in regular order and bringing it to the floor. How about doing something incredible here, actually have a vote on the Nation's number one antipoverty program for the elderly and number one antipoverty program for our children until the child tax credit is fully adopted, and is the program that more veterans rely on for disability than the VA.

This program is so admired and respected by the American people that overwhelmingly Independents, Republicans, and Democrats, all believe that it should be supported, expanded, be-

cause it hasn't been in over 50 years, and paid for.

We have a plan. We are anxiously waiting for the debate and for the discussion and the dialogue to take place here in regular order and have a vote on a plan that is comprehensive and paid for and lifts the 5 million Americans who get below-poverty-level checks from the government above the poverty level and provides people with the opportunity in every single one of our communities to get the benefits they richly deserve.

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

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH), my colleague and friend.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the windfall elimination provision, or WEP as it is more commonly known, was put in place more than four decades ago to prevent workers with earnings that were exempt from Social Security payroll taxes from getting more generous treatment from Social Security than workers who spent their whole careers contributing to Social Security.

Unfortunately, WEP still results in overly generous payments for some while unfairly penalizing others.

H.R. 5342, the Equal Treatment of Public Servants Act, provides current beneficiaries affected by the WEP with an additional \$100 per month and replaces the current-law WEP for future beneficiaries with a new formula that bases benefits on a worker's total career earnings.

This past year, the Ways and Means Committee has held more hearings on WEP than in any other Congress in the past 20 years and identified that the WEP formula could be replaced with a formula that provides all beneficiaries with a fair benefit based on their actual earnings using data that wasn't available when the WEP was put in place 40 years ago.

□ 1630

The bill before us today, the Equal Treatment of Public Servants Act, replaces the WEP with a new formula based on this now-available earnings data to more accurately adjust benefits.

While I have concerns with this bill's short-term costs, I commend my colleagues and the chairman of the Budget Committee, Congressman JODEY ARRINGTON, for his dedication to finding a pragmatic solution that ultimately improves the financial health of the Social Security programs over the long term.

It is vital that any solution to WEP protects the Social Security trust funds that all beneficiaries rely on. I know a very similar proposal to permanently replace the WEP used to share bipartisan support of members of the Ways and Means Committee, but, unfortunately, my Democrat colleagues abandoned this approach several years back.

I share the goals of this legislation and encourage my colleagues to work with myself and Chairman ARRINGTON to develop a permanent, bipartisan solution that permanently fixes the Windfall Elimination Provision, and the related government pension offset, while also protecting the Social Security benefits of all retirees, which could actually pass the United States Senate and become law.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I thank the gentleman from Missouri for his comments. I don't know that I could add anything more to what he said. We are trying to fix this inequity that exists with this subset of the retirement or Social Security beneficiary population.

I agree with Mr. LARSON that we need a broader debate on Social Security, and we had better hurry up because it will be insolvent in less than 10 years, so we need to talk about the solvency and sustainability, the entirety of the program, the pay-fors, programmatic reforms, and the benefits. All of it should be on the table.

That is why as budget chair, I passed a bipartisan fiscal commission that would look at that and also at Medicare, which is another important safety net for seniors. However, we are talking about one specific subset.

I love the gentleman's passion, and I hope that we can get thoughtful Members on both sides of the aisle, like my friend, to sit at the table and do the right, the responsible, and the mature thing and actually work on a compromise solution like Ronald Reagan and Tip O'Neill did, and I will bet the gentleman agrees with that.

However, we are not talking about the entirety of Social Security. We are talking about this subset, this subset of people affected by WEP. It is about 2 million people. I want to fix that for them. I want them to get the money they have earned, because the windfall elimination provision wasn't adequate. It didn't use good information. We still have people who are shortchanged.

We still have people getting a windfall, albeit less, when we have the ability, the wherewithal, the tools, and the data to actually fix it without just eliminating WEP and going back to where the inequity is greater than what it is today.

That is because if the public servants of my State and the gentleman's State would get more than they put into Social Security, then we accelerate the insolvency. Then we add to the cuts that will be automatic on seniors that would be \$2,500 in 2033, and we give almost no peace of mind and hope for future seniors and our children and grandchildren that this important antipoverty safety net program for seniors will still be there when they need it.

Mr. Speaker, it is too easy just to throw money at every problem up here when you are borrowing from China, and you have a \$2 trillion deficit that

will double in 10 years. We have higher levels of indebtedness than we had when we were fighting Imperial Japan and Nazi Germany.

This country is going to go into the fiscal ditch never to come out, never to prosper, never to be offered the American promise, and never to lead the free world because we are going to bankrupt it because we don't know how to address these problems like every American does in their own household, in their businesses, and at the State and local level, and that is conducting their business within their means and not like there is a money tree at the Treasury Department where they can borrow ad infinitum. That is not reality. That is not reality.

Let's fix it. Let's do it the right way. Let's not add to the debt. Let's not add to the inequity. Let's not accelerate the trust fund insolvency.

Then let's do what the gentleman said. I agree with the gentleman. Let's be men and women who love this country and are more concerned with solving these big problems than staying up here and being called Congressman and chairman. Let's do the people's business. I am ready. I am ready.

This is a very finite subset, and we have the solution. It is not perfect, but it balances the things that need to be balanced like these folks up there would at their homes and like my parents have to do back home in Plainview, Texas.

Taxpayers deserve a voice as much as seniors, and my children deserve a voice as much as taxpayers. That is what we are trying to do here.

I hope we can get my friend's support. I feel like that is about as compelling a pitch I can make. I think JOHN LARSON ought to come over and fix this the right way with me, then let's get that fiscal commission going, get our President to lean into this and do the Reagan-Tip O'Neill grand bargain so we can actually solve the bigger and broader issues that plague Social Security.

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

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

I think you gave a very impassioned plea, but I think we have to dispense with we are throwing money at the problem. This is money that people have paid weekly, biweekly, and monthly out of their paychecks.

We are not talking about just 2 million people with regard to WEP. We are talking about 70 million Americans. They understand this program.

Frankly, it doesn't need to be studied. It needs to be voted on.

Where is the plan on your side?

We have a plan, and God only knows that plan should be subject to debate and discussion, but the plan is to enhance Social Security, not to cut it, so that people who are currently struggling, people now, today, not waiting

for a study, but as we speak are getting below poverty-level checks.

You stand there and tell me we are throwing money at them?

They didn't think it was throwing money when we were paying the money out of their paycheck and they put their trust and confidence in the United States of America to return to them a benefit that has been the number one antipoverty program for the country.

I don't care what party you are in or who you are, you understand what Social Security has meant to you. Social Security is the safety net for capitalism. It is what allows entrepreneurialism to succeed, for people to take risks, and if they fail unintentionally or otherwise, people are disadvantaged or out of work, they are protected. We learned that lesson after the Great Depression.

If you think it can't happen again, it can. In 2008 and 2009, people saw their 401(k) become a 101(k), and during that time, that trust fund never missed a payment, not a pension payment, not a disability payment, and not a spousal or child payment.

What it needs is Congress to act and Congress to vote. Congress is going to go one of two ways. They are either going to enhance the benefit and say: Hey, do you know what? This hasn't been adjusted in over 53 years, and we recognize we have the responsibility to do that, but we haven't acted, and we haven't voted.

Both sides haven't acted.

However, now is the time for us to act and to vote and put a plan in front of people so that they get the opportunity to choose.

Have you got a better plan?

We have got one. We have got one that expands benefits and is paid for. We actually have the temerity to ask people who pay nothing to actually contribute to Social Security just like they do to this great military that we have in this Nation. People don't go out and buy their own tanks and their own F-35s. It is long overdue that people in this country all contribute their fair share to the process. This is the safety net for capitalism and entrepreneurialism in order for us to survive. Every single district—every district—is benefited by it. It is an economic development plan.

How do you explain it to people?

How can you look them in the eye and say: I am sorry we couldn't do anything for you, even though your districts all receive over \$200 million, and yet we haven't done anything to enhance that?

These were suggestions that they take less while they are living longer?

Where do they spend that money?

They spend that money right back in your district at the local pharmacy, at the grocery store, paying their rent and mortgages, and at the dry cleaners. It all goes back to the American people and allows our economy to flourish.

The brilliance of Franklin Delano Roosevelt is still with us today. It is

obstinate of Congress to not vote to enhance people's benefits in more than 50 years.

Ask anyone in your district: Have things changed for them since 1971? Could they use a little help from their Congress?

How many do you think even understand there is a cap on Social Security?

Are we proposing that we lift the cap on people making over \$400,000 and that they actually would have to pay the same thing as someone who is making \$30, \$50, and \$100,000?

They all pay.

Isn't that the fair thing to do in the country so that all of your constituents and mine and all 435 Members of this body can make sure that we are taking care of the people whom we are sworn to serve, especially those who are already retired, those who are there now?

While I respect the intention of the gentleman, 14 million people's benefits get cut under your proposal—14 million. That is not acceptable.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their comments to the Chair.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, only in Washington, D.C., and, unfortunately—I respect my Democrat colleague and many of my Democrat colleagues—only from the Democrat side of the aisle could I hear that paying above and beyond what we defined as an earned benefit and has now become a windfall for 2 million people at the expense of 60 million people who don't receive the same benefit so that we can give people equal treatment and not accelerate the insolvency, only in this town could I hear that as a solution. That is not a solution. It is a bad plan. Let's have the broader debate about Social Security, which is what the gentleman is suggesting, but let's fix this.

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

□ 1645

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5342.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

SOCIAL SECURITY FAIRNESS ACT OF 2023

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 82) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the

Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 82

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Social Security Fairness Act of 2023".

SEC. 2. REPEAL OF GOVERNMENT PENSION OFFSET PROVISION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 202(k) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 402(k)) is amended by striking paragraph (5).

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 202(b)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 402(b)(2)) is amended by striking "subsections (k)(5) and (q)" and inserting "subsection (q)".

(2) Section 202(c)(2) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 402(c)(2)) is amended by striking "subsections (k)(5) and (q)" and inserting "subsection (q)".

(3) Section 202(e)(2)(A) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 402(e)(2)(A)) is amended by striking "subsection (k)(5), subsection (q)," and inserting "subsection (q)".

(4) Section 202(f)(2)(A) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 402(f)(2)(A)) is amended by striking "subsection (k)(5), subsection (q)" and inserting "subsection (q)".

SEC. 3. REPEAL OF WINDFALL ELIMINATION PROVISIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 215 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 415) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking paragraph (7);

(2) in subsection (d), by striking paragraph (3); and

(3) in subsection (f), by striking paragraph (9).

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Subsections (e)(2) and (f)(2) of section 202 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 402) are each amended by striking "section 215(f)(5), 215(f)(6), or 215(f)(9)(B)" in subparagraphs (C) and (D)(i) and inserting "paragraph (5) or (6) of section 215(f)".

SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to monthly insurance benefits payable under title II of the Social Security Act for months after December 2023. Notwithstanding section 215(f) of the Social Security Act, the Commissioner of Social Security shall adjust primary insurance amounts to the extent necessary to take into account the amendments made by section 3.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on H.R. 82, the Social Security Fairness Act of

2023, which fully repeals Social Security's windfall elimination provision and government pension offset.

The WEP and GPO are two Social Security policies that adjust benefits for workers who receive a pension from jobs that were exempt from Social Security payroll taxes, frequently police officers, firefighters, teachers, and other public servants. These two provisions affect around 4 percent of all Social Security beneficiaries, more than 60 percent of whom are concentrated in 10 States.

These two policies were put in place more than four decades ago to prevent workers with earnings that were exempt from Social Security payroll taxes from getting more generous treatment from Social Security than workers who spent their whole careers contributing to Social Security. Unfortunately, these policies still result in overly generous benefits for some while unfairly penalizing others.

This Congress, the Ways and Means Committee has held more hearings on WEP and GPO than any other Congress over the past 20 years.

At our first hearing, held at a fire station in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, we heard directly from American retirees who have been affected by these flawed provisions, which took most of them completely by surprise.

At our second hearing, we identified that there are alternatives to the current WEP and GPO formulas, using data which wasn't available when those two provisions were put in place 40 years ago, which would provide all beneficiaries with a fair benefit based on their actual earnings.

Mr. Speaker, while the Social Security Fairness Act repeals the flawed WEP and GPO, it is far from being a perfect solution and does nothing to replace them with a fair formula.

Unfortunately, without a replacement, this bill is projected to cost Social Security almost \$200 billion over the next 10 years and expedite Social Security's insolvency by about 6 months. When that happens, it is projected that all beneficiaries, not just those affected by the WEP and GPO, will receive a 20 to 25 percent benefit cut.

The WEP and GPO are flawed, but they were put in place for a reason: to try to fairly account for workers holding jobs both outside and inside the Social Security system.

I think everyone agrees they have done an imperfect job in treating all workers fairly, and that is certainly something we need to fix. However, to get rid of them without a replacement potentially trades unfair treatment for preferential treatment.

Like many of the Members who support this legislation, I share the goal of providing real relief to those who are harmed by these unfair Washington rules, which is why it is unfortunate that this legislation had to come to the floor this way. I would have much rather had a bipartisan solution that came

to the floor through regular order that both repealed this formula but also replaced it while holding retirees and current workers harmless. It is why I appreciate that while the gentleman could have filed a Consensus Calendar motion for H.R. 82 more than 460 days ago, Representative GARRET GRAVES instead chose to work in good faith with the committee to find an alternative that is fully paid for.

Unfortunately, Democrats and key stakeholders were ultimately unwilling to come together and identify a real bipartisan solution that would protect both those harmed by the WEP and GPO and the Social Security trust fund, which all beneficiaries rely on.

Mr. Speaker, if Members don't want to be right back here next Congress, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to work with us to fix this issue moving forward and protect the retirement security of all American seniors.

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

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, first and foremost, I commend Representatives ABIGAIL SPANBERGER and GARRET GRAVES for their extraordinary work. It is not often in this body, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues are going to find a bipartisan group of more than 300 Members who sign on to a proposal. Why? Well, my colleagues did it because of how dead wrong WEP and GPO are and because of the impact on schoolteachers, firefighters, police officers, and municipal employees. That is why it is so heartening to see colleagues on both sides of the aisle come together and say, yes, there is a path forward, and yes, WEP and GPO need to be reformed and, in fact, eliminated.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the chair. We need regular order. We need regular order because Social Security needs to be addressed comprehensively. If not for the work of Ms. SPANBERGER and Mr. GRAVES, we wouldn't even be here. There would be no dialogue, no discussion, no debate on the number one antipoverty program for the elderly and the number one antipoverty program for children, a program that protects spouses and their children, which every American agrees with and understands.

Congress hasn't acted to expand a program and, in this case, hasn't acted to help people who actually worked other jobs and paid into a system and are being wrongfully penalized, which is why, in our proposal of Social Security 2100, we repeal it, as well, and pay for it.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the chairman. We didn't have all the data over 40 years ago. Now, we do, and now, we have that opportunity. We also have the momentum in a body that recognizes that not only is this unfair, but to have 5 million fellow Americans get below-poverty-level checks is unfair. To not have increased or enhanced ben-

efits in over 50 years is unfair. To not have a COLA that actually reflects what seniors spend their money on is also unfair. To tax Social Security with regular income after you have retired is unfair.

It needs to be addressed. I thank the Members who have done this and have brought this, and we need to respond comprehensively. I will add that we need to pay for it as well, but the Members who have strove to bring this to the floor deserve tremendous credit.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. SPANBERGER).

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as the Representative for tens of thousands of Virginians whose earned retirement benefits have been slashed by the windfall elimination provision and the government pension offset for far, far too long.

I urge my colleagues, 330 of whom have cosponsored this legislation, to join us in passing the Social Security Fairness Act this evening and put an end to this theft.

For generations, hardworking Americans have been promised that if they work hard, save, and contribute to their Social Security, they will be afforded a secure retirement with their earned benefits.

The WEP and the GPO, two misguided provisions that were added to the Social Security Act in 1983, have denied Americans the retirement security they worked for and expected to receive.

Today, the WEP steals benefits from more than 2 million retired Americans, more than 45,000 Virginians, who both paid into Social Security for long enough to earn these benefits and worked in the public sector during their careers. These are firefighters who worked a second job to make ends meet, police officers who began a second career after leaving the force, and teachers who took a summer job to cover the bills and buy school supplies. They are Federal employees who went on to work in the private sector. They are all receiving a fraction of their earned Social Security benefits.

The GPO denies benefits to more than 750,000 Americans and nearly 8,000 Virginians, people who dedicated their careers to public service who were then robbed of the survivor benefits that they should have received while dealing with the death of a spouse. These Americans have been punished simply because they chose to selflessly serve our communities and our country.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard from thousands of Virginians about this issue. Francis, a retired police officer in Virginia, is seeing his benefits slashed by the WEP. Richard, a veteran who served our Nation first in the military, then in civil service, and then in the private sector, sees nearly half of his Social Security benefits stolen. That has been the case for the past 15 years, even though he started working when he was 16 years old and started paying into Social Security.

For more than 40 years, public servants have tirelessly implored their Representatives in Congress to listen to their stories and to correct this glaring injustice. Today, for the first time, Congress will vote on the Social Security Fairness Act, to repeal the WEP and the GPO, and to finally put an end to this theft.

Let me be very clear. The long-term solvency of Social Security is an issue that Congress must address, and the issue of how much those earned benefits pay to those who are in their retirement is something that must be addressed, but that is a separate issue.

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

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Virginia.

□ 1700

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Speaker, that is a separate issue from allowing Americans who did their part, who contributed their earnings, for them to retire with dignity.

In signing their names onto this legislation, more than 330 lawmakers on both sides of the aisle, Democrats and Republicans, have made clear their belief that we must repeal the WEP and GPO. We must pass it tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join us in passing this legislation and in sending it over to the United States Senate, where 61 Senators who are currently serving in that body are cosponsors of our legislation. By passing the Social Security Fairness Act, we can deliver long-overdue relief to the American public, to our public servants, to those who have served our communities.

I thank everyone who will speak on behalf of this bill this evening. I thank my cosponsor, Congressman GARRET GRAVES, for his extraordinary partnership as we have worked with public servants from around the country to get to this point tonight.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES), the author of this legislation.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman SMITH for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I listened to this debate and heard so many things that are simply misunderstandings or maybe just intentionally telling things that aren't true.

When I was growing up, my mom used to ask me: "Is it going to take an act of Congress for you to clean your room?" She would say it all the time. "Is it going to take an act of Congress for you to clean your room?" I didn't know what she meant because I thought my room was pretty clean.

What she meant is: Is it going to take the Earth, wind, stars, and mountains all moving in order for you to act?

Mr. Speaker, this has been 40 years of treating people differently, discriminating against a certain set of workers.

These are police officers, teachers, firefighters, and other public servants. Mr. Speaker, I worked side by side with these folks. They are not people who are overpaid. They are not people who are underworked.

Think about the crime issue, the defend the police issue, the safety of our communities. Police officers are integral to our State. They are integral to our Nation. We need to treat them fairly, respectfully. That means not treating them differently and discriminating against them and their benefits.

Teachers are the ones who train the next generation. Firefighters—who are you going to call when your house is on fire? These are the very people whose benefits we are cutting.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard people sit here and say the solvency of this Social Security trust fund is going to move forward 6 months with this bill. Mr. Speaker, the solvency has been delayed years because you have stolen from these people. Do you not understand math? This number right here—the Congressional Budget Office, \$195 billion—do you know what that number is? That is the number that you are going to be stealing from these same public servants over the next 10 years if you don't fix this.

Mr. Speaker, we can sit here and talk about all of these numbers and math. Here is the reality. Probably somewhere between \$600 billion and \$700 billion in Social Security benefits from police officers, teachers, firefighters, and other public servants has been stolen. If we don't pass this, the Congressional Budget Office says we are going to steal another \$995 billion.

An interesting nugget that was in the Congressional Budget Office's evaluation is they also said if we actually pass this law, we are going to save money on social welfare programs because we are going to lift people out of poverty. They will no longer be dependent upon our social welfare programs.

Mr. Speaker, we can't keep doing this. I heard people talking about penalizing people and taxes and all of that stuff. Let me tell you what is happening. There is a group of people right now that effectively is paying a higher tax than anyone else. That is what is happening. It is the reason why the Social Security trust fund is going to remain solvent for years longer. It is unfair. It is unjust.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to say it again. This is a community of people who cannot afford this. This is a community of people who are some of the hardest working folks in our community, and they have been stolen from for 40 years.

Mr. Speaker, very simply, here is the scenario. Let's say that Chairman SMITH and I were both security guards. We were paid the same amount of money over the same period of time. After 20 years, I say that I am out. I go back and help raise a family. Chairman SMITH goes on to become a sheriff's deputy. He does it for 10 years.

When we retire on the same exact date, my Social Security benefits may be \$1,500 to \$1,800 more. Why? We paid the same amount for same period of time into the Social Security trust fund.

Mr. Speaker, look, there are folks who have tried to throw up other legislation and say that these other alternatives are the right way to go. There is one bill in this Congress that has a majority of Republicans and a majority of Democrats. I don't know the number right now. I know that, recently, it was the most cosponsored bill in all of Congress. With over 12,000 bills introduced, it was the most cosponsored bill.

Mr. Speaker, do you know what? We didn't go through the regular committee process. I do want to thank Chairman SMITH for working with us. Do you know what we did? We had a hearing in Louisiana. We had a hearing in Washington, D.C. We negotiated for months, trying to get there. We couldn't.

Mr. Speaker, there is one package that has the support of the majority of Republicans and the majority of Democrats that will fix this once and for all. How in the world are we trying to beat up on the bill that is the most cosponsored bill in Congress?

My friend, Mr. LARSON, was talking about the divisiveness, the polarization. My gosh, we have finally come together on something.

Mr. Speaker, let's pass this bill. Let's show America that we can do what is right and what is just. Let's make sure this bill gets through the Senate and to the President's desk and that it doesn't take another 40 years to do what is right.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Ms. BUDZINSKI).

Ms. BUDZINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank my Democratic colleague for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in very strong support of H.R. 82, the Social Security Fairness Act.

Right now, millions of Americans who have paid into Social Security are being cut short in their benefits. Police officers, firefighters, and educators, working people who have devoted their professional lives to public service, are being unfairly punished by the windfall elimination provision and the government pension offset.

Mr. Speaker, the Social Security Fairness Act is a bipartisan bill to fix this, restoring benefits that our public servants have paid into throughout the years and ensuring that every American receives the Social Security benefits that they have earned and deserve.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to come together this evening to support this legislation so that we can give these working people the retirement security that they have worked for and earned.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS).

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, Congress frequently falls short of the will of the people. We know this as Representatives. We struggle to do our best. Rarely do we have an opportunity to set things right. I have worked for 8 years on the Social Security Fairness Act, and tonight, it comes to the floor for a vote.

Mr. Speaker, tonight, we can repeal the unrighteous law. Tonight, men and women of this Chamber, of this honored body, can recognize the significance of their signature and can honor their own signature and cast a vote in support of H.R. 82.

Mr. Speaker, I have watched Congress after Congress after Congress as this bill has been skillfully and deviously killed in every Congress by one means or another. There is an echo through the Chamber of: "There is a better bill pending. We will get it next Congress. There is a more conservative bill in the Senate. We can't pass this bill. It won't see the light of day in the Senate."

Mr. Speaker, we shall shine the light of the American people upon this body and upon the Senate. We demand a clean vote. This is why we have forced it. By God, we shall get it. It is totally unrighteous to state that we can use seized and stolen money to address our ledger as a nation.

Mr. Speaker, we must stop the unrighteous theft. H.R. 82 has my full and vigorous support. It carries the signatures of over 300 Members of this people's House. I expect its passage tonight.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LANDSMAN).

Mr. LANDSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank everyone who has worked so hard on this bill for as long as they have. It has been years, way too long.

Tonight is a bill vote. This is one of the most significant votes as a new Member I have been a part of because of the impact it will have on millions and millions of working people and public retirees. It is a huge win for them.

Mr. Speaker, the bipartisan Social Security Fairness Act will help over 160,000 people in Ohio alone. As has been said, these are people who served us. These are retired teachers, retired police officers, retired firefighters, retired nurses, and our letter carriers.

They have paid into the system like everyone else, but they don't get all of their benefits. As has been said, this is theft.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to tell one quick story about a woman named Melissa from my district. She has been teaching kindergarten at a public school.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. D'ESPOSITO). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LANDSMAN. Mr. Speaker, she has taught public school for 20 years.

When she retires next year, she is set to lose \$2,000 a month that she has earned because of this provision.

She is not alone. As I mentioned, there are over 160,000 others in Ohio and millions across the country.

Mr. Speaker, this is the most cosponsored bill in the United States Congress. There are more than 60 Members of the Senate who will pass this bill or at least have said that they will pass this bill.

With our vote tonight, it will get sent to the Senate. It will become law. It will make an enormous difference in the lives of working people, public retirees, so that they can pay all of their bills.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN).

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is great to be back on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives. We wrapped up our election season last Tuesday. I participated in debates. Other people participated in debates.

We are all ready to go after that inflation, that inflation driving up food costs, driving up housing costs, driving up the cost of gasoline. We are ready to get back here and be a little responsible.

Mr. Speaker, what is the first bill up, the first bill on the first day? It is a bill that is going to cost just short of \$200 billion, not cut \$200 billion, as we try to strengthen the dollar. It is going to cost \$200 billion.

It is illuminating that the most cosponsored bill is a bill that will add another \$200 billion to the country's debt, but that is the situation that we are in.

Mr. Speaker, let's forget about the flowery language here. Now is the first opportunity to say no to spending. I was anticipating this biennium. We fight over bills worth \$500 million or \$1 billion. Now, we have a bill before us for \$190 billion, and everyone says it is time to, in a bipartisan way, spend more. The average American is already \$100,000 in debt.

□ 1715

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to please remember the promises about excessive spending that we were all saying just 2 weeks ago and please vote against this bill.

I don't know what is going to happen to me if the first thing the Republicans do after coming back after this election season is pass a bill that is going to cost \$200 billion. Remember, the current system is built to provide a benefit for the low earner. These folks already have a pension and knew what the situation was going to be. Please don't spend \$200 billion.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I will point out as well that the Social Security trust fund is not part of the national debt. This proposal does not run up the national debt. It impacts the trust fund.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOYLE).

Ms. HOYLE of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, my father was in the fire service when this was passed in 1983. He retired in 1991, and because of this wrong, he will get less than people who have private pensions simply because he chose to protect and serve our community.

I agree with what has been said earlier. We need to fix what is broken and do it the right way. It is why I believe we should pass the Social Security Expansion Act, so that we can extend the solvency of Social Security. That is not what is on the floor today.

I could say a lot of things, but I think my cousin said it best. He called me when I was on the way here. He is suffering permanent health effects from the time he spent at the World Trade Center after 9/11 and for the time he spent in the fire service running into fires when everybody else was running away. He said, public employees, police officers, teachers, firefighters, and their spouses are punished for our commitment to serve our community. While trust fund babies and day traders get their full benefits, we do not. This is only part of the solution.

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

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Ms. HOYLE of Oregon. He said, VAL, tell them they need to pass this bill. It is time to right this wrong. We have earned our benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes."

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

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

Mr. Speaker, it is rare when you see in this body the number of people who have come together to support a bill. I think it demonstrates overwhelmingly how badly we need to come together and pass legislation that impacts the American people. We see so many of them as was so eloquently stated by so many speakers today, especially Mr. GRAVES and Mr. HIGGINS, saying how these individuals have had money taken out of their paychecks and receive nothing. It is wrong. We all know that it is wrong. It needs to be corrected, and it needs to be paid for.

I respect the idea and notion that we have to be fiscally responsible, but Social Security, the trust fund, is so solid but for one thing: the inaction of the United States Congress for more than 53 years failing the American people, failing to do the right thing for teachers, for firefighters, and for police officers.

I will bet everybody here has heard from the firefighters' union and from the teachers' union and from others who are standing up and saying, this is flat-out wrong. They are absolutely right, but there are other people that are hurt as well when items aren't paid for.

Who is here to speak for the 5 million Americans who get below-poverty-level

checks from the wealthiest Nation in the world? Who speaks for them? Who speaks for the more than 33 million Americans who the only benefit that they have is Social Security?

As proud as I am of the speakers on our side who have talked about the need to address this issue for people that have been hurt and disadvantaged, if we don't pay for it we hurt and disadvantage people who are in the fund currently by not comprehensively addressing this issue and paying for it.

What that takes is for the discussion to move forward in a manner in which it goes through regular order, it is debated in committee and on the floor, and then voted on.

The great news is that there will actually be a vote and there will actually be a discussion, and people will have to say, well, why was that so and what was the outcome?

In doing so, hopefully, we will have an understanding about the absolute neglect by the United States Congress, both Chambers, to address the Nation's number one antipoverty program for our elderly and for our children. It is the safety net of capitalism and entrepreneurialism. It should be something we are embracing where both sides have good points to make, but one of them clearly isn't cutting benefits intentionally or unintentionally that end up hurting the very people we are sworn to serve, the very people that Social Security was meant to protect. The genius of Roosevelt and the Congress back in 1935 is that they got it. It took a major event like the Great Depression, but if you think it can't happen again, think back to 2008 and 2009 when people's 401(k)'s became 101(k)'s.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are begging us to do something, to have a vote. They are right. These benefits have been taken from them that they earned and paid for. They deserve them, but in the process we can't hurt those people who we have also neglected. There are 5 million fellow Americans in all of our districts getting below-poverty-level checks. That is wrong.

My heart is heavy because I oppose this bill because of who it impacts and hurts, but I totally respect the effort in what was done and the fact, thanks to the efforts of 300 Members of this body, there will at least be a vote, not the vote I would have preferred, but a vote.

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

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, America's public servants deserve to be treated fairly by Social Security, and all of America's seniors deserve access to the benefits that they have earned and to live out their retirement with dignity. These truths are not mutually exclusive.

We owe it to those Americans who dedicated their careers to serving the public that they are not treated unfairly because of a mistake Congress made decades ago. We also have a duty

to the millions of seniors on Social Security not impacted by GPO or WEP to put in place a legislative fix that protects their benefits.

I will commend my colleague and good friend, Congressman GRAVES, for his tireless work on behalf of these seniors and encourage all of my colleagues to consider how this legislation will affect their constituents one way or another as they vote.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, this bill has been amazing. I will say it again. At one point it has been the most cosponsored bill in Congress, 330 cosponsors. This bill has a majority of the majority.

There is one Social Security fix bill that has a majority of the majority as cosponsors. There is one bill that has the Speaker of the House as a cosponsor that fixes this. There is one bill that has the majority leader of the House as a cosponsor that fixes this. There is one bill that will truly solve this problem after 40 years of stealing from police officers, from teachers, from firefighters, and others, and it is H.R. 82.

Now, Mr. Speaker, at home a lot of people are probably confused, and, quite frankly, a lot of Members of Congress are probably confused.

Why are there two different bills that we are voting on today?

I will be very clear: One bill, H.R. 82, actually fixes the problem. I appreciate the efforts of my friend from Texas working to try to solve this. The bill doesn't do it.

Let me just give you one little story, one little anecdote, to make it clear.

Today, Mr. Speaker, if you have a police officer killed in the line of duty, that widow, that spouse, gets zero in spousal benefits in Social Security. If we pass the other bill that was introduced that was suddenly thrown up and put on the agenda, if we pass that legislation, that spouse will continue to get nothing. The widow of a police officer killed in the line of duty, the spousal benefits will still be zero.

According to all of the groups that are out there supporting this legislation that are identified on this poster here, the other bill, H.R. 5342, would actually benefit 1 million and result in cuts to 14 million retirees.

Let me say it another way. You vote "yes" on H.R. 5342, you are voting to cut Social Security benefits. If you want to go home and explain that, have at it. There is one bill that solves the problem.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, Congresswoman SPANBERGER, for being a great partner. I thank Logan De La Barre-Hays, Shaun, Ben, Mark, and Maggie Ayrea, and the staff folks for being so helpful. While the chairman and I were unable to get to an agreement, a consensus on this, I thank Chairman SMITH for his tireless efforts to fix this.

□ 1730

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I want to say it one more time. There is one bill—one bill—that has the support of police officers, teachers, firefighters, and all the other retirees. I urge support for H.R. 82.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters of support from the Federal-Postal Coalition, the Fraternal Order of Police, the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, the National Association of Police Organizations, the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare, NARFE, the International Association of Fire Fighters, and the American Federation of Government Employees.

FEDERAL-POSTAL COALITION,
November 12, 2024.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: As Chair of the Federal-Postal Coalition, an organization of over thirty labor unions and management associations representing the interests of current and retired federal and postal employees, I urge you to vote in favor of H.R. 82, the Social Security Fairness Act, when it is brought up on suspension.

As you are aware, the Social Security Fairness Act would repeal the Government Pension Offset (GPO) and Windfall Elimination Provision (WEP). These policies from the 1970s unfairly target the earned Social Security benefits of our nation's public servants, including a substantial portion of our country's federal retirees.

GPO and WEP reduce the hard-earned retirement benefits from public sector employees at the federal, state and local levels whose work is not covered by Social Security. GPO targets and reduces spousal and survival Social Security benefits, which disproportionately impacts widows and widowers. Currently, widow's benefits are reduced by \$2 for every \$3 earned if the widow is eligible for a pension based on a public sector job that was not covered by Social Security. WEP can result in a monthly Social Security benefit as much as \$512 less than under the regular benefit formula, drastically reducing the amount of fixed income for a retiree to live on.

Repeal of these provisions is long overdue. Social Security is a critical source of income for our nation's retirees, but we have allowed needless discrimination against retired public servants for far too long. These individuals paid Social Security taxes in connection with covered work (e.g., in the private sector), earning their Social Security benefits. Yet because they chose careers in public service and earned a pension through that service, their earned Social Security benefits are significantly reduced—or even eliminated. These penalties discourage public service and hamper the retirement security of those with long careers benefitting this nation.

Now it is time for the House to take action to address these longstanding inequities and vote yes on H.R. 82.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

KATIE MADDOCKS,
Federal-Postal Coalition Chair.

AFSCME,
Washington, DC, November 12, 2024.

Members of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 1.4 million members of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), I urge you to vote in support of

the strongly bipartisan Social Security Fairness Act of 2023 (H.R. 82) and to reject the Equal Treatment of Public Servants Act of 2023 (H.R. 5342).

AFSCME supports H.R. 82 because it would fully repeal the Government Pension Offset (GPO) and the Windfall Elimination Provision (WEP), two provisions that deprive more than 2.8 million public employee retirees of Social Security benefits they have earned.

With 330 co-sponsors, H.R. 82 has robust bipartisan support.

H.R. 82 would permanently end the injustice in the current calculation of Social Security benefits that harms 2.8 million public pensioners and their spouses who paid thousands of dollars into Social Security over decades.

H.R. 82 would permanently end the Government Pension Offset (GPO) cuts to the spousal and widow(er) Social Security benefits of 750,000 beneficiaries (or about 1% of all beneficiaries). Two out of three of these beneficiaries saw the GPO take away all their spousal or widow(er)'s Social Security check, denying them the retirement security they planned.

H.R. 82 would permanently end the Windfall Elimination Provision (WEP) formula that can cut a worker's earned Social Security benefit by more than half, up to \$587 in 2024. WEP is an indiscriminate penalty that is especially unfair because these workers pay the same percentage in payroll contributions on their Social Security covered earnings as all others. They fully earned these Social Security benefits.

AFSCME urges Congress to reject H.R. 5342 as it is deeply flawed in key respects.

H.R. 5342 provides absolutely no relief for the harm caused to spouses and widow(er)s by GPO.

H.R. 5342 picks winners and losers in calculating benefits for workers affected by WEP. The Social Security Administration Actuary estimated that the bill would slightly increase benefits for 1 million future retirees but decrease benefits for 14 million other future retirees.

Currently, former public employees who did not vest in their public pension are exempt from WEP reductions to their earned Social Security benefits. H.R. 5342 eliminates this commonsense exemption and would subject 13.5 million more individuals to a WEP cut in Social Security benefits.

We ask you to permanently end the injustice caused by GOP and WEP by voting in support of the Social Security Fairness Act (H.R. 82) and to reject the Equal Treatment of Public Servants Act (H.R. 5342) so that current and future retirees receive the benefits they have earned.

Sincerely,

EDWIN S. JAYNE,
Director of Federal Government Affairs.

NATIONAL FRATERNAL ORDER
OF POLICE,
November 12, 2024.

The National Fraternal Order of Police is urging Members of the U.S. House of Representatives to vote YES on H.R. 82, the bipartisan "Social Security Fairness Act." The bill has 330 cosponsors, including House Leadership on both sides and a majority of both Republicans and Democrats in the House. It would:

Repeal existing penalties on retired public employees—the Windfall Elimination Provision (WEP) and Government Pension Offset (GPO).

Provide relief for about 1.9 million retired public employees who earned a Social Security benefit through their work but are denied the full benefit because of their public service.

Ensure that Social Security treats all American workers the same—FAIRLY.

The National Fraternal Order of Police is urging Members of the U.S. House of Representatives to vote NO on H.R. 5342, the “Equal Treatment of Public Servants Act.” The bill falls short of true relief/reform because:

It leaves the Government Pension Offset intact, which reduces the survivor benefits, and, in most cases, completely eliminates the benefit. Of the 735,000 spouses who lost their loved one and who are entitled to a survivor's benefit, the majority of these widow(er)s—511,000 of them—will see their benefit completely offset and will receive nothing.

The problem with the WEP in existing law is the unfair and arbitrary nature of the formula. Repealing it will treat all American workers the same. This bill just changes the formula—retired public employees would still be treated differently and not get what they earned.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF POLICE
ORGANIZATIONS, INC.,

Alexandria, Va., November 12, 2024.

House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR COSPONSORS OF H.R. 82: On behalf of the National Association of Police Organizations (NAPO), representing over 250,000 sworn law enforcement officers across the country, I am writing to express our sincere thanks to you for cosponsoring H.R. 82, the Social Security Fairness Act, and to urge you to turn your support into a vote in favor of this important legislation when it comes up for a vote today. The Social Security Fairness Act is the only legislation that can fix a long-standing wrong that has put millions of our nation's retired public servants in financial insecurity.

By cosponsoring H.R. 82, you demonstrated your understanding of the detrimental impact the Windfall Elimination Provision (WEP) and the Government Pension Offset (GPO) have on public servants' Social Security retirement benefits. For over 40 years, the GPO and WEP have been harming the retirement security of our nation's public safety officers simply because they chose a public service profession by taking away hard-earned and much needed benefits.

While initially meant as a “leveling” response, in recent years the GPO and WEP have been used to prolong the life of the Social Security Trust Fund on the backs of our nation's public servants, who are seeing cuts across the board to their hard-earned retirement benefits. By totally repealing both the GPO and WEP, the Social Security Fairness Act would preserve the retirement security of those who selflessly serve and protect our communities.

We urge you to continue standing with us in support of restoring the Social Security retirement benefits of millions of public servants across the country and vote yes on H.R. 82 when it comes up for a vote today and no on H.R. 5342.

If you have any questions, or if we can be of further assistance, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. JOHNSON, ESQ.,
Executive Director.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE TO PRESERVE
SOCIAL SECURITY & MEDICARE,
Washington, DC, November 12, 2024.

House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the millions of members and supporters of the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare, I am writing to express our strong opposition to H.R. 5342, the

“Equal Treatment of Public Servants Act of 2023”, because it will cut benefits for 14 million hard-working future retirees. Members of the National Committee come from all walks of life and every political persuasion. What unites them is their passion for protecting and strengthening programs that are vitally important to older Americans.

Although H.R. 5342 is being presented as an alternative to H.R. 82, the “Social Security Fairness Act of 2023”, it is severely deficient in two major ways. First, it leaves intact the current law Social Security Government Pension Offset (GPO) provision, thus leaving hundreds of thousands of beneficiaries, about one-half of whom are widows and widowers, losing up to the entirety of their Social Security benefit. And second, H.R. 5342 would expand rather than reduce the reach of the current law Windfall Elimination Provision (WEP), cutting the benefits of millions of Americans who are not currently affected by the (WEP).

It is imperative that members of Congress not be misled by the “hold harmless” provision that allows American workers to receive benefits under either the current formula or the new one—whichever is higher—for the next four decades. While this is true, other provisions in the bill would result in benefit cuts for millions of hard-working Americans who were never subject to the WEP in the first place. The Social Security Administration's (SSA) Chief Actuary has projected that H.R. 5342 would cut benefits for 14 million future retirees, while raising benefits for only one million.

While we prefer that the inequities of the GPO and WEP be resolved as part of a comprehensive modernization of the Social Security system such as that proposed by Representative John Larson in the Social Security 2100 Act, the deep flaws in H.R. 5342 make it a completely inadequate alternative to H.R. 82. Unlike H.R. 5342, H.R. 82 completely repeals both the GPO and the WEP, and does not cut benefits for any future retirees.

The National Committee truly hopes that H.R. 5342 does not represent a blueprint for how the Republican leadership of the House of Representatives intends to address the broader issue of Social Security reform. Cutting benefits for a large number of beneficiaries while providing benefit increases for a minority of workers is simply not acceptable to the majority of the American people. Poll after poll has shown broad, bipartisan support for increasing revenue to stabilize Social Security's finances rather than cutting benefits.

We strongly urge all members of the House to oppose H.R. 5342 and support H.R. 82, the Social Security Fairness Act of 2023. Enactment of H.R. 82 will restore the earned Social Security benefits to millions of public servants—including the teachers, police and firefighters who put their lives on the line for our families every day.

Sincerely,

MAX RICHTMAN,
President and CEO.

NATIONAL ACTIVE AND RETIRED
FEDERAL EMPLOYEES ASSOCIATION,
Alexandria, VA, November 11, 2024.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the National Active and Retired Federal Employees Association (NARFE), which is dedicated to advancing the interests of the more than 5 million federal employees and retirees, as well as their spouses and survivors, I write to urge you to vote YES on the Social Security Fairness Act, H.R. 82, when it comes to the House floor this week.

The Social Security Fairness Act would repeal the Windfall Elimination Provision (WEP) and Government Pension Offset

(GPO), both of which unfairly penalize retired public servants by reducing earned Social Security benefits simply due to their receipt of an earned government pension.

Throughout the 118th Congress, we have seen historic progress on this legislation, demonstrating the broad support for ending these unfair penalties. H.R. 82 has garnered overwhelming bipartisan support with 330 cosponsors, making it the most supported bill in all of Congress. The House Ways and Means Committee held two hearings on WEP and GPO repeal, where the committee heard compelling testimony from public servants—including teachers, police officers, firefighters, and federal workers—who detailed the severe financial impacts these provisions have on their lives.

For nearly four decades, WEP and GPO have reduced—or entirely eliminated—earned Social Security benefits for public servants solely because they received a government pension. The WEP can cut monthly Social Security benefits by as much as \$587, while the GPO often eliminates spousal or survivor benefits completely. These cuts create substantial financial burdens, forcing many retirees to consider returning to work just to make ends meet. No former public servant who dedicated their career to serving their country with dignity and honor should face this reality.

Now is the time for Congress to repeal these provisions once and for all. By voting in favor of H.R. 82, you will help restore the benefits these individuals rightfully earned and provide them with the financial security they deserve in retirement. This is a pivotal moment for public servants across the nation, and your support is critical to ensuring justice and fairness for those who have served our communities and our country.

H.R. 5342, THE EQUAL TREATMENT OF PUBLIC
SERVANTS ACT

I also urge you to vote PRESENT on H.R. 5342, the Equal Treatment of Public Servants Act, which is also scheduled for a vote.

In comparison to H.R. 82, the Social Security Fairness Act, this bill would only provide limited relief from the WEP, and no relief at all for those impacted by the GPO. While NARFE has supported H.R. 5342 in the past as one plausible path to providing an improvement over the status quo, we strongly prefer full repeal of both WEP and GPO, and oppose consideration of the bill side-by-side with H.R. 82, especially when it has not earned floor time through majority support for a discharge petition nor committee approval.

H.R. 5342 is only receiving a vote because two rogue members of the House took unauthorized action during a pro forma session of the House, ignoring longstanding parliamentary precedent, and the authority of every other member of Congress to vote on actions of the House, threatening the procedural integrity of the House of Representatives as a body. By taking unauthorized action, they spoke for the entire House as just two members, nullifying your vote on behalf of your constituents. A vote of PRESENT takes no position on the underlying bill, yet signals an objection to consideration of the bill, and protests the actions of two rogue members.

For these reasons, I once again urge you to vote YES on H.R. 82, and PRESENT on H.R. 5342. Thank you for your consideration of our views.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM SHACKELFORD,
National President.

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
FIRE FIGHTERS,
Washington, DC, November 12, 2024.

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

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

DEAR SPEAKER JOHNSON AND LEADER JEFFRIES: On behalf of the more than 352,000 members of the International Association of Fire Fighters (IAFF), thank you for bringing the Social Security Fairness Act (H.R. 82) to a vote on the House Floor. With this vote, the House is poised to make the pivotal decision to restore a dignified retirement to countless retired fire fighters, emergency medical workers, and other public servants. I urge you and your colleagues to vote YES on H.R. 82, and end the misguided denial of benefits that has robbed these men and women of their rightfully-earned benefits.

Every day, fire fighters and emergency medical workers risk their lives and well-being for the greater good. They spend their careers serving our communities, often juggling multiple jobs to support their families—generally while paying into Social Security based on their private-sector earnings. These men and women rightfully expect to receive full Social Security benefits in retirement. The cruel reality is that the WEP and GPO strip away nearly \$500 per month from these retirees, leaving them to struggle in retirement.

The House now holds the power to stand up for these brave men and women. Voting YES on H.R. 82 will restore dignity and fairness to retirees' lives and prove that their sacrifices are honored. This is your chance to make a lasting impact and help the first responders who have given our nation so much. IAFF members are simply asking for fairness and to receive the benefits that they have paid into and earned throughout their careers.

Our union deeply appreciates your work to build a safer and more dignified fire service. Passing H.R. 82 will ensure a system that is fair for public servants and allows retirees to have the retirements that they have earned. I urge you and your colleagues to continue supporting retired fire fighters by voting to pass H.R. 82. Let's get this bill to the Senate and call upon them to follow your lead.

Sincerely,

EDWARD A. KELLY,
General President.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF
GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES, AFL-CIO,

Washington, DC, November 12, 2024.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the American Federation of Government Employees (AFGE), which represents over 750,000 federal and District of Columbia employees at over 70 different agencies, I write to offer our strong endorsement of H.R. 82, the "Social Security Fairness Act of 2023," and our strong opposition to H.R. 5342, the "Equal Treatment of Public Servants Act of 2023," and urge you to vote for H.R. 82 and against H.R. 5342 when they are considered on the House floor today.

H.R. 82 would eliminate the Windfall Elimination Provision (WEP) and Government Pension Offset (GPO), penalties that unfairly deny workers, their spouses, and their children the Social Security benefits earned through their FICA payroll tax contribution. Social Security benefits are modest, but enough to keep millions of seniors, children, disabled individuals and their families out of poverty. The WEP and GPO unfairly target Social Security benefits earned by public service workers, including teach-

ers, police officers, firefighters and hundreds of thousands of federal retirees under the Civil Service Retirement System (CSRS). In total, more than two million Americans have their earned benefits reduced or eliminated by the WEP and around 800,000 Americans have benefits reduced or eliminated by the GPO. These penalties disproportionately affect lower-income workers. About 68 percent of those impacted by the GPO have their benefit fully offset, which means they lose every penny of their promised Social Security benefit. That is why we stand with the 330 bipartisan cosponsors in supporting H.R. 82.

H.R. 5342, the Equal Treatment of Public Servants Act of 2023 is deeply flawed and would hurt millions of more people than it helps. While the bill would slightly increase benefits for nearly one million future retirees, it would decrease benefits for 14 million retirees. The bill also does nothing to provide relief from the unfair GPO. Finally, this bill eliminates an important exemption from WEP for former public employees not receiving a government pension.

AFGE fully supports H.R. 82, the Social Security Fairness Act and encourages you to vote in favor of this much needed legislation. We also urge you to vote against H.R. 5352, which would enact new penalties harming public servants and their families.

Sincerely,

JULIE TIPPENS,
Director of Legislation.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, all of these groups are supporting this bill and urging a "no" vote on the other bill, H.R. 5342.

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 82, the Social Security Fairness Act. This bill is a critical step to ensure fair treatment for hardworking Americans who have dedicated their lives to public service. In Virginia alone, nearly 8,000 individuals are unfairly impacted by the Government Pension Offset, and over 46,000 Virginians suffer from reduced Social Security benefits due to the Windfall Elimination Provision. These provisions penalize teachers, police officers, firefighters, and other dedicated public servants, denying them benefits they have rightfully earned. We must correct these inequities. Most public servants aren't in it for the money—rather, they've decided to work in government because they want to serve their country. For their dedication to service, they should be rewarded, not penalized for their well-earned pension.

Those affected by WEP and GPO are unfairly penalized because these provisions reduce or even eliminate Social Security benefits for retirees who have paid into the system over the course of their careers. The Windfall Elimination Provision (WEP) decreases Social Security benefits for individuals who receive pensions from jobs not covered by Social Security, such as teachers or local government workers, regardless of their income or total lifetime contributions. In reality, this results in a situation wherein workers who have paid into the system but split their careers between covered and non-covered employment see a disproportionate reduction in benefits.

The Government Pension Offset (GPO) adds to this unfairness by reducing spousal or survivor benefits by two-thirds of the individual's government pension, affecting many retirees who rely on spousal benefits for finan-

cial stability. This provision especially impacts lower-income retirees, such as widows, who can lose most or all of their benefits simply because they served in public-sector roles. In short, these provisions punish individuals and their families for dedicating their lives to public service, and make it harder for such individuals to have a secure retirement.

Through this bill, which repeals WEP and GPO, we can provide much-needed relief to public sector retirees and their families who often rely in part on Social Security benefits for financial security. This bill is about fairness, equity, and honoring our commitment to individuals who have served their communities. As such, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 82.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

STOP TERROR-FINANCING AND TAX PENALTIES ON AMERICAN HOSTAGES ACT

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 9495) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to postpone tax deadlines and reimburse paid late fees for United States nationals who are unlawfully or wrongfully detained or held hostage abroad, to terminate the tax-exempt status of terrorist supporting organizations, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 9495

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Stop Terror-Financing and Tax Penalties on American Hostages Act".

SEC. 2. POSTPONEMENT OF TAX DEADLINES FOR HOSTAGES AND INDIVIDUALS WRONGFULLY DETAINED ABROAD.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 77 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after section 7510 the following new section: "SEC. 7511. TIME FOR PERFORMING CERTAIN ACTS POSTPONED FOR HOSTAGES AND INDIVIDUALS WRONGFULLY DETAINED ABROAD.

"(a) TIME TO BE DISREGARDED.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The period during which an applicable individual was unlawfully or wrongfully detained abroad, or held hostage abroad, shall be disregarded in determining, under the internal revenue laws, in respect of any tax liability of such individual—

"(A) whether any of the acts described in section 7508(a)(1) were performed within the time prescribed thereof (determined without regard to extension under any other provision of this subtitle for periods after the initial date (as determined by the Secretary) on

which such individual was unlawfully or wrongfully detained abroad or held hostage abroad),

“(B) the amount of any interest, penalty, additional amount, or addition to the tax for periods after such date, and

“(C) the amount of any credit or refund.

“(2) APPLICATION TO SPOUSE.—The provisions of paragraph (1) shall apply to the spouse of any individual entitled to the benefits of such paragraph.

“(b) APPLICABLE INDIVIDUAL.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘applicable individual’ means any individual who is—

“(A) a United States national unlawfully or wrongfully detained abroad, as determined under section 302 of the Robert Levinson Hostage Recovery and Hostage-Taking Accountability Act (22 U.S.C. 1741), or

“(B) a United States national taken hostage abroad, as determined pursuant to the findings of the Hostage Recovery Fusion Cell (as described in section 304 of the Robert Levinson Hostage Recovery and Hostage-Taking Accountability Act (22 U.S.C. 1741b)).

“(2) INFORMATION PROVIDED TO TREASURY.—For purposes of identifying individuals described in paragraph (1), not later than January 1, 2025, and annually thereafter—

“(A) the Secretary of State shall provide the Secretary with a list of the individuals described in paragraph (1)(A), as well as any other information necessary to identify such individuals, and

“(B) the Attorney General, acting through the Hostage Recovery Fusion Cell, shall provide the Secretary with a list of the individuals described in paragraph (1)(B), as well as any other information necessary to identify such individuals.

“(c) SPECIAL RULE FOR OVERPAYMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) shall not apply for purposes of determining the amount of interest on any overpayment of tax.

“(2) SPECIAL RULES.—If an individual is entitled to the benefits of subsection (a) with respect to any return and such return is timely filed (determined after the application of such subsection), subsections (b)(3) and (e) of section 6611 shall not apply.

“(d) MODIFICATION OF TREASURY DATABASES AND INFORMATION SYSTEMS.—The Secretary shall ensure that databases and information systems of the Department of the Treasury are updated as necessary to ensure that statute expiration dates, interest and penalty accrual, and collection activities are suspended consistent with the application of subsection (a).

“(e) REFUND AND ABATEMENT OF PENALTIES AND FINES IMPOSED PRIOR TO IDENTIFICATION AS APPLICABLE INDIVIDUAL.—In the case of any applicable individual—

“(1) for whom any interest, penalty, additional amount, or addition to the tax in respect to any tax liability for any taxable year ending during the period described in subsection (a)(1) was assessed or collected, and

“(2) who was, subsequent to such assessment or collection, determined to be an individual described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of subsection (b)(1), the Secretary shall abate any such assessment and refund any amount collected to such applicable individual in the same manner as any refund of an overpayment of tax under section 6402.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 77 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 7510 the following new item:

“Sec. 7511. Time for performing certain acts postponed for hostages and individuals wrongfully detained abroad.”

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years ending after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. REFUND AND ABATEMENT OF PENALTIES AND FINES PAID BY ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUALS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7511 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as added by section 2, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f) REFUND AND ABATEMENT OF PENALTIES AND FINES PAID BY ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUALS WITH RESPECT TO PERIODS PRIOR TO DATE OF ENACTMENT OF THIS SECTION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—

“(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than January 1, 2025, the Secretary (in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Attorney General) shall establish a program to allow any eligible individual (or the spouse or any dependent (as defined in section 152) of such individual) to apply for a refund or an abatement of any amount described in paragraph (2) (including interest) to the extent such amount was attributable to the applicable period.

“(B) IDENTIFICATION OF INDIVIDUALS.—Not later than January 1, 2025, the Secretary of State and the Attorney General, acting through the Hostage Recovery Fusion Cell (as described in section 304 of the Robert Levinson Hostage Recovery and Hostage-Taking Accountability Act (22 U.S.C. 1741b)), shall—

“(i) compile a list, based on such information as is available, of individuals who were applicable individuals during the applicable period, and

“(ii) provide the list described in clause (i) to the Secretary.

“(C) NOTICE.—For purposes of carrying out the program described in subparagraph (A), the Secretary (in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Attorney General) shall, with respect to any individual identified under subparagraph (B), provide notice to such individual—

“(i) in the case of an individual who has been released on or before the date of enactment of this subsection, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, or

“(ii) in the case of an individual who is released after the date of enactment of this subsection, not later than 90 days after the date on which such individual is released, that such individual may be eligible for a refund or an abatement of any amount described in paragraph (2) pursuant to the program described in subparagraph (A).

“(D) AUTHORIZATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), in the case of any refund described in subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall issue such refund to the eligible individual in the same manner as any refund of an overpayment of tax.

“(ii) EXTENSION OF LIMITATION ON TIME FOR REFUND.—With respect to any refund under subparagraph (A)—

“(I) the 3-year period of limitation prescribed by section 6511(a) shall be extended until the end of the 1-year period beginning on the date that the notice described in subparagraph (C) is provided to the eligible individual, and

“(II) any limitation under section 6511(b)(2) shall not apply.

“(2) ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUAL.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘eligible individual’ means any applicable individual who, for any taxable year ending during the applicable period, paid or incurred any interest, penalty,

additional amount, or addition to the tax in respect to any tax liability for such year of such individual based on a determination that an act described in section 7508(a)(1) which was not performed by the time prescribed therefor (without regard to any extensions).

“(3) APPLICABLE PERIOD.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘applicable period’ means the period—

“(A) beginning on January 1, 2021, and

“(B) ending on the date of enactment of this subsection.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years ending on or before the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 4. TERMINATION OF TAX-EXEMPT STATUS OF TERRORIST SUPPORTING ORGANIZATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 501(p) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(8) APPLICATION TO TERRORIST SUPPORTING ORGANIZATIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this subsection, in the case of any terrorist supporting organization—

“(i) such organization (and the designation of such organization under subparagraph (B)) shall be treated as described in paragraph (2), and

“(ii) the period of suspension described in paragraph (3) with respect to such organization shall be treated as beginning on the date that the Secretary designates such organization under subparagraph (B) and ending on the date that the Secretary rescinds such designation under subparagraph (D).

“(B) TERRORIST SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘terrorist supporting organization’ means any organization which is designated by the Secretary as having provided, during the 3-year period ending on the date of such designation, material support or resources (within the meaning of section 2339B of title 18, United States Code) to an organization described in paragraph (2) (determined after the application of this paragraph to such organization) in excess of a de minimis amount.

“(C) DESIGNATION PROCEDURE.—

“(i) NOTICE REQUIREMENT.—Prior to designating any organization as a terrorist supporting organization under subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall mail to the most recent mailing address provided by such organization on the organization’s annual return or notice under section 6033 (or subsequent form indicating a change of address) a written notice which includes—

“(I) a statement that the Secretary will designate such organization as a terrorist supporting organization unless the organization satisfies the requirements of subclause (I) or (II) of clause (ii),

“(II) the name of the organization or organizations with respect to which the Secretary has determined such organization provided material support or sources as described in subparagraph (B), and

“(III) a description of such material support or resources to the extent consistent with national security and law enforcement interests.

“(ii) OPPORTUNITY TO CURE.—In the case of any notice provided to an organization under clause (i), the Secretary shall, at the close of the 90-day period beginning on the date that such notice was sent, designate such organization as a terrorist supporting organization under subparagraph (B) if (and only if) such organization has not (during such period)—

“(I) demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Secretary that such organization did not

provide the material support or resources referred to in subparagraph (B), or

“(II) made reasonable efforts to have such support or resources returned to such organization and certified in writing to the Secretary that such organization will not provide any further support or resources to organizations described in paragraph (2). A certification under subclause (II) shall not be treated as valid if the organization making such certification has provided any other such certification during the preceding 5 years.

“(D) RESCISSION.—The Secretary shall rescind a designation under subparagraph (B) if (and only if)—

“(i) the Secretary determines that such designation was erroneous,

“(ii) after the Secretary receives a written certification from an organization that such organization did not receive the notice described in subparagraph (C)(i)—

“(I) the Secretary determines that it is reasonable to believe that such organization did not receive such notice, and

“(II) such organization satisfies the requirements of subclause (I) or (II) of subparagraph (C)(ii) (determined after taking into account the last sentence thereof), or

“(iii) the Secretary determines, with respect to all organizations to which the material support or resources referred to in subparagraph (B) were provided, the periods of suspension under paragraph (3) have ended. A certification described in the matter preceding subclause (I) of clause (II) shall not be treated as valid if the organization making such certification has provided any other such certification during the preceding 5 years.

“(E) ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW BY INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE INDEPENDENT OFFICE OF APPEALS.—In the case of the designation of an organization by the Secretary as a terrorist supporting organization under subparagraph (B), a dispute regarding such designation shall be subject to resolution by the Internal Revenue Service Independent Office of Appeals under section 7803(e) in the same manner as if such designation were made by the Internal Revenue Service and paragraph (5) of this subsection did not apply.

“(F) JURISDICTION OF UNITED STATES COURTS.—Notwithstanding paragraph (5), the United States district courts shall have exclusive jurisdiction to review a final determination with respect to an organization's designation as a terrorist supporting organization under subparagraph (B). In the case of any such determination which was based on classified information (as defined in section 1(a) of the Classified Information Procedures Act), such information may be submitted to the reviewing court ex parte and in camera. For purposes of this subparagraph, a determination with respect to an organization's designation as a terrorist supporting organization shall not fail to be treated as a final determination merely because such organization fails to utilize the dispute resolution process of the Internal Revenue Service Independent Office of Appeals provided under subparagraph (E).”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to designations made after the date of the enactment of this Act in taxable years ending after such date.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on this bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of H.R. 9495, brought forward by Representatives TENNEY, KUSTOFF, and SCHNEIDER of the Ways and Means Committee, as well as Representative TITUS of Nevada.

This bill is about stopping the abuse of the tax code by organizations that support terrorism and ensuring that those who are held against their will by foreign governments or terrorists don't suffer further from tax penalties when they return home to America.

In the wake of Hamas' brutal attacks in Israel on October 7, 2023, we have discovered material support for terrorist organizations like Hamas right here in the United States, much of which has been funded by tax-exempt organizations receiving money from American taxpayers.

Tax-exempt status must be denied to any entity found to have provided material support to a terrorist organization. We must starve the aggressors of the resources they need to commit more atrocities.

At the same time, Hamas is still holding hostages in Gaza, including American citizens, kidnapped by the terrorist organization on October 7 of last year. We must honor the struggle of these victims. Unfortunately, they are made to suffer unintentionally due to aspects of our tax code.

When those who are wrongfully detained around the world—whether by terrorists or by governments—finally return to America, they could be subjected to tax bills, including penalties and interest on taxes that went unpaid during their captivity.

H.R. 9495, the Stop Terror-Financing and Tax Penalties on American Hostages Act, is the much-needed solution to both of these problems.

Under this legislation, the IRS will be given the tools it needs to ensure that American citizens held hostage or wrongfully detained and their families do not incur penalties for late tax payments while in captivity. American victims and their families already went through a nightmare. Tax penalties just add to the harm.

This legislation would also close the IRS loophole that terrorist organizations have exploited for years. It builds on the committee's antiterror financing efforts by prohibiting organizations from maintaining tax-exempt status if they are found to have provided material support or resources to a terrorist or terrorist-supporting organization within a 3-year period.

This issue is devastating. Let me provide two examples. One U.S.-based tax-exempt organization hired a so-called journalist in Gaza, who was a member of Hamas and was literally holding Israelis taken hostage on October 7 in his own home. He was paid using tax-exempt funds. He was paid using tax-exempt funds. That organization is still operating as a tax-exempt organization here in the U.S. today. Even though the Ways and Means Committee has called for the revocation of their status, the IRS Commissioner has yet to do anything.

Another tax-exempt organization based in the U.S. financially sponsored and funded a foreign group that was just designated by Treasury as a sham charity and a funder of terrorism. The IRS once again has yet to revoke the sponsor's tax-exempt status.

This legislation is needed. It received overwhelming bipartisan support in the Ways and Means Committee. I look forward to seeing H.R. 9495 receive even more bipartisan support here on the House floor today.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this bill authorizes Donald Trump to recklessly impose a death penalty on any nonprofit in America that happens to be on his enemies list. With this bill, he can destroy the very life of civil society in this country, one group after another. Even though the group involved that he targets as a “terrorist-supporting” group has not violated a single law, even though the group or the public have not been presented with a shred of evidence for doing this, without offering any specific explanation or reason as to why the life is being taken out of this civil society group, and without providing a day in court, a hearing, and without any meaningful right of appeal, no matter how capricious, no matter how unjustified Trump's action may be.

H.R. 9495 is a repackaged version of legislation that was originally filed months ago, with good intentions, including that of some of my Democratic colleagues.

With Trump's election, the conditions have changed. The dangers of granting additional power to him are far outweighed by any benefits from this bill. This is the same Trump who vowed to be “dictator on day one” and has declared the greatest danger our country faces today is “the enemy within.”

This bill is now opposed by a growing number of civil society groups, over 120 groups—the ACLU, the Brennan Center for Justice, the NAACP, Planned Parenthood, the Center for American Progress, the American Federation of Teachers—a list that goes on and on—including the Freedom of the Press Foundation.

This legislation is done in the name of stopping financial support for terrorism. All of us support stopping terrorism. Like everyone here, I have done that, and I have previously voted for this very language not once but twice, though the last time it came before our committee, I voiced the very same concerns about the lack of due process that I voice today.

Since none of the deficiencies of this bill have been corrected and no amendment is offered today, we must reject it.

If he is on a march to make America Fascist, we do not need to supply Donald Trump with any additional weapons to accomplish his ill purpose. Our freedoms will not be destroyed in one great blow. No, it will be a thousand cuts over the term of this administration, undermining our liberties one after another.

To those who say that this bill only applies to groups that are supporting terrorism, consider how very expansive that term can be, both at home and abroad. The foreign tyrants who Donald Trump so much admires have imprisoned journalists, academics, and rights activists by claiming that they are supporters of terrorism.

State and Federal elected officials in this country have called for terrorism investigations or prosecution of major news outlets. Trump himself has criticized and labeled any racist activist as terrorist. Some have mischaracterized environmental groups as ecoterrorists. Under this bill, Trump's list of targets would only be limited by his imagination. There are not any guardrails in the bill.

For example, if Trump claimed that Democrats, myself included, who didn't clap enough for him in this Chamber when he gave his first State of the Union were traitors, that we were treasonous, we could be targeted. He could target organizations that assist refugees for harboring terrorists.

Planned Parenthood or a hospital could be targeted for the alleged terror of abortion. An environmental group could be mislabeled as an ecoterrorist. A private university that permits too many anti-Trump demonstrations could be targeted. A disability rights group that is objecting to Trump's interference with the Affordable Care Act could be targeted.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, a shelter offering housing to LGBTQ youth could be targeted. A Vietnam Veterans of America group that previously declared Trump's attacks on Gold Star families disgraceful and un-American could be targeted.

Other possible targets might be think tanks that don't happen to think the way Trump wanted, groups fighting Christian nationalism, or simply any tax-exempt group not viewed as sufficiently pro-MAGA.

Now, let's talk about the two examples that the chairman just referred to. He thinks the IRS Commissioner has not acted swiftly enough, and it sounds like perhaps he is right. Well, who do you think appointed the IRS Commissioner? His name is Donald J. Trump.

The defect is not in the law as it exists today, but on the question of whether or not there is being proper administration of the law that exists today that can deal with terrorism.

If the real purpose of this bill, as well, were simply to postpone tax filing deadlines for the very small number of Americans who have been detained hostage, as wrong as that is, our approving right now the bill that has lingered here, as Republicans shelved it for 6 months, that the Senate approved to do that, to provide them that protection, we could put that bill on the President's desk right now.

The very fact that the Republicans used this claim of helping hostages is a subterfuge because what it is really about is empowering Trump to do more harm. They are, in essence, holding the hostages hostage once again.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President-elect.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, may the record also reflect the truth and the facts. The IRS Commissioner, Mr. Werfel, was appointed by President Biden, not President Trump. Let's get the facts straight.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. TENNEY).

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Stop Terror-Financing and Tax Penalties on American Hostages Act, H.R. 9495.

The intent of this bill is simple, no American who has suffered the injustice of wrongful detention or hostage taking by our adversaries should return home to face penalties and interest from their own government.

Under current tax law, individuals who have been held against their will can be subject to late tax payment penalties and interest after returning home from captivity. Not only does this defy common sense, it defies compassion. This is an obvious flaw, and it only worsens the trauma of individuals and families who have already faced extraordinary challenges.

In addition to righting this egregious wrong, the bill revokes the tax-exempt status for organizations found to be supporting these terrorist groups; by the way, an initiative that passed unanimously in the House Ways and Means Committee.

Contrary to what some of my colleagues across the aisle believe, the American people do not want hard-earned tax dollars to be funneled to terrorist organizations. Numerous House Ways and Means Committee investigations have uncovered evidence

that groups like Samidoun, for example, are actively laundering funds through nonprofit organizations to terrorist organizations.

□ 1745

This comes at an important time as last month marked 1 year since Hamas' brutal attack on Israel, with many hostages currently being wrongfully detained at the hands of designated terrorist groups like Hamas.

The Stop Terror-Financing and Tax Penalties on American Hostages Act would ensure that American hostages, wrongful detainees, and their families are not further burdened with tax penalties and interest for circumstances beyond their control.

While I am thankful that we are taking a pivotal step today to correct this injustice, we must continue to fight to secure the release of Americans being illegally held abroad like my constituent, Ryan Corbett, a wonderful husband and father from Dansville, New York, who remains wrongfully detained by the Taliban.

Ryan Corbett has been wrongfully detained by the Taliban for 825 days, being held in a 9- by 9-foot basement cell without regular access to a bathroom, sunlight, or medical care. Ryan's health is deteriorating quickly, and the situation is dire.

I urge President Biden and Secretary Blinken to do everything in their power to bring Ryan home and reunite him with his amazing wife, Anna, and their three beautiful children, Ketsia, Miriam, and Caleb.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman JASON SMITH, Speaker MIKE JOHNSON, and Leader STEVE SCALISE for bringing this important bill to the floor. I also note that this bill passed unanimously out of the House Committee on Ways and Means, including with the support of Ranking Member RICHIE NEAL.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support the Stop Terror-Financing and Tax Penalties on American Hostages Act to send a clear message that we stand by our fellow citizens who have endured unthinkable consequences abroad.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds to tell the chairman he is absolutely right. I stand corrected concerning the IRS Commissioner. That is the only thing I stand corrected on, and I would be glad to join him in a further appeal to the current Commissioner if the facts are as you say because none of us want to see a dollar, profit or nonprofit, going to terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER).

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I also stand in opposition to H.R. 9495, which would provide this administration and any future administration with sweeping, unilateral authority to designate nonprofits as terror-supporting organizations and strip them of their tax-exempt status with no due process and

without sufficient evidence. The authorities provided in this bill are unnecessary and extremely dangerous if they ever fall into the wrong hands.

This legislation would do nothing to improve our ability to combat terrorism because there are already numerous legal mechanisms that effectively monitor and penalize nonprofits that provide support to terrorist organizations. No one in this esteemed body wants any nonprofits to direct even \$1 to a terrorist organization, and it is inappropriate to suggest otherwise.

In the hands of responsible government, the powers provided in this bill are redundant and duplicative. However, history is uncertain. Democracies, even ours, can wax and wane. Sometimes we have great Presidents, and sometimes we do not.

Under the leadership of an unscrupulous or authoritarian President, it is not hard to imagine how that administration could use the powers in this bill to hinder or dismantle organizations they don't like. Remember, there would be no due process, no right of appeal, no right to see the evidence against them, no path to cure.

It is deeply unfortunate this bill was combined with commonsense legislation—led by my friends, Representatives DINA TITUS and CLAUDIA TENNEY, and me—that would have allowed the IRS to waive or postpone fines and fees on taxpayers who have been unlawfully detained or held hostage overseas and not been able to pay their taxes on time. I was pleased to see that piece of legislation unanimously pass the Senate earlier this year. However, its pairing with these deeply controversial provisions in H.R. 9495 risks those provisions ever becoming law.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons, I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 9495, and I hope that we can find a path forward to provide desperately needed relief for Americans who have been wrongfully detained overseas.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I have a question for Mr. BEYER.

The bill the gentleman has is the same one that the Senate passed 6 months ago. Has the gentleman been given any reason why the Republicans, if they are so eager to help the hostages, have held that bill instead of bringing it up to us to consider and getting it on the President's desk right now, this week?

Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) to answer my question.

Mr. BEYER. I have never been given that reason, no.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for responding, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand what is controversial about an organization losing their tax-exempt status if they are funding terrorism. I don't see how that is controversial, but apparently, the prior speakers believe it is controversial.

It is crystal clear. This legislation has passed out of the House with overwhelming support in the past. The Senate has been holding it up. The Democrat-controlled Senate has been holding it up. But guess what. In a couple of months, it won't be the Democrat-controlled Senate.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO).

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 9495, the so-called Stop Terror-Financing and Tax Penalties on American Hostages Act.

This legislation would grant the President-elect unilateral power to essentially shut down any tax-exempt organization based on any simple accusations of wrongdoing—let me repeat: a simple accusation of wrongdoing.

By granting the Treasury Secretary enormous power, the Secretary would have the authority to stifle any nonprofit organization that has provided “material support” to terrorists.

Granting this broad authority to investigate and strip nonprofits of their tax-exempt status paves the way for weaponized action against targeted organizations based on their core missions and political beliefs.

Mind you, I do not support organizations giving material support for terrorists, but I am concerned about a simple accusation of wrongdoing leading to that happening.

To be sure, nonprofits are already prohibited from providing material support to terrorist groups, and this legislation is unnecessary and duplicative. I support full enforcement of existing law.

Under a new President-elect Donald Trump, this proposed law could be punitive. The notion of giving President-elect Trump the power to take away the tax-exempt status of nonprofits associated with his so-called political opponents is staggering. Yet, here we are.

President-elect Trump before and during his campaign made numerous comments regarding his supposed enemies. These so-called enemies include individuals, corporations, or organizations that have been critical of the former President's policies and comments during the past and present.

Let us consider the case of a reputable organization like the Japanese American Citizens League. This nonprofit, tax-exempt charitable organization, a 501(c)(3), has done immeasurable work on behalf of the community and even our Nation advocating for Japanese Americans and other marginalized communities, including arguing against the Muslim ban. As a proud Japanese American myself, I am in awe of the great contributions that this nonprofit has made.

Yet, with this legislation before us today, one can predict a scenario in which this group may be targeted for supporting Muslims should a Trump Muslim ban 2.0 come to fruition.

Every day in this country, nonprofits are doing incredible work. They touch a range of different policy areas and sectors, and with this bill, they are at significant risk.

As written, this bill risks allowing LGBTQ organizations to be vulnerable to attack solely due to their collaboration with human rights groups in hostile areas. Loss of tax exemption would mean that these organizations would be subject to corporate tax rates, increasing financial burdens and the likelihood of financial hardship. New tax liabilities would divert funds away from core missions and activities, therefore impeding the work of supporting initiatives and community outreach.

We all know well that the organizations here that could be implicated are going to be based on political repercussions. A chilling effect of revoking tax-exempt status could deter other organizations from speaking up, essentially curtailing free speech.

Current law dictates it is already a Federal crime for nonprofits to provide this support for these groups, so why are we here today? Granting the executive branch such extraordinary power based off of unilateral accusations paves the way for significant abuse.

This bill is a gift to President-elect Trump, wrapped in a bow right before the holidays, to seek vengeance on his so-called political opponents.

Organizations such as J Street and the ACLU have come out in strong opposition to this bill for good reasons. The potential change in tax-exempt status would not only impact the financial stability of countless nonprofit organizations.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, the potential change in tax-exempt status would not only impact the financial stability of countless nonprofit organizations but would severely undermine the ability to carry out their core missions of advocating for civil rights and social justice.

Loss of funding and a reduction of capacity to serve communities threaten the survival and effectiveness of these nonprofits. We should be uplifting these organizations and not hindering their success.

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

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I will say it once again: It is pretty clear this bill gives the IRS the authority it needs to revoke tax-exempt status for organizations that provide material support for terrorism. That is it. The tax-exempt organizations that aren't providing material support for terrorism have nothing to fear.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the ability to demand that no dollars flow from America to any terrorist organization has been long recognized in the law as it exists today. In fact, the chairman has conceded that when he says his complaint is that the IRS has not moved fast enough under existing law.

This is not a question of inadequate law. It is against the law today to provide support to a terrorist organization, be it exempt or nonexempt. The question here is whether we should change the law to eliminate the right to know the evidence to that effect.

Is it just the chairman's claim that something is a terrorist organization? If it is a terrorist organization, why not present the evidence? Why not provide an opportunity for a hearing for that evidence to be tested? Why not provide a meaningful right of appeal?

None of these safeguards are there, and they are lacking for a reason. The desire is to be able to weaponize the Treasury with regard to these organizations and to do as has happened under one tyrant after another in another country to claim that the opponents are terrorists, a term that is expansive.

Unchecked authority to revoke the nonprofit status of such groups without cause or due process risks Trump truly weaponizing the Treasury Department and destroying civil society organizations across this country.

As David Thompson with the National Council of Nonprofits has said, by violating basic due process rights, this bill "bodes ill . . . without input from the charitable sector."

As civil society groups have stated, over 120 of them: "The executive branch could use this authority to target its political opponents and use the fear of crippling legal fees, the stigma of designation, and donors fleeing controversy to stifle dissent and chill speech and advocacy."

It is not just the denial of tax status; it is the threat of denial. It is the use of intimidation, at which our President-elect is an expert, to let this be an intimidation of one group after another—a church, a social organization that has nothing to do with terrorism but can be characterized as such by him.

That is all it takes. Mr. Speaker, if Trump calls you a terrorist, just as he called me a traitor for not clapping long enough for him, that is all it takes under this bill. You have no hearing. You have no evidence. You have no true appeal rights. The supposed administrative provisions, administrative safeguards of this bill, are a total sham.

Mr. Speaker, after you are found guilty and denied your taxpayer status, then you can complain about it. It is based on the principle that you are guilty before proven innocent. The process there provides no protection whatsoever.

□ 1800

With regard to helping the hostages, let's be very clear about that. For 6

months, we have had in this House the opportunity to pass a Senate bill that is word for word a bill that is pending here in the House to help the hostages. Why has that not been done?

The very fact that there is such great interest in the hostages today and such total insensitivity over the last 6 months to do anything about them tells you that there is an ulterior motive here, that the goal is not about helping perhaps a dozen hostage victims' families who have gone through hell. It is not about that. It is about placing one civil society group after another on the line under a new President to use unlimited discretion to attack his political foes.

We have an opportunity tonight to either advance the cause of fascism or to push back against it. We have statements not from Democrats but from those who worked closest with President Trump raising concern, causing my concern about giving him any additional power.

After he called the press the enemy of the people, there is concern about the impact on the press. So many of our journalist organizations now at the local level are nonprofit organizations. To lose their tax-exempt status is to destroy freedom of the press.

We know with regard to President-elect Trump, that his appointee, General Mark Milley, the former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, a decorated hero and patriot, referred to Mr. Trump as fascist to the core, that his former Chief of Staff, the longest serving Chief of Staff, one of those best people in the world that he told us he would bring to Washington, said he is certainly an authoritarian, admires people who are dictators. He has said that.

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOST). The gentleman has 2¼ minutes remaining.

Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President-elect.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, the former Chief of Staff said he is certainly an authoritarian, admires people who are dictators, so he certainly falls into the general definition of fascism.

Kelly also said that our President-elect has said that Hitler did some good things. I don't want those kinds of good things done here in America. I want people that disagree with me, as much as the chairman does tonight, from across this country to have the opportunity to have their say. I think that a vibrant, diverse, civil society and freedom of the press here is vital to the future of American democracy, and I don't want to see it snuffed out by one new figure. Let us not tonight give a wannabe tyrant the tool of tyranny.

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

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

gaging in personalities toward the President-elect, including by making references to other sources that would have been out of order if spoken in the Member's own words.

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

In response to the prior speaker's comments of the Senate hostage bill that was passed earlier, we had the IRS and we had the Joint Committee on Taxation that said there were flaws in how it was drafted. This bill fixes those flaws, according to what the IRS said and the Joint Committee on Taxation.

Also, the prior speaker is also a member of the Ways and Means Committee, and he knows that according to the Constitution, all revenue measures originate in the House of Representatives. That bill is a revenue measure that originated in the Senate. That is why we are doing this legislation, in order to get it accomplished to follow a very important document called the U.S. Constitution.

There is something terribly wrong when organizations that support terrorism can abuse the tax code here in the United States but American citizens who are victimized by bad actors abroad can be subjected to tax penalties when they return home to America. There is something terribly wrong when a so-called journalist in Gaza, who had been hired by a tax-exempt organization in the U.S., holds Israelis taken hostage in his own home for months.

There is something wrong when the U.S.-based, nonprofit sponsor of a designated sham charity and funder of terrorism still has not had its tax-exempt status revoked. There is something terribly wrong when families, who have already gone through a nightmare, face tax penalties when they get home.

H.R. 9495 is the answer. It received overwhelming bipartisan support in the Ways and Means Committee. I look forward to even more bipartisan support here on the House floor today.

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of Rep. TENNEY's H.R. 9495, the Stop Terror-Financing and Tax Penalties on American Hostages Act, which will address a profound injustice faced by Americans who return home after being wrongfully detained abroad.

As Co-Chair of the Hostage Task Force in the House alongside my friend HALEY STEVENS of Michigan, I have seen the unimaginable stress and hardships these Americans and their families face while being detained firsthand.

The last thing they should have to worry about when they return home is a notice from their own government telling them that they now face penalties and fines for missing tax deadlines because of circumstances entirely beyond their control.

This bill fixes that irksome issue and sends a clear message:

That the U.S. government stands by its citizens when they are put through these unthinkable circumstances.

With this measure, we are standing up for Americans who have already been through so much.

I am proud to see this commonsense measure come to the floor for consideration, and I urge my colleagues to support it so we can ensure these Americans have the relief they desperately deserve.

And, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for her leadership on this critical need.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 9495, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

FEDERAL ACQUISITION SECURITY COUNCIL IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2024

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 9597) to amend title 41, United States Code, to make changes with respect to the Federal Acquisition Security Council, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 9597

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Federal Acquisition Security Council Improvement Act of 2024”.

SEC. 2. CHANGES WITH RESPECT TO THE FEDERAL ACQUISITION SECURITY COUNCIL.

(a) DEFINITION OF SOURCE OF CONCERN, COVERED SOURCE OF CONCERN, RECOMMENDED ORDER, AND DESIGNATED ORDER.—Section 1321 of title 41, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (5) through (8) as paragraphs (7) through (10);

(2) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

“(5) COVERED SOURCE OF CONCERN.—The term ‘covered source of concern’ means a source of concern that is specifically designated as a ‘covered source of concern’ by a statute that states that such designation is for the purposes of this subchapter.

“(6) DESIGNATED ORDER.—The term ‘designated order’ means an order described under section 1323(c)(3).”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(11) RECOMMENDED ORDER.—The term ‘recommended order’ means an order recommended under section 1323(c)(2).

“(12) SOURCE OF CONCERN.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘source of concern’ means a source—

“(i) subject to the jurisdiction, direction, or control of the government of a foreign adversary, or operates on behalf of the government of a foreign adversary; or

“(ii) that poses a risk to the national security of the United States based on collaboration with, whole or partial ownership or control by, or being affiliated with a military, internal security force, or intelligence agency of a foreign adversary.

“(B) FOREIGN ADVERSARY DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term ‘foreign adversary’ has the meaning given the term ‘covered nation’ in section 4872(d) of title 10.”.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT AND MEMBERS OF COUNCIL.—Section 1322 of title 41, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “executive branch” and inserting “Executive Office of the President”; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The members of the Council shall be as follows:

“(A) The Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy.

“(B) The Deputy Director for Management of the Office of Management and Budget.

“(C) The following officials, each of whom shall occupy a position at the level of Assistant Secretary or Deputy Assistant Secretary (or equivalent):

“(i) Two officials from the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, one of which shall be from the National Counterintelligence and Security Center.

“(ii) Two officials from the Department of Defense, one of which shall be one from the National Security Agency.

“(iii) Two officials from the Department of Homeland Security, one of which shall be one from the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency.

“(iv) An official from the General Services Administration.

“(v) An official from the Office of the National Cyber Director.

“(vi) Two officials from the Department of Justice, one of which shall be one from the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

“(vii) Two officials from the Department of Commerce, one of which shall be from the National Institute of Standards and Technology and one of which shall be from the Bureau of Industry and Security.

“(viii) An official from any executive agency not listed under clauses (i) through (vii) whose temporary or permanent participation is determined by the Chairperson of the Council to be necessary to carry out the functions of the Council while maintaining the intended balance in subject matter expertise.”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the heading, by striking “LEAD REPRESENTATIVES” and inserting “MEMBERS”;

(ii) by amending subparagraph (A)(i) to read as follows:

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The head of each executive agency listed under paragraph (1)(C) shall designate the official or officials from that agency who shall serve on the Council in accordance with such paragraph.”;

(iii) by amending subparagraph (A)(ii) to read as follows:

“(ii) REQUIREMENTS.—To the extent feasible, any official designated under clause (i) shall have expertise in supply chain risk management, acquisitions, law, or information and communications technology.”;

(iv) by amending subparagraph (B) to read as follows:

“(B) FUNCTIONS.—A member of the Council shall—

“(i) regularly participate in the activities of the Council;

“(ii) ensure that any information requested by the Council from the agency represented by the member is provided to the Council; and

“(iii) ensure that the head of the agency represented by the member and other appropriate personnel of the agency are aware of the activities of the Council.”;

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Chairperson of the Council shall be—

“(A) the National Cyber Director; or

“(B) another member of the Council designated by the National Cyber Director.”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (B), by striking “(b)(1)(H)” and inserting “(b)(1)(C)(viii)”;

and

(ii) in subparagraph (C), by striking “lead representative of each agency represented on the Council” and inserting “members of the Council”; and

(4) in subsection (d)—

(A) by striking “The Council” and inserting the following:

“(1) COUNCIL MEETINGS.—The Council”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) OTHER MEETINGS.—The Chairperson of the Council shall meet, not less frequently than semiannually, with—

“(A) the Secretary of Homeland Security, Secretary of Defense, and Director of National Intelligence; or

“(B) in the case that any of the officials under subparagraph (A) delegated authority to an official under section 1323(c)(6)(C), with the delegated official.”.

(c) FUNCTIONS AND AUTHORITIES.—Section 1323 of title 41, United States Code is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “supply chain” each place it appears and inserting “acquisition security and supply chain”; and

(B) in paragraph (1), as amended by subparagraph (A), by striking “, particularly” and inserting “that arise”;

(C) in paragraph (2), as amended by subparagraph (A), by inserting “associated with the acquisition and use of covered articles” after “risk”;

(D) in paragraph (6), as amended by subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking “posed by” and inserting “associated with”; and

(ii) by inserting “and use” before “of covered articles”;

(E) in paragraph (7), by striking “posed by acquisitions” and inserting “associated with the acquisition”;

(F) by redesignating paragraph (7) as paragraph (12); and

(G) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following:

“(7) Implementing a prioritization scheme for evaluating the security risks associated with the acquisition and use of covered articles provided or produced by a covered source of concern.

“(8) Evaluating each covered source of concern to determine whether to issue a designated order with respect to the covered source of concern or a covered article produced or provided by the covered source of concern.

“(9) Evaluating sources of concern to determine whether to issue a recommended order with respect to the source of concern, or any covered article produced or provided by the source of concern.

“(10) Monitoring and evaluating compliance by the Secretary of Homeland Security, Secretary of Defense, and Director of National Intelligence with the requirement to issue designated orders under subsection (c)(6)(B).

“(11) Reporting to Congress annually on the security risks associated with the acquisition and use of covered articles produced or provided by sources of concern.”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking “The Council” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Council”; and

(B) in paragraph (1), as so redesignated, by striking “a program office and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) FEDERAL ACQUISITION SECURITY COUNCIL PROGRAM OFFICE.—

“(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Council shall establish a Federal Acquisition Security Council Program Office (referred to in this paragraph as the ‘Program Office’) within the Office of the National Cyber Director to carry out the functions of the Council duties described under subparagraph (B).

“(B) DUTIES.—The Program Office shall provide to the Council, including any committees, working groups, or other constituent bodies established by the Council under paragraph (1)—

“(i) administrative, legal, and policy support; and

“(ii) analysis and subject matter expertise on information communications technology, acquisition security, and supply chain risk.

“(C) STRUCTURE.—The head of the Program Office shall be a senior official from the Office of the National Cyber Director that occupies a position at the level of Assistant Secretary or Deputy Assistant Secretary (or equivalent).

“(D) PROHIBITION.—The Program Office may not provide administrative support to the Council for any activities of the Council carried out pursuant to a provision of law other than a provision of law under this chapter.

“(E) FUNDING AND RESOURCES.—The Program Office may use the staff and resources of the Office of the National Cyber Director or maintain dedicated staff and resources, as appropriate, in the performance of the duties of the Office.

“(F) SHARED STAFFING AUTHORITY.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Program Office may accept officers or employees of the United States or members of the Armed Forces on a detail from an element of the intelligence community (as such term is defined in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003)) or from another element of the Federal Government on a nonreimbursable basis, as jointly agreed to by the heads of the receiving and detailing elements, for a period not to exceed three years.

“(ii) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subparagraph may be construed as imposing any limitation on any other authority for reimbursable or nonreimbursable details.

“(iii) NONREIMBURSABLE DETAIL.—A nonreimbursable detail made under this subparagraph shall not be considered an augmentation of the appropriations of the receiving element of the Program Office or the Office of the National Cyber Director.

“(G) SUNSET.—The Program Office shall terminate on the date described under section 1328.”;

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “supply chain risk” and inserting “acquisition security and supply chain risk associated with the acquisition of covered articles”;

(ii) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “recommended” before “exclusion orders”;

(iii) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “recommended” before “removal orders”;

(iv) in subparagraph (C), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

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

(vi) by adding at the end the following:

“(E) issuing designated orders.”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the heading, by striking “RECOMMENDATIONS” and inserting “RECOMMENDED ORDERS”;

(ii) by striking “use” and inserting “, using”;

(iii) by striking “subsection (a)(3)” and inserting “subsection (a)(4)”;

(iv) by striking “to issue recommendations” and inserting “, recommend orders”;

(v) by striking “Such recommendations” and inserting “Any such order recommended”;

(vi) by inserting “to the officials described under clause (iii) of paragraph (6)(A) for issuance under such paragraph” after “thereof.”;

(vii) in subparagraph (D), by striking “supply chain risk” and inserting “acquisition security and supply chain risk associated with the acquisition of covered articles”;

(viii) in subparagraph (E), by striking “exclusion or removal”;

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (7) as paragraphs (4) through (8);

(D) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) DESIGNATED ORDERS.—

“(A) EXCLUSION OR REMOVAL OF COVERED SOURCES OF CONCERN.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 270 days after a source of concern is designated as a covered source of concern, the Council—

“(I) shall provide to the officials described under clause (iii) of paragraph (6)(B) for issuance under such paragraph orders requiring—

“(aa) the exclusion of the covered source of concern from any executive agency procurement action, including source selection and consent for a contractor; or

“(bb) the removal of covered articles produced or provided by the covered source of concern from the information system of executive agencies; or

“(II) report to Congress why the Council has determined to not issue an order described under subclause (I) with respect to the covered source of concern or covered articles produced or provided by the covered source of concern.

“(ii) CONTENTS OF ORDER.—Any order provided under clause (i) shall include—

“(I) information regarding the scope and applicability of the order, including any information necessary to positively identify the covered source of concern or covered articles produced or provided by the covered source of concern required to be excluded or removed under the order;

“(II) a summary of any risk assessment reviewed or conducted in support of the order;

“(III) a summary of the basis for the order, including a discussion of less intrusive measures that were considered and why such measures were not reasonably available to reduce security risk;

“(IV) a description of the actions necessary to implement the order; and

“(V) where practicable, in the Council’s sole and unreviewable discretion, a description of mitigation steps that could be taken by the covered source of concern that may result in the Council rescinding the order.

“(B) EXCLUSION OR REMOVAL OF SECOND ORDER SOURCES OR COVERED ARTICLES.—

“(i) ISSUANCE.—In the case that the Council provides an order under subparagraph (A), the Council may also provide an order to the officials described under paragraph (6)(A)(iii) requiring the exclusion of sources or covered articles from executive agency procurement actions or removal of covered articles from executive agency information systems if—

“(I) such covered articles or such sources use a covered source of concern in the performance of a contract with the executive agency; or

“(II) such sources enter into a contract, the performance of which such source knows or has reason to believe will require, in the performance of a contract with the executive agency, the use of a covered source of concern or the use of a covered article produced or provided by a covered source of concern.

“(ii) EFFECTIVE DATE CONSIDERATIONS.—Any effective date prescribed by the Council for an order issued pursuant to clause (i) shall take into account—

“(I) the risk posed by the covered source of concern or the covered article produced or provided by the covered source of concern to the national security of the United States;

“(II) the likelihood of the covered source of concern or the covered article produced or provided by the covered source of concern causing imminent threat to public health and safety;

“(III) the availability of an alternative source or covered article produced or provided by an alternative source; and

“(IV) an assessment of the potential direct or quantifiable costs that may be incurred by the Federal Government, a State, local, or Tribal government, or by the private sector, as a result of compliance by the head of an executive agency with such an exclusion or removal order.”;

(E) in paragraph (4), as so redesignated—

(i) in the heading, by striking “OF RECOMMENDATION AND REVIEW” and inserting “AND REVIEW OF RECOMMENDED AND DESIGNATED ORDERS”;

(ii) by striking “the recommendation” each place the term appears, and inserting “the order”;

(iii) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “A notice of the Council’s recommendation under paragraph (2)” and inserting “Before the Council recommends an order under paragraph (2) or issues an order under paragraph (3), a notice”;

(iv) in subparagraph (A), by striking “a recommendation has been made” and inserting “the order will be recommended or issued”;

(v) in subparagraph (D), by striking “paragraph (5)” and inserting “paragraph (6)”;

(vi) by inserting a new subparagraph to read as follows:

“(F) Until an order is issued pursuant to paragraph (6), information collected under this paragraph shall be exempt from public disclosure and shall be exempt from disclosure under section 552(b)(3)(B) of title 5, United States Code (commonly referred to as the ‘Freedom of Information Act’).”;

(F) in paragraph (5), as so redesignated—

(i) by striking “paragraph (3)” and inserting “paragraph (4)”;

(ii) in subparagraph (A), by striking “paragraph (5)” and inserting “paragraph (6)”;

(iii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “paragraph (6)” and inserting “paragraph (7)”;

(G) in paragraph (6), as so redesignated—

(i) by amending subparagraph (A) to read as follows:

“(A) ISSUANCE OF RECOMMENDED ORDERS.—

“(i) MODIFICATIONS TO ORDER.—After considering any response properly submitted by a source under paragraph (4) related to an order to be recommended under paragraph (2), the Council shall—

“(I) make such modifications to the order as the Council considers appropriate; and

“(II) provide the order (together with any information submitted by a source under paragraph (4) related to such order) to the officials described under clause (iii).

“(ii) ORDER.—Not later than 90 days after receiving a recommended order, the officials described under clause (iii) shall—

“(I) issue the order to the heads of the applicable agencies; or

“(II) submit a notification to the Council that the order will not be issued, that includes in the notification to the Council, all the reasons for why the order will not be issued.

“(iii) OFFICIALS.—The officials described in this clause are as follows:

“(I) The Secretary of Homeland Security, for exclusion and removal orders applicable to civilian agencies, to the extent not covered by subclause (II) or (III).

“(II) The Secretary of Defense, for exclusion and removal orders applicable to the Department of Defense and national security systems other than sensitive compartmented information systems.

“(III) The Director of National Intelligence, for exclusion and removal orders applicable to the intelligence community and sensitive compartmented information systems, to the extent not covered by subclause (II).”;

(ii) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) through (E) as subparagraphs (C) through (F), respectively;

(iii) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

“(B) ISSUANCE OF DESIGNATED ORDER.—

“(i) MODIFICATIONS.—After considering any response properly submitted by a source under paragraph (4) related to a designated order, the Council shall—

“(I)(aa) make any such modifications to the order as the Council considers appropriate; or

“(bb) if the Council determines that the issuance of a designated order is not warranted, rescind the designated order and notify the source of the rescission; and

“(II) except in the case that the Council rescinds the designated order under subclause (I)(bb), provide the designated order (including any modifications made to such order by the Council) to the officials described in clause (iii).

“(ii) ISSUANCE.—The officials described in clause (iii) shall, not later than 90 days after receiving a designated order, issue the order to the heads of the applicable agencies.

“(iii) OFFICIALS.—The officials described in this clause are as follows:

“(I) The Secretary of Homeland Security, for exclusion and removal orders applicable to civilian agencies, to the extent not covered by subclause (II) or (III).

“(II) The Secretary of Defense, for exclusion and removal orders applicable to the Department of Defense and national security systems other than sensitive compartmented information systems.

“(III) The Director of National Intelligence, for exclusion and removal orders applicable to the intelligence community and sensitive compartmented information systems, to the extent not covered by subclause (II).

“(iv) WAIVER.—An official described under clause (iii) may waive for a period of not more than 365 days the application of an order issued by such official under clause (ii) with respect to a covered source of concern or a covered article produced or provided by a covered source of concern if the official submits, not later than 30 days after making such waiver, a written notification to the Council, appropriate congressional committees, and leadership that contains the justification for such waiver.

“(v) RENEWAL OF WAIVER.—An official described under clause (iii) may renew a waiver under clause (iv) for an additional period of not more than 180 days if—

“(I) the renewal of the waiver is in the national security interests of the United States; and

“(II) the official submits, not later than 30 days after renewing such waiver, a written notification to the Council, appropriate congressional committees, and leadership that includes the justification for renewing the waiver.

“(vi) NATIONAL SECURITY WAIVER.—An official described under clause (iii) may waive the application of an order issued by such official under clause (ii) with respect to a covered source of concern or a covered article produced or provided by a covered source of concern for any activity subject to the reporting requirements under title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3091 et seq.) or any authorized intelligence activities of the United States.

“(vii) RESCISSION OF ORDER.—An exclusion or removal order issued under this subparagraph by an official may be rescinded only by the Council.”.

(iv) in subparagraph (C), as so redesignated—

(I) by striking “subparagraph (A)” and inserting “subparagraph (A)(iii) or (B)(iii)”;

(II) by striking “this subparagraph” and inserting “subparagraph (A)(iii) or (B)(iii)”;

and

(III) by striking “, except” and all that follows before the period at the end;

(v) in subparagraph (D), as so redesignated—

(I) by striking “this paragraph” and inserting “subparagraph (A)(iii) or (B)(iii)”;

(II) by striking “help”;

(vi) in subparagraph (E), as so redesignated, by striking “this paragraph” and inserting “subparagraph (A)”;

(vii) by adding after subparagraph (F), as so redesignated, the following:

“(G) EFFECTIVE DATE OF ORDERS.—The effective date of an order issued under this paragraph may not be more than 365 days after the order is issued.”;

(H) in paragraph (7), as so redesignated, by striking “paragraph (5)(A)” and inserting “subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (6)”;

and

(I) in paragraph (8), as so redesignated, by striking “paragraph (5)” and inserting “paragraph (6)”;

(4) in subsection (e), by inserting “the Chief Data Officers Council,” before “the Chief Acquisition”;

(5) in subsection (f)(2), by striking the period at the end and inserting “unless such source is specifically designated by statute as a covered source of concern for the purposes of this subchapter.”;

(d) STRATEGIC PLAN.—Section 1324(a) of title 41, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting “, and periodically thereafter” after “2018”;

(2) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “acquisition security and” before “supply chain risks”;

(3) in paragraph (8), by inserting “acquisition security and” before “supply chain risks”;

(4) in paragraph (9)(A), by inserting “acquisition security and” before “supply chain risk”.

(e) REQUIREMENTS FOR EXECUTIVE AGENCIES.—Section 1326 of title 41, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “; and”

and inserting a semicolon;

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

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) providing any information requested by the Chairperson of the Council for the purpose of carrying out activities of this subchapter, subject to applicable law or policy

on the control and handling of classified, sensitive, or proprietary information.”;

(2) by striking “supply chain” each place such term appears and inserting “security and supply chain”;

(3) in subsection (b)(6), by striking “supply chain” and inserting “security or supply chain”.

(f) JUDICIAL PROCEDURE.—Section 1327(b) of title 41, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “section 1323(c)(6)” and inserting “section 1323(c)(7)”;

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking “section 1323(c)(5)” and inserting “sections 1323(c)(6)”;

and

(3) in paragraph (4), by amending subparagraph (B)(i) to read as follows:

“(i) FILING OF RECORD.—The United States shall file with the court an administrative record, which shall consist of—

“(I) the information the Council relied upon in issuing a designated order under 1323(c)(6); and

“(II) the information that the appropriate official relied upon in issuing an exclusion or removal order under section 1323(c)(6) or a covered procurement action under section 4713.”.

(g) ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS.—Subchapter III of chapter 13 of title 41, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 1329. Additional provisions

“(a) COMPLIANCE WITH EXISTING PROHIBITIONS.—In implementing this subchapter, the Council shall coordinate, as applicable and practicable, with the head of an agency to assist with compliance by the agency with—

“(1) section 889 of the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act of 2019 (Public Law 115–232; 41 U.S.C. 3901 note);

“(2) section 5949 of the James M. Inhofe National Defense Authorization Act of 2023 (Public Law 117–263; 41 U.S.C. 4713 note); and

“(3) sections 1821 through 1833 of the American Security Drone Act of 2023 (Public Law 118–31).

“(b) UPDATE TO REGULATIONS.—The Federal Acquisition Security Council shall update, within two years after the date of the enactment of this section, any regulations of the Council as necessary.”.

(h) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING CHANGES.—Subchapter III of chapter 13 of title 41, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the table of sections for the subchapter by adding after the item related to section 1328 the following:

“1329. Additional provisions.”;

(2) in section 1321(1)(B), by striking “Government Reform” and inserting “Accountability”;

(3) by striking “of this title” each place the term appears.

SEC. 3. REALLOCATING EXISTING RESOURCES.

Section 5949(l) of the James M. Inhofe National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023 (Public Law 117–263) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “Office of Management and Budget” and inserting “Office of the National Cyber Director”;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking “Office of Management and Budget” and inserting “Office of the National Cyber Director”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. 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 this measure.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER), the chairman of our committee.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana for yielding.

Our foreign adversaries have been using information technology and telecommunications equipment to infiltrate and exploit the systems of Federal agencies.

Congress has worked to address this threat by passing numerous bills to prohibit Federal agencies from purchasing or using technology from sources of concern.

This includes legislation to prohibit Federal agencies from using telecommunications and video surveillance equipment provided by certain Chinese companies, legislation to prohibit Federal agencies from procuring electronic products or services that include semiconductors produced by certain Chinese companies, and legislation to prohibit Federal agencies from buying or using drones manufactured or assembled by certain Chinese companies.

In addition to these outright prohibitions, Congress has already previously established the Federal Acquisition Security Council, or the FASC.

The FASC has the authority to recommend that agencies exclude certain sources from Federal procurement processes or remove certain technologies from Federal information systems. However, Congress must have a more active role in directing the FASC to consider the exclusion and removal of certain sources of concern from Federal systems.

This bill, the FASC Improvement Act, authorizes the FASC to issue binding removal and exclusion orders when directed by Congress. Such new binding removal and exclusion orders would complement the existing authorities of the FASC to issue recommendations.

However, this new authority provides Congress a streamlined and standardized process for prohibiting Federal agencies from buying or using a source of concern in the future. To carry out this responsibility, the FASC needs to have adequate support and be appropriately resourced.

H.R. 9597 provides this support by strengthening the governing structure of the FASC by moving it into the executive office of the President and elevating the FASC's agency membership requirements.

This bill expands the FASC's focus to include acquisition security more broadly, beyond its current narrower focus on supply chain risks, and requires the FASC to proactively monitor and evaluate certain sources for ongoing risks. This bill also reallocates

currently authorized appropriations to establish a FASC program within the Office of the National Cyber Director.

This FASC program is authorized to provide the FASC critical operational, legal, and policy support it needs to draft and issue removal and exclusion orders, such support it currently lacks.

Importantly, this bill incorporates best practices from the recent government-wide procurement prohibitions, including necessary due process considerations, national security exemptions, case-by-case waiver processes, and second-order prohibitions.

In other words, the FASC Improvement Act consolidates the past 6 years of congressional legislation addressing national security procurement risks by reforming established processes and expanding authorities.

We need to ensure the executive branch can promptly act to protect the Federal supply chain and agency information systems from nefarious technology influenced by a foreign adversary.

This bill will help prevent American taxpayer dollars from supporting companies owned or controlled by foreign enemies and hostile actors.

This bipartisan bill provides the FASC with the teeth and resources it needs to protect the Federal supply chain.

I thank my colleagues, Oversight Committee Ranking Member JAMIE RASKIN, as well as the leadership of the Select Committee on China, Chairman MOOLENAAR and Representative KRISHNAMOORTHY, for partnering with me on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support this important national security bill.

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

I rise in support of H.R. 9597, the Federal Acquisition Security Council Improvement Act. I am proud to be an original cosponsor of the bill.

I thank the gentleman from Louisiana and Chairman COMER for working closely with us on the legislation.

The bill strengthens the Federal Acquisition Security Council's capacity to guard our Nation's supply chains against foreign adversaries.

The council was established in 2018, and this bill would improve its governing structure by moving it into the executive office of the President and elevating FASC membership requirements.

□ 1815

The bill would always expand the council's authorities beyond supply chain security to include acquisition security more broadly and grants the council the authority to issue removal or exclusion orders of specific companies when necessary or when directed to do so by the United States Congress.

Finally, our bill would create a streamlined process for Congress to designate sources of concern and requires the council to launch an inves-

tigation into these sources, with appropriate due process government-wide input and potential subcontractor prohibitions.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the staff on both sides of the aisle for their creative collaboration on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I am closing with an admonition to everybody to vote for this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. I support the bill, Mr. Speaker, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 9597, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL REGISTER MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2024

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 9592) to amend title 44, United States Code, to modernize the Federal Register, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 9592

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Federal Register Modernization Act of 2024".

SEC. 2. FEDERAL REGISTER MODERNIZATION.

(a) REFERENCES TO PRINTING.—Chapter 15 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 1502—

(A) in the heading, by striking "printing" and inserting "publishing"; and

(B) by striking "printing and distribution" and inserting "publishing";

(2) in section 1507—

(A) by striking "the duplicate originals or certified copies of the document have" and inserting "the document has"; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking "printed" and inserting "published"; and

(3) in section 1509, by striking "printing, reprinting, wrapping, binding, and distributing" each place it appears and inserting "publishing".

(b) PUBLISH DEFINED.—Section 1501 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking "and" at the end of the definition for "person" and inserting a semicolon; and

(2) by inserting after the definition for "person" the following:

"publish" means to circulate for sale or distribution to the public, as determined by the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register; and".

(c) FILING DOCUMENTS WITH OFFICE AMENDMENT.—Section 1503 of title 44, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 1503. Filing documents with Office; notation of time; public inspection; transmission for publishing

"The original document required or authorized to be published by section 1505 shall

be filed with the Office of the Federal Register for publication at times established by the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register by regulation. The Archivist of the United States shall cause to be noted on the original of each document the day and hour of filing. Upon filing, the document shall be immediately available for public inspection. The original shall be retained by the National Archives and Records Administration and shall be available for inspection under regulations prescribed by the Archivist, unless such original is disposed of in accordance with disposal schedules submitted by the Administrative Committee and authorized by the Archivist pursuant to regulations issued under chapter 33; however, originals of proclamations of the President and Executive orders shall be permanently retained by the Administration as part of the National Archives of the United States. The Office shall transmit to the Government Publishing Office, as provided by this chapter, each document required or authorized to be published by section 1505. Every Federal agency shall cause to be transmitted for filing the original of all such documents issued, prescribed, or promulgated by the agency.”.

(d) **FEDERAL REGISTER AMENDMENT.**—Section 1504 of title 44, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 1504. ‘Federal Register’; publishing; contents; distribution; price; physical copies

“Documents required or authorized to be published by section 1505 shall be published immediately by the Government Publishing Office in a serial publication designated the ‘Federal Register’. The Director of the Government Publishing Office shall make available the facilities of the Government Publishing Office for the prompt publication of the Federal Register in the manner and at the times required by this chapter and the regulations prescribed under it. The contents of the daily issues shall constitute all documents, required or authorized to be published, filed with the Office of the Federal Register up to the time of the day immediately preceding the day of publication fixed by regulations under this chapter. There shall be published with each document a copy of the notation, required to be made by section 1503, of the day and hour when, upon filing with the Office, the document was made available for public inspection. Distribution shall be made at a time in the morning of the day of distribution fixed by regulations prescribed under this chapter. The prices to be charged for the Federal Register may be fixed by the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register established by section 1506 without reference to the restrictions placed upon and fixed for the sale of Government publications by sections 1705 and 1708. The Government Publishing Office shall print at least two physical copies of each published Federal Register issue. Of those, not less than two copies shall be stored, each in a separate facility, to ensure the preservation of the Federal Register for the purposes of continuity of government.”.

(e) **DOCUMENTS TO BE PUBLISHED IN FEDERAL REGISTER.**—Section 1505 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the heading, by striking “COMMENTS” and inserting “NEWS COMMENTARY”; and

(B) by striking “comments” and inserting “news commentary”;

(2) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d);

(3) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

“(c) **ALTERNATIVE PUBLICATION.**—In a continuity of operations event in which the Government Publishing Office does not fulfill

the publication requirements of this chapter, the Office of the Federal Register may establish an alternative method to publish the Federal Register until such time that the Government Publishing Office resumes publication.”; and

(4) in subsection (d), as so redesignated, in the matter following paragraph (2)—

(A) by inserting “telecommunications, the Internet,” after “the press, the radio,”; and

(B) by striking “and two duplicate originals or two certified copies” and inserting “document”.

(f) **ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE OF THE FEDERAL REGISTER AMENDMENT.**—Subsection (a) of section 1506 of title 44, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(a) **COMPOSITION; DUTIES.**—The Administrative Committee of the Federal Register shall consist of the Archivist of the United States or Acting Archivist, who shall chair the committee, an officer of the Department of Justice designated by the Attorney General, and the Director of the Government Publishing Office or Acting Director of the Government Publishing Office. The Director of the Federal Register shall act as secretary of the committee. The committee shall prescribe, with the approval of the President or their designee, regulations for carrying out this chapter. The regulations shall provide for, among other things, the following:

“(1) The documents which shall be authorized under section 1505(b) to be published in the Federal Register.

“(2) The manner and form in which the Federal Register shall be published.

“(3) The manner and form in which agencies submit documents for publication in the Federal Register and special editions of the Federal Register.

“(4) Subject to subsection (b), the manner of distribution to Members of Congress, officers and employees of the United States, or Federal agency, for official use, and the number which shall be available for distribution to the public.

“(5) The prices to be charged for individual copies of, and subscriptions to, the Federal Register and any reprints and bound volumes of it.

“(6) The manner and form by which the Federal Register may receive information and comments from the public, if practicable and efficient.

“(7) Special editions of the Federal Register.”.

(g) **CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS AMENDMENT.**—Section 1510 of title 44, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 1510. Code of Federal Regulations

“(a) **SPECIAL EDITION FOR CODIFICATION OF AGENCY DOCUMENTS.**—The Administrative Committee of the Federal Register, with the approval of the President or their designee, may require, from time to time as it considers necessary, the preparation and publication in a special edition of the Federal Register a complete codification of the documents of each agency of the Government having general applicability and legal effect, issued or promulgated by the agency by publication in the Federal Register or by filing with the Administrative Committee, and which are relied upon by the agency as authority for, or are invoked or used by it in the discharge of, its activities or functions, and are in effect as to facts arising on or after dates specified by the Administrative Committee.

“(b) **CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS.**—A codification prepared under subsection (a) of this section shall be published and shall be designated as the ‘Code of Federal Regulations’. The Administrative Committee shall regulate the manner and forms of publishing this codification.

“(c) **SUPPLEMENTATION, COLLATION, AND REPUBLICATION.**—The Administrative Committee shall regulate the supplementation and the collation and republication of the codification with a view to keeping the Code of Federal Regulations as current as practicable. Each unit of codification shall be supplemented and republished at least once each calendar year. The Office of the Federal Register may create updates of each unit of codification from time to time and make the same available electronically or may provide public access using an electronic edition that allows a user to select a specific date and retrieve the version of the codification in effect as of that date.

“(d) **PREPARATION AND PUBLICATION BY THE FEDERAL REGISTER.**—The Office of the Federal Register shall prepare and publish the codifications, supplements, collations, indices, and user aids authorized by this section.

“(e) **PRIMA FACIE EVIDENCE.**—The codified documents of the several agencies published in the Code of Federal Regulations under this section, as amended by documents subsequently filed with the Office and published in the daily issues of the Federal Register, shall be prima facie evidence of the text of the documents and of the fact that they are in effect on and after the date of publication.

“(f) **REGULATIONS.**—The Administrative Committee, with approval of the President or their designee, shall issue regulations for carrying out this section.

“(g) **EXCEPTION.**—This section does not require codification of the text of Presidential documents published and periodically compiled in supplements to title 3 of the Code of Federal Regulations.”.

(h) **TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—The table of sections for chapter 15 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking the items related to sections 1502, 1503, and 1504 and inserting the following:

“1502. Custody and publishing of Federal documents; appointment of Director.

“1503. Filing documents with Office; notation of time; public inspection; transmission for publishing.

“1504. ‘Federal Register’; publishing; contents; distribution; price; physical copies.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on this measure.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 9592, the Federal Register Modernization Act.

Our government must be both transparent and accountable to the American people.

Laws requiring proper recordkeeping are vital to both. In 1935 the Federal Register Act established the Federal

Register, a daily publication of the Federal Government's activities including Presidential documents, proposed and final rules, and public notices.

In other words, the Federal Register provides official notice to the public and Congress that an executive branch document exists.

The Federal Register also provides the building blocks for the Code of Federal Regulations, which makes it easier for the American public to find and understand the Federal regulations governing our Nation.

In 1994, the Government Publishing Office began publishing the Federal Register online with modern search tools and downloadable content.

Congress has recently taken steps to make the Federal Register more efficient by passing the Federal Register Printing Savings Act in 2017. However, additional reforms are still needed to alleviate the Government Publishing Office of the 1935 law's requirement to print and distribute paper copies of the Federal Register every day.

H.R. 9592 allows the Government Publishing Office to stop wasting paper and money and instead publish the Federal Register and the Code of Federal Regulations online.

The bill also streamlines the process for Federal agencies to transmit official documents to the National Archives, ensuring a more efficient process for making these important Federal documents public.

Lastly, the bill provides necessary safeguards so that backup physical copies are properly stored and alternate publication systems can be established in cases of a continuity of government national crisis.

Taken together, these reforms will bring the Federal Register into the 21st century and save taxpayer dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this commonsense legislation. I thank my colleague Representative GERRY CONNOLLY for partnering with me to ensure these long overdue reforms get done, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 9592, the Federal Register Modernization Act. This bill represents a big step forward in streamlining how the Federal Government retains public records and communicates with the public.

The Federal Register Act of 1935 was designed to ensure government transparency by requiring publication of Federal laws, Presidential proclamations, agency rules, and public notices in the Federal Register.

Today, with the increasing use of digital devices to conduct government operations, an electronic edition of the Federal Register is published every single business day. The publication of hard copy agency document submissions to the Office of the Federal Register creates unnecessary redundancy and administrative burdens, and, as my

friend from Louisiana says, administrative burdens and environmental waste.

In 1936, the Office of the Federal Register published 2,620 pages in a year, just over 2,500 pages. By 2023 the Federal Register had expanded to more than 90,000 pages in a year. The volume of Federal documentation has grown exponentially over the last century, so the need for a more efficient and streamlined process is obvious.

This act would align with the current digital practices of Federal agencies and eliminate the need for multiple print submissions.

This bill allows for electronic only publication of the Federal Register except for two print copies maintained by the Office of the Federal Register. By maintaining and improving the digital format of the Federal Register, the office will operate more efficiently, ultimately benefiting not only Federal agencies and the environment but also the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I support this commonsense, bipartisan legislation. I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers at this time on this bill, and I am prepared to close.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 9592, as amended.

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

VALUE OVER COST ACT OF 2024

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 9596) to amend title 41, United States Code, and title 10, United States Code, to provide best value through the multiple award schedule program, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 9596

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Value Over Cost Act of 2024".

SEC. 2. PROVIDING BEST VALUE THROUGH THE MULTIPLE AWARD SCHEDULE PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 152(3)(B) of title 41, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(B) orders and contracts under those procedures result in—

“(i) the lowest overall cost alternative; or

“(ii) in the case that the Administrator of General Services determines that obtaining

best value (as described under section 15.101 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation) is necessary to promote the best interests of the Federal Government, obtaining the best value to meet the needs of the Federal Government.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 3012(3)(B) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(B) orders and contracts under those procedures result in—

“(i) the lowest overall cost alternative; or

“(ii) in the case that the Administrator of General Services determines that obtaining best value (as described under section 15.101 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation) is necessary to promote the best interests of the Federal Government, obtaining the best value to meet the needs of the United States.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material for this measure.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 9596, the Value Over Cost Act.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DONALDS).

Mr. DONALDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Value Over Cost Act. This is a simple, commonsense piece of legislation that modernizes the antiquated Federal procurement process. Specifically, this bill provides the General Services Administration with additional contracting flexibility by allowing for the consideration of best value in addition to the lowest overall cost alternative.

Instead of just looking at the initial price tag, the Federal Government should be fiscally responsible and also consider the contractual value of products and services over time, if it is in the best interest of the Federal Government.

Ultimately, my bill increases contractual flexibility and contracting competition, provides clarity for acquisition stakeholders, maximizes the Federal Government's ability to procure modern technology, and helps the small business community by reducing regulatory burdens associated with Federal procurement.

In sum, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this commonsense piece of legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of H.R. 9596, the Value Over Cost Act. The GSA keeps a list of goods and services that

are available to Federal agencies for multiple GSA-approved vendors at different prices. This schedule is known as the Federal supply schedule. Agencies can order commercial goods and services listed on this schedule in different quantities at the prices stated on the schedule.

It provides a simplified process for agencies to acquire goods and services while also earning the volume discounts for the Federal Government as a whole.

Current law is ambiguous about whether the contracts and orders under the Federal supply schedule program must be the lowest price or the best value price. Best value contracts consider price but also things like the quality of the product and the expertise of the service provider.

The bill clarifies that both the lowest price and the best value are acceptable outcomes for contracts obtained under the scheduled program.

I commend Representative BYRON DONALDS and Representative GERRY CONNOLLY from Virginia for their work on the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers on this bill, and I am prepared to close.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my House colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 9596.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELIMINATE USELESS REPORTS ACT OF 2024

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5301) to amend title 31, United States Code, to require agencies to include a list of outdated or duplicative reporting requirements in annual budget justifications, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5301

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Eliminate Useless Reports Act of 2024”.

SEC. 2. SUNSETS FOR AGENCY REPORTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1125 of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d);

(2) by striking subsections (a) and (b) and inserting the following:

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) BUDGET JUSTIFICATION MATERIALS.—The term ‘budget justification materials’ has the meaning given the term in section 3(b)(2)

of the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (31 U.S.C. 6101 note; Public Law 109-282).

“(2) PLAN OR REPORT.—The term ‘plan or report’ means any plan or report submitted to Congress, any committee of Congress, or subcommittee thereof, by not less than 1 agency—

“(A) in accordance with Federal law; or

“(B) at the direction or request of a congressional report.

“(3) RECURRING PLAN OR REPORT.—The term ‘recurring plan or report’ means a plan or report submitted on a recurring basis.

“(4) RELEVANT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE.—The term ‘relevant congressional committee’—

“(A) means a congressional committee to which a recurring plan or report is required to be submitted; and

“(B) does not include any plan or report that is required to be submitted solely to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives or the Senate.

“(b) AGENCY IDENTIFICATION OF UNNECESSARY REPORTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The head of each agency shall include in the budget justification materials of the agency the following:

“(A) Subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), the following:

“(i) A list of each recurring plan or report submitted by the agency.

“(ii) An identification of whether the recurring plan or report listed in clause (i) was included in the most recent report issued by the Clerk of the House of Representatives concerning the reports that any agency is required by law or directed or requested by a committee report to make to Congress, any committee of Congress, or subcommittee thereof.

“(iii) If applicable, the unique alphanumeric identifier for the recurring plan or report as required by section 7243(b)(1)(C)(vii) of the James M. Inhofe National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023 (Public Law 117-263).

“(iv) The identification of any recurring plan or report the head of the agency determines to be outdated or duplicative.

“(B) With respect to each recurring plan or report identified in subparagraph (A)(iv), the following:

“(i) A recommendation on whether to sunset, modify, consolidate, or reduce the frequency of the submission of the recurring plan or report.

“(ii) A citation to each provision of law or directive or request in a congressional report that requires or requests the submission of the recurring plan or report.

“(iii) A list of the relevant congressional committees for the recurring plan or report.

“(C) A justification explaining, with respect to each recommendation described in subparagraph (B)(i) relating to a recurring plan or report—

“(i) why the head of the agency made the recommendation, which may include an estimate of the resources expended by the agency to prepare and submit the recurring plan or report; and

“(ii) the understanding of the head of the agency of the purpose of the recurring plan or report.

“(2) AGENCY CONSULTATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In preparing the list required under paragraph (1)(A), if, in submitting a recurring plan or report, an agency is required to coordinate or consult with another agency or entity, the head of the agency submitting the recurring plan or report shall consult with the head of each agency or entity with whom consultation or coordination is required.

“(B) INCLUSION IN LIST.—If, after a consultation under subparagraph (A), the head

of each agency or entity consulted under that subparagraph agrees that a recurring plan or report is outdated or duplicative, the head of the agency required to submit the recurring plan or report shall—

“(i) include the recurring plan or report in the list described in paragraph (1)(A); and

“(ii) identify each agency or entity with which the head of the agency is required to coordinate or consult in submitting the recurring plan or report.

“(C) DISAGREEMENT.—If the head of any agency or entity consulted under subparagraph (A) does not agree that a recurring plan or report is outdated or duplicative, the head of the agency required to submit the recurring plan or report shall not include the recurring plan or report in the list described in paragraph (1)(A).

“(3) GOVERNMENT-WIDE OR MULTI-AGENCY PLAN AND REPORT SUBMISSIONS.—With respect to a recurring plan or report required to be submitted by not less than 2 agencies, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall—

“(A) determine whether the requirement to submit the recurring plan or report is outdated or duplicative; and

“(B) make recommendations to Congress accordingly.

“(4) PLAN AND REPORT SUBMISSIONS CONFORMITY TO THE ACCESS TO CONGRESSIONALLY MANDATED REPORTS ACT.—With respect to an agency recommendation, citation, or justification made under subparagraph (B) or (C) of paragraph (1) or a recommendation by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget under paragraph (3), the agency or Director, as applicable, shall also provide this information to the Director of the Government Publishing Office in conformity with the agency submission requirements under section 7244(a) of the James M. Inhofe National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023 (Public Law 117-263; chapter 41 of title 44 note) in conformity with guidance issued by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget under section 7244(b) of such Act.

“(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION ON AGENCY REQUIREMENTS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to exempt the head of an agency from a requirement to submit a recurring plan or report.”; and

(3) in subsection (d), as so redesignated, by striking “in the budget of the United States Government, as provided by section 1105(a)(37)” and inserting “in the budget justification materials of each agency”.

(b) BUDGET CONTENTS.—Section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraph (39).

(c) CONFORMITY TO THE ACCESS TO CONGRESSIONALLY MANDATED REPORTS ACT.—

(1) AMENDMENT.—Subsections (a) and (b) of section 7244 of the James M. Inhofe National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023 (Public Law 117-263; chapter 41 of title 44, United States Code, note), are amended to read as follows:

“(a) SUBMISSION OF ELECTRONIC COPIES OF REPORTS.—Not earlier than 30 days or later than 60 days after the date on which a congressionally mandated report is submitted to either House of Congress or to any committee of Congress or subcommittee thereof, the head of the Federal agency submitting the congressionally mandated report shall submit to the Director the information required under subparagraphs (A) through (D) of section 7243(b)(1) with respect to the congressionally mandated report. Notwithstanding section 7246, nothing in this subtitle shall relieve a Federal agency of any other requirement to publish the congressionally mandated report on the online portal of the Federal agency or otherwise submit the congressionally mandated report to

Congress or specific committees of Congress, or subcommittees thereof.

“(b) GUIDANCE.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection and periodically thereafter as appropriate, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in consultation with the Director, shall issue guidance to agencies on the implementation of this subtitle as well as the requirements of section 1125(b) of title 31, United States Code.”.

(2) UPDATED OMB GUIDANCE.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall issue updated guidance to agencies to ensure that the requirements under subsections (a) and (b) of section 1125 of title 31, United States Code, as amended by this Act, for agency submissions of recommendations and justifications for plans and reports to sunset, modify, consolidate, or reduce the frequency of the submission of are also submitted as a separate attachment in conformity with the agency submission requirements of electronic copies of reports submitted by agencies under section 7244(a) of the James M. Inhofe National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023 (Public Law 117–263; chapter 41 of title 44, United States Code, note) for publication on the online portal established under section 7243 of such Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on this measure.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5301, I urge support across the aisle, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5301, the Eliminate Useless Reports Act. I thank my distinguished colleague from California, the ranking member of the Oversight and Accountability Committee, Subcommittee on National Security, the Border, and Foreign Affairs, Mr. GARCIA for introducing H.R. 5301. I am proud to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from California (Mr. ROBERT GARCIA) 2 minutes to discuss it.

Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support this commonsense bipartisan bill, the Eliminate Useless Reports Act, and I thank my co-lead, Representative GROTHMAN from Wisconsin, for all his work and support.

This bill is very simple. Congress, as we know, frequently requires that Federal agencies provide reports on var-

ious topics and issues. These reports provide Congress with important information, and we couldn't do our jobs without them.

However, drafting these reports often takes lots of time and resources.

Under this bill, every year, when agencies report their budget requests, they will also send a list of any congressional reports they believe that are outdated or duplicative. They can recommend that we sunset, modify, or consolidate these reports.

We, in Congress, are unable to actually decide what is needed. When I was mayor of Long Beach, I worked to cut red tape so we could support small businesses and develop more housing where we needed it most. In Congress, this is a bipartisan way to pursue that same goal which is cutting the red tape.

I thank the Senate leads on this bill, Senators Ossoff and Lankford. Finally, I will point out the bill has already passed the House once by voice vote. Now we just need to pass it again as the previous bill was adopted as a vehicle for separate legislation in the Senate.

Today, I hope we pass this back to the Senate so it can again be agreed upon by unanimous consent and send it to the President's desk. I urge everyone to vote for this legislation.

□ 1830

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, this bill would increase government efficiency and save taxpayer dollars by eliminating unnecessary reports.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Representatives GARCIA and GROTHMAN for their leadership on this issue and for the House Budget Committee's collaboration.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues on both sides to support the bill. I have no further speakers on this bill, and I am prepared to close.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5301, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 82;
H.R. 5342; and
H.R. 9495, if ordered.

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

SOCIAL SECURITY FAIRNESS ACT OF 2023

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 82) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 327, nays 75, answered “present” 1, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 456]

YEAS—327

Adams	Clyburn	Golden (ME)
Aderholt	Cohen	Goldman (NY)
Aguilar	Cole	Gonzales, Tony
Alford	Comer	Gonzalez, V.
Allred	Correa	Gooden (TX)
Amo	Costa	Gosar
Amodei	Courtney	Gottheimer
Auchincloss	Craig	Graves (LA)
Babin	Crockett	Graves (MO)
Bacon	Crow	Green (TN)
Balderson	Cuellar	Green, Al (TX)
Balint	Curtis	Greene (GA)
Banks	D'Esposito	Guest
Barr	Davids (KS)	Guthrie
Barragán	Davidson	Hageman
Beatty	Davis (IL)	Harder (CA)
Bera	Davis (NC)	Hayes
Bergman	De La Cruz	Higgins (LA)
Beyer	Dean (PA)	Hill
Bice	DeGette	Himes
Billirakis	DeLauro	Hinson
Bishop (GA)	DelBene	Horsford
Blumenauer	Deluzio	Houchin
Blunt Rochester	DeSaulnier	Hoyle (OR)
Boebert	DesJarlais	Hudson
Bonamici	Diaz-Balart	Huffman
Bost	Dingell	Huizenga
Boyle (PA)	Duarte	Issa
Brown	Ellzey	Ivey
Brownley	Emmer	Jackson (IL)
Budzinski	Escobar	Jackson (NC)
Burgess	Eshoo	Jackson (TX)
Bush	Espallat	Jacobs
Calvert	Ezell	James
Caraveo	Fallon	Jayapal
Carbajal	Feenstra	Jeffries
Cárdenas	Finstad	Johnson (LA)
Carey	Fischbach	Johnson (SD)
Carl	Fitzpatrick	Jordan
Carson	Fleischmann	Joyce (OH)
Carter (LA)	Fletcher	Joyce (PA)
Carter (TX)	Flood	Kaptur
Casar	Fong	Kean (NJ)
Case	Foster	Kelly (IL)
Casten	Foushee	Kelly (MS)
Castor (FL)	Frankel, Lois	Kelly (PA)
Castro (TX)	Franklin, Scott	Kennedy
Chavez-DeRemer	Frost	Khanna
Cherfilus-	Gallego	Kigans (VA)
McCormick	Garamendi	Kildee
Chu	Garbarino	Kiley
Ciscomani	Garcia (IL)	Kilmer
Clark (MA)	Garcia (TX)	Kim (CA)
Clarke (NY)	Garcia, Mike	Kim (NJ)
Cleaver	Garcia, Robert	Krishnamoorthi
Cloud	Gimenez	Kuster

LaLota	Napolitano	Sherman
LaMalfa	Neal	Sherrill
Lamborn	Neguse	Simpson
Landsman	Nehls	Slotkin
Langworthy	Nickel	Smith (NJ)
Larsen (WA)	Norcross	Smith (WA)
Latta	Nunn (IA)	Sorensen
LaTurner	Oberholte	Soto
Lawler	Ocasio-Cortez	Spanberger
Lee (CA)	Omar	Stansbury
Lee (FL)	Owens	Stanton
Lee (NV)	Pallone	Stauber
Lee (PA)	Panetta	Steel
Lesko	Pappas	Stevens
Letlow	Pelosi	Strickland
Levin	Peltola	Strong
Lieu	Pence	Suozi
Lofgren	Perez	Swallow
Lucas	Peters	Sykes
Luetkemeyer	Petterson	Takano
Luna	Pfluger	Tenney
Luttrell	Phillips	Thanedar
Lynch	Pingree	Thompson (CA)
Magaziner	Pocan	Thompson (MS)
Malliotakis	Porter	Thompson (PA)
Maloy	Posey	Titus
Manning	Pressley	Tlaib
Massie	Quigley	Tokuda
Mast	Ramirez	Tonko
Matsui	Raskin	Torres (CA)
McBath	Reschenthaler	Trahan
McCaul	Rodgers (WA)	Turner
McClain	Rogers (AL)	Underwood
McClellan	Rogers (KY)	Valadao
McCollum	Ross	Van Drew
McGarvey	Ruiz	Van Orden
McGovern	Rulli	Vargas
McIver	Ruppersberger	Vasquez
Meeks	Rutherford	Veasey
Menendez	Ryan	Velázquez
Meng	Salazar	Wagner
Meuser	Salinas	Walberg
Miller (OH)	Sánchez	Wasserman
Miller-Meeks	Sarbanes	Schultz
Mills	Scanlon	Waters
Molinaro	Schakowsky	Watson Coleman
Moore (AL)	Schiff	Weber (TX)
Moore (WI)	Schneider	Webster (FL)
Morelle	Scholten	Wenstrup
Moskowitz	Schrier	Williams (GA)
Moulton	Scott (VA)	Williams (NY)
Mrvan	Sessions	Williams (TX)
Mullin	Sewell	Yakym
Nadler		

NAYS—75

Allen	Foxx	Murphy
Arrington	Fry	Norman
Baird	Fulcher	Ogles
Bean (FL)	Good (VA)	Palmer
Bentz	Griffith	Perry
Biggs	Grothman	Rose
Bishop (NC)	Harris	Rosendale
Brecheen	Harshbarger	Rouzer
Burchett	Hern	Roy
Burlison	Hoyer	Schweikert
Cammack	Hunt	Scott, Austin
Carter (GA)	Johnson (GA)	Self
Cline	LaHood	Smith (NE)
Clyde	Larson (CT)	Smucker
Collins	Lopez	Spartz
Crane	Loudermilk	Stefanik
Crawford	Mace	Steil
Crenshaw	Mann	Steube
Doggett	McClintock	Tiffany
Donalds	McCormick	Timmons
Duncan	Miller (IL)	Van Duyne
Dunn (FL)	Miller (WV)	Westerman
Edwards	Moolenaar	Wilson (SC)
Estes	Moore (UT)	Womack
Fitzgerald	Moran	Zinke

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Smith (MO)

NOT VOTING—29

Armstrong	Granger	Newhouse
Bowman	Grijalva	Scott, David
Buchanan	Houlihan	Torres (NY)
Bucshon	Kamlager-Dove	Trone
Cartwright	Keating	Waltz
Connolly	Kustoff	Wexton
Evans	Leger Fernandez	Wild
Ferguson	McHenry	Wilson (FL)
Gaetz	Mfume	Wittman
Gomez	Mooney	

□ 1855

Messrs. SMUCKER, CLINE, LOPEZ, GOOD of Virginia, JOHNSON of Georgia, and CARTER of Georgia changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mses. PINGREE, MCCOLLUM, Messrs. HILL, GOSAR, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Messrs. CLYBURN, HUDSON, and BABIN changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. WEXTON. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was not able to be present to vote today. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 456.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, November 12, 2024.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a copy of a letter received from Ms. Christina Adkins, Director of Elections, with the Texas Office of the Secretary of State indicating that, according to the unofficial results for the Special General Election held on November 5, 2024, the Honorable Erica Lee Carter was elected Representative to Congress for the Eighteenth Congressional District of Texas.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KEVIN F. MCCUMBER,
Acting Clerk.

THE STATE OF TEXAS,
JANE NELSON, SECRETARY OF STATE,
November 8, 2024.

Hon. KEVIN F. MCCUMBER:
Acting Clerk, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. MCCUMBER: This is to advise you that the unofficial results of the Special Election held on Tuesday, November 5, 2024 for Representative in Congress from the Eighteenth Congressional District of Texas, show that ERICA LEE CARTER received 144,660 or 67.8% of the total number of votes cast for that office.

It would appear from these unofficial results that ERICA LEE CARTER was elected as Representative in Congress from the Eighteenth Congressional District of Texas.

To the best of our knowledge and belief at this time, there is no contest to this election.

As soon as the official results are certified to this office by all counties involved and certified by the Governor of Texas, an official Certificate of Election will be prepared for transmittal as required by law.

Sincerely,

CHRISTINA ADKINS,
Director of Elections.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, November 12, 2024.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a copy of a letter received from Ms. Meagan Wolfe, Administrator, with the Wisconsin Elections Commission indicating that, according to the unofficial results for the Special General Election held on November 5, 2024, the Honorable Tony Wied was elected Representative to Congress for the Eighth Congressional District of Wisconsin.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KEVIN F. MCCUMBER,
Acting Clerk.

Enclosure.

WISCONSIN ELECTIONS COMMISSION,
Madison, WI, November 11, 2024.

Hon. KEVIN F. MCCUMBER,
Acting Clerk, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. MCCUMBER: This is to advise you that the unofficial results of the Special Election held on Tuesday, November 5, 2024, for Representative in Congress from the Eighth Congressional District of Wisconsin show that Tony Wied received approximately 241,930 votes or 57.38% of the total number of votes cast for that office, excluding write-in votes and scattering data for all locations which have not yet been fully reported or canvassed by Wisconsin's election officials. Democratic candidate, Kristin Lysterly, has received approximately 179,862 votes or 42.62% of the total number of votes cast for this office. The Commission's web page provides a link to the real-time data posted by each county: <https://elections.wi.gov/wisconsin-county-election-websites>.

It would appear from these current, unofficial, and non-aggregate results that Tony Wied was elected as Representative in Congress from the Eighth Congressional District of Wisconsin. The latest date that the eleven counties in the Eighth Congressional District of Wisconsin may transmit their completed canvass is November 18, 2024, although they may do so earlier. The Chairwoman of the Wisconsin Elections Commission must conduct the canvass and certification process at the state level once any recount deadline has passed, and only then are the results official.

To the best of our knowledge and belief at this time, there is no contest to this election. Wisconsin Statutes would only allow a recount for this race if the trailing candidate were “aggrieved,” which in this race means the trailing candidate must trail by no more than one percent of the total votes cast. If a recount petition could be submitted, the last possible date for submission would be November 21, 2024, for this race, which is unlikely based on current, unofficial reporting.

As soon as the official results are certified to this office by all county officials involved, an official Certificate of Election will be prepared for transmittal as required by law.

Sincerely,

MEAGAN WOLFE,
Administrator, Wisconsin Elections
Commission.

**SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE
ERICA LEE CARTER, OF TEXAS,
AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE**

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable Erica Lee Carter, be permitted to take the oath of office today.

Her certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest and no question has been raised with regard to her election.

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

There was no objection.

**SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE
TONY WIED, OF WISCONSIN, AS A
MEMBER OF THE HOUSE**

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin, the Honorable Tony Wied, be permitted to take the oath of office today.

His certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest and no question has been raised with regard to his election.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS-ELECT

The SPEAKER. Will the Representatives-elect present themselves in the well.

All Members will rise and the Representatives-elect will please raise their right hand.

Mrs. Lee Carter of Texas and Mr. Tony Wied of Wisconsin appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear or affirm that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations, you are now Members of the 118th Congress.

**WELCOMING THE HONORABLE
ERICA LEE CARTER TO THE
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to welcome to the House a new addition from Texas, ERICA LEE CARTER. This is a somewhat bittersweet moment for all of us because it was only a few months ago that we gathered here to commemorate the life and legacy of her mother, Sheila Jackson Lee. There is more than physical resemblance between the two.

When I was elected in 1994 in the same small class of 13 that Sheila was a Member of, ERICA was a teenager. She has been here a number of times over the three decades that Sheila served. Sheila was a fierce advocate for justice who fought relentlessly for her community. ERICA, I know, has her mother's tenacity and her compassion.

She carries on a legacy of helping those with the least. She has led initiatives on economic equality and voting rights in Harris County. She spearheaded a funding drive for after-school programs. She has also worked to end discriminatory practices in the workplace and uplift minority- and women-owned businesses.

She is a graduate of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. She earned a master's degree at Duke University's Terry Sanford School of Public Policy. She began her career as an elementary schoolteacher in Houston. Her expertise in the classroom and in making education more accessible for every child, regardless of ZIP Code, is a great example of why her strong voice will be valuable.

While cancer cruelly cut Sheila's term short and ERICA will be with us for a short time, I believe that we can count on her to continue carrying the torch for social justice in whatever role she may play, and we welcome her tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mrs. LEE CARTER), our new colleague for her maiden speech.

Mrs. LEE CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman DOGGETT, my fellow colleagues in the Texas delegation, and Mr. JEFFRIES for welcoming me to the House.

I, Congresswoman ERICA LEE CARTER, rise on behalf of the 18th Congressional District of Texas to return their voice and their vote to this esteemed body, the United States House of Representatives, to finish the 118th Congress with dignity, honor, and service.

I thank God, the author and finisher of my faith, for this awesome privilege, which I do not take lightly.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my husband, Dr. Roy L. Carter, Jr., for his unwavering support and sense of humor that keeps me going. To my twin children, Roy Lee Carter, III, and Ellison Bennett Carter, I love you with all of my heart.

To my father, Dr. Elwyn C. Lee, your unconditional love and guidance has continued to lift me.

To my brother, Jason Lee, and cousin Whitney, thank you for being my biggest supporters.

To the Jacksons, Lees, Carters, Cannons, and other extended family, thank you for being with me throughout this enormously challenging time and serving as a source of strength and support.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be the fifth person to serve the 18th Congressional District of Texas, a line of service which began with the Honorable Barbara Jordan, who was the first

Black woman from the South to be elected to Congress. She was followed by the Honorable Mickey Leland, a global humanitarian who brought attention to the suffering of many around the world, particularly on the continent of Africa.

After Mickey came the Honorable Craig Washington, who was an astute jurist. Then came my mother, the Honorable Sheila Jackson Lee, a prolific legislator who served as a bridge from the civil rights era till now, and a dedicated public servant who was committed to making America better for her children.

I rise in the memory of my mother, the late, great Congresswoman Sheila Jackson Lee, who served this Chamber for nearly three decades. Her legacy of fierce advocacy, a voice for the voiceless, her unwavering commitment to speak truth to power shaped the lives of countless Americans. Her eloquence and mastery in the art of legislation brought forth reforms that echoed from Houston to the entire Nation.

She was a social justice leader who advocated tirelessly for women, survivors of violence, and the wrongfully accused. As a senior member of the Judiciary Committee, she always fought to ensure that the United States Constitution was a living, breathing document that lived up to its promise for all people. She held it close and knew it could create a more perfect Union that we all desire.

This is why she was proud to be the lead sponsor of the Juneteenth National Independence Day Act to recognize when freedom reached all America's shores. As an early member of the Homeland Security Committee, she worked to keep Americans safe at home and abroad and supported creating the Transportation Security Administration.

She was known to work across the aisle through all Presidential administrations and congressional terms, doing what was necessary to make progress, bring resources back to Houston, and bend the moral arc of the universe toward justice.

On behalf of my family, friends, and the 18th Congressional District, I offer my heartfelt thanks to her colleagues, now mine, who offered their support during her illness and beyond. Your kindness was a great comfort to her, and it reassured her that her work would endure.

As for this moment tonight, while joyful, it is bittersweet because I wish she were standing at this podium to finish the 118th Congress on her own terms. Nevertheless, there is much work to do, and it is my honor to finish what she started alongside each of you.

Mr. Speaker, I will stand for justice, freedom, economic opportunity, and the dignity for all Americans. I am so proud to serve all the people of the 18th Congressional District of Texas that starts near the bottoms of Third Ward, travels through Freedmen's Town where the newly emancipated slaves

settled and began to celebrate Juneteenth, steps into the Fifth Ward, the birthplace of Barbara and Mickey, travels toward the resilient Independence Heights, moves to North Forest then Humble, and then west toward Acres Homes.

Mr. Speaker, I pledge every day to work hard for my constituents because every day they work hard to reach their American Dream. I am grateful for this moment in time to do this work and be a small part of my mother's tremendous legacy in this body. May God bless our work and may God bless the United States of America.

WELCOMING THE HONORABLE TONY WIED TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the newest member of the Wisconsin delegation, TONY WIED, on being sworn in this evening.

TONY joins our delegation with an impressive three-decade career of starting, building, and running three retail outlets in northeast Wisconsin, including Dino Stop locations in Green Bay, Ledgeview, Manitowoc, New Franken, Little Suamico, and Abrams.

Through his years in business, TONY has learned a lot about the value of hard work, strong customer service, and uniting people around a common mission.

TONY has employed hundreds of Wisconsinites over the years and now brings that same commonsense business acumen to this body, where it is greatly needed. We need more people dealing with the common sense that requires you to be a small businessman, and he is going to help the everyday Americans pursue the American Dream.

Mr. Speaker, once again, I extend my heartfelt congratulations to TONY; his wife, Angela; and his four sons: Charlie, Frank, George, and Simon on this momentous occasion.

I certainly had a chance to see his four sons on the campaign trail. They are like a whirlwind across northeastern Wisconsin.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. WIED).

Mr. WIED. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Wisconsin, the Republican Dean of the delegation, Congressman GLENN GROTHMAN, for yielding.

I will start by expressing my deepest gratitude to my wife of 24 years, Angela, and also to my four boys and my mom and dad.

Family is everything to me, and all of you have made this journey so much fun and special. I also thank my constituents for placing their trust in me. It is a privilege to serve you and an honor of a lifetime.

Our country faces a lot of difficult challenges: record-high inflation, a

border crisis, and increasing crime rates in our neighborhoods, to name only a few.

Now is the time to bring some Wisconsin common sense to Washington to lower costs, secure our border, and rein in out-of-control government spending.

I ran for Congress to solve America's toughest problems, and I pledge to work with my congressional colleagues to lower prices for northeast Wisconsin's middle-class families, small businesses, and farmers by putting more money back in their pockets.

Mr. Speaker, I am excited to get to work.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the administration of the oaths of office to the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Wisconsin, the whole number of the House is 434.

EQUAL TREATMENT OF PUBLIC SERVANTS ACT OF 2023

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5342) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to replace the windfall elimination provision with a formula equalizing benefits for certain individuals with noncovered employment, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 175, nays 225, answered “present” 1, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 457]

YEAS—175

Aderholt
Alford
Allen
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Baird
Balderson
Barr
Bean (FL)
Bentz
Bergman
Bice
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Bost
Brecheen
Burchett
Burgess
Burlison
Cammack
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Case
Ciscomani
Cline
Cloud

Clyde
Cole
Collins
Comer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Curtis
Davidson
De La Cruz
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duarte
Duncan
Dunn (FL)
Edwards
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Ezell
Fallon
Feenstra
Finstad
Fitzgerald
Fleischmann
Flood
Fong
Franklin, Scott

Fry
Fulcher
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez, V.
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Guest
Guthrie
Hageman
Harris
Harshbarger
Hern
Hill
Hinson
Houchin
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunt
Issa
Jackson (TX)
James
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan

Joyce (PA)
Kelly (MS)
Kiggans (VA)
Kim (CA)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Langworthy
Latta
LaTurner
Lee (FL)
Lesko
Letlow
Lopez
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luna
Luttrell
Mace
Maloy
Mann
Massie
Mast
McClain
McClintock
McCormick
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (OH)

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Amo
Auchincloss
Bacon
Balint
Barragán
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Biggs
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Boebert
Bonamici
Boyle (PA)
Brown
Brownley
Budzinski
Bush
Caraveo
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Casar
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chavez-DeRemer
Cherfilus-
McCormick
Chu
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crane
Crockett
Crow
D'Esposito
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Davis (NC)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Escobar
Eshoo
Espallat
Fischbach
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Foster
Foushee

Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Mills
Moolenaar
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Moran
Murphy
Nehls
Norman
Nunn (IA)
Oberholte
Ogles
Owens
Palmer
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reschenthaler
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rulli
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin

NAYS—225

Fox
Frankel, Lois
Frost
Garbarino
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Garcia, Mike
Garcia, Robert
Gimenez
Golden (ME)
Goldman (NY)
Gottheimer
Graves (LA)
Green, Al (TX)
Grothman
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Higgins (LA)
Himes
Horsford
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jackson (NC)
Jacobs
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Kean (NJ)
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kiley
Kilmer
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
LaLota
Landsman
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawler
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Lee Carter
Levin
Lieu
Lofgren
Lynch
Magaziner
Malliotakis
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCaul
McClellan
McCollum
McGarvey
McGovern
McIver
Meeks

Sessions
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smucker
Spartz
Steel
Steil
Steube
Strong
Tennet
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Valadao
Van Dуйne
Wagner
Walberg
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wied
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

Menendez
Meng
Molinaro
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Nickel
Norcross
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pelosi
Peltola
Pence
Perez
Peters
Petterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Raskin
Ross
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rutherford
Ryan
Salinas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Self
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Sorensen
Soto
Spanberger
Stansbury
Stanton
Stauber
Stevens
Strickland
Suozy
Swalwell
Sykes

Takano Torres (NY)
 Thanedar Trahan
 Thompson (CA) Trone
 Thompson (MS) Underwood
 Titus Van Drew
 Tlaib Van Orden
 Tokuda Vargas
 Tonko Vasquez
 Torres (CA) Veasey

Velázquez
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watson Coleman
 Wild
 Williams (GA)
 Williams (NY)

Brecheen
 Budzinski
 Burchett
 Burgess
 Burlison
 Caraveo
 Carey
 Carl
 Carter (GA)
 Carter (TX)
 Case
 Castor (FL)
 Chavez-DeRemer
 Ciscomani
 Cline
 Cloud
 Clyde
 Cole
 Collins
 Comer
 Costa
 Craig
 Crane
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Cuellar
 Curtis
 D'Esposito
 Davids (KS)
 Davidson
 Davis (NC)
 De La Cruz
 DesJarlais
 Diaz-Balart
 Dingell
 Donalds
 Duarte
 Duncan
 Dunn (FL)
 Edwards
 Ellzey
 Emmer
 Estes
 Ezell
 Fallon
 Feenstra
 Finstad
 Fischbach
 Fitzgerald
 Fitzpatrick
 Fleischmann
 Flood
 Fong
 Foxx
 Frankel, Lois
 Franklin, Scott
 Fry
 Fulcher
 Garbarino
 Garcia, Mike
 Gimenez
 Golden (ME)
 Gonzalez, V.
 Good (VA)
 Gooden (TX)
 Gosar
 Gottheimer
 Graves (LA)
 Graves (MO)
 Green (TN)
 Greene (GA)
 Griffith
 Grothman
 Guest
 Guthrie
 Hageman
 Harder (CA)
 Harris
 Harshbarger

Hayes
 Hern
 Higgins (LA)
 Hill
 Hinson
 Houchin
 Hoyer
 Hudson
 Huizenga
 Hunt
 Issa
 Jackson (TX)
 James
 Johnson (LA)
 Johnson (SD)
 Jordan
 Joyce (OH)
 Joyce (PA)
 Kaptur
 Kean (NJ)
 Kelly (MS)
 Kelly (PA)
 Kiggans (VA)
 Kiley
 Kim (CA)
 LaHood
 LaLota
 LaMalfa
 Lamborn
 Landsman
 Langworthy
 Latta
 LaTurner
 Lawler
 Lee (FL)
 Lee (NV)
 Letlow
 Levin
 Lopez
 Loudermilk
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Luttrell
 Mace
 Malliotakis
 Maloy
 Mann
 Manning
 Mast
 McBeth
 McCaul
 McClain
 McClintock
 McCormick
 Meng
 Meuser
 Miller (IL)
 Miller (OH)
 Miller (WV)
 Miller-Meeks
 Mills
 Molinaro
 Moolenaar
 Moore (AL)
 Moore (UT)
 Moore (WI)
 Moran
 Moskowitz
 Mrvan
 Murphy
 Nehls
 Norcross
 Norman
 Nunn (IA)
 Obernolte
 Ogles
 Owens
 Pallone
 Palmer

Panetta
 Pappas
 Pence
 Perez
 Perry
 Pfluger
 Posey
 Reschenthaler
 Rodgers (WA)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rose
 Rosendale
 Rouzer
 Roy
 Rulli
 Rutherford
 Ryan
 Salazar
 Scalise
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Scholten
 Schrier
 Schweikert
 Scott, Austin
 Self
 Sessions
 Sherman
 Simpson
 Slotkin
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smucker
 Sorensen
 Spartz
 Stanton
 Stauber
 Steel
 Stefanik
 Steil
 Steube
 Stevens
 Strickland
 Strong
 Suozzi
 Sykes
 Tenney
 Thanedar
 Thompson (PA)
 Tiffany
 Timmons
 Torres (CA)
 Torres (NY)
 Turner
 Valadao
 Van Drew
 Van Duyne
 Van Orden
 Vargas
 Vasquez
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup
 Westerman
 Wied
 Williams (NY)
 Williams (TX)
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Womack
 Yakym
 Zinke

Goldman (NY)
 Green, Al (TX)
 Himes
 Horsford
 Hoyle (OR)
 Huffman
 Ivey
 Jackson (IL)
 Jackson (NC)
 Jacobs
 Jayapal
 Jeffries
 Johnson (GA)
 Kelly (IL)
 Kennedy
 Khanna
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Krishnamoorthi
 Kuster
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Lee (CA)
 Lee (PA)
 Lee Carter
 Lieu
 Lofgren
 Lynch
 Magaziner
 Massie
 Matsui

McClellan
 McCollum
 McGarvey
 McGovern
 McIver
 Meeks
 Menendez
 Morelle
 Moulton
 Mullin
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Neguse
 Nickel
 Ocasio-Cortez
 Omar
 Pelosi
 Peltola
 Peters
 Pettersen
 Phillips
 Pingree
 Pocan
 Porter
 Pressley
 Quigley
 Ramirez
 Raskin
 Ross
 Ruiz

Ruppersberger
 Salinas
 Sánchez
 Sarbanes
 Scanlon
 Schakowsky
 Scott (VA)
 Sewell
 Sherrill
 Smith (WA)
 Soto
 Spanberger
 Stansbury
 Swalwell
 Takano
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Titus
 Tlaib
 Tokuda
 Tonko
 Trahan
 Trone
 Underwood
 Veasey
 Velázquez
 Waters
 Watson Coleman
 Wild
 Williams (GA)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Smith (MO)

NOT VOTING—33

Armstrong Gallego McHenry
 Banks Garamendi Mfume
 Bowman Gomez Mooney
 Buchanan Granger Newhouse
 Buoshon Grijalva Salazar
 Calvert Houlihan Scott, David
 Cartwright Kamlager-Dove Stefanik
 Connolly Keating Waltz
 Evans Kim (NJ) Wexton
 Ferguson Kustoff Wilson (FL)
 Gaetz Leger Fernandez Wittman

□ 1919

Ms. PEREZ changed her vote from "yea" to "nay."

So (two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. HOULAHAN. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 456, H.R. 82, and NAY on Roll Call No. 457, H.R. 5342.

STOP TERROR-FINANCING AND TAX PENALTIES ON AMERICAN HOSTAGES ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOST). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 9495) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to postpone tax deadlines and reimburse paid late fees for United States nationals who are unlawfully or wrongfully detained or held hostage abroad, to terminate the tax-exempt status of terrorist supporting organizations, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. DOGGETT. 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 256, nays 145, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 458]

YEAS—256

Aderholt Bacon Bergman
 Alford Baird Bice
 Allen Balderson Biggs
 Allred Banks Bilirakis
 Amodei Barr Bishop (NC)
 Arrington Bean (FL) Boebert
 Babin Bentz Bost

Adams
 Aguilar
 Amo
 Auchincloss
 Balint
 Barragán
 Beatty
 Bera
 Beyer
 Bishop (GA)
 Blumenauer
 Blunt Rochester
 Bonamici
 Boyle (PA)
 Brown
 Brownley
 Bush
 Carbajal

NAYS—145

Cárdenas
 Carson
 Carter (LA)
 Casar
 Casten
 Castro (TX)
 Cherfilus-McCormick
 Chu
 Clark (MA)
 Clarke (NY)
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Cohen
 Correa
 Courtney
 Crockett
 Crow

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1928

Mr. THANEDAR changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1930

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEMBRANCE OF THE HONORABLE DAVID HOBSON

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise, along with my dear colleagues on both sides of the aisle, as dean of the Ohio delegation with a very grateful but heavy heart as we honor the memory of our distinguished former Ohio colleague, Congressman DAVID HOBSON, who passed away on October 6, 2024.

DAVID was a true patriot, dedicated to accomplishing innovative and tangible results and projects of merit. To all of his colleagues, he was a personal friend whose impact will be felt for generations. He embodied a joy of life. It was fun to know DAVE, and he devoted his life to his family and serving the people of greater Springfield and Ohio.

His 18-year tenure in Congress was marked by his enthusiasm, remarkable perseverance, and relentless commitment to achieve results. As he ascended to significant roles, including

as ranking member of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies and chair of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies, he distinguished himself with unwavering dedication to the defense and sustenance of our country.

What set DAVID apart was his precious ability to work across the aisle, and this is a legacy other Members could do well to learn from. He not only valued bipartisanship, but he thrived on it. His achievements from the shores of Normandy, France, to Springfield, Ohio's betterment are a testament to his profound tenacity, legacy of service, and leadership.

His wit and humor brought light to our discussions, and his insights were invaluable.

We all will sorely miss his visits, his laughter, and his unceasing efforts to improve the living conditions for his constituents and all of America.

Today, all of us extend our deepest sympathies to his beloved wife, Carolyn; his children, Susan, Lynn, and Doug; and his family, constituents, and friends.

As we remember Congressman HOBSON today, let us carry forward his exemplary spirit of service and dedication, and may his soul rest in eternal peace. May his legacy inspire us all.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues if they could please join us in a moment of silence in recognition of his good life.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman KAPTUR for calling to the attention of our colleagues the distinguished service of DAVID HOBSON.

When she said he worked across the aisle, that is exactly what he did, with respect for the dignity and the views of all of us in this body.

I had the privilege of traveling with him to theaters of war, with him and Jack Murtha, his pal. I have had the joy of enjoying the candy that he would bring from Ohio, saying it was the best chocolate candy ever.

I also had deep gratitude to him for what he did to help us with the Presidio in San Francisco, for our appropriations funding, again reaching across the aisle.

This was a very special person, a person full of joy but very serious about the legislation and very committed to bipartisanship in the body. It was an honor to serve with him. I join in extending condolences to his family.

Mr. Speaker, I thank his family for sharing him with us. DAVID HOBSON was a blessing to our country.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EDWARDS). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further

proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

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

GAO INSPECTOR GENERAL PARITY ACT

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1510) to amend provisions relating to the Office of the Inspector General of the Government Accountability Office, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1510

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "GAO Inspector General Parity Act".

SEC. 2. OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE GOVERNMENT ACCOUNT- ABILITY OFFICE.

Section 705 of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by inserting "(A)" before "The Inspector General";

(ii) in subparagraph (A), as so designated, by striking the second sentence; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

"(B) If the Inspector General is removed from office or is transferred to another position or location within the Government Accountability Office, the Comptroller General shall communicate in writing the substantive rationale, including detailed and case-specific reasons, for any such removal or transfer to both Houses of Congress (including to the appropriate congressional committees), not later than 30 days before the removal or transfer.

"(C) If there is an open or completed inquiry into the Inspector General that relates to the removal or transfer of the Inspector General under subparagraph (A), the written communication required under subparagraph (B) shall—

"(i) identify each entity that is conducting, or that conducted, the inquiry; and

"(ii) in the case of a completed inquiry, contain the findings made during the inquiry.

"(D) Nothing in this paragraph shall prohibit a personnel action otherwise authorized by law, other than transfer or removal."

(B) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

"(3)(A) Subject to the other provisions of this paragraph, only the Comptroller General may place the Inspector General on non-duty status.

"(B) If the Comptroller General places the Inspector General on non-duty status, the Comptroller General shall communicate in writing the substantive rationale, including detailed and case-specific reasons, for the change in status to both Houses of Congress (including to the appropriate congressional committees) not later than 15 days before the date on which the change in status takes effect, except that the Comptroller General may submit that communication not later

than the date on which the change in status takes effect if—

"(i) the Comptroller General has made a determination that the continued presence of the Inspector General in the workplace poses a specific threat; and

"(ii) in the communication, the Comptroller General includes a report on the determination described in clause (i), which shall include—

"(I) the substantive rationale, including detailed and case-specific reasons, for the determination made under clause (i);

"(II) an identification of each entity that is conducting, or that conducted, any inquiry upon which the determination under clause (i) was made; and

"(III) in the case of an inquiry described in subclause (II) that is completed, the findings made during that inquiry.

"(C) The Comptroller General may not place the Inspector General on non-duty status during the 30-day period preceding the date on which the Inspector General is removed or transferred under paragraph (2)(A) unless the Comptroller General—

"(i) has made a determination that the continued presence of the Inspector General in the workplace poses a specific threat; and

"(ii) not later than the date on which the change in status takes effect, submits to both Houses of Congress (including to the appropriate congressional committees) a written communication that contains the information required under subparagraph (B), including the report required under clause (ii) of that subparagraph.

"(D) Nothing in this paragraph may be construed to limit or otherwise modify any statutory protection that is afforded to the Inspector General or a personnel action that is otherwise authorized by law."

(2) in subsection (f)—

(A) by striking "The Comptroller General" and inserting the following:

"(1) PROHIBITION.—The Comptroller General"; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

"(2) BUDGET INDEPENDENCE.—The Comptroller General shall include the annual budget request of the Inspector General in the budget of the Government Accountability Office without change."; and

(3) in subsection (g)—

(A) in paragraph (1), in the second sentence, by striking "except that no personnel of the Office may be paid at an annual rate greater than \$1,000 less than the annual rate of pay of the Inspector General"; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

"(5) LEGAL ADVICE.—The Inspector General shall, in accordance with applicable laws and regulations governing selections, appointments, and employment at the Government Accountability Office, obtain legal advice from a counsel reporting directly to the Inspector General or another Inspector General."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. 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 this measure.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1510, the GAO Inspector General Parity Act.

Two years ago, Congress passed sweeping bipartisan reforms for the inspector general community. Those reforms, passed in the fiscal year 2023 NDAA, provided critical reforms to enable both the independence of Federal agency inspectors general and proper congressional oversight over their activities.

As a legislative branch entity, the Government Accountability Office's inspector general was not included in those reforms. H.R. 5300 fixes that by providing the GAO inspector general the same resources and oversight now provided to other IGs across the government.

Those reforms include requiring the head of GAO to notify the Congress if the GAO inspector general is to be removed or transferred, providing Congress the knowledge it needs to weigh in on such decisions if necessary.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1510, the GAO Inspector General Parity Act. I commend both Senator MICHAEL BRAUN for introducing the bill and also my colleagues, Representatives ROBERT GARCIA and LISA MCCLAIN, for introducing the House companion.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROBERT GARCIA) to explain the bill.

□ 1945

Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge the House to pass the bipartisan Government Accountability Office Inspector General Parity Act.

The GAO, of course, is an independent, nonpartisan agency responsible for monitoring government operations to detect waste, fraud, and abuse.

Like other Federal agencies, the GAO has an inspector general watching over their operations, conducting audits, improving efficiency, and ensuring the agency follows the law.

Congress has in the past several years made important reforms to strengthen the inspectors general systems for all of our agencies, to guarantee their independence, and to make sure they have the resources and the tools that they need.

Those reforms regrettably did not apply to the GAO. Our bill is a simple and bipartisan fix to correct these oversights.

Among other reforms, we are going to ensure the GAO has the independent general counsel they need to communicate budget requests directly to Congress without any sort of interference.

The bill did pass the Senate unanimously, thanks to the Senate sponsors, Senator and now Governor-elect MIKE BRAUN and Homeland Security and Government Affairs Committee Chairman GARY PETERS.

In the House, I am grateful for the support of Chairman COMER, Ranking Member RASKIN, and my House co-lead, Representative LISA MCCLAIN of Michigan.

This bill passed unanimously by voice vote from the Oversight Committee, and I urge adoption of this long overdue bill to send to the President's desk and urge it to become law.

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

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers on this bill, and I am prepared to close.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has the only time remaining.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I encourage my House colleagues to support this commonsense bill to support the GAO Inspector General in carrying out their oversight mission.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1510.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DESSIE A. BEBOUT POST OFFICE

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2274) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 112 Wyoming Street in Shoshoni, Wyoming, as the "Dessie A. Bebout Post Office".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2274

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

SECTION 1. DESSIE A. BEBOUT POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 112 Wyoming Street in Shoshoni, Wyoming, shall be known and designated as the "Dessie A. Bebout Post Office".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Dessie A. Bebout Post Office".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. 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 this measure.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 2274, which would name a post office in Wyoming for Dessie A. Bebout, and I encourage support from both sides of the aisle.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 2274. Dessie Bebout was a lifelong public servant, and this legislation would honor her legacy by naming a post office in Shoshoni, Wyoming, after her.

We support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I encourage my House colleagues to support this bill honoring a veteran and a local postmaster, Dessie A. Bebout.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 2274.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FIRST LIEUTENANT THOMAS MICHAEL MARTIN POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3267) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 410 Dakota Avenue South in Huron, South Dakota, as the "First Lieutenant Thomas Michael Martin Post Office Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 3267

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

SECTION 1. FIRST LIEUTENANT THOMAS MICHAEL MARTIN POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 410 Dakota Avenue South in Huron, South Dakota, shall be known and designated as the "First Lieutenant Thomas Michael Martin Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "First Lieutenant Thomas Michael Martin Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. 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 this measure.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 3267, which would name a post office in South Dakota for First Lieutenant Thomas Michael Martin.

I encourage support on both sides of the aisle, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in support of S. 3267, which would honor the enduring legacy of First Lieutenant Thomas Michael Martin by naming a post office building in Huron, South Dakota, after him.

He enlisted in the U.S. Army in 1998 and pursued his military and academic education at West Point. He completed his armor officer basic training at Fort Knox and served as a dedicated armor officer.

Tragically, while conducting combat operations in Iraq in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom, First Lieutenant Martin was killed in action on October 14, 2007. He was 27 years old.

Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I encourage my House colleagues to support this bill honoring First Lieutenant Thomas Michael Martin. I encourage support on both sides of the aisle, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 3267.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN CHARLES TRAUB POST OFFICE

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3419) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1765 Camp Hill Bypass in Camp Hill, Pennsylvania, as the "John Charles Traub Post Office".

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

S. 3419

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

SECTION 1. JOHN CHARLES TRAUB POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1765 Camp Hill Bypass in Camp Hill, Pennsylvania, shall be known and designated as the "John Charles Traub Post Office".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "John Charles Traub Post Office".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. 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 this measure.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 3419, which would honor John Charles Traub by naming a post office in Pennsylvania in his honor, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in support of S. 3419. John Charles Traub, otherwise known as Chuck, dedicated his life to this country. He was a World War II, U.S. Army Air Corps veteran and served 40 years in the Postal Service, including 10 years as postmaster of Camp Hill in Pennsylvania. He was a dedicated member of numerous civil society groups and church organizations in Camp Hill, including the Camp Hill Fire Company and The American Legion. He volunteered at Holy Spirit Hospital. He was a Camp Hill Borough officer and also participated at the Church of God Nursing Home.

Chuck passed away on November 6, 2017, at the age 94, leaving a great legacy of community service.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support and urge passage of this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I encourage my House colleagues to support this bill, to honor John Charles Traub, a veteran and postmaster who served his community with honor.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr.

HIGGINS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 3419.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STAFF SERGEANT ROBB LURA ROLFING POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2143) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 320 South 2nd Avenue in Sioux Falls, South Dakota, as the "Staff Sergeant Robb Lura Rolwing Post Office Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2143

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

SECTION 1. STAFF SERGEANT ROBB LURA ROLFING POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 320 South 2nd Avenue in Sioux Falls, South Dakota, shall be known and designated as the "Staff Sergeant Robb Lura Rolwing Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Staff Sergeant Robb Lura Rolwing Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on this measure.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 2143, which names a post office in South Dakota for Staff Sergeant Robb Lura Rolwing who served with honor.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support on both sides of the aisle, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am rising in support of S. 2143. Staff Sergeant Robb Lura Rolwing studied astronomy and physics at Vassar. He enlisted in the U.S. Army in January of 2023 and was stationed at Fort Campbell in Kentucky with 101st Airborne Division. He completed his first tour in Iraq before joining the U.S. Army Special Forces where he

earned his Green Beret. At the age of 29, on June 20, 2007, Staff Sergeant Roling was killed in action in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to honor his life by naming a post office in Sioux Falls, South Dakota, after him, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I encourage my House colleagues to support this bill, to honor Staff Sergeant Roling, who paid the ultimate sacrifice in protecting our country, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 2143.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING THE LIFE OF DARIEL VASQUEZ

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

Mr. LAWLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Darriel Vasquez, a courageous young man from Pomona, New York, who tragically lost his life at just 18 years old.

Dariel was a dedicated parks and recreation aide with the New York State Parks Department and a selfless volunteer with the wildland fire crew, who gave his life battling a wildfire in Sterling Forest in Greenwood Lake.

A 2024 graduate and captain of the Ramapo High School varsity baseball team, Darriel was a true leader, beloved by his teammates, coworkers, and friends alike.

His coach described him as authentic, a young man who inspired everyone around him with his kindness, strength, and unwavering dedication.

Dariel was a star player and a beloved son, brother, and friend. He had big dreams, plans for college, and hopes for the future, all left tragically unfulfilled.

At his vigil, family, friends, and community members gathered to remember a young man who embodied the spirit of service and who bravely gave his life to protect our Hudson Valley community.

May Darriel Vasquez rest in peace.

□ 2000

LA PURISIMA CATHOLIC CHURCH'S 100-YEAR ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to celebrate the 100th anniversary of La Purisima Catholic Church, that

is 100 years of service to our community in the city of Orange.

Established in 1924, the church originally served local residents and seasonal migrant farm workers from Mexico. As the city of Orange grew, so did La Purisima. It adapted to meet the needs of its new parishioners, leading to some of the first trilingual services in the Diocese of Orange County.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing La Purisima Catholic Church as it celebrates 100 years of great service. We look forward to the next 100 years.

Congratulations for service well done.

RECOGNIZING BROOKE COTTRELL FROM CORRYTON, TENNESSEE

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

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker, I recognize Brooke Cottrell from Corryton, Tennessee, who recently graduated from Lincoln Memorial University as a physician assistant. She is the daughter of my good friend, Scott Moore.

Brooke has always been a very good student. She graduated from Gibbs High School as their valedictorian in 2015 and attended East Tennessee State University where she graduated in 2018 before heading to LMU.

She was inspired to become a physician assistant because tragically she lost her Meemaw and Papi to COVID. She said: "God called me to take care of people during some of the most vulnerable and scary moments in people's lives. I want to use my medical training and faith in God to provide healing and comfort."

Along with her academic achievements, Brooke has a heart to help those in need. She has spent a lot of her time working with local community organizations to help folks who are less fortunate, and she wants to use her career to continue taking care of east Tennesseans who need it most.

Brooke is a true Tennessean, so, of course, she loves the country life, farming, and UT football. She enjoys the opportunity to take in the natural beauty of east Tennessee while hiking and spending time with her dogs, Enzo and Biscuit.

I congratulate Brooke on her recent graduation.

I am looking forward to seeing Brooke's bright future that she has ahead of her.

I drove by their house, Mr. Speaker, on the day of her celebration. My daughter asked me what was going on. I said: Honey, I don't know, but, obviously, we weren't invited.

Oddly enough, when I got home I found the invitation, so I missed the party.

GAVIN NEWSOM'S POLITICAL THEATER

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, once again, California Governor Gavin Newsom is prioritizing political theater over solving California's real issues.

While he is busy here in Washington touting his so-called Trump-proofing efforts, Californians are struggling under the weight of his failed policies.

He claims his latest moves on guns, climate, housing, and healthcare are about protecting Californians, but let's get real. Newsom's high-cost rail project, the high-speed train, is costing four times what it originally was projected. It is over budget and many years behind schedule. He is pushing for more taxpayer funding for that.

The California Air Resources Board, known as CARB, is coming down with even more rules that are driving the cost of fuel.

California is already about \$1 per gallon higher than the rest of the country, maybe even \$1.50. They just added rules the other day that will raise it anywhere from 47 cents to 65 cents per gallon or even more because of some climate change rule.

Are they tone-deaf to what just happened?

Not to electioneer here, but the people of this country spoke loudly that they are tired of unnecessary pain being inflicted upon them by governments. The State of California is stepping up to do that even more so, and they want the Federal Government to help them with EPA and more waivers to do this kind of stuff that will hurt families and hurt industry.

UNITED METHODIST CHURCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by stating some very related facts.

First and foremost, I am a proud United Methodist. In fact, I am an ordained United Methodist elder. I served one church for 38 years as pastor. The church, St. James United Methodist Church, is located in Kansas City, Missouri. I followed the Reverend Phillip J. Lawson as the pastor.

Phil Lawson was a very prominent social activist in Kansas City. In terms of his activism, he followed his big brother, the inimitable James Lawson. James Lawson was the civil rights iconic pastor of the Centenary United Methodist Church in Memphis, Tennessee.

It was Jim Lawson who, upon returning from India spending 3 years working under the tutelage of Mahatma Gandhi, met Martin Luther King, Jr., and began to talk about this theory of nonviolence.

Dr. King invited him to move to the South and work with this fledgling organization called the Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

Jim Lawson also remained in Memphis where he began to tutor individuals who were going to participate in the freedom rides.

Jim Lawson was a major human being, and he is someone who helped give me the guidance I needed as a young person becoming involved in not only the United Methodist Church but the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. Jim Lawson was so prophetic to all of the young people, including our own John Lewis, who served here with us for many years, for several decades.

It was a pleasure of mine when I left the mayor's office in Kansas City to be given a radio program that was broadcast live in Kansas City from Union Station.

I brought in various guests. My first guest was the Reverend James Lawson. I talked about things that I thought people wanted to know. He is the pastor who invited Martin Luther King to Memphis when Dr. King was killed. He is also the first layperson to go in and meet with James Earl Ray. He is the person who after the assassination of Dr. King created all of the national attention not only on the assassination but on the movement.

James Lawson died a few months ago at the age of 95. We thank God for giving him those years.

When I decided to run for Congress, Jim Lawson said: I hope that you will call and see if there is some kind of way that you can stay in the United Methodist Building.

Of course, my first question was: What is the United Methodist Building?

At that time I did not have a full knowledge about the United Methodist Building here in Washington, D.C.

Decades ago, there was a man with tremendous vision in the early 1900s, the Reverend Clarence True Wilson who had this vision of a building right across the street from the United States Capitol. This building was initially supposed to be the headquarters of the Methodist Episcopal Church's efforts to pass the laws relating to Prohibition. I guess I should say first that it didn't work. However, I don't think we Methodists should be upset because the prohibition God gave Adam and Eve didn't work either.

I do think, however, that the building of that building located right across the street from us here has been not only a place for United Methodist witness but a place where people from all over the world have been able to come and hold meetings. It has also been a place where people who were demonstrating could find a place where they could get a cool sip of water. It was a place where people in emergencies could come in. It was a place of refuge. Frankly, it still is a place of refuge.

I think a part of the definition of what that Methodist building became was a result of the March on Washington in 1968. People came to the March on Washington, mainly Methodists, gathered around the Methodist building and in the Methodist building.

It was a place where Native Americans were able to gather later for demonstrations and where they could come and discuss the major issues.

I was fortunate enough to bump into Jim Winkler who responded to my inquiry about living in the Methodist building. I am proud and pleased to say that was 20 years ago. Twenty years ago, I came to Washington and moved into the United Methodist Building at 110 Maryland Avenue, NE, right across the street from this Capitol.

I will have to say that many of my early mornings were started before I wanted to start my early morning because it is also right across the street from the United States Supreme Court, and the protesters will quite often ignore my sleeping pattern and will begin to protest in the wee hours of the morning. I would say 6 o'clock is wee hours of the morning for me.

I think that people have come now, and here we are all these years later, over 100 years. Now, after 100 years, the Methodist building stands as a monument not only to a denomination but for a large piece of the United States population. That is the population of people who believe that we all have the right to worship as we please. It is a part of the legislative and founding articles of the United States.

People will be able to come by the Methodist building. Some people say that we sometimes have controversial messages out in front of the building, and I like to tell them that if you stay around long enough and walk by here long enough, you will finally see something that you like. There will be some kind of sign there that you can embrace.

All of those messages that are placed there are messages that we believe help to create the kind of government that all of us in reality would like to have, which is a free and just system of government and the right to worship as we choose.

We are not keeping that building open for the purpose of proselytizing and trying to convert people to the United Methodist Church.

□ 2015

It stands, therefore, as the United Methodist Building, but it is open to every single person who desires to come into those doors.

There are coalitions. For example, Jim Winkler, who I spoke of earlier, chaired a coalition opposing the Iraq war during President George W. Bush's administration. There were people who, at the same time, understood that George W. Bush was the son of a person who had been a part of another denomination, but the President at that time, President Bush, was a United Meth-

odist. One of the places that was considered for his daughter's wedding was the United Methodist Building, performed by the Reverend Kirbyjon Caldwell, the United Methodist pastor of Houston, Texas.

In the United Methodist Building, there are, of course, apartments, and there are offices of many different denominations. In fact, in that building, one can find just about any denomination actively involved in the affairs of this country officing in that building.

During the whole process of the Affordable Care Act, which brought tens of thousands of people from around the country to Washington, D.C., that place did two things. One, it was a place where this coalition that had formed around the Affordable Care Act could come and meet, but it was also a place where those many people stopped when they needed water or needed some other emergency service. I was here. I saw it. I witnessed it. I was inconvenienced by it because I couldn't get to my apartment for several days.

We look at the United Methodist Church as just a religious organization, but the United Methodist Building, which is representing the United Methodist Church, is much more than just a religious organization.

I also have to say that it is not a perfect location, but it is about as good as you can get. We don't have any parking. There is no parking there.

I have to tell a story that may be true. The Senate was trying to decide whether to build another office building. It was decided that the best location was on the lot that we now know as the 110 Maryland site. The United States Government, of course, through eminent domain, can take property and give a fair amount for that property.

As the story goes, the Methodist bishop for this area knew about this plan from a Member of the United States Senate, and this Senator, giving the bishop that information, told the bishop he wished that there was something he could do to prevent this from happening, but it was going to happen.

This bishop began to think: What can we do? He got a list of all the members of the United Methodist Church who were Members of the United States Senate. He sent them all a letter inviting them to come over to the building. When they came to the building, he said: Look, we have been thinking about converting some of these offices into apartments, and we just wanted to make sure that the Members of the Senate who were a part of the United Methodist Church would have the first opportunity to get an apartment.

Needless to say, the eminent domain faded and faded away. From that point on, as the story goes, those apartments have been there. When I first moved into the United Methodist Building, my next-door neighbor was Al Gore's mom, who was a Baptist. I lived there for about a year during the time that she was there, and then she passed.

The reality was I knew Al Gore through politics, so I could always tell

when I was very secure in the United Methodist Church. Those were the days that Al Gore visited his mom, coming into the church with Secret Service. I told my wife and family back in Kansas City that those were the safest moments of my life, when there were 12 or 13 Secret Service agents running in.

I also am very proud that when they came to clean up her apartment after she had passed, she forgot one thing. I walked in there during the last few hours of the cleaning, and there was a yard placard which read "Al Gore for President." I have that in my apartment right now. I kept that as a point of remembering not only Mrs. Gore but also my friendship with the Vice President, Al Gore, also a former Member of the United States House.

Let me just say in conclusion that, on January 6, I was here in Washington. In my office, I had no idea of what was going on. When we turned on the annunciator and found out what was going on here at the Capitol, my great fear was that I would not be able to go home.

Then, of course, about 3 a.m. in the morning, after we took care of business in here by confirming the electoral college's report, I walked out of the building and began to walk to the fence and go to my apartment.

I was met by several police officers who said they had to accompany me. The police were from the Capitol Police force. Also, most people don't realize this, but there is a Supreme Court Police force. I mention that because I tell people that the United Methodist Building is one of the safest places. There are actually three police departments taking care of the whole area. The Capitol Police, the Supreme Court Police, and then the Metropolitan Police are all taking care of this area.

It is safe for anybody and everybody to visit the United Methodist Building. If you see that there are activities over there that you would like to participate in, feel free to contact the United Methodist Building. The building was there for one purpose. Since that purpose is no longer an issue in the United States, it serves many other purposes, one of them being a place of refuge.

I have performed three weddings in the building. I baptized two people, including one Member. The Methodist Building is a point of joy not only for me but for a number of people here.

I baptized the children of Majority Leader STENY HOYER's chief of staff and felt really good about performing weddings there because I have a 100 percent record there. Everybody who I married in the United Methodist Building is still married. That is a hint to those of you who are watching this. Get married in the United Methodist Building.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 13, 2024, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

"I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Members of the 118th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

TONY WIED, Eighth District of Wisconsin.

ERICA LEE CARTER, Eighteenth District of Texas.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

EC-5967. A letter from the Program Analyst, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Web Links for Plant Commodity Import Requirements [Docket No.: APHIS-2024-0034] received October 24, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

EC-5968. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of the Commission, Division of Clearing and Risk/Division of Market Oversight, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Provisions Common to Registered Entities (RIN 3038-AF28) received November 1, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

EC-5969. A letter from the Program Analyst, Rural Development, Rural Business-Cooperative Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modernizing Grant Program Regulation [Docket No.: RBS-24-BUSINESS-0004] (RIN: 0570-AB03) received October 24, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

EC-5970. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Office of Chief Counsel, Regulatory Affairs Division, Federal Emergency Management

Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Flood Insurance Program Installment Payment Plan [Docket ID FEMA-2024-0030] (RIN: 1660-AB16) received November 1, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC-5971. A letter from the Director, Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Update to the Public Utility Exemption Under the Beneficial Ownership Information Reporting Rule (RIN: 1506-AB49) received November 1, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC-5972. A letter from the Special Counsel, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final guidelines — OCC Guidelines Establishing Standards for Recovery Planning by Certain Large Insured National Banks, Insured Federal Savings Associations, and Insured Federal Branches [Docket ID: OCC-2024-0008] (RIN: 1557-AF27) received October 24, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC-5973. A letter from the Policy and Rules Division Chief, Office of Engineering and Technology, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — In the Matter of Amendment of Parts 15 and 74 of the Rules for Wireless Microphones in the TV Bands, 600 MHz Guard Band, 600 MHz Duplex Gap, and the 941.5-944 MHz, 944-952 MHz, 952.850-956.250 MHz, 956.45-959.85 MHz, 1435-1525 MHz, 6875-6900 MHz and 7100-7125 MHz Bands [ET Docket No.: 21-115] (RM-11821) received November 1, 2024, 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-5974. A letter from the Supervisory, Program Analyst, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Public Safety and Homeland Security, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — In the Matter of Amendment of Part 90 of the Commission's Rules [WP Docket No.: 07-100] received November 1, 2024, 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-5975. A letter from the Director, Rule-making Operations, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; FMVSS No. 213; "Child Restraint Systems", FMVSS No. 213a, "Child Restraint Systems--Side Impact Protection", and FMVSS No. 213b, "Child Restraint Systems"—Response to Petitions for Reconsideration [Docket No.: NHTSA-2024-0058] (RIN: 2127-AM64) received October 31, 2024, 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-5976. A letter from the Director, Rule-making Operations, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Anti-Ejection Glazing for Bus Portals; Bus Emergency Exits and Window Retention and Release [Docket No.: NHTSA-2024-0061] (RIN: 2127-AL36) received October 31, 2024, 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-5977. A letter from the Congressional and Public Affairs Specialist, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final

rule — Revisions to the Unverified List [Docket No.: 241004-0262] (RIN: 0694-AJ91) received November 1, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-5978. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a memorandum of justification for the exercise of authority under section 614(a)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to provide assistance to Ukraine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-5979. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a determination under section 614(a)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (FAA) to Provide Assistance to Ukraine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-5980. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a memorandum of justification for the exercise of authority under section 614(a)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to provide assistance to Ukraine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-5981. A letter from the Assistant Secretary Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 24-056, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-5982. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting DC Act 25-617, "Housing in Downtown Tax Abatement Amendment Act of 2024", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-5983. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting DC Act 25-618, "Hotel Enhanced Cleaning and Notice of Service Disruption Temporary Amendment Act of 2024", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-5984. A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive and Administrative Officer, Federal Labor Relations Authority, transmitting the 72st Semiannual Report of the Federal Labor Relations Authority Inspector General for the period April 1, 2024, through September 30, 2024, pursuant to Section 5 of the Inspector General Act of 1978; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-5985. A letter from the Biologist, Branch of Domestic Listing, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Species Status for Ocmulgee Skullcap and Designation of Critical Habitat [Docket No.: FWS-R4-ES-2021-0059; FXES111090FEDR-256-FF09E21000] (RIN: 1018-BE01) received November 4, 2024, 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-5986. A letter from the Acting Regulations Specialist, Office of Subsistence Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Subsistence Management Regulations for Public Lands in Alaska—Subpart B, Federal Subsistence Board Membership [Docket No.: FWS-R7-SM-2024-0017; 245D0102DM DS61900000DMSN00000.000000 DX61901; 70101-1261-0000L6] (RIN: 1018-BH67) received November 1, 2024, 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-5987. A letter from the Fishery Management Specialist, Office of Protected Re-

sources, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's direct final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Technical Correction for the Coral *Fimbriaphyllia paradivisa* [Docket No.: 240919-0246] (RTID: 0648-XR137) received November 1, 2024, 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-5988. A letter from the Fisheries Regulations Specialist, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — SERO, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and Atlantic Region; Commercial Closure for Atlantic Spanish Mackerel in the Northern Zone [Docket No.: 140722613-4908-02; RTID 0648-XE115] received November 1, 2024, 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-5989. A letter from the Fisheries Regulations Specialist, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries-Alaska Region, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Gulf of Alaska; Final 2024 and 2025 Harvest Specifications for Groundfish; 2024 Rockfish Program Cooperative Allocations [Docket No.: 240227-0061; RTID 0648-XD879] received November 1, 2024, 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-5990. A letter from the Fisheries Regulations Specialist, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries-GARFO, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Quota Transfer From North Carolina to Virginia [Docket No.: 231215-0305; RTID 0648-XE028] received November 1, 2024, 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-5991. A letter from the Fisheries Regulations Specialist, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries-GARFO, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Quota Transfer From Virginia to Rhode Island [Docket No.: 231215-0305; RTID 0648-XE044] received November 1, 2024, 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-5992. A letter from the Fisheries Regulations Specialist, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries-HMS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule; closure — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries; Closure of the Angling Category Gulf of Mexico Area Trophy Fishery for 2024 [Docket No.: 220919-0193; RTID 0648-XD922] received November 1, 2024, 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-5993. A letter from the Fisheries Regulations Specialist, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries-SERO, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule; closure — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; 2024 Red Snapper Recreational For-Hire Fishing Season in the Gulf of Mexico [Docket No.: 140818679-5356-02; RTID 0648-XD939] received November 1, 2024,

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-5994. A letter from the Fisheries Regulations Specialist, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries-SERO, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; 2024 Red Snapper Private Angling Component Accountability Measure in Federal Waters Off Alabama, Florida, and Mississippi [Docket No.: 200124-0029; RTID 0648-XD967] received November 1, 2024, 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-5995. A letter from the Fisheries Regulations Specialist, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries-SERO, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2024 Commercial Trip Limit Reduction and Closure for Gulf of Mexico Greater Amberjack [Docket No.: 1206013412-2517-02; RTID 0648-XE023] received November 1, 2024, 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-5996. A letter from the Fisheries Regulations Specialist, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries-SERO, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic Region; Temporary Measures To Reduce Overfishing of Red Snapper [Docket No.: 240610-0155] (RIN: 0648-BN05) received November 1, 2024, 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-5997. A letter from the Manager, Branch of Delisting and Foreign Species, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Reclassification of the Red-Cockaded Woodpecker From Endangered to Threatened With a Section 4(d) Rule [Docket No.: FWS-R4-ES-2019-0018; FXES1113090FEDR-223-FF09E22000] (RIN: 1018-BE09) received November 1, 2024, 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-5998. A letter from the Solicitor General, Department of Justice, transmitting a decision by the Department of Justice not to seek Supreme Court review of the case *Texas v. Yellen*, No. 22-10560 (5th Cir. 2024), pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 530D(a)(1); Public Law 107-273, Sec. 202(a); (116 Stat. 1771); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-5999. A letter from the Secretary, Judicial Conference of the United States, transmitting the Report on the Adequacy of the Rules Prescribed under the E-Government Act of 2002, pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 3501 note; Public Law 107-347, Sec. 205(c)(3)(C) (as amended by Public Law 108-281, Sec. 1); (118 Stat. 889); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-6000. A letter from the Management Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Restricted Area R-6611A, R-6611B, R-6613A, and R-6613B; Dahlgren Complex, VA [Docket No.: FAA-2024-2259; Airspace Docket No.: 24-AEA-8] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received October 29, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-6001. A letter from the Management Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final

rule — U.S. Agents for Service on Individuals With Foreign Addresses Who Hold or Apply for Certain Certificates, Ratings, or Authorizations [Docket No.: FAA-2023-1194; Amendment No.: 3-3] (RIN: 2120-AL85) received October 21, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-6002. A letter from the President, transmitting documents to the Congress that describe the safeguard action proclaimed on imports of fine denier polyester staple fiber, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2253(b); Public Law 93-618, Sec. 203(b); (88 Stat. 2015) (H. Doc. No. 118—179); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

EC-6003. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's Major final rule — Advanced Manufacturing Production Credit [TD 10010] (RIN: 1545-BQ85) received November 1, 2024, 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-6004. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Manufacturer Registration and Written Agreement, Qualified Product Identification Number Assignment, Labeling, and Periodic Report Requirements Under Section 250(c)(2)(B) [Rev. Proc. 2024-31], 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-6005. A letter from the Inspector General, Office of Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a Review of Medicare Administrative Contractor Information Security Program Evaluations for Fiscal Year 2023, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1395kk-1(e)(2)(C)(ii); Aug. 14, 1935, ch. 531, title XVIII, Sec. 1874A(e)(2)(C)(ii) (as amended by Public Law 108-173, Sec. 912(a)); (117 Stat. 2388); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

EC-6006. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Medicare and Medicaid Programs; CY 2025 Payment Policies under the Physician Fee Schedule and Other Changes to Part B Payment and Coverage Policies; Medicare Shared Savings Program Requirements; Medicare Prescription Drug Inflation Rebate Program; and Medicare Overpayments [CMS-1807-F and CMS-4201-F5] (RIN: 0938-AV33 and 0938-AU96) received November 6, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

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. WESTERMAN: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1449. A bill to amend the Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 to increase the frequency of lease sales, to require replacement sales, and for other purposes (Rept. 118-730). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GUEST: Committee on Ethics. In the Matter of Allegations Relating to Representative Victoria Spartz (Rept. 118-731). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BURGESS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1568. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8932) to establish an earlier application processing cycle

for the FAFSA; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7409) to amend the Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 to waive the requirement for a Federal drilling permit for certain activities, to exempt certain activities from the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8446) to amend the Energy Act of 2020 to include critical materials in the definition of critical mineral, and for other purposes (Rept. 118-732). Referred to the House Calendar.

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. BURCHETT (for himself, Ms. MACE, Mrs. LUNA, and Mr. BURLISON):

H.R. 10111. A bill to provide whistleblower protections to Federal personnel for disclosing the use of Federal taxpayer funds to evaluate or research unidentified anomalous phenomenon material, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability, and in addition to the Committees on Intelligence (Permanent Select), and 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. CHAVEZ-DE REMER:

H.R. 10112. A bill to amend the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 to establish a system to regulate compostable agricultural packaging, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. DE LA CRUZ:

H.R. 10113. A bill to financially assist certain agricultural producers in the State of Texas with farming operations along the Rio Grande; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FULCHER (for himself and Mr. SIMPSON):

H.R. 10114. A bill to amend the Aquifer Recharge Flexibility Act to clarify a provision relating to conveyances for aquifer recharge purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LANDSMAN:

H.R. 10115. A bill to amend the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to provide resources, counseling, and access to capital for child care providers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. MAGAZINER:

H.R. 10116. A bill to direct the Secretary of Interior to submit to Congress a report on the National Park Service's interpretation and application of the Standards for Rehabilitation for use of the Federal Historic Preservation Tax Incentives program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUCHSHON:

H.J. Res. 218. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Energy relating to "Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Commercial Water Heating Equipment"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself, Mr. PANETTA, and Ms. CHU):

H. Res. 1569. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the week beginning on November 11, 2024, as "National School Psychology Week"; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY AND SINGLE SUBJECT STATEMENTS

Pursuant to clause 7(c)(1) of rule XII and Section 3(c) of H. Res. 5 the following statements are submitted regarding (1) the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution and (2) the single subject of the bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. BURCHETT:

H.R. 10111.

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

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Allow for disclosures related to the use of taxpayer funds to evaluate or research unidentified anomalous phenomenon

By Mrs. CHAVEZ-DE REMER

H.R. 10112.

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

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 to establish a system to regulate compostable agricultural packaging, and for other purposes.

By Ms. DE LA CRUZ:

H.R. 10113.

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

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Emergency aid for farmers.

By Mr. FULCHER:

H.R. 10114.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 allows Congress to make all laws "which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution" any of Congress' enumerated powers, including Congress's power over appropriations.

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill to amends the Aquifer Recharge Flexibility Act to clarify a provision relating to conveyances for aquifer recharge purposes.

By Mr. LANDSMAN:

H.R. 10115.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to provide resources, counseling, and access to capital for child care providers, and for other purposes.

By Mr. MAGAZINER:

H.R. 10116.

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

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

A bill to direct the Secretary of Interior to submit to Congress a report on the National Park Service's interpretation and application of the Standards for Rehabilitation for use of the Federal Historic Preservation Tax Incentives program

By Mr. BUCHSHON:

H.J. Res. 218.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Energy

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

- H.R. 419: Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 681: Mr. CASTEN.
H.R. 715: Mrs. RAMIREZ.
H.R. 782: Mr. CARSON.
H.R. 971: Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 972: Mr. SMUCKER.
H.R. 1077: Ms. BARRAGÁN.
H.R. 1330: Mr. LANDSMAN.
H.R. 1344: Mrs. FLETCHER and Mr. GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 1526: Mr. LANDSMAN.
H.R. 1595: Mr. NICKEL.
H.R. 1619: Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 1624: Ms. SCHRIER.
H.R. 1666: Mr. LUCAS and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1691: Ms. STRICKLAND.
H.R. 1719: Ms. DE LA CRUZ.
H.R. 1729: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.
H.R. 1770: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.
H.R. 1787: Ms. TENNEY and Ms. CRAIG.
H.R. 1826: Mr. CARBAJAL.
H.R. 2474: Mr. LANDSMAN and Mr. RUPPERS-BERGER.
H.R. 2757: Mr. GOTTHEIMER and Mr. MILLS.
H.R. 2808: Mr. HUIZENGÁ.
H.R. 2822: Ms. SCHOLTEN and Ms. DELAULO.
H.R. 3012: Mr. CROW.
H.R. 3086: Mr. LIEU and Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 3113: Mr. MOULTON.
H.R. 3331: Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. BROWNLEY, and Ms. BALINT.
H.R. 3420: Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, and Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 3489: Mr. IVEY.
H.R. 3498: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 3589: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 3592: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 3610: Ms. SCANLON.
H.R. 3826: Ms. TENNEY.
H.R. 4048: Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mr. CARSON, Ms. SCANLON, and Mr. ESPAILLAT.
H.R. 4050: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 4326: Mr. MORELLE.
H.R. 4363: Mr. LANDSMAN and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 4498: Mr. NUNN of Iowa.
H.R. 4803: Mr. BURLISON.
H.R. 4897: Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.
H.R. 5012: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 5065: Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 5077: Mr. DUNN of Florida.
H.R. 5089: Ms. MALOY.
H.R. 5282: Ms. TLAIB.
H.R. 5312: Mr. HORSFORD.
H.R. 5406: Mr. TIMMONS.
H.R. 5414: Mr. NICKEL.
H.R. 5419: Mr. KILEY.
H.R. 5555: Mr. KUSTOFF.
H.R. 5568: Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H.R. 5658: Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. MCCLAIN, Mr. RASKIN, and Mr. COMER.
H.R. 5827: Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 5920: Ms. SPANBERGER.
H.R. 5976: Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 6003: Mr. NICKEL.
H.R. 6031: Mr. GOLDEN of Maine and Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 6284: Ms. BALINT.
H.R. 6348: Mr. MENENDEZ.
H.R. 6407: Mr. LANDSMAN and Ms. SEWELL.
H.R. 6451: Mr. CASAR.
H.R. 6592: Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 6601: Mr. AMO.
H.R. 6681: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 6805: Mr. MOSKOWITZ.
H.R. 6860: Mr. LANDSMAN and Mrs. KIM of California.
H.R. 7027: Mr. HUIZENGÁ.
H.R. 7050: Mr. VAN DREW.
H.R. 7087: Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 7108: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 7307: Mr. MAGAZINER.
H.R. 7384: Mr. PAPPAS.
H.R. 7543: Mr. COHEN and Ms. CRAIG.
H.R. 7573: Ms. UNDERWOOD.
H.R. 7735: Mr. LEVIN and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 7849: Ms. PETTERSEN.
H.R. 7873: Mrs. HINSON.
H.R. 7944: Mr. CARBAJAL.
H.R. 7996: Mr. BACON and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 8018: Mr. STEUBE, Mrs. PELTOLA, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. NICKEL.
H.R. 8061: Mr. BOST.
H.R. 8075: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 8147: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 8303: Mr. GIMENEZ.
H.R. 8307: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.
H.R. 8331: Mr. BERA.
H.R. 8370: Mr. VARGAS, Mrs. FLETCHER, and Ms. JAYAPAL.
H.R. 8371: Mr. NEWHOUSE.
H.R. 8594: Mr. GARBARINO.
H.R. 8600: Mr. LIEU, Ms. BROWNLEY, and Ms. ROSS.
H.R. 8653: Mr. VAN DREW.
H.R. 8702: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. POSEY, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. GUEST, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Mr. LANDSMAN.
H.R. 8724: Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California.
H.R. 8776: Mr. MURPHY.
H.R. 8843: Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 8960: Mr. CARSON.
H.R. 8963: Mr. SMUCKER.
H.R. 9001: Mr. DUNN of Florida.
H.R. 9060: Ms. BUDZINSKI.
H.R. 9109: Mr. BIGGS.
H.R. 9129: Mr. BERA.
H.R. 9131: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 9141: Mrs. LUNA.
H.R. 9152: Mr. LANDSMAN.
H.R. 9336: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 9344: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 9382: Mr. GROTHMAN.
H.R. 9386: Mr. BALDERSON.
H.R. 9501: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 9570: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
H.R. 9647: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 9653: Mr. GIMENEZ.
H.R. 9662: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 9695: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 9715: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.
H.R. 9739: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 9821: Mr. VEASEY, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 9849: Mrs. FOUSHEE.
H.R. 9885: Mr. EZELL and Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 9928: Mr. GARBARINO and Mr. EZELL.
H.R. 9964: Mr. MULLIN.
H.R. 10044: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK.
H.R. 10045: Ms. GRANGER.
H.R. 10066: Mr. BUCHANAN.
H.R. 10073: Mr. MOOLENAAR.
H.R. 10079: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. STRICKLAND.
H.R. 10084: Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.
H. Res. 128: Mr. CRAWFORD.
H. Res. 589: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
H. Res. 858: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.
H. Res. 1037: Mrs. LUNA.
H. Res. 1060: Mrs. LUNA.
H. Res. 1131: Mr. PALLONE.
H. Res. 1157: Mr. CISCOMANI.
H. Res. 1286: Mr. SUOZZI.
H. Res. 1328: Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H. Res. 1382: Mr. NICKEL.
H. Res. 1394: Mr. CASTRO of Texas.
H. Res. 1491: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CARSON, Mr. NADLER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. SWALWELL, Ms. TITUS, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California, Ms. JAYAPAL, and Mr. BERGMAN.
H. Res. 1544: Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas.
H. Res. 1547: Mr. JACKSON of Texas.
H. Res. 1555: Ms. DELBENE.
H. Res. 1566: Mr. CASE, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. LAWLER.