



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 170

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 2024

No. 173

House of Representatives

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

PRAYER

Pastor Clark Boshier, Willow Park Baptist Church, Willow Park, Texas, offered the following prayer:

Our Father, how grateful we are for the privilege that is ours to gather here today, and how thankful we are for Your Son, the living Lord Jesus Christ, God, who is the hope of the world.

We are thankful that, God, we can confess our sins and know that, God, we cannot save ourselves and that, God, we can turn to Your Son, the Lord Jesus. He said whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved, and we thank You for that.

God, how we thank You for the privilege that is ours to know Him as Savior and Lord of our lives and, God, to live in a country where we are free. God, we are free because of men and women who go around the world and who, for freedom, God, fight and live and die so that, God, we can have moments like this in our lives.

God, how I pray today that You would protect our military. I pray You bless those men and women all around the world, that they would know Your favor and they would know Your blessings.

God, for the men and women who make up our Congress, would You put Your hand upon them. You said if any man lack wisdom, let him ask of God that giveth to all men liberally, so, God, would You give them wisdom, would You give them Your favor, would You give them Your anointing. God, would You let them know about life and where it begins and where it ends and, God, who is the giver of life, and that would be You.

God, I pray today that, God, You would help us to know that Your Word says suffer the little children to come

unto me, for such is the kingdom of God.

God, would You remind us of what Your Word says in 2 Chronicles, where it says if my people which are called by my name shall humble themselves and pray and seek my face and turn from their wicked ways, then will I hear from Heaven and will forgive their sin and heal their land.

God, remind us that righteousness exalts a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people, so, God, put Your hand on us today as a nation. God, give us Your mercy. God, give us Your grace. God, give us Your favor.

God, especially today, as Congress meets, would You put Your hand on them and let them know that, God, one day, all of us will give an accounting of our lives and our decisions to You. God, in advance, I want You to know that we love You, and, God, we praise You, and, God, we thank You for your Son, Jesus Christ, because it is in His name that we do pray.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. TLAIB 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.

WELCOMING PASTOR CLARK BOSHER

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome my dear friend, Pastor Clark Boshier, to our Nation's Capitol for the distinct honor of opening the House floor in prayer.

For nearly two decades, Pastor Boshier has led Willow Park Baptist Church in the great State of Texas, where my family and I have been blessed to know him. Under his leadership, our church has flourished, and countless lives have been transformed. His ability to deliver the Word of God across all walks of life leaves a lasting impact on so many.

It is an honor to have Pastor Boshier here with us today. My prayer is that he inspires us all in his prayer, through his words, as we work for the American people. In God we trust.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MOLINARO). The Chair will entertain up to five further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

CONGRATULATING CADET COLONEL CORY MATEJOVICH

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Cadet Colonel Cory Matejovich on earning the General Carl A. Spaatz Award.

The Spaatz award is Civil Air Patrol's highest cadet honor. Since 1964, the Spaatz award has been presented to

□ 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.

H6157

cadets who have demonstrated excellence in leadership, character, fitness, and aerospace education.

Cadets qualify for this prestigious award after progressing through 16 achievements in the CAP Cadet Program. Along the way, they develop self-discipline, leadership abilities, and the foundations necessary for pursuing a career in aviation, space, or technology.

Recently, Howard native Cadet Colonel Cory Matejovich earned his Spaatz award. He is among only 2,559 individuals to have achieved this honor.

Along with the Spaatz award, Colonel Matejovich is an exceptional student and athlete, ranking in the top percent of his class and competing in three varsity sports.

Mr. Speaker, through the years of hard work, discipline, and leadership, Colonel Matejovich has exemplified the core values of the Civil Air Patrol and inspired those around him.

Receiving the Spaatz award is no small feat. I commend Colonel Matejovich for his dedication.

CELEBRATING BIPARTISAN INFRASTRUCTURE LAW AND IMPROVEMENTS TO PORT OF HOUSTON

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

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last week, we learned that the Port of Houston will receive more than \$25 million in a grant to support critical infrastructure improvements.

This funding will enhance export capacity, reduce emissions, and create good-paying jobs across the Houston region.

This is more than just a grant. It is a commitment to the safety, sustainability, and economic strength of Houston and its surrounding communities.

Mr. Speaker, this milestone was made possible by the bipartisan infrastructure law, which marked its third anniversary last week, for which I thank the President.

When we passed that law, we responded to the call of Americans who were ready to get back to work. They were ready to invest in communities and neighborhoods all across the Nation. They were ready to build a better tomorrow.

We are doing that in the greater Houston region. We are putting people over politics.

BURNT BEAN COMPANY EARNS BIB GOURMAND AWARD

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

Ms. DE LA CRUZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with immense pride to honor the incredible achievement of Ernest Servantes and David Kirkland, the talented owners of Burnt Bean Company, a barbecue restaurant in Seguin, Texas.

They were recently presented with the prestigious Bib Gourmand award during the inaugural Michelin Guide Texas ceremony in Houston. This recognition places Burnt Bean Company among an elite group of 45 distinguished establishments across Texas.

Ernest and David's dedication and passion have not only earned them this award but also three James Beard Award nominations in the past, affirming Burnt Bean Company's place as culinary leaders in our Nation.

Today, we celebrate Burnt Bean Company as a beacon of hard work, creativity, and excellence that continues to put Seguin and Texas on the map.

CONGRATULATING ART HAYWOOD

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

Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today I celebrate Senator Art Haywood's 10th anniversary in the Pennsylvania State Senate.

Senator Haywood is not only my former colleague but also a longtime friend and neighbor. In fact, we both have the privilege of representing Pennsylvania's Fourth Congressional District, he in Harrisburg and I in Washington.

Ignited by President Obama's 2008 campaign and aided by a savvy friend, Senator Haywood got in the arena. He became one of the first of two African-American township commissioners on the Cheltenham Board of Commissioners in 2009, eventually serving as board president.

As State senator, Art dutifully serves Abington, Cheltenham, Jenkintown, Rockledge, and Springfield in our shared Montgomery County, as well as Mt. Airy, Germantown, West Oak Lane, Logan, and Chestnut Hill in Philadelphia.

In Harrisburg, Art tackles issues at the heart of his communities: voting rights, gun rights, homelessness, and poverty, including his yearslong advocacy to raise the minimum wage.

When he is not fighting for us, you might find Art riding his bike and connecting with neighbors. Together with his wife, Julie, co-chair of the Cheltenham School District, the Haywoods are community leaders. I congratulate Art.

CELEBRATING 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF NATIONAL APPRENTICESHIP WEEK

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

Mr. GIMENEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate National Apprenticeship Week, a time to recognize the value of hands-on training and the incredible opportunities of apprenticeships that are offered to American workers and businesses.

As a strong believer in the dignity of hard work and the power of education, I know that apprenticeships serve as a vital bridge between learning and earning. They empower individuals to gain valuable skills in industries that form the backbone of our American economy, all while earning a paycheck and building a lifelong career.

Whether in AI technology, cybersecurity, construction, or countless other fields, these programs open pathways of success for countless Americans. In south Florida and across the Nation, apprenticeships transform lives and strengthen our communities.

Apprenticeships are not just investments in the people of our community, they are investments in America's competitiveness on the global stage.

On this 10th anniversary of National Apprenticeship Week, let us continue to champion programs that open doors for young people and working families so that we can build a stronger, more skilled workforce for generations to come.

FUNDING LIVONIA'S SENIOR WELLNESS CENTER

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

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to present the city of Livonia in the beautiful 12th Congressional District with \$1.25 million in community project funding for their new senior wellness center.

There are 30,000 seniors who are 60 or older living in the city of Livonia, and this facility will provide them with a better quality of life as an accessible resource with services and programs.

Earlier this year, I was honored to attend the groundbreaking for the new project with Mayor Brosnan and a number of other elected officials.

Our seniors have played a vital role in shaping our communities, especially communities like Livonia, and it is our responsibility to ensure that they retire with dignity, respect, and access to the resources they need.

I am honored to be able to fight in Congress for all of my seasoned residents in Livonia and throughout the 12th Congressional District. I will continue to always have their back.

RECOGNIZING NEW YORK STATE PURPLE HEART TRAIL

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

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, New York has a long and distinguished history of supporting our servicemembers and veterans, from the battlefields of the Revolutionary War to those serving today at Fort Drum and Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station. It is our duty to honor these courageous individuals in New York-24.

We especially remember the members of our armed services who have been

wounded in combat and awarded the Purple Heart, a symbol of the highest form of service and sacrifice to our country. The Purple Heart Memorial in Niagara County and the Purple Heart Municipalities along the United States Purple Heart Trail help ensure that their bravery is recognized and preserved for generations.

Today, I rise to advance these efforts by officially proclaiming New York's 24th Congressional District as a Purple Heart Congressional District. This designation will place New York-24 on the New York State Purple Heart Trail, preserving the legacy of Purple Heart recipients for generations. It is a tribute to the exceptional men and women who have sacrificed for our Nation and a reminder to never forget the true cost of freedom.

□ 0915

HONORING AND REMEMBERING LT. CMDR. LYNDSEY EVANS AND LT. SERENA WILEMAN

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

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor and remember Lieutenant Commander Lyndsay Evans and Lieutenant Serena "Dug" Wileman, two naval aviators who died during a routine training flight near Mount Rainier on October 15.

Lieutenant Commander Evans and Lieutenant Wileman were exemplary leaders who deeply believed in their country, their mission, and their fellow naval aviators. Both natives of California, Lieutenant Commander Evans and Lieutenant Wileman proudly served their country with the Electronic Attack Squadron, or VAQ-130, also known as the Zappers, which is based at Naval Air Station Whidbey Island in my district.

Both recently returned from a 9-month deployment at sea, distinguishing themselves in combat operations to defend U.S. and coalition forces and ensure freedom of navigation in the Red Sea and the Middle East.

In a tribute to Lieutenant Commander Evans and Lieutenant Wileman, Naval Air Station Whidbey Island wrote that beyond their names and ranks, they were role models, trailblazers, and women who influenced and touched countless people on the flight deck and well beyond.

My sympathies are with the families of Lieutenant Commander Evans and Lieutenant Wileman. On behalf of my constituents, I thank them for their service and sacrifice.

REMEMBERING TED OLSON

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to remember a giant of the legal world, Ted Olson. It may seem odd that a Democrat would stand on the floor of the House of Representatives to honor this rock-ribbed Republican lawyer.

Remember, this is the man who successfully argued *Bush v. Gore*, and later represented the Bush administration before the Supreme Court. Mr. OLSON's conservative vision did not come at the expense of those who some of his peers sought to relegate to the margins.

He stood up for people like Dreamers and LGBTQ+ Americans because he understood that everyone had the right to pursue the American Dream.

I am personally grateful that he took up and won *Hollingsworth v. Perry*, the case that overturned California's Proposition 8 and restored marriage equality to my home State of California.

As we honor Mr. OLSON, I remain hopeful that my Republican friends will honor his vision for conservatism, one that brings people together and not divides them.

STOP TERROR-FINANCING AND TAX PENALTIES ON AMERICAN HOSTAGES ACT

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1576, I call up 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, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1576, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, printed in the bill, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, 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) 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).

"(d) 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:

“(e) 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)—

“(1) 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 (with-out 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. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) each will control 30 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 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 today in support of H.R. 9495, the Stop Terror-Financing and Tax Penalties on American Hostages Act.

This legislation ends the flow of tax subsidies to any U.S. nonprofit that has clearly violated its tax-exempt status by providing material support to terrorist organizations.

At the same time, this bill ends the unfair treatment of Americans who are

held hostage by terrorist organizations or wrongfully detained by foreign governments by ensuring that when they return home, they are not dealing with penalties from the IRS for past-due taxes owed from the time that they were held in captivity.

To be clear, we were here just last week to consider this same piece of legislation. This piece of legislation received unanimous approval by the Committee on Ways and Means and contains provisions that already passed this House with overwhelming bipartisan support and received unanimous consent in the U.S. Senate.

Yet, despite that consistent showing of bipartisan support, the majority of our Democrat colleagues voted last week to block passage of this bill.

Why? Why did they block passage of this bill?

Because President Trump won the election.

Don't take my word for it. Our Democrat colleagues said it themselves on this very House floor. Nevertheless, we are back here today to consider this bill under a rule so that we can advance this commonsense policy despite the partisan antics we witnessed last week.

Those who opposed this legislation last week invented all sorts of excuses. We heard a number of fear-mongering scenarios under which they now believe the authorities in this bill might be abused. Every concern raised by Democrats has been addressed in this bill to ensure due process and to protect legitimate nonprofits.

Moreover, instead of engaging in the myths we hear from the other side, we have real-world examples that show why this bill is desperately needed to end the tax-exempt status of organizations that have provided material support to terrorists.

As I noted last week, we have evidence of a U.S.-based, tax-exempt entity that helped fund the hiring of a so-called journalist whose real day job was working for Hamas and holding Israeli hostages in his home.

There is also the U.S.-based, tax-exempt organization that financially sponsors a foreign entity that the Biden Treasury Department has designated a sham charity because of its support for terrorism.

Yet, both of those U.S.-based nonprofits still enjoy tax-exempt status under the Biden administration. In fact, this week I once again called on the IRS to revoke the tax-exempt status of the organization supporting that fake charity because the Biden administration has yet to do so.

In no circumstances, not one circumstance, should the U.S. taxpayer be asked to subsidize this activity by allowing such organizations to retain their tax-exempt preferential status. Unlike the made-up stories our colleagues told last week, and that they will no doubt continue to tell this week, this is the reality, and there is absolutely no excuse for it, Mr. Speaker.

Congress must act to stop the abuse of our tax code that is funding terrorism around the world. We must act to end the unfair tax treatment of Americans who have already suffered enough and whose families have suffered enough from being held hostage or wrongfully detained abroad.

This is the right thing to do, and I encourage my colleagues to do the right thing and support this legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this is a death penalty bill that we are considering today, a bill that empowers Donald Trump to extinguish the life of any nonprofit, of any civic society group, which happens to be on his enemies list.

Authoritarianism is not born overnight. It creeps in. It erodes our freedoms. A tyrant tightens his grip, not just by seizing power, but when he demands new powers and those who can stop him willingly cede and bend to his will.

Opposing terrorism and hostage taxation, truly those are not even issues this morning, but fascism is. Today we must show that we are more than a speed bump on the march to fascism.

Of course, we oppose terrorism and all who support terrorists. That is why it is already a Federal criminal offense to provide material support for terrorism or foreign entities who are engaging in terrorism. Tax-exempt organizations are already prohibited from engaging in illegal activity.

What current law does not prohibit, however, is the type of sweeping power advocated today to enact a revenge campaign and silence any nonprofit or public media outlet that may criticize Donald Trump, assist the many innocent people he demonizes, or those who simply don't offer enough support to satisfy him.

There are so many groups in America, almost 300, that have expressed their concern about this bill and their opposition to it. Nor does anyone here today oppose protection of American hostages from tax penalties.

The chairman is absolutely correct about one tiny thing: A part of this bill has been approved by unanimous consent in the United States Senate. That is the part that he won't let us consider today as a freestanding bill, which as late as Monday, we have tried again to have presented here because we could have unanimous consent here to protect those hostages.

No. What he is doing is holding the hostages' tax provision hostage to provide more power to Donald Trump. Chairman SMITH did not bother to disclose to this House that on October 1 of this year, the Internal Revenue Service renewed relief for taxpayers affected by terrorist attacks, postponing the hostages' tax filings and payment deadlines. Without our approving even the legislation we support, hostages would not face penalties or interest costs.

As to the over 290 groups that are opposing this legislation and calling for a "no" vote, they recognize the danger that it poses. Today I urge my colleagues to believe more in Donald Trump.

Believe what he says. Listen when he says the press is the "enemy of the people." Listen to him when he declares "I am your justice, I am your retribution." Listen to him when he says he will be a dictator "on day one."

Trump will not use this provision provided today as a shield to protect us from some foreign terrorism. He will use it as a sword against those he views as his political enemies. Today's vote is a chance for this House to take Trump at his word.

A "no" vote signals that we will not be accomplices in turning threats into reality. If this bill were to become law, we would hand him a bludgeon for a crusade against those who he deems the greatest danger to America, what he called the enemy within.

A unilateral designation by the President-elect through his Treasury Secretary would mean immediate—The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself an additional 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, through the Treasury Secretary, he would be given the power to have immediate revocation of the tax-exempt status, an effective death penalty for the nonprofits.

An appeal after the tax-exempt status is taken away is no relief at all. The President would not be required to provide the reasons for the decision or the evidence upon which he relied.

It is not just Trump imposing a death sentence that should concern us, but it is his power to intimidate, to threaten to eliminate a hospital, to eliminate a community nonprofit press entity, to eliminate those who give aid to immigrants.

The fear of that death penalty, that intimidation, is what would do great damage to American civil society.

Clearly, the bill would have a chilling effect on any group that has the audacity to criticize his dark vision. Surely, the first rule of confronting a wannabe tyrant is not to provide him more tools to achieve that tyranny.

□ 0930

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members, despite the passion with which we might use to debate an important piece of legislation, that we are to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President-elect.

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

I will point out the reason why this Chamber cannot take up the bill that was passed by the United States Senate to make sure there are not penalties for hostages is because of a thing called the U.S. Constitution. It is called Article I, Section 7, that says all revenue

measures must come from the House of Representatives. That is why we are doing this piece of legislation.

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 my bill, H.R. 9495, the Stop-Terror Financing and Tax Penalties on American Hostages Act, which has been the subject of political hysteria since the election of President Trump on November 5.

I want to be clear to my Democratic colleagues, most of whom supported Congressman KUSTOFF's legislation last April, about what this bill actually does.

The bill does two things: It allows the IRS to waive penalties for late taxes on Americans held hostage abroad. While the IRS can waive penalties on the back end when the taxpayer returns home, this would allow them to do it on the front end to ensure that returning hostages and their families, who have endured unimaginable hardship, don't have the burden of having to deal with it upon return.

It directs the IRS to revoke the tax-exempt status of a nonprofit found to be providing financial support to a terrorist organization. Right now, an entity must be deemed a terrorist organization itself to lose its tax-exempt status. This bill says that if a nonprofit provides material support to a designated terrorist group, they will also lose that status. This bill and parts of this bill have received strong bipartisan support on multiple occasions from this Congress.

H.R. 9495 passed unanimously out of Ways and Means in September by a vote of 38-0, including and with the support of Ranking Member RICHARD NEAL, along with Mr. DOGGETT.

The portion of this bill to terminate the tax-exempt status of nonprofit organizations supporting terrorist groups, H.R. 6408, led by my fabulous colleague Representative KUSTOFF, also passed unanimously out of Ways and Means last year as a standalone bill by a vote of 41-0, and the House passed it overwhelmingly by a vote of 382-11. That is resounding, in my book.

Legislation preventing the IRS from imposing fines and tax penalties on Americans held hostage upon their return was approved by unanimous consent in the Senate. It is shameful that Democrats who supported this commonsense position are now opposing it and citing the election of President Trump as the reason and also manufacturing concerns about the targeting of nonprofits' tax-exempt status for unrelated purposes.

I want to clarify, Treasury can only revoke tax-exempt status under this legislation if the nonprofit in question is providing material support to terrorist groups designated under longstanding statutory standards. There are no changes to those standards or the executive branch's ability to make those designations. There is even an

opportunity to cure included in this bill where the organization can make reasonable efforts to recoup funds given to the terrorist organization—imagine that—given to a terrorist organization and certify in writing to Treasury that they will not provide any further support to said organization and they will not lose their nonprofit status.

Organizations abusing tax-exempt status to funnel money to terrorist organizations has been a pervasive issue, which was exposed by Chairman SMITH's ongoing investigation into various nonprofit groups' ties to foreign terrorist organizations.

This is a crucial time for Congress to act and to make it clear that we stand for our fellow citizens who have endured unthinkable circumstances abroad, like my constituent, Ryan Corbett of Dansville, New York. He is husband to Anna, and he and his wife are the parents of three children, Ketsia, Miriam, and Caleb. Today marks the 834th day since he has been wrongfully detained by the Taliban in a 9-by-9-foot cell. It is a tragic situation.

In closing, I urge my colleagues, especially my Democratic colleagues, not to put their hatred of President Trump and I daresay Trump derangement syndrome—by the way, there is no vaccine and no cure that we know of right now for that, which is obvious from what we are seeing on the other side—and let's not put the needs of terrorist adversaries ahead of helping American hostages and their families and stopping the flow of cash to terrorists that are actively working to harm the United States, by supporting H.R. 9495.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to grab some common sense and allow this bill to pass and put some relief finally in the hands of the people who greatly need it, those in harm's way.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to respond before calling on my colleague to speak.

The gentlewoman well knows that at that very hearing when we chose not to block her bill from coming to the floor, I raised the same concerns, as did Mr. BEYER, that we have today and asked them to amend it, to provide due process in this bill, the very thing they have refused to do.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU), who is in the same position from the Ways and Means Committee.

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 9495, legislation that would grant dangerous new powers to allow the incoming administration to target its political enemies.

Crucially, it is already illegal for anyone, including nonprofit organizations, to provide material support to foreign terrorist organizations, and prosecutors are already empowered to indict and convict individuals of terrorism charges based on evidence of wrongdoing. This bill would create a new tool that allows the Secretary of

the Treasury to mete out punishment for tax-exempt organizations based solely on accusations, even without evidence.

Keeping in mind the President-elect's long crusade of vengeance and grievance, along with his announced Cabinet nominations of his cronies and loyalists, many of my constituents have been contacting my office all week, and they and I are very uncomfortable with the creation of this new power.

There would be nothing to stop the incoming Trump administration from using this tool to cancel the tax-exempt status, and therefore, incapacitate any civil society or nonprofit organization with which the President disagrees. This could be an organization that provides legal support for immigrants facing mass deportations or clinics that provide lifesaving reproductive healthcare.

While the bill does lay out a process for organizations to appeal the accusations brought by the Secretary of the Treasury and retain their tax-exempt status, there is little consolation when the final determination lies within the same Secretary that made the accusations in the first place.

Unfortunately, these dangerous, nonsensical provisions have been attached to unrelated legislation that would accomplish the very, very worthy goal of providing relief to American hostages for unfair tax penalties they incur while wrongfully detained abroad.

The Senate has already passed this measure as a standalone bill unanimously. The House should follow suit by stripping the bill before us today of its controversial provisions to provide hostages and their families with the relief they deserve.

Mr. Speaker, in its current form, I will vote "no," and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

I include in the RECORD a September 24, 2024, letter from the Committee on Ways and Means to the IRS that refers the Alliance for Global Justice to the IRS for revocation of its tax-exempt status.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,

Washington, DC, September 24, 2024.

Hon. DANIEL WERFEL,
Commissioner, Internal Revenue Service,
Washington, DC.

DEAR COMMISSIONER WERFEL: I write today to refer the Alliance for Global Justice, an Arizona-based 501(c)(3) tax-exempt organization, for investigation and ultimately revocation of its tax-exempt status. The Alliance for Global Justice, in conjunction with its fiscally sponsored project, Samidoun, has funded and supported conduct intended to incite violence and instill chaos and holds suspicious ties to designated terrorist organizations. This is despite receiving tax-exempt status as a charitable organization. This conduct is designed to sow chaos and discord in our society, has involved illegal activities, and certainly is not in furtherance of any tax-exempt purpose.

As you know, section 7803 of the Internal Revenue Code ("IRC") grants the Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service

("IRS") the authority to execute and apply internal revenue laws, including section 501 of the IRC's requirements and prohibitions. Pursuant to section 501(c)(3), tax-exempt organizations must be organized and operated exclusively for a tax-exempt purpose, which includes charitable, educational, literary, and other purposes. However, if a nonprofit organization conducts substantial activities that do not further its exempt purposes, such activity may result in the loss of the organization's tax-exemption.

Tax-exempt organizations must meet other requirements to maintain their tax-exempt status. For example, under section 501(c)(3) of the IRC, organizations seeking to receive an exemption from federal taxes are prohibited from certain activity, including being involved in certain types of political activity. In addition to the prohibitions of section 501, the IRS has also noted that violations of the law are an "antithesis of the public good" and, as such, may be a bar to tax-exemption. Not only has the IRS found conducting illegal activities to be inconsistent with tax-exemption, but it has stated that the "planning and sponsoring of such activities are also incompatible with charity and social welfare."

For example, while mass demonstrations and other confrontational activities are generally permissible under section 501, the IRS previously found that an organization that sponsored protests where members were pressed to commit acts of civil disobedience "did not qualify for IRC 501 (c)(3) or (4) exemption." When determining whether these types of demonstrations are consistent with IRC section 501(c)(3), the IRS has historically implemented a three-part test which states that such activities are permissible if: (1) the organization's tax-exempt purpose is charitable; (2) the activities are not illegal, contrary to established public policy, or in conflict with statutory restrictions; and (3) the activities further the organization's exempt purpose and are reasonably related to the accomplishment of that purpose.

Additionally, under Section 501(p) of the Internal Revenue Code, organizations which have been designated as terrorist organizations cannot maintain tax-exempt status, and the IRS has revoked the tax-exempt status of terrorist organizations. Along with the prohibition on tax-exempt status for terrorist organizations themselves, the IRS also previously revoked the tax-exempt status of organizations that could not show that it directed funding exclusively for charitable purposes as required under the IRC.

Aside from restrictions on conducting illegal activity and acts supporting or promoting civil disobedience, Internal Revenue Manual ("IRM") Part 7, Chapter 20, Section 6, asserts that "[c]ases involving grants or activities in foreign countries present a higher risk of terrorism, especially in countries where there is war and civil unrest. Given the language of the IRC, IRM, and previous IRS revenue rulings. I am referring the Alliance for Global Justice and its fiscally sponsored project, Samidoun, to the IRS based on the facts and reasons stated in the appendix attached below.

I ask that you use your authority to make this and similar referrals a top priority and make certain the IRS moves as quickly as possible to examine and revoke the tax-exempt status of the Alliance for Global Justice. Operating at the agency's historically slow pace is not acceptable given what is occurring in our streets and on our college campuses. The IRS must act quickly to address these serious issues. Thank you in advance for your time, cooperation, and response. If you have any questions, please contact Ways and Means Majority staff.

Sincerely,

JASON SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means.

[Attachment 1—Appendix]

ALLIANCE FOR GLOBAL JUSTICE: RELEVANT
FACTS

INTRODUCTION

The Alliance for Global Justice (the "Alliance") is an Arizona-based 501 (c)(3) organization that serves as a fiscal sponsor to over 130 "projects." The Alliance is an offshoot of the Nicaragua Network, an organization that previously supported the socialist Sandinista regime in Nicaragua. According to their website, the Alliance envisions "societies which explore and implement alternatives to the unjust domination of governments, global financial institutions and multinational corporations" and their mission is to "achieve social change and economic justice by helping to build a stronger more unified grassroots movement." According to the Alliance's 2023 Form 990, its mission is to "achieve social change and economic justice by helping to build a stronger and more unified grassroots movement."

To help bring these visions to life and fulfill its mission, the Alliance fiscally sponsors more than 130 projects. Samidoun is one of the Alliance's fiscally sponsored projects, and describes itself as "an international network of organizers and activists working to build solidarity with Palestinian prisoners in their struggle for freedom." However, Samidoun's conduct and activity suggests more than activism in support of Palestine.

SAMIDOUN'S TIES TO A FOREIGN TERRORIST ORGANIZATION

For example, in February 2021, the National Bureau for Counter Terror Financing of Israel ("NBCTF") designated Samidoun a terrorist organization and a "part of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP)" which "was founded by members of the PFLP in 2012." The PFLP was designated as a foreign terrorist organization by the U.S. Department of State on October 8, 1997. According to the NBCTF, one of Samidoun's leaders is part of the leadership of the PFLP, has been involved in the establishment of militant cells, and has motivated terrorist activity in "Judea & Samaria and abroad."

ACTIONS TAKEN AGAINST SAMIDOUN BY PRIVATE COMPANIES AND FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS

In January 2023, it was reported that the Alliance and Samidoun were actively fundraising for a France-based organization which partners with the PFLP. Later in February 2023, the Alliance announced that it was unable to process credit card donations following reports that the group was fundraising for the PFLP, a U.S. designated foreign terror organization. Additionally in 2023, Germany outlawed Samidoun after determining that the group spread "anti-Israel and antisemitic propaganda under the guise of solidarity for Palestinian prisoners." The ban of Samidoun in Germany came after the group's leadership was deported from the country in 2019. Two of Samidoun's leaders were also deported from the European Union in 2022.

In January 2020, Mastercard, Visa, and American Express began blocking direct donations to Samidoun. Discover, the credit card company, also cut ties with the Alliance a few months after Israel's NBCTF designated Samidoun a terrorist organization.

IRS GUIDANCE ON FISCAL SPONSORSHIPS

Although fiscal sponsorship is not defined in statute and the IRS has not provided comprehensive guidance regarding fiscal sponsorships, Revenue Ruling 68-489 provides insight into the IRS's policy regarding fiscal

sponsorships. Revenue Ruling 68-489 states that 501 (c)(3) tax-exempt organizations may accept tax-deductible funds on behalf of an entity that is not tax-exempt under 501(c)(3) if the following three conditions are satisfied: (i) the 501 (c)(3) organization ensures that funds are used for exempt purposes "by limiting distributions to specific projects that are in furtherance of its own exempt purposes;" (ii) the 501 (c)(3) organization "retains control and discretion as to the use of the funds;" and (iii) the 501(c)(3) organization "maintains records establishing that the funds were used for section 501 (c)(3) purposes.

CONCLUSION

Samidoun's designation as a terrorist organization associated with the PFLP does not further the Alliance's stated tax-exempt purpose. The European Union, Israel, and major credit card companies have recognized Samidoun and the Alliance for what they are, yet tax-exempt dollars continue to flow to the Alliance and ultimately to Samidoun. This must stop. The IRS should revoke the Alliance's tax-exempt status. Please see the exhibits below for numerous examples of activity that fails to advance any tax-exempt purpose.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the Alliance of Global Justice, an Arizona-based, tax-exempt organization currently fiscally sponsors Samidoun, a group which was recently designated as a sham charity in financial support of terrorists—by what? The Biden Department of the Treasury.

Despite this letter to the IRS, the Alliance still maintains its tax-exempt status in the United States. This letter, coupled with their recent designation as a financial supporter of terrorist organizations, demonstrates the need for H.R. 9495 and the risk of not passing this legislation.

I would also point out that, as the prior speaker said that we should rip out the controversial legislation within this bill, that controversial piece of legislation passed this body by a vote of 382-11. It doesn't sound too controversial to me.

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

Mr. KUSTOFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 9495, the bill titled the Stop Terror-Financing and Tax Penalties on American Hostages Act. I am proud that it is a bipartisan bill. In my opinion, it will make much needed improvements to our tax code.

I also thank my colleagues, Representatives CLAUDIA TENNEY from New York, BRAD SCHNEIDER from Illinois, and DINA TITUS from Nevada, for joining me in introducing this legislation. I thank Chairman JASON SMITH for his strong support and leadership with this bill.

Mr. Speaker, today, right now, there are American citizens being held captive by terrorist groups and foreign adversaries.

Under our current law, Americans who have been detained illegally abroad may be subject to certain tax penalties and IRS fees. It is our responsibility to bring these Americans home and, frankly, to fix this unacceptable

flaw in the Federal tax code. The last thing that Americans should have to deal with is more government red tape and bureaucracy.

H.R. 9495 also works to prevent tax abuse in our tax code. Since the horrific attack on Israel by Hamas, the Ways and Means Committee has investigated terror groups and bad actors that threaten the U.S. and our allies.

One finding, Mr. Speaker, which should enrage all of us, is that there are tax-exempt nonprofits operating in the United States despite being suspected of providing support to terrorist groups such as Hamas.

□ 0945

More recently, and I am using this term in quotes, a “journalist” working for a publication called “The Palestine Chronicle,” which is part of a 501(c)(3) tax-exempt organization based in the U.S., was discovered holding Israeli hostages in his Gaza home.

This is unacceptable. The financing of terrorism and extremism should not have preferential treatment under the U.S. tax code. I think this should be a no-brainer.

This legislation would revoke the tax-exempt status of any organization found to have provided—and here are the key words—material support or resources to a designated terrorist group within the past 3 years.

I do want to note that this part of the bill was originally considered on this floor on April 15 of this year under H.R. 6408. The language in H.R. 6408 affecting these tax-exempt groups is the same language in the legislation that we are considering today. It did pass by a vote of 382 in favor to 11 against, which I think in the current political atmosphere is pretty remarkable.

I also appreciate that there are a number of people who are speaking against this bill today who voted in favor of the former bill, H.R. 6408, on April 15 of this year. Obviously, a vote of 382 in favor and 11 against shows the resounding support of this body. If there are any due process concerns, which we have been hearing about this morning, they existed in that bill on April 15, yet there were only 11 people who voted “no.”

I was glad to see this commonsense legislation unanimously pass out of the Ways and Means Committee. Chairman SMITH, in his remarks, termed it as commonsense, and that is exactly what it is.

Mr. Speaker, for all of these reasons, I strongly urge my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation today.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER), who serves on the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I also stand in opposition to this bill, which would provide the administration 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 dangerous in the wrong hands. The legislation would do nothing to improve our ability to combat terrorism, as there are already numerous legal mechanisms which effectively monitor and penalize nonprofits that provide support for terrorist organizations.

No one serving in this institution wants a single dollar to find its way into the hands of a terrorist group, and it is inappropriate to suggest otherwise, but in the hands of a responsible government, the powers provided in this bill are merely redundant. However, Mr. Speaker, 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 authoritarian, it is not hard to imagine how an administration could use the powers in this bill to hinder or dismantle organizations that its leader does not like.

Mr. Speaker, some 15 years ago, before I was here, there was a huge controversy over the IRS under Barack Obama investigating nonprofit organizations that may not have actually been nonprofits, that they were political organizations and campaign organizations promoting ideologies doing nothing to help the American people.

It turns out there were as many on the left doing this perhaps as on the right. However, my Republican friends were apoplectic about this because they said that a President could unscrupulously cross out and take away the tax-exempt status of these NGOs that are their rightful thing. It is fair right now to consider that Democratic Presidents and Republican Presidents could misuse this power.

I voted for it with concerns a couple of weeks ago, but that was before organization after organization met with me, called my office, and sent letters. Community foundations across this region, hardly terrorist-supporting organizations, are terrified that their nonprofit status will be taken away from them unjustly and inappropriately.

It is deeply unfortunate that this was matched with a very good, commonsense legislation that Congresswomen DINA TITUS, CLAUDIA TENNEY, and I are co-leading on postponing fines and fees on taxpayers who have been unlawfully detained as hostages. This is what passed the Senate overwhelmingly. In pairing this deeply controversial legislation, we have all woken up to that potential, not just because of Donald Trump, but because the nonprofits could be affected by it and are aware of its impact. It happened immediately after it came out of the Ways and Means Committee.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, 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

the Americans who have been wrongfully detained overseas.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, only in Washington is a bill that passed 382-11 considered deeply controversial, a bill that says that U.S. tax dollars should not subsidize terrorist organizations.

The other side views that as deeply controversial. That is the statement you just heard from the prior speaker. That is very, very unfortunate. That is why the American public is so upset with Washington. It is because they are completely out of touch with reality.

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

Mr. ESTES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of a commonsense bill that should receive unanimous support in the Chamber today, H.R. 9495, the Stop Terror-Financing and Tax Penalties on American Hostages Act.

Our discussion today is against the backdrop of the atrocious attacks on Israel by Hamas terrorists more than 1 year ago, and while nearly 6,000 miles away from our Nation’s Capital, seven Americans, three of whom are presumed dead, are still held captive by Hamas.

Mr. Speaker, I know this bill won’t bring them home, but it does two critical things to prevent support of terrorists and to provide some relief when our brothers and sisters do arrive back on U.S. soil.

First, it ends the tax-exempt status of organizations that support terrorist groups like Hamas. This is a no-brainer. We shouldn’t reward organizations that provide resources to terrorists or other terrorist-supporting organizations. It is unconscionable to think that organizations supporting the savages who are holding Americans hostage would be in the same tax category as the Red Cross, the Salvation Army, and local churches throughout Kansas.

The United States shouldn’t be giving any incentive for organizations to be helpful to terrorists, period.

Second, the bill addresses a lingering issue for survivors and their families when they do return home: harassment from the IRS. The Americans held hostage in Gaza and elsewhere throughout the globe have suffered enough and don’t need their own government pursuing back taxes and fines upon their homecoming. Current law prevents the IRS from having the authority to extend relief beyond a single year. This is insufficient.

The policies in this bill are commonsense and bring some measure of relief to our fellow Americans who are suffering under terrorist restraint, and I urge all Members to vote in favor of this bill.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I would reiterate that on October 1, the IRS, once again, extended for another year the protection that the gentleman says he wants. I am as opposed to Hamas as he is, but this has nothing to do with that. It has everything to do with what happens within this country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) for further explanation of that and to tell us a little bit about what due process means.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I had a law professor who once asked the class: What are the two most beautiful words in the English language? He said due process. I thought the answer might be free speech, but all four of these words are ravaged and devoured by H.R. 9495, which is truly a werewolf in sheep's clothing.

Mr. Speaker, it is a Federal felony crime today to provide any material support to terrorist groups. If your not-for-profit does that, then you are going to prison for at least 10 years and maybe for the rest of your life. Losing your 501(c)(3) tax-exempt status is the least of your worries.

If rendering support to terrorists is already a felony crime, then what is this all about?

Americans have an absolute First Amendment right to give money to support political groups that don't engage in terrorism, like the ACLU, Amnesty International, Razom for Ukraine, and the International Rescue Committee, but this bill would give the new administration unilateral power to designate any of them a terrorist-supporting group and strip them of their tax-exempt status while capsizing and inverting the Constitution's guaranty of due process.

In *Freedman v. Maryland* in 1965, the Supreme Court found that the government can only impose a prior restraint on speech, which is what this is, if there is first a judicial determination in an adversary proceeding in which the party being targeted can hear all the evidence against them, provide rebutting evidence of their own, and obtain an independent adjudication of the charge by a neutral judge. That is what due process is.

This sloppy bill thrown before us today contains everything condemned by the Supreme Court. The Treasury Department will be able to unilaterally affix the terrorist-supporting label on a not-for-profit group without going to court, without offering any legal proof, without meeting any legal standard, and without giving the target an opportunity even to know the evidence against them.

Although the Treasury Secretary must notify the group that it will be designated a terrorist-supporting organization in 90 days unless the Secretary is satisfied with the group's answer, it remains completely up to the Secretary to make a "final agency determination" without meeting any standard of proof.

Once this scarlet letter and the infamy of being designated a terrorist-supporting group are firmly affixed on the organization, the stigmatized then can finally go to a judge. Incredibly,

the legal burden is explicitly put on them to prove they are not a terrorist-supporting group, completely reversing the burden of due process, which properly belongs to the government. A sixth grader would know this is unconstitutional.

This is an unlawful power to vest in any President and a dangerous power to vest in a President who shows no qualms about leveling threats of retribution and revenge against his enemies. The President-elect has said that Special Counsel Jack Smith should be arrested, former Congresswoman Liz Cheney, the former head of the Republican Conference, should be jailed, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Mark Milley should be court-martialed.

Mr. Speaker, you can imagine what they would do to a human rights group that dares to criticize Vladimir Putin or another of the beloved autocrats around the world.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, American civil society and the not-for-profit sector must be protected against political censorship and government vendetta.

To get America to bite on this toxic sandwich, they have tucked the rotten unconstitutional meat in with language clarifying that Americans held hostage are not subject to IRS penalties for failing to pay their taxes on time. The Senate already passed this fine legislation, and we could do that unanimously today. Instead, they want us to vote to give the President Orwellian powers and the American not-for-profit sector Kafkaesque nightmares.

I voted against this bill last week, and I will vote against it today, tomorrow, next week, for the next 4 years, and beyond.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, we just heard that a sixth grader could see that this is unconstitutional. However, a Harvard lawyer thought this was okay in April when it passed with only 11 dissenting votes, so to me, I believe that argument does not hold water.

Tax-exempt status, Mr. Speaker, is not a constitutional right. It is not a constitutional right, but there is still robust due process protection in this bill that we worked out with our Democratic colleagues before passage in the Ways and Means Committee.

That didn't stop, though, the gentleman from Maryland from voting in favor of these same exact identical provisions earlier this year.

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

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, what we are witnessing on the floor today is, I believe, one of the most bizarre arguments against a bill that I have seen since I have been here in my 8 years in Congress.

In fact, look over there and see how they are contorting themselves to say they are against this bill.

Mr. Speaker, remember that old game we used to play as kids, Twister? It looks like a game of Twister over on that side today.

First, about the facts in this bill, today, it is 411 days since Hamas terrorists captured and continue to hold men, women, and children, including seven American citizens, hostage in the Gaza Strip.

In the wake of those attacks, nefarious groups have leveraged their status as nonprofits under section 501(c)(3) of the tax code to provide material and financial support to Hamas.

□ 1000

We have examples. One is the Alliance for Global Justice, which is linked to the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, which the State Department has designated as a terrorist organization.

Another example is the Popular Media Project, which employed a Hamas spokesperson who held three Israelis hostage at his home in Gaza.

Mr. Speaker, we don't negotiate with terrorists, so why should we allow tax-advantaged groups to fund them?

Why should taxpayers be on the hook to subsidize organizations aiding Hamas terrorists and continuing to hold American citizens hostage?

Why did our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, along with Mr. DOGGETT, vote for this bill unanimously in the Ways and Means Committee on September 11?

Why was it okay to prevent the funding of terrorists by nonprofits then, but it is not okay to do so now?

Why did our colleagues on the floor of the House vote for this, but not now?

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle say it is because suddenly we have Donald Trump as our President. You are saying, folks, this would have been okay if President HARRIS had been elected, but not with Donald Trump?

Maybe it makes sense because, under Democratic Presidents, the IRS did target conservative groups. Where was your outrage at that when the IRS was targeting conservative groups?

Do you know that President Trump won the election by a wide margin? He has a mandate by the American people. He won the popular vote. He won 312 electoral votes.

The American people believe that Donald Trump will save this country and will put this country on the right path. They don't believe that he is a fascist. They don't believe that he is the kind of dictator that you think he will be.

Talk about election denialism. When are you going to accept that President Trump won this election and that President Trump will do what is right for the American people?

Mr. Speaker, this is the most bizarre argument that I have heard on this bill. It is the most bizarre argument I

have heard since I have been in Congress. They have completely reversed their vote in just a few months. It is unbelievable, Mr. Speaker. It is sad.

This is a bill that has parameters around the bill. They say now, suddenly, it doesn't have parameters.

It simply says, if a nonprofit is supporting a terrorist organization, their tax status should be revoked. It is a commonsense bill. Do not believe what they are saying today.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is trying to turn the world upside down. We are the ones who accept election results. We are not the ones who stormed the Capitol. We are not the ones who still deny the results of the last election. We believe in democracy and the will of the people and the responsibility of the Members of this body to stand up and exercise effective checks and balances.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO), the distinguished ranking member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, who was here with me last week to oppose this very bad bill.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 9495. As Members of Congress, it is our duty to stand against terrorism and stand up for our common values, but this bill does neither.

What does it do?

What it does is grant sweeping draconian powers to the executive branch to essentially shut down any nonprofit.

On what basis would future administrations, Democratic or Republican, be able to exercise such power?

On a mere accusation.

I repeat, an accusation.

All nonprofits could be under scrutiny. These are decent people who are advocating on issues from religious freedom to animal welfare.

Mr. Speaker, why would conservatives, the very same people who gnashed their teeth at executive overreach, support such a measure?

Why would they suddenly about-face and sacrifice the values they claim to stand for?

It is because this is a gift to the President-elect, Mr. Trump, wrapped up in a bow right before the holidays.

On the campaign trail, he has made no secret of who he would seek to go after. This is bigger than the President-elect because now every President who would be king would be free to seek vengeance on their political opponents for every perceived slight.

I caution my colleagues to consider how far-reaching the consequences of this bill would be. This bill would apply to all future Presidents.

At a time when we should be strengthening our checks and balances

and shoring up our guardrails, this legislation would do the opposite.

Mr. Speaker, in the strongest possible terms, I urge my colleagues to vote against this executive branch power grab.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, one of the speakers on the other side who had previously voted in support of this bill said last week, when explaining his new opposition: "With Trump's election, the conditions have changed."

We just heard that from the prior speaker, as well. If the minority thought Ms. HARRIS would have been the President-elect, my colleagues would still be supporting this bill.

Terrorism exists regardless of who the President of the United States is, and we as Members of Congress have the duty to make sure that taxpayers are not subsidizing terrorism. It is very, very simple.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BEAN).

Mr. BEAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, common sense will tell Members that an American held hostage overseas probably is not going to get a chance to file their taxes. Common sense, Mr. Speaker, will tell my colleagues that they probably won't even get a chance to file an extension.

Mr. Speaker, one would think that that American being held hostage overseas should not be subject to penalties and interest on taxes that went unpaid during their captivity. Mr. Speaker, that is not the case in crazy town.

Mr. Speaker, one would also think that American tax dollars should not be used to subsidize groups supporting terrorist activities but remember that this is crazy town.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to bring common sense back to crazy town, and that is why we need H.R. 9495, the Stop Terror-Financing and Tax Penalties on American Hostages Act. The bill would bring common sense and allow the IRS to waive penalties for late taxes for Americans being held hostage overseas and would direct the IRS to revoke the tax-exempt status of a nonprofit found providing financial support to a terrorist organization.

Mr. Speaker, it is just common sense.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB).

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, this is going to be my third time voting against this bill because I don't care who the President of the United States is. This is a dangerous and unconstitutional bill that would allow unchecked power to target nonprofit organizations as political enemies and shut them down without due process.

If Members really truly cared about the hostages or Americans being held captive, the Stop Tax Penalties on American Hostages Act is already here as a standalone bill that passed out of the Senate. Let's not make it about that.

This legislation is part of a broader assault on our civil liberties, including

our right to dissent in our country. It aims to criminalize the very social justice movements fighting for justice and peace here at home, as well as abroad.

Make no mistake, and I constantly have said this to my colleagues. This is not just about Palestinian human rights advocacy organizations. This is about the NAACP, the ACLU, Planned Parenthood, organizations that have been trying to make it safe for our kids to go to school, away from gun crises and violence.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 10½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Missouri has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL), the chair of the Progressive Caucus within our Democratic Party.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this bill, which would give Donald Trump, and any future President, unfettered power to punish civil society groups, news outlets, hospitals, and universities with zero due process.

This bill is an authoritarian play by Republicans to expand the sweeping powers of the executive branch, to go after political enemies, and to stifle political dissent. It allows Republicans to empower Donald Trump to go after enemies at will, to put hospitals that provide reproductive care to women out of business, to label environmental advocates as ecoterrorists, to target humanitarian organizations or the foundations that support them, to punish news organizations and think tanks that put out research or policies that contradict Donald Trump, and to obliterate civil liberties groups who seek to protect those very liberties from authoritarianism.

Mr. Speaker, Americans want checks and balances, not a blank check for a President to label anyone as a terrorist.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, Americans want checks and balances, not a blank check for any President to label anyone as a terrorist without evidence.

Providing material support to terrorist groups is already a crime and can be criminally prosecuted, but this bill removes all due process protections.

That is exactly why the same bill failed on the House floor last week, but instead of moving on and taking on the real economic issues that are facing Americans today or working simply to fund the government, Republicans are fixated on giving unchecked powers to the Trump administration.

Weaponizing the government is the foundation of Trump's Project 2025. It is step one of Trump's project in action.

With this bill, the only guardrail against authoritarian abuse toward any voice of dissent to his agenda will be Trump's imagination.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on abusive, unchecked Presidential powers. I did last week, and I will this week, and at any other time it comes up.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I point out that the prior speaker voted in April for the exact language that she was railing against, for due process. The only thing that has changed for the majority of the people changing their votes over there is Donald Trump was elected President. That is unfortunate.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Ms. BUSH).

Ms. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, St. Louis and I rise in opposition to H.R. 9495.

Mr. Speaker, what we are witnessing today is straight out of a comic book, the part where the villain's origin story turns into a revenge plot. After years of stewing, Trump is ready to enact his plan, and H.R. 9495 is one of his weapons of choice.

With Trump, we face an administration obsessed with silencing dissent and with punishing those who Trump deems as his enemies. Every day, we watch unqualified TV personalities and accused sexual abusers walk into what would be his Cabinet.

Why? It is because loyalty to Trump is the only qualification that matters.

H.R. 9495 takes that demand for loyalty even farther. It hands Trump unchecked power to crush his opposition. This bill is about control. It is about revenge and stifling free expression.

News flash: America doesn't bow to wannabe dictators. We will fight your petty revenge plots at every turn. We will not stop fighting. You work for us, and we do not work for you. This bill is an affront to democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill.

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

The Chair would remind Members to direct their comments to the Chair.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I disagree with everything the gentlewoman from Missouri (Ms. BUSH) said.

What I will say is that at least she is consistent. She was 1 of the 11 that voted against the bill in April. Unfortunately, we have seen a lot of other people flip-flop, and that is what is unacceptable.

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

□ 1015

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

Mr. Speaker, let me reiterate what is not at stake today, and that is tax relief for the hostages. The IRS issued an order on October 1 as it had issued an order previously. If we pass no legislation, they have protection. That has never been denied here.

Indeed, we offered other protection. The Constitution was used as an argument against our approving that very relief. Mr. BEYER and others have a bill that could easily have been taken up here in the House, but no. They want to hold the hostage tax bill itself hostage for their other unfortunate purposes.

The second thing that is not at stake is our opposition to terrorism. Everyone, Republican and Democrat, oppose terrorists and we want to do all that we can to prevent terrorists from affecting this country, affecting Israel, the Middle East, and any other part of the world. We have laws on the books today to do just that.

They have been used against terrorist organizations. They have been used against those who support terrorist organizations, but they have been used with regard to due process. The only reason they have this bill up here is to empower future Presidents to ignore those two vital words of "due process."

Let's talk a little about what is at stake here. Mr. SMITH presented to this body a letter that he sent the IRS on September 24.

I have that letter here. It was one of nine letters he sent to the IRS on the 24th, and he is complaining that less than 2 months later, they have not acted on all nine of his letters. He says that he is only interested in protecting legitimate nonprofits, not any illegitimate nonprofits.

Well, if we look at his letters as I have, we find out what he considers to be "material support to terrorism" that he wants to prohibit, and it is the very kind of thing that is at stake in this bill that a future President, our President-elect, could use to undermine civic organizations all over this country.

One of the organizations that he wants to deny, wants to terminate their nonprofit status, the material support that they provided to terrorism was that they had a protest and they engaged in civic disobedience.

Surprisingly, I would say, the same organization he complains about has protested one of my speeches. I believe America is stronger when we provide and permit dissent in all its forms, as long as it is done in a proper way.

Let's think a little bit about civil disobedience. There are today 151 Members of this Congress who are women. Does anyone think they would be here if the suffragettes had not had the willingness to engage in civic disobedience and be taken to jail from out in front of the White House?

We have 64 African-American Members in this Congress today. Does anyone think that had it not been for the

Freedom Riders, for those who put their lives on the line to protect the right to vote, who engaged in civil disobedience and did not obey the laws of Mississippi, Alabama, and Texas, does anyone think we would have moved our country as far as it has despite its many successes, its many shortcomings?

We have made some progress, and those who are willing to put their lives on the line and, yes, engage in civil disobedience, they have contributed on the whole to this being a fairer and more just country, and to deny, to terminate the life of a civic organization because they choose to engage and face the penalties of civil disobedience, but not the elimination of their right to exist as a nonprofit organization.

Protests are inconvenient. The one I had was inconvenient. Sometimes they are misconceived. They get out of hand, but over our Nation's history, nonviolent protests and acts of civil disobedience have made this a more equal country.

We all live in a better Nation today because people and civic organizations have stood up for our democratic values and our fundamental freedoms, even when we found their conduct to be most disagreeable.

Now, there has been much made in this debate of the fact that some of us have switched our positions. We have been called flip-floppers. I voted for this part of this legislation three times, including the times in committee, though, I did ask in committee that it be amended to address the very concerns I am raising today. But what is the answer to those who may change their vote today, as many will, and vote "no"?

The answer is, we listened to our constituents, and the Republicans who support this bill, they were listening also, but as you can tell from the frequent flyer miles they have been earning going back and forth to Mar-a-Lago, they were listening to one person. We were listening to constituents from all over this country.

Now almost 300 organizations expressed concern and fear about what will happen in the next 4 years under a vengeful President against these organizations who this chairman says are not legitimate because they protest. They sometimes engage in civic disobedience.

Let me tell you a little bit about who those organizations are and how they cover and involve so many people across this country.

The American Civil Liberties Union has its work cut out over the next 4 years with regard to what is already happening. The American Public Health Association may not agree with destroying ObamaCare and denying and making people who are poor who rely on Medicaid pay for tax cuts for the rich. The Brennan Center is another

voice for civil society and civil liberties in our country. Planned Parenthood has been attacked by one extremist group as a terrorist organization because it recognizes that abortion care is healthcare. The AFL-CIO, the Service Employees Union, the United Auto Workers, the American Federation of Teachers, the National Education Association, these are the kind of employee groups and professionals that serve our country whose voice is being heard, who many of my colleagues who, like I, once voted for this bill, have listened to them and the impact that they think this bill under the incoming President will have on their ability to function and defend working people.

The League of Conservation Voters and the Sierra Club are attacked by extremists as being eco-terrorists sometimes when they don't automatically approve every mine that gets opened, every destruction of native lands that occurs, and stand up and speak up for the environment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Again, the Chair reminds Members not to engage in personalities toward a President-elect.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am extremely grateful that the American people have been able to watch the debate of this piece of legislation today because they have seen with their own eyes the differences between the House Republicans and the House Democrats, and the insanity that just in April, 382 individuals in this Chamber voted for and 11 voted against.

The provisions are the same. The only thing that has changed, Mr. Speaker, according to their quotes on the floor, is Donald Trump was elected President. That is the only thing that has changed.

This bill is very simple. If a nonprofit organization is funding terrorism, you lose your tax-exempt status. If we are truly against terrorism, our actions will speak louder and we will vote for this legislation, but we will see. We will see who is brave on the other side, who wants to stand with real America and not woke policies.

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

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 1576, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on passage of H.R. 9495 will be followed by a 5-minute vote on:

The motion to suspend the rules and agree to H. Res. 915.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 184, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 477]
YEAS—219

Aderholt	Gimenez	Moolenaar
Alford	Golden (ME)	Mooney
Allred	Gonzales, Tony	Moore (AL)
Amodei	Gonzalez, V.	Moore (UT)
Armstrong	Good (VA)	Moran
Arrington	Gooden (TX)	Moskowitz
Babin	Gosar	Nunn (IA)
Bacon	Graves (LA)	Obernolte
Baird	Graves (MO)	Ogles
Balderson	Green (TN)	Owens
Banks	Griffith	Palmer
Barr	Grothman	Panetta
Bean (FL)	Guest	Pence
Bentz	Guthrie	Hageman
Bergman	Hagman	Harris
Bice	Harris	Harshbarger
Biggs	Harshbarger	Hern
Bilirakis	Hern	Higgins (LA)
Bishop (NC)	Higgins (LA)	Hill
Boebert	Hill	Hinson
Bost	Hinson	Houchin
Brecheen	Houchin	Hudson
Buchanan	Hudson	Huizenga
Bucshon	Huizenga	Hunt
Burchett	Hunt	Issa
Burgess	Issa	Jackson (TX)
Burlison	Jackson (TX)	James
Calvert	James	Johnson (LA)
Cammack	Johnson (LA)	Johnson (SD)
Caraveo	Johnson (SD)	Jordan
Carey	Jordan	Joyce (PA)
Carl	Joyce (PA)	Kean (NJ)
Carter (TX)	Kean (NJ)	Kelly (MS)
Case	Kelly (MS)	Kelly (PA)
Ciscomani	Kelly (PA)	Kiggans (VA)
Cline	Kiggans (VA)	Kiley
Cloud	Kiley	Kim (CA)
Clyde	Kim (CA)	Kustoff
Cole	Kustoff	LaHood
Collins	LaHood	LaLota
Comer	LaLota	LaMalfa
Crane	LaMalfa	Lamborn
Crawford	Lamborn	Langworthy
Crenshaw	Langworthy	Latta
Cuellar	Latta	LaTurner
Curtis	LaTurner	Lawler
D'Esposito	Lawler	Lee (FL)
Davidson	Lee (FL)	Lee (NV)
Davis (NC)	Lee (NV)	Lesko
De La Cruz	Lesko	Letlow
Diaz-Balart	Letlow	Lopez
Donalds	Lopez	Loudermilk
Duarte	Loudermilk	Lucas
Dunn (FL)	Lucas	Luetkemeyer
Edwards	Luetkemeyer	Luna
Ellzey	Luna	Luttrell
Emmer	Luttrell	Mace
Estes	Mace	Malliotakis
Ezell	Malliotakis	Maloy
Fallon	Maloy	Mann
Feenstra	Mann	Mast
Finstad	Mast	McCaul
Fischbach	McCaul	McClain
Fitzgerald	McClain	McClintock
Fitzpatrick	McClintock	McCormick
Fleischmann	McCormick	McHenry
Flood	McHenry	Meuser
Fong	Meuser	Miller (IL)
Fox	Miller (IL)	Miller (OH)
Franklin, Scott	Miller (OH)	Miller (WV)
Fry	Miller (WV)	Miller-Meeks
Fulcher	Miller-Meeks	Mills
Garcia, Mike	Mills	Molinaro

NAYS—184

Adams	Auchincloss	Beatty
Aguilar	Balint	Bera
Amo	Barragan	Beyer

Bishop (GA)	Houlahan	Pallone
Blumenauer	Hoyer	Pappas
Blunt Rochester	Hoyle (OR)	Pelosi
Bonamici	Huffman	Peltola
Bowman	Ivey	Peters
Brown	Jackson (IL)	Pettersen
Budzinski	Jacobs	Pingree
Bush	Jayapal	Pocan
Carbajal	Jeffries	Pressley
Cárdenas	Johnson (GA)	Quigley
Carson	Kamlager-Dove	Ramirez
Carter (LA)	Kaptur	Raskin
Cartwright	Keating	Ross
Casas	Kelly (IL)	Ruiz
Casten	Kennedy	Ruppersberger
Castor (FL)	Khanna	Ryan
Castro (TX)	Kildee	Salinas
Cherfilus-	Kilmer	Sánchez
McCormick	Kim (NJ)	Sarbanes
Chu	Krishnamoorthi	Scanlon
Clark (MA)	Kuster	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Landsman	Schiff
Cleaver	Larsen (WA)	Scholten
Clyburn	Larson (CT)	Schrier
Cohen	Lee (CA)	Scott (VA)
Correa	Lee (PA)	Sewell
Costa	Lee Carter	Sherman
Courtney	Leger Fernandez	Sherrill
Craig	Levin	Slotkin
Crockett	Lieu	Sorensen
Crow	Lofgren	Soto
Davids (KS)	Lynch	Spanberger
Davis (IL)	Magaziner	Stansbury
Dean (PA)	Manning	Stanton
DeGette	Massie	Stevens
DeLauro	Matsui	Strickland
DelBene	McBath	Swalwell
Deluzio	McClellan	Sykes
DeSaulnier	McCollum	Takano
Dingell	McGarvey	Thanedar
Doggett	McGovern	Thompson (CA)
Escobar	McIver	Thompson (MS)
Eshoo	Meeks	Titus
Espallat	Menendez	Tlaib
Fletcher	Meng	Tokuda
Foster	Mfume	Tonko
Frost	Moore (WI)	Trahan
Garamendi	Morelle	Trone
Garcia (IL)	Moulton	Underwood
Garcia (TX)	Mrvan	Vargas
Garcia, Robert	Mullin	Vasquez
Goldman (NY)	Nadler	Veasey
Gomez	Napolitano	Velázquez
Green, Al (TX)	Neal	Waters
Grijalva	Neguse	Watson Coleman
Harder (CA)	Nickel	Wild
Hayes	Norcross	Williams (GA)
Himes	Ocasio-Cortez	Wilson (FL)
Horsford	Omar	

NOT VOTING—30

Boyle (PA)	Frankel, Lois	Newhouse
Brownley	Gallego	Norman
Carter (GA)	Garbarino	Phillips
Chavez-DeRemer	Gottheimer	Porter
Connolly	Granger	Salazar
DesJarlais	Greene (GA)	Scott, David
Duncan	Jackson (NC)	Smith (WA)
Evans	Joyce (OH)	Torres (NY)
Ferguson	Murphy	Waltz
Foushee	Nehls	Wexton

□ 1047

Mr. BLUMENAUER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. PALMER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

URGING THE GOVERNMENT OF UKRAINE TO REVIEW AND MODIFY ITS DECISION TO SUSPEND ADOPTION BY FOREIGN NATIONALS WITH A VIEW TO RESUMING SUCH ADOPTIONS

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 agree to

the resolution (H. Res. 915) urging the Government of Ukraine to review and modify its decision to suspend adoption by foreign nationals with a view to resuming such adoptions, particularly in cases where the mutual concerns of the Governments of Ukraine and of the United States can be substantially addressed, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Guam (Mr. MOYLAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 372, nays 6, not voting 54, as follows:

[Roll No. 478]

YEAS—372

Adams	Collins	Grijalva
Aderholt	Comer	Grothman
Aguilar	Correa	Guest
Alford	Costa	Guthrie
Allen	Crane	Hageman
Allred	Crawford	Harder (CA)
Amo	Crenshaw	Harris
Amodei	Crockett	Harshbarger
Armstrong	Crow	Hayes
Arrington	Cuellar	Hern
Auchincloss	Curtis	Higgins (LA)
Babin	D'Esposito	Hill
Bacon	Dauids (KS)	Himes
Baird	Davidson	Hinson
Balderson	Davis (IL)	Horsford
Balint	Davis (NC)	Houchin
Banks	De La Cruz	Houlahan
Barr	Dean (PA)	Hoyer
Barragán	DeGette	Hoyle (OR)
Beatty	DeLauro	Hudson
Bentz	DelBene	Huffman
Bera	Deluzio	Huizenga
Bergman	DeSaulnier	Hunt
Beyer	Diaz-Balart	Issa
Bice	Dingell	Ivey
Biggs	Doggett	Jackson (IL)
Bilirakis	Donalds	Jackson (TX)
Bishop (GA)	Duarte	Jacobs
Bishop (NC)	Dunn (FL)	James
Blumenauer	Edwards	Jayapal
Blunt Rochester	Ellzey	Jeffries
Boebert	Emmer	Johnson (GA)
Bonamici	Escobar	Johnson (SD)
Bost	Eshoo	Jordan
Bowman	Españillat	Joyce (PA)
Brecheen	Estes	Kaptur
Brown	Ezell	Kean (NJ)
Bucshon	Fallon	Keating
Budzinski	Feenstra	Kelly (IL)
Burchett	Finstad	Kelly (MS)
Burgess	Fischbach	Kelly (PA)
Burlison	Fitzgerald	Kennedy
Bush	Fitzpatrick	Khanna
Calvert	Fleischmann	Kigrans (VA)
Caraveo	Fletcher	Kildee
Carbajal	Flood	Kiley
Cárdenas	Fong	Kilmer
Carey	Fox	Kim (CA)
Carl	Franklin, Scott	Kim (NJ)
Carson	Frost	Krishnamoorthi
Carter (LA)	Fry	Kuster
Carter (TX)	Fulcher	Kustoff
Cartwright	Garamendi	LaHood
Case	Garcia (IL)	LaLota
Casten	Garcia (TX)	LaMalfa
Castor (FL)	Garcia, Mike	Lamborn
Castro (TX)	Garcia, Robert	Landsman
Cherfilus-	Golden (ME)	Langworthy
McCormick	Goldman (NY)	Larsen (WA)
	Gomez	Larson (CT)
Ciscomani	Gonzales, Tony	Latta
Clark (MA)	Gonzalez, V.	LaTurner
Clarke (NY)	Good (VA)	Lawler
Cleaver	Gooden (TX)	Lee (CA)
Cline	Graves (LA)	Lee (FL)
Cloud	Graves (MO)	Lee (NV)
Clyburn	Green (TN)	Lee (PA)
Clyde	Green, Al (TX)	Lee Carter
Cohen	Griffith	Leger Fernandez

Lesko	Nunn (IA)	Sorensen
Letlow	Oberholte	Soto
Levin	Ocasio-Cortez	Spanberger
Lieu	Ogles	Spartz
Lofgren	Omar	Stansbury
Loudermilk	Owens	Stanton
Lucas	Pallone	Steel
Luetkemeyer	Palmer	Stefanik
Luna	Panetta	Steil
Luttrell	Pappas	Steube
Lynch	Pelosi	Stevens
Mace	Peltola	Strickland
Malliotakis	Pence	Strong
Maloy	Perez	Suozzi
Mann	Perry	Swalwell
Manning	Peters	Takano
Mast	Petterson	Tenney
Matsui	Pfluger	Thanedar
McBath	Pingree	Thompson (CA)
McCaul	Posey	Thompson (MS)
McClain	Pressley	Thompson (PA)
McClellan	Ramirez	Tiffany
McClintock	Raskin	Timmons
McCollum	Reschenthaler	Titus
McCormick	Rodgers (WA)	Tokuda
McGarvey	Rogers (AL)	Tonko
McGovern	Rogers (KY)	Torres (CA)
McHenry	Rose	Trahan
McIver	Rosendale	Trone
Meeks	Ross	Turner
Menendez	Rouzer	Underwood
Meng	Roy	Valadao
Meuser	Ruiz	Van Drew
Mfume	Rulli	Van Duyn
Miller (IL)	Rutherford	Van Orden
Miller (OH)	Ryan	Vargas
Miller (WV)	Salinas	Vasquez
Miller-Meeks	Sánchez	Veasey
Mills	Scalise	Velázquez
Molinaro	Scanlon	Wagner
Moolenaar	Schiff	Walberg
Mooney	Schneider	Wasserman
Moore (AL)	Scholten	Schultz
Moore (UT)	Schrier	Waters
Moore (WI)	Schweikert	Watson Coleman
Morelle	Scott (VA)	Weber (TX)
Moskowitz	Scott, Austin	Westerman
Moulton	Self	Wied
Mrvan	Sherman	Wild
Mullin	Sherrill	Williams (GA)
Mullins	Simpson	Williams (TX)
Nadler	Slotkin	Wilson (SC)
Neal	Smith (MO)	Womack
Neguse	Smith (NJ)	Yakym
Nickel	Smith (NE)	Zinke
Norcross	Smucker	

NAYS—6

Cammack	Gosar
Casar	Magaziner
Bean (FL)	Garbarino
Boyle (PA)	Gimenez
Brownley	Gottheimer
Buchanan	Granger
Carter (GA)	Greene (GA)
Chavez-DeRemer	Jackson (NC)
Cole	Joyce (OH)
Connolly	Kamllager-Dove
Courtney	Lopez
Craig	Murphy
DesJarlais	Napolitano
Duncan	Nehls
Evans	Newhouse
Ferguson	Norman
Foster	Phillips
Foushee	Pocan
Frankel, Lois	Porter
Gallego	Quigley

NOT VOTING—54

□ 1054

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 478.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 478.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. BROWNLEY. Mr. Speaker, I was not able to vote today. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 477 and YEA on Roll Call No. 478.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 477 and YEA on Roll Call No. 478.

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present to cast my votes today. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 477 and YEA on Roll Call No. 478.

APPOINTMENT OF INDIVIDUALS TO CONGRESSIONAL AWARD BOARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to section 803(a) of the Congressional Recognition for Excellence in Arts Education Act (2 U.S.C. 803(a)), and the order of the House of January 9, 2023, of the following individuals on the part of the House to the Congressional Award Board:

Ms. Brenda Larsen Becker, Alexandria, Virginia

Mrs. Susan Brackin Hirschmann, Alexandria, Virginia

Ms. Sylvie Legere, Wilmette, Illinois

COMMUNICATION FROM THE SPEAKER

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

WASHINGTON, DC,

November 21, 2024.

I hereby designate the period from Thursday, November 21, 2024, through Monday, December 2, 2024, as a "district work period" under section 3(z) of House Resolution 5.

MIKE JOHNSON,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

□ 1100

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL FAMILY CAREGIVERS MONTH

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

Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a co-chair of the Assisting Caregivers Today, or ACT, Caucus, to recognize National Family Caregivers Month.

Every November, we bring awareness to the people who dedicate their time, money, and efforts to care for their loved ones. There are roughly 48 million family caregivers in the United States who give around-the-clock care for their family members.

On average, caregivers across the country provide nearly \$600 billion in unpaid labor annually. In addition to providing these essential services unpaid, more than three in four family

caregivers spend their own hard-earned money to take care of their loved ones.

These sacrifices often go unrecognized, so it is important that we, as Members of Congress, do what we can to recognize their commitment and ensure they have the resources they need.

As the only geriatric nurse-practitioner in Congress, I have seen firsthand the challenges they face and the vital services they provide. I am proud to advocate for caregivers and policies that would make their already difficult situation easier to navigate.

Today and every day, we thank those who dedicate their lives to caring for their parents, children, spouses, and other loved ones.

AMERICAN EDUCATION WEEK

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

Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the teachers, education support professionals, family volunteers, and above all, learners at all levels.

As we celebrate American Education Week, it is essential to reflect on how education shapes our future. Education is a lifeline, especially in eastern North Carolina.

Our communities demonstrate enormous resilience and a deep commitment to the success of learners. Educators work tirelessly to create an environment where every learner can live the American Dream.

Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate American Education Week in eastern North Carolina, we are so excited to break ground today for the East Carolina University Center for Medical Education building.

Indeed, education is a pathway to personal success and building a stronger economy. We must continue to support and uplift education in America.

RECOGNIZING BRENDON GALLO

(Mrs. LESKO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the person that helps my world go round, my deputy chief of staff, Brendon Gallo.

Brendon is a dedicated staffer who works tirelessly to ensure our office runs smoothly each and every day. He is committed to serving me and the constituents of Arizona's Eighth Congressional District.

Whether it is a meeting in our office, a Capitol tour, or a visit to the White House, Brendon is the guy you call to get the job done.

A graduate of NYU and a Pennsylvania native, Brendon joined my team in 2020 and has shown his commitment to public service throughout his tenure.

I cannot thank him enough for his dedication to me, our district, the State of Arizona, and the Nation. As I

leave Congress, I have no doubt Brendon will go on to do great things as he continues his public service.

Mr. Speaker, I wish him nothing but the best in all of his future endeavors. I am going to miss him. God bless him.

HONORING NATIONAL RURAL HEALTH DAY

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

Ms. SALINAS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize National Rural Health Day. Approximately, one-fifth of America and about one in three Oregonians lives in a rural or frontier community.

However, many rural areas do not have enough providers or facilities to meet community needs, forcing residents to travel long distances and requiring time off of work.

Your Zip Code should not prevent you from accessing potentially life-saving care. As a founding member of the Bipartisan Rural Health Caucus, I have championed several pieces of legislation that will help close these gaps and ensure rural America is not left behind.

For example, my Home-Based Telemental Health Care Act would expand access to virtual mental health and substance use treatment services in rural communities.

In addition to making it easier and cheaper for folks to see a provider, the bill would also help reduce stigma by allowing people to get care from the comfort and safety of their own homes. This is just one commonsense idea among many I have supported to expand access to healthcare in our rural communities.

As we approach the start of a new Congress, I remain committed to working with anyone on both sides of the aisle who is serious about finding solutions to the mental health and addiction crisis. Every American deserves high quality, affordable healthcare regardless of where they live.

RECOGNIZING DESSIE BEBOUT

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

Ms. HAGEMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and legacy of Dessie Bebout.

Born as the fourth of nine children and raised in the small town of Hudson, Wyoming, love of family and community quickly became guiding principles that steered the course of Dessie's life of unending service.

Following the 1941 attack on Pearl Harbor, Dessie was one of the first women to join the war effort under the newly established Women Accepted for Volunteer Emergency Service program where she took part in recording and tracking the arrival and departure of sailors to and from the Pacific fleet throughout the war.

Despite her excelling in this role and later being presented with the opportunity to participate in officer training school, Dessie chose to return to Wyoming with the love of her life, Herbert Hugh Bebout, after getting married while they were both on leave.

However, it was in 1962 that Dessie began her notable 13-year-long career at the Shoshoni Post Office where she would serve as the postmaster with great distinction, and upon her retirement, received the Order of the Vest, the highest and most prestigious recognition given to postmasters.

Dessie peacefully passed away in May 2023 at the age of 102, after living a remarkable life rooted in public service.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY MOM

Ms. HAGEMAN. Madam Speaker, shout out to my mother today for her birthday. She is 101 years young. Happy birthday, Marion Hageman.

RECOGNIZING THE NOTTOWAY TRIBE

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

Ms. McCLELLAN. Madam Speaker, the Commonwealth of Virginia is home to seven federally recognized Indian Tribes, including the Chickahominy Tribe in my district.

In addition, we have four State-recognized Tribes, one of which is the Nottoway Indian Tribe of Virginia, which received State recognition in 2010.

During the October recess, I had the opportunity to visit the Tribe's community house and interpretive center in Southampton County where I met with Chief Lynette Allston and Tribal Chair Denise Walters to discuss their rich history.

The Nottoway people first appear in the written record in 1650, when merchant and colonist, Edward Bland, encountered two Nottoway towns on the Nottoway River.

These Iroquoian-speaking people live in dispersed communities along the river in present day Dinwiddie, Isle of Wight, Nottoway, Sussex, and Southampton Counties.

Today, in honor of Native American History Month, I am filing a resolution to provide Federal recognition to the Nottoway Tribe of Virginia and look forward to finally seeing their sovereignty recognized.

HONORING CONGRESSMAN RICK NOLAN

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

Mr. STAUBER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and service of my predecessor, Congressman Rick Nolan.

Congressman Nolan has a long and distinguished history in this Chamber.

He first served as the Representative of Minnesota's Sixth Congressional District from 1975 through 1981, and then returned to Congress to serve as the Representative of Minnesota's Eighth Congressional District from 2013 to 2019.

Many who served with Rick remember him as a fighter for northern Minnesota and an avid lover of the great outdoors, and an advocate for those diagnosed with cancer.

I will always remember Rick as an exceptionally kind man. My favorite memory of Rick is the time I ran into him on a flight to Minnesota from Washington, D.C. He was a departing Member of Congress, and I was preparing to begin my first term.

Even though we disagreed on many issues, he made sure to come over and give me a hug and wish me well. I appreciated his kindness that day, and I know all of Minnesota appreciates his service.

My thoughts and prayers go out to his wife, Mary, and all of his loved ones as they grieve his loss.

RECOGNIZING THOMAS VIOLANTE

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

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the honorable life of Thomas Violante, an incredible businessowner from Royal Oak, Michigan, who inspired many through his pursuit of the American Dream and service to others.

Mr. Violante was born in 1929 to a working-class family. His father ran a small market, and he gained a passion for supporting his community through entrepreneurship. This passion solidified in 1951 when Thomas and his wife, Janet, purchased a small specialty store for just a pack of cigarettes and six-pack of beer. It would become the Holiday Market of Royal Oak.

Thomas Violante's business was more than just a grocery store, though. It was the embodiment of his values. He empowered his employees to be creative, to work hard, and to achieve their dreams.

Mr. Violante passed away on his 95th birthday last month. Beyond his role as a businessowner, he was a proud father, grandfather, great grandfather, veteran, and philanthropist.

He left an incredible mark on Michigan's 11th District, and I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring him.

THE RADICAL GREEN AGENDA

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, California Democrats are at it again, doubling down on their radical green agenda and threatening personal freedom.

A State-funded study has suggested a ban now on gas-powered classic cars from public roads, claiming they are too harmful to the environment. We are talking about parade cars. We are talking about hobby cars. We are talking about the stuff people enjoy. We are talking about the stuff politicians like to ride in parades in when they are running for reelection.

Let's be clear, classic cars are a lot more than just vehicles. They are pieces of our history, symbols of culture, and a source of pride for countless Californians.

It doesn't stop there. These same people trying to do these bans, these green policies, could hike gas prices by as much as 85 cents, 90 cents a gallon. They want to force you into an electric vehicle while our power grid can't even handle a summer heat wave.

Meanwhile, the elites pushing these bans are still flying private jets off to meet-ups overseas and cruising on their big yachts, which spew far more emissions than they want to outlaw.

It is not about saving the planet. It is about control. We need to call out this hypocrisy and stand up for the freedoms of individuals, for their automobiles, for what have you.

I can speak for a lot of them, knowing that you will pry my 1968 Mustang gearshift out of my cold, dead fingers.

HONORING COMMUNITY OF FAITH CHURCH

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

Mrs. LEE CARTER. Madam Speaker, today I rise to honor an incredible milestone for a wonderful institution in the 18th Congressional District, The Community of Faith church, which was founded after the vestiges of slavery is celebrating 150 years of faith, service, and community impact.

Founded in 1873 by the Reverend Jack Henry Yates, a former slave, who defied the odds and went on to establish businesses, schools, and churches. This congregation has a rich history of perseverance and resilience.

From its humble beginnings as Mount Pillow Missionary Baptist Church to its relocation during tumultuous times, it is now under the leadership of Bishop James Dixon II and has become a beacon of hope and transformation in our community.

I honor its former leaders, including Reverend Charlie Daniel James Dixon who served 50 years, guiding it through racial adversity, and Reverend Clovis Emory Johnson who served for 2 years and helped transition the church into new era of growth.

We also remember the leadership of Reverend Dixon's own grandfather, Reverend Jack Henry Yates who served from 1873 to 1927.

This place continues to be a wonderful place of worship, a community hub for development, education, and social justice.

As we celebrate this monumental 150 anniversary, we honor the rich legacy, but also the bright future ahead that may continue to do greater works for the glory of God and the service of all people.

Madam Speaker, I salute Bishop James Dixon II for his tremendous leadership, and his three children, Mariah, Victoria, and James W.E. Dixon III.

□ 1115

RECOGNIZING THE UNITED WAY OF GREATER TOLEDO

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I rise today, in anticipation of the Thanksgiving holiday, to recognize the invaluable efforts of the United Way of Greater Toledo to address hunger during this holiday season.

In Lucas, Wood, and Ottawa Counties, 40 percent of hardworking Iowans are at risk of not having enough to eat.

This reality highlights the critical importance of community-driven initiatives. Partnering with multiple nonprofit organizations, the United for the Holidays program brings the northwest Ohio community together to create more than 500 holiday boxes filled with 2 weeks' worth of food for families in need.

Not only are these volunteers delivering food but also hope and dignity to our neighbors in a season of giving and a time of need due to high food prices.

We are all committed to fighting hunger year round, and I am honored to keep fighting for laws that expand access to school meals and food coupons for our seniors in our summer fruit and vegetable programs and emergency food support across our communities. No family should face an empty table in the United States of America.

The majority party must move the long-delayed farm bill forward in order that our people can eat. We must build strong support systems to ensure that every Iowan has access to nutritious, reliable meals. Again, I thank the United Way of Greater Toledo for leading the way with love, for this vital effort at this season of Thanksgiving.

RECOGNIZING NORMA GRIFFIN

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

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and work of Norma Griffin.

Norma was a devoted educator, deeply committed to her community and empowering young people. She was a native New Yorker who settled in Concord, California, with her husband, Ralph, and their two sons, Ralph and Steven. She worked for over three decades in education, teaching in the New

York public school system, the Oakland Unified School District, the Mt. Diablo Unified School District, and overseas in Japan and France.

On top of teaching, Norma was a founding member of the Black Families Association of Contra Costa County in the bay area. She was a member of the Oakland Symphony Chorus and served as president of the American Association of University Women's local chapter.

For her work, Norma was recognized in 1995 as Teacher of the Year and Woman of the Year for State Assembly District 11 in the California legislature in 2008.

Sadly, Norma has passed away, and our hearts are with her friends and family. Norma will be remembered for her kindness, determination, and courage.

Please join me in honoring Norma Griffin for her incredible impact on our community and on this country.

PARTISAN GERRYMANDERING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. NICKEL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. NICKEL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to discuss the urgent need for Congress to act on partisan gerrymandering in the United States. The FAIR MAPS Act is a bill I have authored. We will talk about that today. This is a huge problem for the U.S. Congress, and I am glad to have the chance to speak about this today. I am joined by one of my outstanding colleagues from the great State of North Carolina, Congresswoman KATHY MANNING.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), my friend and colleague, to speak on this issue.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I really want to thank him, first of all, for his FAIR MAPS Act.

Ohio is the poster child for unfair maps. If you look at a State that voted twice for President-elect Trump and twice for President Obama, you would think that, for example, if the State has 15 Members, that it would be 8 and 7, you would sort of try to divide it equally because of 15 Members of Congress from Ohio and what is fair is fair.

What has happened in Ohio, because of a veto-proof legislature, due to gerrymandering in Ohio, in both chambers, what happens is that out of 15 seats, our side of the aisle, in Columbus, what they did down there, we have only 5 Democrats out of 15, only 33 percent, not 50 percent out of the 15. To be fair, if you have 15 seats, maybe it should be 8 and 7, you know, but to give us equal voice based on the public's right to full representation. Ohio is really the poster child for radical gerrymandering.

Recently, the polls showed that three-quarters of the people of Ohio wanted reform, and they wanted to set up a special independent commission to draw the districts in Ohio. The vast majority of people wanted change.

What happened? In Ohio, that issue was put on the ballot, but the secretary of state, who has been part of this veto-proof, one-party rule in Ohio that has become corrupt actually—Ohio is an extremely corrupt State right now, I am sad to say. People have gone to prison and more will go to prison because absolute power corrupts absolutely, including in gerrymandering.

There was this initiative that was placed on the ballot that the people voted to put on the ballot, but what did the secretary of state and attorney general in Ohio do? They wrote a gerrymandering proposition that was placed on the ballot that took up 3 pages. When the people went in to vote, just reading that, on these computers that we vote on now, took so much effort, the measure failed by a small margin because they were afraid. They didn't know what it was exactly, and it was made so complicated. Study Ohio as a classic case of hurting the people and not giving fair representation.

I just wanted to place that on the record so that those who are listening across this Chamber, across the intelligent media in our country, and the people of Ohio could hear this because they are not being represented fairly, and voices are being suppressed. That really goes against the very principle of one person, one vote and one person, one mind, to be able to have all of those views properly reflected.

I thank the Congressman for introducing the FAIR MAPS Act and focusing on this really critical matter of a democratic voice for the people of the United States of America. I can't compliment him enough. I am proud of his work and thank him for doing this.

Mr. NICKEL. Madam Speaker, I am grateful to my colleague from the great State of Ohio, a true champion for Ohio families.

Madam Speaker, I am going to talk about this a lot today, but in 1984, we had 190 Members elected to Congress in split-ticket districts. These are districts that voted for President of one party and a Member of Congress of another. This election, it looks like we are down to 13. Representative KAPTUR was one of those and has a great story to tell.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. MANNING).

Ms. MANNING. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend from North Carolina, Representative WILEY NICKEL, for holding this Special Order hour so that we can talk about such an important issue, an issue that strikes at the very heart of our democracy, and that is gerrymandering.

Last year, in my State of North Carolina, the Republican-led general assembly passed blatantly gerry-

mandered congressional districts engineered with one clear purpose: to reduce the number of Democrats in Congress.

These new maps deliberately distort the will of the people, systematically diluting the votes of Democratic-leaning areas, like my district.

Communities of interest were split, districts were manipulated with surgical precision, leaving many voters voiceless in the very communities they call home.

In my own Sixth District, the city of Greensboro, a city of 300,000 people, was split into three parts. Each piece combined with farflung, ruby-red, rural districts. The majority of Greensboro was drawn into a district stretching across 10 counties all the way to the Tennessee border. In doing so, the new maps also separate the heart of Greensboro from High Point and from Winston-Salem, effectively dismantling a triad district, a community of interest that deserves cohesive representation.

Remarkably, and not coincidentally, the newly drawn Sixth District gives a 16-point advantage to a Republican candidate over a Democratic one. As someone who has lived in Greensboro for four decades, I am outraged by the brazen disregard Republicans in Raleigh have shown the citizens of my district.

Let's be clear. This is not democracy at work. This is political manipulation at its worst, designed not to represent the people but for partisan gain.

I want to give a little bit of history about how ridiculous this gerrymandering is and what has taken place, because the Republican-led legislature in North Carolina did the exact same thing in 2021. Despite their own statements that they would keep communities of interest together and avoid splitting counties, they drew a map back then that split my former triad district into three pieces and split two counties.

My constituents brought a lawsuit. The North Carolina Supreme Court found that the partisan gerrymandering, which the court found, based on presentations by esteemed statisticians and computer experts and other experts, that extreme gerrymandering was done with surgical precision and that that violated the North Carolina State Constitution.

The court ordered the maps to be redrawn, and eventually they had to appoint a three-judge panel to redraw fair maps. That panel, two Republicans and one Democrat, redrew the maps to keep communities of interest together and to avoid splitting counties. The result? In a truly purple State, where voters have just elected—well, I am going to come back to that. In a truly purple State, the voters elected seven Republicans and seven Democrats to the U.S. House of Representatives. Now, that was in 2021.

□ 1130

What happened to those same maps in 2023? That same North Carolina Supreme Court that found that gerrymandering was not allowed under the North Carolina State constitution was now dominated by Republicans, and they actually reversed their prior decision. They decided that extreme partisan gerrymandering is just fine in the State of North Carolina.

There were no new facts, no new communities of interest, no new counties, no new law, no new North Carolina constitution, just new Republican Supreme Court judges.

The result of those new maps drawn with no guardrails by our Republican-dominated general assembly, well, North Carolina, the State that just elected a Democratic Governor, a Democratic Lieutenant Governor, a Democratic attorney general, a Democratic secretary of state, and a Democratic superintendent of public instruction will, next term, have 10 Republicans and only 4 Democrats in the House of Representatives.

Thanks to the hypocrisy of our supreme court, the elected officials of our State have decided whom they want to represent rather than allowing the voters to decide whom they want to represent them.

In a democracy, the voters should choose who represents them, not the other way around.

That is why I was so proud to join my fellow North Carolinian Democratic delegation colleagues, including Congressmen WILEY NICKEL and JEFF JACKSON, whose seats were also targeted by the partisan Republican gerrymander, to introduce the Redistricting Transparency and Accountability Act.

I thank my colleague, Representative WILEY NICKEL, for that legislation.

The legislation goes after the partisan, secretive redistricting process, which, in North Carolina, Republicans used to overhaul the balanced, fair maps that I described earlier that were in place for the 2022 election by enhancing public input and increasing transparency in the map-drawing process. The maps this time around were drawn in secret with no legitimate public input.

Additionally, I am proud to cosponsor the Freedom to Vote Act, which seeks to put an end to partisan gerrymandering once and for all.

This critical legislation will ensure that all North Carolinians, Republicans and Democrats alike, have the right to fair representation. While these gerrymandered maps will prevent me from continuing to serve my constituents in Congress, the fight for fair districts is far from over.

Madam Speaker, I want to take a moment to thank the hundreds of constituents who have called me, texted me, written letters, emailed me, and stopped me in the public streets to tell me how disgusted they are by the extreme partisan gerrymandering that will prevent me from continuing to

represent them. I appreciate their support. I want them to know what a true privilege it has been for me to represent them and the communities I love so much in the Sixth District of North Carolina. I will continue to stand with all those who fight for a system where every voter's voice is heard and every vote truly counts.

Mr. NICKEL. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague from North Carolina. She deserves to have a fair shot to come back to Congress and the ability to continue representing her constituents. She was robbed by partisan Republicans in the North Carolina General Assembly, which gerrymandered our State with surgical precision.

This is a huge problem not just for North Carolina but for the entire rest of the country. Voting rights have been under the legislative microscope for years now, with threats to roll them back and add obstacles for voters who want to cast their ballots.

Madam Speaker, I firmly believe voters should choose their politicians; politicians should not choose their voters. North Carolinians deserve a fair and transparent electoral process that ensures that every voice and every vote is heard and accounted for. This shouldn't be a partisan or political issue. It is about fairness.

In States and in places where voters have a choice, where they are allowed to put ballot initiatives on the ballot, they vote overwhelmingly for fair maps to bring balance to the U.S. Congress, but the fact of the matter is that 90 percent of the people in this Congress come from districts that are gerrymandered or safe seats for Democrats or Republicans. Less than 10 percent of the seats in this body are in seats like the one that I won in 2022 that are truly competitive and that could go either way. That is what gerrymandering has done to this Congress and to this country.

We are on track, Madam Speaker, to be the least productive Congress in our Nation's history, and if you want to put your finger on one thing, it is 100 percent partisan gerrymandering, which is wrecking our democracy and the U.S. House of Representatives. It is far past time that we end this.

This, for me, is a personal issue. It is why I got involved in elected office. As a former staffer for President Obama, I traveled all over the country and all over the world with him during his first term in office and his first campaign. When he left office, like many, I was sad. I was tuned in for his farewell speech, where he said if you want to fix the way things work in Washington, then grab a clipboard, get moving, and get organized.

I took those words to heart. I grabbed my clipboard and was elected to the North Carolina State Senate in 2018. As he left office, President Obama said the one thing that we have to fix in this country to bring politics back to the center is to end partisan gerry-

mandering. He has continued to be a leading voice on this issue, putting his time and attention toward ending partisan gerrymandering.

It was one of the main reasons I put my name on a ballot back in 2018 to run for the North Carolina State Senate, and then, as I was elected to the senate, I continued to work on this issue in North Carolina. The top issue for me was voting rights and an end to partisan gerrymandering in the great State of North Carolina.

In the State senate, I served on the North Carolina Senate Redistricting Committee, where I got to see firsthand how Republicans targeted communities of color with surgical precision as they drew maps that disenfranchised voters across the State. I saw firsthand how the process works and the way that politicians picked their voters instead of allowing voters to choose their politicians. They circumvented the transparency that came with drawing fair maps.

I spoke out against partisan gerrymandering as a State senator over and over and joined with so many others—Democrats, Republicans, and Independents—in North Carolina to outlaw this practice. Then, I was reelected again to the North Carolina Senate, and we continued to fight on this issue.

In 2021, a 4-3 Democratic court, our Supreme Court of North Carolina, drew fair maps for North Carolina. They responded to partisan gerrymandering from Republicans in the legislature, but they didn't draw Democratic maps, and they didn't draw Republican maps. They drew fair maps.

They drew maps that, in all likelihood, would have elected seven Republicans, six Democrats, and one seat that could have gone either way. That was the seat that I won. That is North Carolina's 13th District. In a 50-50 State like North Carolina, which is a true purple State, we elected Donald Trump in the last election, but we elected a Democratic Governor and Democrats up and down the ballot.

Madam Speaker, you would expect to have seven Democrats and seven Republicans. That is what North Carolina sent for the 118th Congress, seven Democrats and seven Republicans. We won a Republican-leaning seat. It was an R plus 2 seat. It could have gone either way, but the best ideas won at the ballot box.

Right now, we have maps that are fair. This is the current map right here. Madam Speaker, you can see seven Democratic seats and seven Republican seats. There is North Carolina's 13th District right there. You can see this is what maps look like. There is no packing and cracking. These are maps that represent communities of interest, that represent the State, and that allow voters to have a real choice in whom they send to Washington. This is what maps should look like.

Again, this North Carolina 13th District, by some accounts, was exactly in the middle of the U.S. Congress. It is

one of the most fair districts in the country. It is a competitive district where every vote is critical to our election. We won by 10,000 votes. It was a close election, but we were able to do it in a fair map.

Again, we got to have a real debate over the best ideas and whose party had the best ideas, and the best ideas won. In the same election when I won this district in North Carolina by a small margin, two seats flipped on the supreme court from Democratic to Republican, taking the court from 4-3 for Democrats to 5-2 for Republicans. They have proven over and over again that this extreme partisan MAGA court is nothing more than a rubber stamp for a MAGA Republican legislature.

In February, after the 2022 election, the North Carolina Supreme Court relied on a rarely used procedural rule to rehear the 2022 partisan gerrymandering case, *Harper v. Hall*, and took the incredibly unprecedented step of reversing its prior ruling on April 28. This opinion, authored by Justice Michael Morgan, charged the majority with improper motivations and willful blindness.

Madam Speaker, I am very glad and grateful to be joined by Democratic Leader HAKEEM JEFFRIES, who I understand is here to join and put his name and his voice behind this incredibly important piece of legislation and this incredibly important push.

I will say this: It looks like we are on track to have a 220-215 Congress. The three seats that Republicans gerrymandered in North Carolina with surgical precision are going to be the difference in this election. There are still a few more votes to count, but that is why I expect we will land a three-seat majority for the Republicans.

Had North Carolina had the chance with fair maps to send Democrats back, a 7-7 delegation, then I would be addressing him as Speaker HAKEEM JEFFRIES.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES).

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, Representative WILEY NICKEL, for yielding and for his leadership on this incredibly important issue around prohibiting extreme partisan gerrymandering across the country and certainly in the great State of North Carolina.

I thank Representative WILEY NICKEL for his extraordinary leadership in this Congress.

I thank Representative KATHY MANNING for all that she has done to combat anti-Semitism and for many other issues throughout her time in Congress.

I thank JEFF JACKSON for his leadership and certainly congratulate him on his continued journey as a public servant as the next attorney general from the great State of North Carolina.

These are three extraordinary public servants who were elected by the peo-

ple but then unable to continue to serve not because of any decision made by the people of North Carolina, but because of extreme partisan gerrymandering by far-right extremists in the North Carolina legislature and this MAGA North Carolina Supreme Court. It is an extraordinary thing.

As Representative NICKEL has indicated, the people of this great country should determine who represents them. We shouldn't have so-called representatives making the decision as to the people whom they will represent.

There has been a lot of talk in the aftermath of this most recent election about an extraordinary and overwhelming mandate. Let's just look at the State of North Carolina.

I congratulate the incoming President on his success in North Carolina—a close race—on his success in North Carolina and in every other battleground State. In that very same State, every single Democrat running statewide for constitutional office won, proving the point that North Carolina is an evenly divided State. It is a 50/50 State. That should be clear to anyone.

When fair maps were drawn in advance of the 2022 election, the North Carolina congressional delegation, upon the success of Representative WILEY NICKEL in an evenly divided district, was seven Democrats and seven Republicans. That is the will of the people of North Carolina. It makes sense in an evenly divided 50-50 State.

Apparently, because far-right extremists in this country aren't convinced that they can win elections on their own or even hold the United States House of Representatives on their own, they decided to rip away three seats from the people of North Carolina through extreme partisan gerrymandering.

It is interesting. I hadn't fully thought about that because we are still counting votes, but as Representative NICKEL indicated, Democrats are on their way to perhaps 215 seats. In the 119th Congress, when every single vote is counted in California, House Republicans will have 220 seats. By the way, that is the smallest majority of any incoming party, Democratic or Republican, since before the Great Depression.

What mandate? It is an evenly divided House of Representatives. The people of this country want us to work together, which we are willing to do, and find bipartisan common ground on any issue whenever and wherever possible to make life better for the American people and deliver real results for hardworking American taxpayers.

□ 1145

At the same period of time, we will push back against far-right extremism whenever necessary, but it is interesting that this so-called overwhelming mandate wouldn't have even yielded a majority in the House of Representatives if it wasn't for the extreme partisan gerrymandering that took place in the great State of North Carolina.

I thank Representative NICKEL for raising this issue because it should shape how we proceed in the next Congress of finding bipartisan, common ground together to get things done because there is no mandate to enact far-right extremist policies in the United States House of Representatives or, by the way, anywhere in this country. That is the reality of this most recent election.

I thank Representative NICKEL for his leadership, his service to the people of the great State of North Carolina, to the Congress, and to the country. I know that the great Representative from North Carolina is not finished in his public-service journey, and we look forward to the best being yet to come.

Mr. NICKEL. Madam Speaker, my colleagues heard it here. In my 2 years in Congress, I have voted 19 times for HAKEEM JEFFRIES for Speaker of the House. I had very much hoped to be able to once more vote for him for Speaker of the House. Unfortunately, partisan gerrymandering has robbed the voters of that choice, and I did not run for reelection.

We have an incredibly important issue here before us in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Going back to North Carolina and how we got to this point in our State, the North Carolina Supreme Court, in an incredibly rare procedural rule, decided to rehear a case that had already been decided. The only reason they decided to rehear the case was because the election changed the composition on the court. It was unprecedented and the rule is very rarely used.

The dissenting opinion by Justice Michael Morgan charged the majority with improper motivations and willful blindness. Speaking to their motivation, the dissent wrote that "the five justices which constitute the majority here have emboldened themselves to infuse partisan politics brazenly into the outcome of the present case. . . ."

Madam Speaker, that was an absolutely terrible ruling, giving Republican extremists in North Carolina's gerrymandered legislature the ability to draw any maps they chose and the North Carolina Supreme Court did nothing there.

There is so much more work to do, but the North Carolina General Assembly Republicans carved up North Carolina's 13th District.

As you can see here, this is the current map that our rubber-stamped supreme court allowed that is now sending 71 percent of the seats in a 50-50 State to Republicans. It would have been almost 79 percent if DON DAVIS hadn't won in a Trump district by just a little bit.

This is a 10-to-4 delegation, you can see. You can see North Carolina's 13th District which is not connected by any real road or actual way to get there, but only by the colors of a map going all the way around the triangle in an obvious partisan gerrymander.

This is not a fair map, Madam Speaker. This is a map where politicians

have chosen their voters instead of voters choosing their politicians, giving Republicans three extra seats in the 119th Congress that they would not have had had there been fair maps.

Again, while the votes are still being counted, I believe we will end up at 220 Republicans and 215 Democrats. Had we been allowed to have fair maps in North Carolina, I would have returned, KATHY MANNING would have returned, JEFF JACKSON would have returned, and we would have had a 7-7 delegation, and we would be preparing for the legislative agenda under Speaker HAKEEM JEFFRIES. Those three seats are very likely the difference in the control of Congress.

This was a rare, mid-decade redraw of our maps. It is wrong, and we need to do something about it.

Madam Speaker, as we see, this is another example of extreme partisan gerrymandering, but it happens all over the country. If we look to Texas, Florida, Tennessee, and again, North Carolina, these are extreme gerrymanders, legislators handpicking their own voters and predetermining the outcome of our elections before they even happen.

Madam Speaker, we have gotten this down to a science. It is with surgical precision that maps can be drawn. It is known that if a map is drawn a certain way, the outcome can be guaranteed if you take it out of the middle range of a 45 percent to 55 percent district, which I will get into in a little bit, and I have a chart for that.

I will talk about folks in North Carolina who have experienced a continuous redrawing of their maps. We are the most litigated State in the country. We continue to spend more and more money fighting over maps instead of allowing nonpartisan, independent redistricting, which is the goal of the FAIR MAPS Act. Folks have seen a change of representation 4 times in the last 10 years in many districts because of Republican gerrymandering in the North Carolina General Assembly.

Madam Speaker, courts threw out electoral maps drawn by the legislature three times in the past decade due to gerrymandering. That was in 2016, 2019, and 2021.

Again, North Carolina is a 50-50 State. It is not fair to force a 10-to-4 map on the voters. Again, this very easily could have been 11-3. If DON DAVIS hadn't run such a tough campaign, that would be 79 percent of the seats for Republicans, again, in a 50-50 State.

My colleagues heard before that North Carolina in the last election gave its electoral college votes to Donald Trump, but it gave Democrats votes for the North Carolina Supreme Court, for superintendent of public instruction, for secretary of state, for attorney general, for Lieutenant Governor, and for Governor. We are a true 50-50 State. We deserve to have fair maps.

These maps that you see here target African-American voters with surgical

precision to diminish their voting power. They are clearly unconstitutional. We have lawsuits going on right now.

We have seen success in southern States on racial gerrymandering. I expect and hope that this map will be changed because it is not a constitutional map. It is not a fair map.

Those lawsuits are ongoing. We are going to fight for fair maps. We are going to continue fighting to end partisan gerrymandering and to protect the right to vote for every single North Carolinian.

Madam Speaker, partisan gerrymandering has been a tool used by politicians in nearly every State to manipulate the outcomes of elections. It doesn't matter who is doing it. Partisan gerrymandering is wrong whether it is Democrats doing it or it is Republicans doing it. It is bad for our democracy. It is bad for the United States Congress.

There are some States—not many—where Democrats gerrymander with surgical precision. It leads to hyperpartisanship, increased polarization, and it disenfranchises voters. We need to end the practice. We need to put in place nonpartisan and independent redistricting commissions.

We can do that by removing the ability of politicians to draw lines in their favor. We can restore fairness and ensure that voters are the ones choosing their politicians and not the other way around.

Now, I have in front of us here a chart with 140 dots. We have 14 congressional districts in North Carolina. We are an even, 50-50 State, 50 percent Democrats, 50 percent Republicans in terms of this map right here.

If you have the power to decide how you draw the maps, you can do it any way you want. We can easily see here a map where you give four of the blue dots to Democrats, six to Republicans. It is a pretty safe Republican seat. You could it again here, again, 6 to 4. Again, you do it here with this one here, and then I have got this one here, and then this one here, 6 to 4. Then you want to draw a Democratic seat, packing and cracking, you select two of the red dots, eight of the blue dots.

If you do this over and over, you get a map that would send 4 Democrats, 10 Republicans to the U.S. Congress. Again, six and four; six and four; six and four. Again, you can do it over and over, and the outcome will be the same. If you have the ability to do it, you can predetermine the outcome.

Here is the next chart.

Again, you can see right here, this is what it looks like, 4 to 10, and this last 1 here could have gone either way.

How does that work?

What does that look like when you draw a map a certain way?

From what we have seen here, this is what North Carolina looks like in the congressional elections that just happened. You see 10 safe Republican seats outside of this middle competitive zone

that I want to talk about, 3 Democratic seats accomplished through packing as many Democrats as possible into 3 congressional districts.

Then another one that was a 50-50 seat, this is DON DAVIS. It is a district that Donald Trump won, we believe. The votes are still being finalized. This is a 50-50 seat. It could have gone either way. This allows 71 percent of the seats for Republicans. Could have been 79 percent if DON DAVIS hadn't won by just a little bit.

When you put a district, Madam Speaker, outside of this middle competitive range, we kind of call it the 45-to-55 percent range, but to be even more precise, we have 46.5 to 53.5 percent. That is the range of districts where anybody has a decent chance of flipping a seat from red to blue or from blue to red.

When you draw it outside of this range, outside of 55 percent, the chances are minuscule. You are looking at less than 1 percent that any of these seats could ever flip. It may happen in a tsunami year, or maybe with a candidate who does something absolutely horrific, but when you draw a map and you put it in this area, you know that it is virtually impossible to flip.

Again, here, you see three Democratic seats, incredibly safe. They put as many Democrats as possible. This is the place. This is the place right here, Madam Speaker, where we need to have many, many more congressional districts.

I sent a survey to all of my constituents to ask how they felt about gerrymandering. I got over 1,300 answers. Here are some of the quotes from my constituents, and here is what they said: I feel like my vote doesn't count the way both sides use the maps.

Another constituent said: I haven't moved in 20 years but have been in 3 or 4 different congressional districts.

Another constituent said: It is hard to have a relationship when they keep changing because the district keeps being changed.

Another constituent said: Since moving to North Carolina in 2015, I believe we have been in at least three different congressional districts. It has become frustrating and confusing.

Another constituent said: I don't feel like I am accurately represented.

Another said: Having my district number change is confusing.

Another said: Makes me feel distrustful in my Representatives.

Another said: Not sure what is going on. We need transparency.

Another said: It decreases trust that Representatives have citizens as their top priority.

Another said: It adds to the dirty politics stereotype.

Another said: Political races have become very noncompetitive.

They certainly have if you are outside of that range.

Another said: Once elected, they only care what their party wants.

Lastly, another said: It makes me feel like my vote doesn't matter and reduces a desire to engage with elected officials since I don't feel like my Representatives truly represent me.

They used words including "distrust," "confusion," "unrepresented," and "extreme" over and over and over, as you see the word cloud of responses from my constituents who wrote in about their thoughts on this.

Madam Speaker, I think it is important, as we are talking about North Carolina, to explain where we are as a State. In order to change our constitution to require fair maps, there is no way that citizens can put something on the ballot. The only way to get something on the ballot is to have 60 percent of the statehouse and the State senate agree to put an initiative on the ballot.

When you have extreme partisan gerrymandering, gerrymandering legislative districts, as well as congressional districts, it is virtually impossible to ever allow Democrats to get to 60 percent under these partisan gerrymandered maps, so we can't put anything on the ballot.

The only choice we have is the supreme court. Democrats in North Carolina have shown repeatedly they are willing to draw fair maps, to push for the fact that our State constitution says we should have free and fair elections. Right now, it is two Democrats to five Republicans on the North Carolina Supreme Court. We just elected Justice Allison Riggs by just a few hundred votes recently, but she won.

The next election, we will have one seat on the ballot. The next election after that, there will be three seats on the ballot. If Democrats win three out of four elections for supreme court over the next two election cycles, we might be able to see fair maps in 2030, but we need action in Congress. Congress can do this immediately.

With a simple majority in the House, simple majority in the Senate, signed by the President, we can get the FAIR MAPS Act entered into law to make sure that we have nonpartisan, independent redistricting in every State in the country with all States playing by the same rules. We don't have to worry about the North Carolina Supreme Court. We don't have to worry about the U.S. Supreme Court, if we just do the job that voters sent us here to do.

The majority of voters across the country support nonpartisan, independent redistricting. If we put it to a ballot initiative in the U.S., to the entire country, the vast majority would support nonpartisan, independent redistricting. When you do it in every State, you see it on the ballot, it succeeds, and you get fair maps.

□ 1200

One thing I will point out about North Carolina, the Governor of our State doesn't have the ability to veto legislative maps. They took that power away. We have one of the weaker Governors in the country.

Right now in North Carolina, we see legislative Republicans trying to weaken Governor-elect Josh Stein even more as they pass legislation to take away his powers. Unfortunately, the Governor can't veto legislative maps, congressional maps, so we need action in Congress.

The U.S. Congress can fix partisan gerrymandering in North Carolina and in every State in the country, and that is what my bill, the FAIR MAPS Act does.

Madam Speaker, the FAIR MAPS Act would help to make independent redistricting commissions a reality in every State. That means every State playing by the same rules. Specifically, I will mention Texas, I will mention Florida, Ohio, Tennessee, North Carolina. These are States where we see extreme partisan gerrymanders.

The number of truly competitive districts in Congress is declining. It leads to more polarization and less willingness to work across the aisle and to do what is right for our Nation. It is why we are on track to be the least productive Congress in our Nation's history. There is no incentive to work across the aisle.

As I stand here, it is so incredibly easy to reach across the aisle. It is not a large space. You can put your hand across and shake hands and actually do the right thing for folks.

What does that mean? What would the FAIR MAPS Act do for North Carolina? What would it do for the country? We analyzed this and we looked at the numbers. Right now, anybody will say we have less than 40 seats out of 435 seats in the U.S. House of Representatives that are competitive. The other seats, the other 90 percent of the seats, guaranteed to go to whoever wins the Democratic primary or Republican primary, almost without exception.

We took this issue to the experts at Duke University, and we said, if the FAIR MAPS Act were to become law, what would that do for this Chamber? What would it do for the people who serve here in Congress?

They said, if the FAIR MAPS Act were law in every State including Texas, Illinois, Tennessee, and Florida, and Texas had to draw fair maps, we would double the number of competitive seats. We would go from 40 to 80 where the voters are the ones picking their Representatives, where more Members of Congress would be forced to do the right thing by working across the aisle to get things done.

Madam Speaker, there are many amazing Members here who do what is right. They love their country, whether Democrats or Republicans in safe districts, but they are not incentivized to do it. If voters don't like a Member's position on ending gun violence, they really don't have a way to make their voice heard because the districts are overwhelmingly Democrat, overwhelmingly Republican. It is a big deal.

My bill, the FAIR MAPS Act, would double the number of competitive seats in the U.S. Congress.

Again, we see constituents all over the country who are gerrymandered, finding they have new Members every election, and they don't know who represents them. In the last election, again, we saw what happened in North Carolina: 4 Democrats, 10 Republicans.

When we take politicians out of the process completely, we had better results. We had more fair elections. We have competition to get here. It has been tried and it has worked successfully in other States.

We see great examples in Arizona, in Colorado where independent, nonpartisan redistricting commissions had been able to draw fair maps, and you have responsive districts that change with the will of the people.

The voters are the ones who should be deciding who serves in this body, not partisan Democrats or partisan Republicans trying to add an abnormal number of Members to these States.

We need more legislative action. We need to make it easier, not harder, for eligible voters to make their voice heard. In Congress, there is a lot we can do to make it easier for people to vote and to participate in our democracy.

I helped introduce the North Carolina Redistricting Transparency and Accountability Act, a bill that would establish transparency and accountability requirements for congressional redistricting processes.

I am proud to support the John Lewis Voting Rights Act and the Freedom to Vote Act, which would end partisan gerrymandering, expand voting by mail, protect early voting, help get big money out of our elections, combat dark money, support election integrity, and make additional reforms to improve ballot access.

As I stand here, I am, again, brought to the very simple conclusion: We are on track to be the least productive Congress in our Nation's history because there is no incentive for Democrats and Republicans to work together because there are so few competitive districts. Ending partisan gerrymandering would do so much to change this body.

Again, 90 percent of the Members here are in safe seats. All they are focused on is winning their Democratic primary or their Republican primary. It is statistically guaranteed, if you are going to bet money on it, it is a great bet that if you are in a safe Democratic seat, safe Republican seat, you are going to be able to win. Hyperpartisanship has been fueled by gerrymandering. It creates a legislative body that struggles to address even the most pressing issues facing Americans.

In this Congress, we have only been able to do must-pass bills: debt ceiling, continuing resolution. We passed one budget. We were able to stand with our allies in Ukraine and Israel and Taiwan, but that is pretty much it.

I was proud of some of the work that we have done. I worked on FIT21, one of the biggest nonmust-pass bills we

passed to finally provide a regulatory structure for digital assets. I organized 71 Democrats to vote with my Republican colleagues. That was one example of working across the aisle to get something done, but there have been so few examples of that in this Congress. There have been so few real accomplishments because of partisan gerrymandering and because of a Republican majority that is unable to get their act together, to do the work that they need to do.

Again, we have seen chaos and confusion in this body, and it has been fueled by partisan gerrymandering. It is contributing directly to the dysfunction by creating these safe seats where politicians are only focused on their primary elections and not the general election.

It is increasingly filled with Members here who are more beholden to party leaders than to the diverse needs of their constituents and their communities. Congress is failing to deliver because it is no longer designed to reflect the will of the people; it is designed to protect incumbents and perpetuate partisanship.

If we want Congress to actually get things done, we need to fix this broken system. The FAIR MAPS Act is one way to start. By implementing independent, nonpartisan redistricting commissions, we can bring fairness and competition back to our elections so that the best ideas win at the ballot box, the best people serve in the U.S. Congress as we will send more responsive Members to Congress to do what they are supposed to do to work for the American people.

Madam Speaker, we are doing our best to understand how partisan gerrymandering has affected this election, but one statistic that I think is incredibly important is the number of split districts in the U.S. Congress.

What is a split district? A split district is a district that elects a Member of Congress of one party and a President of the other party. Let's look over the course of our history here in the United States. Split districts used to be very common. We would have voters picking Democrats and Republicans for different offices up and down the ballot, but those folks in the center have continued to decline, in part, because of partisan gerrymandering and the extremism it has brought to the U.S. Congress.

In 1984, there were 190 Members of this body who came to Washington in districts that elected a President of one party and a Member of Congress of the other. In this election, it is districts that voted for KAMALA HARRIS for President and a Republican for the House, or districts that voted for a Democrat for Congress and Donald Trump for President.

In 1984, 190 split ticket districts. In 2004, 20 years later, we are down to just 58 split ticket districts in the U.S. House of Representatives. My election, 2022, just 23 Members of Congress from

split ticket districts, 17 Republicans, 6 Democrats, that is what we have in the 118th Congress.

With this last election, we are down to what looks to be—again, votes are still being counted—just 13 Members of the U.S. House of Representatives from split ticket districts. I know for sure that is DON BACON and BRIAN FITZPATRICK. Those are two districts where voters sent a Republican to Congress, but KAMALA HARRIS as their choice for the White House and then Democratic districts where the rest, including Members like JARED GOLDEN, MARIE GLUESENKAMP PEREZ, TOM SUOZZI, DON DAVIS, and others, but just 13.

We had 190 40 years ago down to 13 now. If you draw a congressional district that KAMALA HARRIS won or that Donald Trump won, you can be almost certain that they are going to send a Democrat or a Republican to the U.S. House of Representatives. That is why gerrymandering is wrong. That is why we have to fix it. The time for action is now. This is the most pressing need of this Congress.

Madam Speaker, as I close out my time, I will leave this body with this incredibly important thought. You heard it from leader HAKEEM JEFFRIES. We are very likely to see a Congress decided by North Carolina partisan gerrymandering, a mid-decade redraw of our maps.

This wasn't a 10-year draw. This is something that partisan Republicans in our legislature did sending 10 Republicans, 4 Democrats, a net gain of 3 for Republicans, and those 3 seats were not even close.

Gerrymandering will very likely decide control of the next U.S. House of Representatives, 220–215. That is what it looks like, and those three seats in North Carolina are very likely the difference.

Madam Speaker, thanks, again, for letting me take the time to be here on this incredibly important discussion. While my name won't be on the ballot and wasn't on the ballot this year, I am not giving up or going out quietly in the fight for fair maps and to end partisan gerrymandering.

I firmly believe that voters should choose their politicians; politicians should not choose their voters. Right now, democracy is on the line and North Carolina and all the other States in this country are worth fighting for to get this right, to end partisan gerrymandering.

We have got a bill to do that, the FAIR MAPS Act, which I have talked about at length. It just takes a majority of the House, majority of the Senate, and we would have districts that allow folks to have a real choice at the ballot box in November.

I continue to fight with every ounce of my energy for fair maps and to end partisan gerrymandering and to protect the right to vote for every single North Carolinian.

This is the biggest issue for this Congress. It is one that we need to address

and it would bring balance to the House. It would allow for more bipartisan legislation. It would require folks to know that if you don't work across the aisle, if you don't reach your hand across that aisle to the opposing party, the voters are going to send you home because it is a district that could go either way.

That is what we need more of, that is what my bill would do, and that is why I am going to continue pushing to end partisan gerrymandering, so we don't have States that look like North Carolina.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would ask Members to observe proper decorum in the use of exhibits in debate.

CONCEPTS THAT ARE INCONVENIENT TO THE COUNTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), my good friend.

□ 1215

HONORING NEIL MIDDLETON FOR HIS DISTINGUISHED SERVICE

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Neil Middleton for his distinguished and award-winning career in journalism, as a longtime trusted news broadcaster and vice president of WYMT-TV, a CBS affiliate in Hazard, Kentucky.

Broadcasting from the heart of Kentucky's Appalachian region, the station's call letters, WYMT, stand for We're Your Mountain Television. It is much more than an acronym. It is the station's mission.

WYMT-TV has become synonymous with the very region it serves, thanks in large part to the leadership and journalistic integrity of Neil Middleton and those who blazed a trail for news coverage and weather alerts in one of the most rural areas of the United States.

In an expansive region separated by mountainous terrain, national media outlets have only made their way to Appalachia after major disasters, while others have blistered our communities by drudging up negative stereotypes that have misrepresented our beloved hometowns that are filled with hardworking, innovative, and extremely talented people.

As both well-known and unknown reporters from around the country have breezed in and out of our region for 15 seconds of fame, it is WYMT that has earned the trust of southern and eastern Kentuckians since the station first signed onto the air in 1985.

They have not only provided lifesaving weather alerts during catastrophic floods and tornadoes but they

have also followed their news coverage with fundraising telethons, using the power of the airwaves to collect vital donations to help our communities recover in the wake of disaster.

WYMT has also built a reputation for holding local State and Federal leaders accountable in the public eye, while not only providing critical news to the region in every newscast but also celebrating our victories in regional development and success.

Thanks to their central location in the region, mountain student athletes have had an exclusive highlight reel on the station's "Sports Overtime" program, swelling up pride through every rural county for student athletes who get little notoriety elsewhere.

In fact, that is where Neil Middleton started his broadcast television news career in 1987. He drove across the mountains from Harlan County every day to cover news and sports in southeastern Kentucky for WYMT and WKYT-TV in Lexington.

Starting out as a radio DJ in high school, Neil worked his way up the ranks as a broadcaster, eventually taking over the helm of WYMT as vice president and general manager. Under his leadership, WYMT achieved a record-breaking growth in advertising sales. He expanded newscasts, sports, and weather. Neil developed new digital media assets and earned countless accolades including regional Emmy awards.

The Associated Press has also recognized Neil's personal excellence in journalism with numerous awards throughout his career. His same passion and work for the region has also been recognized by the Kentucky National Guard, local chambers of commerce, and many others.

Over the last four decades, Neil's passion to serve Kentucky's Appalachian region has reached far beyond the news desk. He has served as a board member for several organizations in the region, including The Center for Rural Development, One East Kentucky, Alice Lloyd College, Eastern Kentucky PRIDE, East Kentucky Leadership Foundation, the Challenger Learning Center of Kentucky, and the Kentucky Associated Press, among others.

As Neil closes this chapter of his career at WYMT, I want to express my deepest gratitude for his unwavering commitment and loyalty to Kentucky's Appalachian region. With every breath, he has advocated for growth and development in the mountains, understanding the value of every investment here and, likewise, the pain of every opportunity sent away from central Appalachia.

Madam Speaker, it has been an honor to work in tandem with Neil on many projects, including a hard-fought battle to add WYMT to satellite broadcast in select areas to ensure local people have access to news and weather alerts close to home. Neil should take great pride in his efforts to make southern and eastern Kentucky a better place to live.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, it has been almost 2 months since Congress has reconvened. Certainly, a lot of things have taken place back home, things in the news that are a little bit shocking and ought to be commented on.

The first thing I would like to point out—and we saw this again in the first week back—a prominent Member of this Congress spoke about the need to protect democracy. Again and again, people from both sides of the aisle, but disproportionately from the Democrat side of the aisle, talk about the necessity of protecting democracy and refer to our country's democracy.

I remember hearing this for the first time when I was at Marquette University, one of the largest universities in the State of Wisconsin. A professor of government or history or something like that referred to our country as a democracy.

When we recite the Pledge of Allegiance every day, they might want to ponder that we talk about the Republic, the Republic for which it stands. We don't talk about the democracy for which it stands. People might wonder why politicians like to refer to our form of government as a democracy but in the Pledge of Allegiance we refer it to as a Republic.

At the time our Constitution was drafted, Ben Franklin talked about giving us a Republic if we can keep it. In other words, he didn't say a democracy if we can keep it. He said a Republic if we can keep it.

You might wonder whether our forefathers ever mentioned democracy. Of course, they did. In Federalist No. 10, James Madison wrote: "Democracies have ever been spectacles of turbulence and contention; have ever been found incompatible with personal security or the rights of property; and have in general been as short in their lives as they have been violent in their deaths."

In other words, James Madison did talk about democracy, and he talked about it negatively.

Why don't politicians like to talk about our country being a Republic and prefer to talk about it as a democracy or a representative democracy?

It is because in democracy the government is determined by the people collectively or the majority of the people. In a Republic, we turn to our Constitution.

There may, at any given time, be a majority of people in this body or a majority of people in this country who don't like a given religion, or they feel like we can confiscate people's property, or because there has been a shooting on the news the night before, they want to ignore the Second Amendment. Therefore, they might not like certain religions and want to suppress that religion. They might not like certain ideas, and they want to say that they were elected here, so they can suppress those ideas.

There are two examples I would like to share with this body. There was a

bill called the McCain-Feingold Act that was passed by two popular Congressmen around the year 2000. They wanted to restrict what people could say or how much time people could buy in an election. In other words, they wanted to restrict the freedom of speech. I am sure both politicians at that time felt we are very popular. We have been elected several times. We have the right to trample on somebody's free speech.

Certainly, in an election season, I would like there to be less or would prefer there to be less advertisements, less mailing going on.

The McCain-Feingold Act passed. The Supreme Court at the time had to lecture, in essence, Senator Feingold and Senator McCain that we do not live in a democracy. We don't care if you receive 60 or 65 percent of the vote in your district. You do not have the right to say certain people cannot buy time on television or send out mailings.

Another example, there was a very popular Governor in the State of Wisconsin. I think very highly of the man. He wanted to say if you have property along a State highway, we can restrict what you can do on that property because someday we might want to buy that property when this highway goes from a two-lane to a four-lane highway. Therefore, we will make your front 50 feet or 60 feet along the highway less valuable because, after all, we represent the government. We have been elected overwhelmingly. The implication is this is a democracy, and we can take your property from you.

Again, the State Supreme Court had to say that, hey, wait a minute. We don't have a democracy here. We have a Republic. We don't care how popular you are. You cannot interfere with what people can do with their land along a highway.

It is another example in which politicians wished we had a democracy or a representative democracy so they can tell you what you can do with your property. In fact, our Constitution stood tall and said that we don't care how you were elected or how many people voted for you, we will not allow you to take people's property.

I believe that is why politicians like to talk about democracy. Because they received 70 percent or 51 percent around here, they like to believe they can determine what you can and cannot say.

As we continue throughout this bienium, let us try not to refer to our form of government as a democracy. Let's refer to it as James Madison or Ben Franklin would have liked to have us refer to it. What they gave us was a republic under our wonderful, great Constitution.

Even though our Constitution allows people to say things we might disagree with, even though our Constitution allows us to quote our wonderful Holy Bible, even though our Constitution prevents the government from taking

people's property without the Constitution, even though our Constitution allows the carrying or owning of firearms, when a lot of people around here don't think we should have the right to carry those firearms, let us stand with our Republic and, bravely, just like when we say the Pledge of Allegiance, bravely describe our country as a Republic, not a democracy.

Again, James Madison said, democracies are spectacles of turbulence and contention; have been found incompatible with personal security or the rights of property; and have in general been short in their lives.

Now, I think during the past month or whatever it was we were not in Washington, a couple of prominent Americans took aim at our Constitution. In particular, they didn't like the First Amendment. They didn't like that people were out there, saying things that they disagreed with.

These former politicians both almost became the President of the United States, which shows how precarious our hold on our great Republic is.

I am talking, in part, about Hillary Clinton, the former First Lady but, even worse, former Secretary of State, who almost became President of the United States. She talked about social media companies and said they must moderate content on their platforms or we will lose total control.

In other words, Hillary Clinton felt that the government should control our lives and they didn't like social media companies allowing things to seep out into the zeitgeist. Maybe those things were hostile to what Hillary felt. It is kind of hard to believe she almost became President. She should always be remembered as someone who believed the First Amendment caused the government to lose control.

□ 1230

While we were out on recess, John Kerry, another man who almost became President of the United States, called the First Amendment a major block in combating misinformation and fighting climate control.

Of course, there is a disagreement with regard to climate change, where it comes from, if it is happening, but John Kerry felt the way to deal with this issue was apparently to deal with the First Amendment.

What he was doing here was talking to the World Economic Forum in a panel on green energy. John Kerry was not only trying to trample on the First Amendment rights of Americans; he wanted this idea to spread throughout the world.

Can you imagine if he had ever become President of the United States, a man who called the First Amendment a major block? My goodness. This is what is going on, and the American public has to wake up.

During this time, there was also a letter made public by Mark Zuckerberg, one of the wealthiest men in America. You would think the

wealthiest people in America above all would have the freedom to exercise their First Amendment rights. Apparently not.

The Biden administration weighed in with Mark Zuckerberg. They didn't like it that people out there had different opinions about COVID, how to address it, and what was appropriate. The Biden administration apparently contacted Mark Zuckerberg and his group, saying that maybe there were things that the American public should know. In other words, rather than having a free exchange of ideas on the value of the vaccine or the value of social distancing or whatever, we shouldn't have an open exchange of ideas. It would be better if we didn't have that pesky First Amendment. It would be better if the people who know best—Anthony Fauci or Pfizer, say—that we should just defer to them because we all know how important Pfizer is. They certainly give a lot of campaign contributions, which we politicians like. Therefore, we should weigh in on the social media platforms and say there are some things that are inconvenient to the country.

I hope when we return we do something to put a little more energy in that First Amendment and, above all, educate the American public that there are politicians out there—like Hillary Clinton, John Kerry, or, apparently, Joe Biden—who view the First Amendment as an obstacle in their expansion of government.

I think this has, to a certain extent, been commented on, but not commented on enough because too many important people—and here we are talking about one President and two almost Presidents—wanted to end people's First Amendment rights.

The First Amendment is only one of the things that make America so great. Others are, I think, things referred to by Nikita Khrushchev and other Communists who, at the time, wanted governments the exact opposite of what we have.

We have a free country based on a republic and our Constitution and anticipated to be a country for moral and religious people. Under communism, we had a country aiming for atheism and totalitarianism in which a government elite decides who we can work for, what goods are to be produced, and the degree to which we penalize people who say things that are not appropriately in line with what the government wants.

In any event, Nikita Khrushchev—in the 1950s and early 1960s, the Soviet Union was kind of the center of communism—promised to someday take over the United States. They would take over the United States without firing a shot.

We spend a great deal around here on munitions, submarines, tanks, and airplanes, but it was interesting that at one time the Communists—and I think Nikita Khrushchev was speaking for the Communists—felt they would take over this country without firing a shot.

What evidence is there that they are trying to weaken our country? I think in addition to the fact that they want to chip away at the First Amendment, I think there is hostility to families, old-fashioned nuclear families, going on in this country. How are we trying to chip away at the families? After all, people like Karl Marx did not like the family.

One way to look at it is that there are currently over 90 programs in the United States in which the benefits of those programs depend on something referred to as percent of poverty. A percent of poverty calculation penalizes two-parent families, or at least it penalizes two-parent families if at least one of them is working a full-time job. In other words, it encourages one-parent families.

I, and probably most of the people in this institution, were around in 1965. Back at that time, only 5 percent of the children born in this country were born into families who did not have both a mother and father at home.

Over time, we have built up over 90 programs in which it was difficult for this family to form. In other words, you get more money right away if you have a family in which only one parent was there. We have worked our way up to a situation where the child is born without both parents at home in over 40 percent of families. Normally, this means it is a fatherless family.

In other words, the government, which is supposed to treat everybody equally, if you have a scale out there, it is overwhelmingly trying to create an America in which the old-fashioned family is becoming more obsolete.

I should point out that this has gone, like I said, from 5 percent to 40 percent. Programs that these families are eligible for are things like SNAP or the Food Stamp program, the low-income housing program, the earned income tax program, the Medicaid healthcare program, things like the Pell Grant Program, TANF program cash assistance, SSI disability program for the children all are inducements not to form an old-fashioned family.

Every biennium—last time, Joe Biden's final budget request—the government usually puts new programs on the heap or adds money to old programs to make the gap between somebody who decides to have both parents in the house compared to somebody who has only one parent in the house.

One person who has written very eloquently on this hasn't been listened to as much as he should—Robert Rector is one—is George Gilder, who wrote a bestseller in 1980. I know there was anticipation that Ronald Reagan would act on this book. He was not able to act on it—my guess is primarily because the Republican House was always in the minority at that time.

George Gilder used to look at what normally I refer to as slums or low-income areas of the city. He focused on Albany, New York, and he followed around a young couple where the young lady was pregnant.

To his surprise, it was not cause for concern like it has been throughout all of history when a young girl gets pregnant and isn't married. Rather, it was a cause for celebration, as the gleeful new couple went around from the low-income housing people to the food stamp people, to the Medicaid people, and signed up for all sorts of benefits. At the time, they had something called AFDC cash payments. It was a cause for celebration because now the young lady would not have to live with her parents anymore. She was getting her own place.

I am sure the people who devised these programs were primarily a money-oriented group, and they felt that this new program would be more likely to have the young lady live on her own without having to live with her mother or with her parents, so they felt they were doing something good.

I think, over time, given the hostility of Karl Marx, given the hostility to the radicals even in the 1960s and 1970s, there were people who knew exactly what they were doing as they destroyed the nuclear family in parts of America.

In any event, this is something we have to look at. When you combine Federal programs with State programs, which frequently team up with Federal programs, you can have situations in which there are \$20,000, \$30,000, \$35,000 penalties for people who decide to get married rather than have people live with a single mother.

It is not like single mothers cannot be very good parents. It is not hard to find people who have been raised in single-parent families who are wonderful children. On the other hand, it is tougher. Statistics would show that it is tougher.

In America, where we try to keep everybody equal, we should not continue to have programs which kind of push more and more people into that single-family situation.

I saw George Gilder weighing in on a topic just the other day. Like I said, he wrote a great bestseller called "Wealth and Poverty" in 1980, and he is still around. He made the case that not only is this bad for the children, but it is bad for the men because you create swaths of society in which men have no purpose because, traditionally, the purpose in an old-fashioned nuclear family is to be the breadwinner.

Here, we have a situation in which he is not going to be able to make enough money, in many cases, to match the government. As a result, we have a situation in which the mother marries the government rather than the husband, and in the long run, it hurts the husband as well.

I hope that this Congress, with such high hopes, works to take away this marriage penalty. Regardless of what Karl Marx would have said, regardless of what certain radical groups would say, we do not want to penalize the father for becoming part of that household.

We know these people are still around. I mentioned, again, Black Lives Matter, a group which many people in this institution were not afraid to stand with, coming out against the traditional nuclear family. It didn't cause people to run away from that group.

There are other quotes of radicals, Angela Davis, that crowd, over the last 50 years, which, again, are hostile to the nuclear family, making fun of the nuclear family, a preference for single parenthood.

I hope this Congress begins to chip away at that ideal. We do not want to any longer have people penalized for getting married and trying to form a traditional family. Indeed, we ought to be encouraging that.

It didn't work out as well as people wanted, but the next attack on freedoms that I think our forefathers would not have seen is congressional programs or programs created by Congress or the executive branch trying to treat people differently by sex or race. These are sometimes referred to as affirmative action programs, but there are many other ways to refer to the programs.

The idea is that the government ought to aim programs at certain subgroups of society, that we have to weigh in to have a disproportionate number of women in a program compared to the women who want to be in the program, a disproportionate number by ancestry. Be it Asian American, African American, so-called Hispanic American, Pacific Islander, or North African, the government should be favoring people by the group that they are from.

This is another thing our forefathers would have been opposed to. They wanted to treat all Americans equally. They did not want the government to have our elections become a contest between ethnic groups. They did not want our government programs to be a contest between men and women as the government weighs in, as they do today, on who owns companies that get government contracts.

If you get a government contract, the government wants to know which ethnic group you are. Of course, you self-identify, so because you are one-quarter Hispanic or one-quarter Native American, you should get preferences to a program. Of course, they don't care here on amount of wealth, so you are going to have a situation in which, say, an Asian American worth tens of millions of dollars gets preference on a government contract compared to a poor person of European descent, a poor guy.

□ 1245

The problem is not just the preferences, which are unfair in its own right, it does result—soon, we are going to have a bill around here—a lot more the government-at-large has to take care of with the problems caused by the hurricanes. That just results in

additional cost, maybe quality, but certainly cost, depending upon who gets the project, but it creates animosity.

It creates an America in which people do not say: I want to have the best person for this program. Every government program, every government hiring decision becomes a contest between men and women, or a contest between Hispanic or Asian or what have you. It is a kind of ridiculous contest because America is so nonracist in the first place, but that is what we have going on in the program.

We have got to save some money by getting rid of these bureaucrats. We ought to realize that the purpose of these programs is to divide America.

There is a book out—I don't know if it is okay to use a picture of a book here—but it is called, "America's Cultural Revolution," by Christopher Rufo. In this book, he points out that this idea of breaking apart America by racial groups would be a way to destroy America.

There was a Communist by the name of Marcuse, Herbert Marcuse, who was very powerful in the late sixties and early seventies.

At that time, the Communist element, the Progressive element, has always wanted to fundamentally change America. They were hoping to change America by dividing America by wealth, and they wanted Americans to be bitter and angry because some people lived in a nice house or had a big bank account. They felt they could rile people up and make them mad and bring out their worst emotions and create a revolution in America.

They failed. In the late sixties and early seventies, there were a lot of bombings, there were a lot of riots, but America was still a country at heart that was proud to be American. They realized anybody in America could realize the American Dream if they were willing to work hard.

The Progressives failed in the late sixties and early seventies to divide America by bitterness, by economic divide. As a fallback position, they felt that maybe we can divide America by race, maybe we can create bitterness and anger if we persuade people America is a horrible racist country.

That is what they talk about in "America's Cultural Revolution," the desire to destroy America because we want most Americans bitter and angry and thinking that we have a racist country.

We have to get rid of the people who are pushing this division, whether they are an American business, in academia, in government, a lot of times they are referred to as DEI specialists.

The purpose of these people is to divide America and tell people America is a horrible, racist country. It is on its face, by the way, absurd.

I mean, the wealthiest subgroup in America today is Indian Americans. They do not look European in nature. Many of them come here not knowing

how to speak English. Most of them who come here are not Christian. If the people are right that America is a horrible, racist country, that they discriminate against people, these people would not be able to rise to the level they have.

If you look at the other wealthiest Americans, almost none of them are White and of European descent: Chinese Americans, Filipino Americans, Japanese Americans, Cuban Americans, second-generation African Americans all outperform native persons.

Nevertheless, this evil group of DEI people who administer these programs use their positions to try to create resentment in America. It should be a goal to cause Herbert Marcuse's successors to fail. We have got to do all we can to get rid of these DEI specialists who encourage hate, encourage racism, encourage resentment, spread a myth that we have a big white supremacist problem.

There is no way, when we get down with the next level of appropriation bills that this government—which is broke out of its mind—ought to still have any bureaucrats who make this pitch throughout America.

Of course, during the campaign, you will notice—some Republicans fall guilty of this as well—there are campaign promises aimed at individual ethnic groups rather than treating all Americans as one. This is not something we had to do 20 or 30 years ago. It is obvious that Herbert Marcuse Communists or radical socialists have achieved his goal in that at least one political party plans to maintain power by putting programs out there that benefit one ethnic group over another ethnic group or promises financial benefits if you belong to one group over another group.

Fortunately, so far, they haven't had a huge amount of success, but if you talk around, they have made some progress in persuading some people that we have a huge problem in society.

In any event, certainly an immediate goal for this institution is to get rid of anybody preaching that DEI nonsense, certainly anybody whose position in our government is to encourage their horrible philosophy.

In any event, there are some comments on what is going on in America. Just to summarize again, I think we have to provide a little bit more oomph behind our First Amendment so that people like Hillary Clinton or John Kerry or Joseph Biden are pushed to the dustbin of history if they decide to attack it or feel that is part of our problem.

I think we have to be very careful to not discourage the formation of two-parent families like we have in the last 60 years.

I think we have to get rid of the bureaucracy, which is growing up, which tries to divide America by ethnic background, is something else that I think has to be done.

We have to educate our young people that we do not have a democracy. James Madison and our forefathers would be shocked and stunned and disappointed if this land, which they had founded, had twisted itself all around, abandoned our respect for our Constitution, the Republic, and instead was teaching our young ones that we had a democracy, including some of the people with the greatest positions up here.

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

RIGHTS FOR ALL PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, and still I rise. I rise proud to be a Member of this august body, always honored to have the preeminent privilege of standing here or in the well and making statements, hopefully, that can have an impact on society in a very positive way.

I rise today, Madam Speaker, because I am concerned about the rights of others. I stand for the rights of others notwithstanding who I am. I am not Asian, but I stand for the rights of Asians. I am not Palestinian, but I will stand up for Palestinians. I am not a Muslim, nor am I a person who is from some country that I may not be aware of. I will still stand up for their rights.

I believe that the rights of persons who are Jewish have to be focused on. We have to stand up for them, especially given what is happening with anti-Semitism today.

I am not a member of the LGBTQ+ community, but I stand up for their rights. Today, I am going to take a stand for those persons who are among the trans community, the transgender community.

I am not a member of the LGBTQ+ community, as I have indicated, but I still stand up for the rights of people, doesn't matter what community you are in. If you are being wronged, someone should stand up to make that wrong right.

Today, I want to talk about the bathroom issue, but before going there, let me just share this: I am a son of the segregated South. I know what invidious discrimination looks like, what it smells like, what it sounds like, what it hurts like. I know because I suffered invidious discrimination.

In the segregated South, I was not allowed to go into certain places because of the complexion of my skin. In the segregated South, even if I went into certain places, there were areas that I could not go into because of the color of my skin.

In the segregated South, there were signs on the doors of the necessary facilities, the toilets, that would indicate that they were for Whites or they were for colored. I understood, because my

parents made it very clear to me, that you should never go into the area for Whites because people would harm me. It was their belief that I would be harmed, in fact, that I might even lose my life for simply going into the wrong toilet.

So I learned early in life what invidious discrimination was like. I had no differences with the people who were going into the Whites-only facility. I didn't dislike them. I didn't say bad things about them. I didn't try to hurt them in any way, but they chose to keep me out of a certain facility because of who I was, the color of my skin.

Now, this is an interesting phenomenon: But for the color of my skin, we had the same characteristics. We had the same number of arms and legs and eyes, same characteristics generally speaking.

Our physicality was quite similar, but the color of my skin was something that would not allow me to go into a Whites-only necessary facility, a Whites-only toilet.

That color of my skin made all the difference in the world. When I was within the facility, I used it the same way they would. There was no difference in the way I approached the use of it as it relates to the facility. We did it the same way. We went in the same door. We would come out the same door. While there, we would use the facilities in the same way. Nothing different other than the color of my skin that kept me out of a Whites-only restroom.

This is a remarkable circumstance. If you haven't lived it, you don't have the same understanding of how it impacts a person to know that you are now somehow a second-class citizen given that you cannot go into the first-class restroom.

By the way, it was a first-class facility because it was always clean. I know. I worked in a restaurant where my job was to clean facilities. It was always clean. It always had the fine fixtures. It always had the most room for persons to negotiate their way through the facility.

The other restroom for the coloreds was usually one that might have a broken fixture that wouldn't be repaired. It had floors that were not always the same in terms of how they were structured and how they were covered with various types of flooring. They were just different.

□ 1300

That was intentional. There was no desire to improve and have both of them the same. It was separate but equal then, but separate but equal simply meant there is a place for you and there was a place for Whites.

I mention this, Madam Speaker, because of this circumstance and the way I had been treated in life. Having celebrated my 25th birthday for the third time and now 2 years into my fourth 25th, I cannot in good conscience support the segregation of people based

upon gender. I cannot support it because I believe that people who are transgender have a right to go to the facility that they have now transformed themselves into by virtue of the transformation process that assigns them their gender. I just believe that I cannot in good conscience decide that I am going to force them to go to now a facility that does not align with the transformed gender that they now have.

I believe that the science is correct. I believe that persons who have this transformation have every right to go into a facility that now aligns with their transformed gender.

This is something that I absolutely believe. Because I believe it, it is going to be very difficult for me—in fact, it would be impossible, in my opinion—for me to support a rule or a mandate that would require persons who are of the trans community to go into a facility simply because it is the gender at birth that determines the place that you would now use as your necessary facility.

Your gender at birth is a wonderful thing. I accept my gender at birth. I am heterosexual. I live that life. However, there are some people who are born with a physicality that does not match their mentality, and science has demonstrated that they can be transformed such that their mental belief and definition of themselves can conform to their physical by virtue of having a transformation operation.

I am all for having people have necessary facilities. I support it. However, I support the notion that we would treat the trans community with the dignity and respect that they deserve simply because they are human beings just like the rest of us. We should not make them second-class citizens. We ought not decide that they can't go into certain facilities that are aligned with the gender that they now have simply because of their birth gender. The birth gender is not necessarily controlling if you within are of a different gender. It just cannot control, and I cannot impose this upon people.

Having gone now to segregated facilities myself, I see this as a step backward. I see this as taking us back to a time when we could segregate people. I don't support any form of segregation.

I understand that there are efforts afoot to resegregate society. Vouchers are a step in that direction. Vouchers can lead to the resegregation of society. It was Milton Friedman, Nobel laureate, who proposed keeping segregation, maintaining segregation after *Brown v. Board of Education* in 1954.

Proposed vouchers for the school systems to privatize the school systems, to make sure that people attended the school that they chose to based upon race, based upon color. This was proposed by Milton Friedman, the Nobel laureate.

From the moment he proposed it to this moment, there have been efforts to

voucherize and privatize the public school system. We see it happening in Louisiana. It is happening in Texas. Our Governor went out of his way to defeat persons at the polls who would not support vouchers. Now, he is prepared to pass a bill in the Texas House of Representatives and the Texas Senate, that he will sign, that will allow schools to have private dollars, personal dollars, to go to private schools—personal dollars going to private schools is fine—but to take public funds from public schools and take these public dollars and put them into private schools.

If you want to pay for a private school, I support that. However, if you want your child to go to public schools, I also support having a public school available. If we privatize the school systems and if we find ourselves with Blacks going to certain schools, Whites going to other schools, Latinos perhaps in other schools, Asians in other schools, we will find ourselves revisiting a time that I lived through in the segregated South, a time when I was relegated to certain schools because of my color.

It won't be said to be because of color, but it can take place because of color and because of finance. Black people, generally speaking, are not as well financed as White people and as a result will not be able to afford to send their children to the same schools that Whites can send theirs. Some will say that is just going to be class. It is class that ends up being race-oriented because if you can't go in because of your money and you happen to be of a certain color, that is going to lead to the resegregation of society.

I refuse to stand by and allow this resegregation to take place without voicing my concerns. I want people to understand that I see these vouchers and I see these bathroom movements as nothing more than steps toward the resegregation of society.

I contend this: There are very few laws that prevent us from having a segregated society. There are many that we can name but very few. At the very heart of these few would be *Brown v. Board of Education*.

Brown v. Board of Education outlawed discrimination in public schools. It was a form of racism that we lived through that was called segregation, but it was racism. That racism caused segregation, forced me to go to one school where there were only people of my color and forced Whites to go to schools where there were only people who were of the White complexion. I don't like the term. I am using the term to communicate. They were forced to use these public schools, and I was forced to public schools where they were segregated.

If we allow *Brown* to be eroded by virtue of using vouchers, we are taking a step back to a time prior to 1954 when the *Brown* decision was rendered. If we go back beyond 1954, we will find ourselves slowly chipping away at other

aspects of society such that I may again find myself having to go to a back door or I may find myself having to go to a colored-only restroom or I may find myself having to go to the balcony of the movie or the back of the bus. These are the things that I lived through, and I never believed—now that I have seen the change that has taken place in our country, I do not believe that we can conclude that we can't go back.

If you believe that we can't go back, ask women who believe that they should have the right to have choice in their lives as it relates to abortion. Ask them about what happened to the law that was but 50 years of age. Fifty years had passed, and we find ourselves with the Supreme Court overturning the law that gave women the constitutional right to have an abortion. Now this law has been challenged at the Supreme Court level, passed back down to the States to do with as they choose, and many States choose to literally do all they can to ban abortion in the United States of America.

Don't assume that what you have today you will have tomorrow. If you don't fight for it today, you can lose it tomorrow. If you don't fight for the rights of others, you could lose your rights. The rights of others are the rights that protect us. All of us are protected because we protect the rights of others and others protect our rights. If we don't protect each other, we can lose precious rights that we have.

This is a society that desires to have people sometimes subservient, as has been indicated by virtue of the fact that many people were enslaved. This subserviency is something that still exists in the hearts of many in this society, this desire to have people succumb. The need for some to have supremacy is something that we have to be alert for, and we have got to fight against.

I am going to stand up against it, which means I have to stand against any mandate that would require a trans person to go to a facility that is aligned with their birth gender as opposed to the gender that they currently have by virtue of having gone through the transformation.

I stand with them. I stand for the rights of all people to not suffer invidious discrimination. If you are going to stand for all people, you have got to stand with the trans community. This is my opinion.

Let others do what they may. I have taken my position. I don't know when there will be a vote on it or if ever there will be a vote. The judicious thing, they tell me, is if there is something that you may never have to vote on, never comment on it. However, there are some things that are so precious, some things that are so near and dear to the heart that you have to comment on them when you see a mistake about to be made.

I believe it would be a mistake for this House to conclude that trans people cannot go to the necessary facility

that aligns with their current sex, their current transformed sex. I believe it would be a mistake for the House to do this. I trust that it will be reconsidered and that it won't happen. The Senate has not done it. I pray that they will not, and I pray that the House will not.

Again, I stand for the rights of others. People not born into their lives—in the sense that I am not an Asian, I am not Latino, I am not Muslim, I am not Jewish, but I stand for the rights of all of these people. I also stand for the rights of Palestinians. I never want to leave them out, because Palestinian rights are being trampled upon every day now.

For me, standing up for the rights of others is a way of protecting my very own rights. I am here to do that. I am here to let the world know that trans people have the same rights to a facility as anybody else when it aligns with the gender that they currently have.

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

COMMERCIAL SPACE TRANSPORTATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. KILEY) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KILEY. Madam Speaker, today, I am announcing new legislation that is of great importance to the future of space exploration.

My bill will elevate the Office of Commercial Space Transportation as an independent entity within the Department of Transportation. It will remove it from the jurisdiction and the auspices of the FAA, the Federal Aviation Administration.

This is actually the way the office was originally set up when it was created in 1984, but in the mid-nineties, it was folded into the FAA. That was never a good fit. It was never really what the FAA was designed to do, and the commercial space industry is a dramatically different enterprise today than it was in the mid-nineties, than it even was just a few years ago.

This is a commonsense reform that, in fact, has been endorsed by the FAA's own Commercial Space Transportation Advisory Committee, which unanimously recommended removing the Office of Commercial Space Transportation from the FAA and making it its own independent entity that reports directly to the Secretary of the Department of Transportation.

This will remove a layer of bureaucracy that has proven to be very problematic when it comes to innovation in space. It was underscored very dramatically just last month when the world witnessed the extraordinary scene captured in this photograph, when the launch of flight 5 for SpaceX's Starship, which is the most powerful rocket ever built, resulted in the booster being returned to the

launch site and being caught in this tower without the use of landing legs or anything like that, using the Mechazilla chopstick arms.

□ 1315

This booster, by the way, has 33 of what are called Raptor engines. Each one of those 33 engines has twice as much thrust as the engines of a Boeing 747. It is truly an awe-inspiring amount of force, and the scale and power of this space vehicle is truly unprecedented. The feat that was accomplished in flight 5 was something that folks didn't even think was possible.

By the way, I had the chance to go to flight 6 earlier this week, which was another very successful test for SpaceX and truly something that was remarkable to witness in person.

However, this amazing scene almost didn't happen, or at least wouldn't have happened when it did, because the FAA had tried to hold back the launch. The FAA had come out and said that it was going to depart from the previously announced timeline and was going to delay the launch by months for no good reason at all.

I cross-examined the FAA Administrator about this myself, and he could provide no good reason, certainly no public safety reason, for delaying the launch. He, in fact, came up with bogus reasons that were quickly debunked as false.

Thankfully, the FAA did finally come around and allowed the launch to move forward, but if those initial delays had been allowed to stick, then both flight 5 and flight 6 wouldn't have happened by now.

This all just goes to underscore that the FAA really should not be involved in these matters.

With my legislation, we will get them out of the picture. The Office of Commercial Space Transportation would be housed as an independent entity within the Department of Transportation.

The fact is it should not be more difficult to get the paperwork approved for a launch than it is to actually build and launch the rocket.

This is worth putting in perspective because, in spite of the fact that we have had a redundant and, at times, hostile regulatory regime, we have seen incredible progress in the commercial space industry, in particular by SpaceX, which has given the United States a position of dominance when it comes to space.

In fact, SpaceX, this one company, accounts for well over 90 percent of the mass that is launched into orbit around the world. In fact, just in the last 48 hours, SpaceX has had four different launches from not just Texas, where Starship was launched, but from Florida and California as well. That is unprecedented, four launches in 48 hours. As a point of comparison, the entire continent of Europe has had fewer launches this entire year.

It is truly extraordinary what is being accomplished in spite of regula-

tions and bureaucracies that are attempting to hold us back.

Just imagine, Madam Speaker, what we could accomplish if we actually had our laws and regulations and agencies be on the side of innovation. Just imagine what might be possible.

The dominance that the United States currently has in space is a tremendous national asset, and it is of vital importance in a number of ways when it comes to national security, of course, as well as when it comes to connectivity, bringing the internet to all corners of the globe. I have constituents in Death Valley, which I represent, who use SpaceX's Starlink system. It has also been used by our fire agencies when connectivity is disrupted with wildfires.

They have managed to accomplish all of this in spite of adverse regulations. If we manage to change that paradigm, if we manage to actually have regulations that are designed to encourage those who are innovating to make these seemingly impossible feats be brought somewhat closer or more readily within the bounds of possibility, then it will not only enhance U.S. dominance in space and it will not only further all of those advantages I just mentioned, but I think it will continue to bring folks together around something that is truly inspiring around this common purpose. It will be something that is larger than any of us.

I think that when we witnessed this epic catch of the Starship booster last month, it was really a singular moment, more than any other moment perhaps in decades. It has heralded a new era of space exploration with literally infinite possibilities.

I am truly excited about this. I think it is something that everyone in our country and all across the world can be excited by. I am excited about the new possibilities that will open up when we get this bill passed and signed into law.

CRIME ONCE AGAIN ILLEGAL IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. KILEY. Madam Speaker, I rise to present some good news from California, which is that crime is, once again, illegal in my home State.

California voters have overwhelmingly passed, with almost 70 percent of the vote, Proposition 36, an initiative to make crime illegal again.

It passed with a higher percentage of the vote than any other initiative on the ballot in California. It passed in each and every one of California's 58 counties, and it wasn't close anywhere. It passed in San Francisco. It passed in L.A.

It passed everywhere across the State, and this was despite the fact that the leaders of the supermajority legislature were against it. It is despite the fact that Governor Gavin Newsom fought the initiative tooth and nail each and every step of the way. Newsom concocted schemes to try to remove the initiative from the ballot. When that failed, he led the campaign against the initiative.

Yet, at the end of the day, California voters overwhelmingly passed it, and

Governor Newsom, for his part, decided to insult the voters. He said that the initiative was a very lazy response to the State's crime problem. He even said that he doesn't recognize the State that he is living in. That is probably a good thing because the State that we have been living in is one where crime has effectively been legalized.

Madam Speaker, if you walk into a store in many parts of California, first of all, on your way into the store, you might have to walk through an open-air drug market or a place where drugs are being openly exchanged and used. You might have to step around needles that are on the ground. This might happen on your way to school, or in a park, or in many other public places.

Then, you go into a store. Let's say it is a CVS, and you just need to get some shampoo or a stick of deodorant. You can't just take it off the shelf and pay, Madam Speaker. It is going to be under lock and key, and you are going to need to press a button or summon an attendant to unlock the cabinet so you can get your stick of deodorant or your bottle of shampoo.

The reason, of course, they are doing that is because the legal system cannot be relied upon to deter crime, so retailers have had to take matters into their own hands. If there is a theft incident, which does actually dramatically reduce the margins of retailers and is driving many out of business in California, there is nothing they can do about it. They just have to watch the person walk out the door with stolen merchandise. Usually, they won't even bother to report it to the authorities because they know nothing is going to happen because the laws on the books are not strong enough to make a prosecution worth going through in most places.

That is why I say that this initiative was designed to make crime illegal again, because currently in the State, there is no consequence for criminal activity, so crime effectively is legal. Proposition 36, which has been overwhelmingly approved by voters, changes that.

First of all, what it does is it restores penalties for those who repeatedly steal merchandise from our stores. Number two is that it restores rehabilitation, mandatory treatment, for those who are repeatedly arrested for drug use. Number three is it toughens penalties for fentanyl dealers, with fentanyl poisoning and overdoses continuing to result in such tragic losses in every community throughout California.

Our State, Madam Speaker, I am happy to report, is on a path back to sanity. For folks around the country who love California, who have considered it the Golden State and are dismayed by what has happened in recent years, this is cause for hope.

Not only that but a decision of the U.S. Supreme Court, which I wrote an amicus brief for, has restored the abil-

ity of our communities to actually remove homeless encampments from public places, which a previous Ninth Circuit decision blocked them from doing. We are already seeing some of our streets getting cleaned up.

Not only that but we just had a couple of the most reckless district attorneys in the country, including George Gascon in Los Angeles, removed from office, so we truly are on a path back to sanity.

I believe it is a new day for California, and I am very excited about the progress that we are going to continue to make in the months and years ahead.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF JOHN HIDAHL

Mr. KILEY. Madam Speaker, I wish to recognize and honor the memory of a good friend of mine, John Hidahl, the El Dorado County supervisor for District 1, who passed away this month on November 2.

Supervisor Hidahl was an outstanding public servant who served in the El Dorado Hills area for over 40 years, most recently two terms on the board of supervisors.

John was raised in Ceres, California, on the Hidahl family ranch, where he performed farm work as well as driving for his family trucking business.

John's family had been ranching for generations, and beyond his work for the family growing up, he continued the family farming legacy by serving as the chairman of the board of Hidahl Ranch.

During his years at Ceres High School, John earned his Eagle Scout rank at the age of 16. I actually used to see him at every Eagle Scout ceremony I went to in the area. He was always there, a proud Eagle himself, and so proud to recognize and honor the young Eagles as they reached that milestone.

Also in high school, he met his wife of 52 years, Eileen, who is a retired public school teacher.

John studied mechanical engineering at California Polytechnic State University-San Luis Obispo, which launched his career in the aerospace industry. During these years, he conducted impressive work at Aerojet and Northrop Grumman and excelled at multiple roles, including rocket test engineer, rocket design engineer, director of engineering, and chief systems engineer.

John was propelled by his personal motto of "Service before self" to serve his community, guiding his transition to public service. He led his community in various roles. He served on the El Dorado Hills Water District for 33 years, the El Dorado Hills Area Planning Advisory Committee for 36 years, the El Dorado Hills Community Council for 23 years, and the list goes on.

The thorough dedication and leadership shown by John is one of the things that has allowed our region to remain an amazing place to live, learn, work, and raise a family. It has been a true privilege to know John, and I am cer-

tain that the impact of his lifelong "Service before self" slogan will be felt by the county for many, many years and for generations to come.

During my time in both the State assembly and in Congress, it has been an honor to work alongside Supervisor Hidahl. He truly exemplified what it means to be in public service, and he worked tirelessly to improve the quality of life for all of his constituents.

Therefore, on behalf of California's Third Congressional District and the United States House of Representatives, I extend my heartfelt condolences to John's wife, Eileen; their five daughters, Kathryn, Maureen, Christine, Rachel, and Brittani; and to the many others whose lives John touched in El Dorado County and the neighboring region.

John will be greatly missed, and his legacy will be felt for a long, long time to come.

CELEBRATING LAKE TAHOE COMMUNITY COLLEGE'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. KILEY. Madam Speaker, I wish to mark and celebrate the 50-year anniversary of Lake Tahoe Community College.

In 1974, the formation of the college was approved, with the official opening of their doors taking place on September 18 of the following year. Now, 50 years later, the Lake Tahoe Community College is a true pillar in the community.

Ranked among the top 20 best community colleges in the country in 2023, Lake Tahoe Community College is an evolving, dynamic academic institution located in the heart of South Lake Tahoe, California.

It is northern California's highest elevation college, and it is a microcosm of the natural beauty of the nearby national treasure, Lake Tahoe.

The college currently serves 7,500 students annually from the local community, neighboring jurisdictions, other States, and even from across the globe.

Their academic programs help students earn terminal degrees, prepare them for transfer to 4-year institutions, and ready them for exciting and fulfilling careers.

Of particular note is the college's career and technical education program, which provides certifications and training with an avenue directly into employment in a variety of important local career paths, such as firefighting with CAL FIRE and forestry protection with the U.S. Forest Service.

In fact, they have had students who have gotten their certifications and have gone right out immediately to help fight against wildfires, providing an incredibly and very much needed service.

The college's dedication to promoting educational opportunities and access to higher learning contributes to a diverse and enthusiastic college environment that inspires scholars through hard work and determination to thrive in their academic and career goals.

The professors, administrators, staff, and board of the college are to be highly regarded for their remarkable leadership, contributions to the Tahoe community, and the instrumental support they provide toward the success of their students.

I am proud to represent exemplary colleges like Lake Tahoe Community College in Congress.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of the United States House of Representatives, I am honored to recognize Lake Tahoe Community College for more than five decades of dedication to academic achievement, empowering individuals, and enriching our community.

□ 1330

DEATH VALLEY '49ERS

Mr. KILEY. Madam Speaker, I wish to mark and celebrate the 75-year anniversary of the Death Valley '49ers.

For more than seven decades, this volunteer, nonprofit organization has been dedicated to raising public awareness and preserving the history and natural beauty of Death Valley National Park, the Nation's largest conserved desert landscape.

The Death Valley '49ers had its beginning in 1949, when it produced a historical pageant in Death Valley to highlight the spirit of the California pioneers. Since then, the Death Valley '49ers have sponsored an annual encampment each November to celebrate this pioneer spirit and the highly valued national resource of Death Valley.

Through their efforts to both protect the rare desert environment and famed recreational space, this organization has played a pivotal role in educating the public on the history of Death Valley in the settlement of the west.

In addition to sponsoring the annual encampment, they are also involved with a variety of projects that support Death Valley and the surrounding community, including hosting art shows and musical events, providing scholarships and educational opportunities for local students, publishing books and other communications about the park, assisting in renovation projects, spearheading monument and State landmark efforts, and maintaining contact with the Timbisha-Shoshone Tribe.

Their devoted efforts have made a lasting impact in the region, and I am confident that their ongoing contributions will continue to serve the park, visitors, and residents for many generations to come.

Therefore, on behalf of the United States House of Representatives, I am honored to recognize the Death Valley '49ers for their 75 years of commitment to the Death Valley National Park and the history within.

ROSEVILLE HOUSING AUTHORITY

Mr. KILEY. Madam Speaker, I wish to mark and celebrate the 50-year anniversary of the Roseville Housing Authority.

The Roseville Housing Authority started providing rental assistance in 1980 and has since directed more than

\$132 million in Federal funds to those in need who qualify as low-income households for rental assistance.

Acting in conjunction with the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Roseville Housing Authority works as the hands that reach out to the local community to make housing assistance both affordable and accountable.

This outreach has expanded as they administer for the city of Rocklin in providing both project-based vouchers and housing choice vouchers. Moreover, in the last decade alone, the Roseville Housing Authority ran the Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing Program, which collaborates with the United States Department of Veterans Affairs.

I am proud to say that their work of housing veterans is progressing. In 2021, the Roseville Housing Authority leased the first project-based vouchers in Roseville, which provided lease assistance for households directly from homelessness, and nearly two-thirds were issued to veterans.

The enduring strength and innovation of the Roseville Housing Authority in creating and implementing new housing opportunities was on full display last year when their new landlord incentive program served 140 households and achieved a near-perfect 97 percent lease success rate.

These recent successes provide a short glimpse into the Roseville Housing Authority's dedication to assisting with and initiating housing opportunities in the community.

Their success is consistent and historic, as they have earned the designation of "High Performer" by the Department of Housing and Urban Development for decades.

This distinguished and meritorious status is the highest rating the Department can bestow on a public housing agency. The Roseville Housing Authority is and has been among the top public housing authorities in the country.

It is a great honor and privilege to represent pioneering and exceptional organizations such as the Roseville Housing Authority in Congress. Therefore, on behalf of the United States House of Representatives, I am honored to recognize the Roseville Housing Authority for 50 years of providing outstanding contributions to our community.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE RETIREMENT OF PLACER COUNTY BOARD SUPERVISOR JIM HOLMES

Mr. KILEY. Madam Speaker, I would like to take a moment to recognize retiring Placer County Board Supervisor Jim Holmes, who has served the foothill communities of Placer County, California, for nearly 20 years.

A native to the city of Auburn with long family roots that extend back five generations, Supervisor Holmes attended Placer High School and Sierra College and completed his undergraduate education at Humboldt State University with a bachelor of arts degree.

He worked for nearly 30 years as a manager and owner of a gas station and repair shop, thus setting the stage for his public service based on lessons learned as a small businessman.

Supervisor Holmes is known for being accessible to his constituents, active in the community, and attentive to varying sides of an issue before making a decision he believed to be in the best interests of Placer County citizens. By any measure, Supervisor Jim Holmes has established a tradition of public service in Placer County that sets a marker and an expectation.

He has served faithfully on a wide variety of community boards, commissions, and committees, including: the First Children and Families Commission; Auburn Area Salvation Army Advisory Board; Placer County Consolidated Fire Protection District Board; and, the Placer County Transportation Planning Agency, among others. He was also a founding member of the North Auburn Municipal Advisory Council, as well as the Highway 49 Business Association Board.

During Supervisor Holmes' tenure, he promoted affordable housing projects and programs, improved traffic and highway safety concerns, invested in fire protection and prevention efforts, supported our local public libraries, preserved the agricultural heritage of the area, and enhanced overall services throughout the county.

Supervisor Jim Holmes achieved a wide diversity of accomplishments to improve the quality of life and experiences for residents, businesses, and visitors of Placer County. Some of his particularly noteworthy accomplishments include his contributions toward fully funding the Placer County retirement obligation, bringing Mercy Housing to North Auburn, building the Rocklin Public Library, and leading improvements to Highway 49, just to name a few.

It is because of the leadership and commitment of people like Supervisor Jim Holmes that Placer County is such a great place to live, work, and recreate. I am confident that the legacy he built and the public service he provided will continue to benefit the county for many years to come.

Therefore, on behalf of the United States House of Representatives, I am honored to recognize Supervisor Jim Holmes for the years of dedicated leadership he provided to the people of Placer County, and I wish him all the best in his retirement.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE RETIREMENT OF SACRAMENTO COUNTY SUPERVISOR SUE FROST

Mr. KILEY. Madam Speaker, I wish to recognize the retiring Sacramento County supervisor for district 4, Sue Frost, for her years of service to the Sacramento area community.

Supervisor Frost has served the people of the Sacramento area for more than three decades with a career in elected office that spanned 12 years.

Before pursuing her interests in the public sphere, Supervisor Frost held a

distinguished career and made exceptional contributions in both healthcare and business. With a strong foundation in nursing and physical education from Pacific Union College, she became a California certified emergency nurse, showcasing her dedication to community health.

In the business world, she has excelled as a businessowner for 34 years in mortgage lending, consulting, and real estate investments until her retirement in 2014.

Her involvement with the Sacramento Association of Realtors has allowed Supervisor Frost to have an impact on the industry with her vast knowledge and unwavering commitment to the community.

Transitioning to public service, Supervisor Frost impacted our region through extensive service on various boards and associations, including serving as a vice president of the Birdcage Heights Neighborhood Association, vice president of Roseville Parkinon's Support Group, and former president of the Citrus Heights Green Team. Elected to the Citrus Heights City Council in 2012, she served as vice mayor in 2014 and mayor in 2015.

During this period, she championed fiscal discipline, economic growth, and public safety.

As mayor, Supervisor Frost sought regional and economic cooperation and supported nonprofit organizations through key initiatives, such as the Regional Leadership Council, the Community Leadership Conference, and the We Support Veterans celebration, which raised over \$10,000 for the Vets Helping Vets Fund.

In January 2017, Supervisor Frost was sworn in to represent district 4 on the Sacramento County Board of Supervisors.

Dedicated to engaging with residents across her district, including Orangevale, Folsom, and surrounding communities, Supervisor Frost prioritized engagement with her constituents with continuing community meetings, which allowed residents to interact directly with her and her office.

Furthermore, she showed commitment to supporting county services by working with over 30 departments to foster safe neighborhoods, ensure economic development, advocate for veterans' resources, and protect our quality of life.

It is because of the leadership and commitment of people like Supervisor Sue Frost that our communities are such a great place to live, work, and recreate.

I am confident that the legacy she built and the public service that she provided in so many ways will continue to benefit the county for many, many years to come.

Therefore, on behalf of the United States House of Representatives, I am honored to recognize Supervisor Sue Frost for the dedicated leadership and years of service that she provided to

the people of Sacramento County, and I join the Sacramento area and all of her constituents in wishing her the very best in her retirement.

IN MEMORY OF ROBERT HUGH "BOBBY" TANNER

Mr. KILEY. Madam Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I wish to take a moment to honor the memory of Robert Hugh Tanner, known as Bobby, an Inyo County resident and community leader who passed away earlier this year in June.

Bobby Tanner was known by others as an inspiration, a role model, a local legend, a man of integrity, a great "mule man," and a friend to the Eastern Sierra who contributed greatly to his community.

He was born in Inyo County in the city of Bishop in 1959. Bobby was raised working in his family business, the Red's Meadow Resort and Pack Station, where he would lead pack strings into the Sierra Nevada mountains, a way of life that became one of his dearest passions. He graduated from Bishop Union High School in 1978 and went on to earn his degree from Cal Poly San Luis Obispo.

Bobby owned and operated his own businesses, Tanner Hay Company and Rock Creek Lodge, and eventually became the owner of his family business, Red's Meadow Resort and Pack Station. As a businessman and entrepreneur himself, he maintained a strong commitment to supporting other local small businesses and organizations, contributing to the strength and economic vitality of the region.

He loved the outdoors, which was reflected in his enthusiasm for sports; namely, skiing and football, skills of which led him to mentoring and coaching youth in the local ski and high school football teams.

Bobby placed his heart in the center of the Eastern Sierras and served the community in several capacities. Of particular note were the monumental contributions he and his family made to the famous Bishop Mule Days Celebration, a first-rate mule show and classic Eastern Sierra tradition. As a son to one of the founders of Mule Days, Bobby participated in this event since its inception in 1970, when he was just 10 years old, and served for many years as a member and president of the board later in life. He also played a vital role in recreating and operating the famed Twenty Mule Team, a special historical attraction iconic to Death Valley.

Undoubtedly, Bobby Tanner's many contributions are part of the fabric and fiber of the city of Bishop and surrounding communities, and I am confident that the impact of the remarkable legacy he left will be felt for many generations to come.

Therefore, on behalf of California's Third Congressional District and the United States House of Representatives, I offer my heartfelt condolences to Bobby's mother, Jean; wife, Claudia; son, Bo; sister and brother-in-law Suzanne and Harvey Bertrand; and the

countless others whose lives he touched throughout Inyo County and the Eastern Sierra region. Bobby Tanner will be greatly missed.

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

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Kevin F. McCumber, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 599. An ACT to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3500 West 6th Street, Suite 103 in Los Angeles, California, as the "Dosan Ahn Chang Ho Post Office".

H.R. 807. An ACT to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the invaluable service that working dogs provide to society.

H.R. 1060. An ACT to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1663 East Date Place in San Bernardino, California, as the "Dr. Margaret B. Hill Post Office Building".

H.R. 1098. An ACT to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 50 East Derry Road in East Derry, New Hampshire, as the "Chief Edward B. Garone Post Office".

H.R. 1505. An ACT to modify the prohibition on recognition by the United States courts of certain rights relating to certain marks, trade names or commercial names.

H.R. 3608. An ACT to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 28081 Marguerite Parkway in Mission Viejo, California, as the "Major Megan McClung Post Office Building".

H.R. 3728. An ACT to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 25 Dorchester Avenue, Room 1, in Boston Massachusetts, as the "Caroline Chang Post Office".

H.R. 5476. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1077 River Road, Suite 1, in Washington Crossing, Pennsylvania as the "Susan C. Barnhart Post Office".

H.R. 5490. An act to amend the Coastal Barrier Resources Act to expand the John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5640. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 12804 Chillicothe Road in Chesterland, Ohio, as the "Sgt. Wolfgang Kyle Weninger Post Office Building".

H.R. 5712. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 220 Fremont Street in Kiel, Wisconsin, as the "Trooper Trevor J. Casper Post Office Building".

H.R. 5985. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 517 Seagaze Drive in Oceanside, California, as the "Charlesetta Reece Allen Post Office Building".

H.R. 6073. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 9925 Bustleton Avenue in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, as the "Sergeant Christopher David Fitzgerald Post Office Building".

H.R. 6249. An act to provide for a review and report on the assistance and resources that the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency provides to individuals with disabilities and the families of such individuals that are impacted by major disasters, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6651. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located

at 603 West 3rd Street in Necedah, Wisconsin, as the “Sergeant Kenneth E. Murphy Post Office Building”.

H.R. 7192. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 333 West Broadway in Anaheim, California, as the “Dr. William I. ‘Bill’ Kott Post Office Building”.

H.R. 7199. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at S74w16860 Janesville Road, in Muskego, Wisconsin, as the “Colonel Hans Christian Heg Post Office”.

H.R. 7423. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 103 Benedette Street in Rayville, Louisiana, as the “Luke Letlow Post Office Building”.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

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

S. 3126.—An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish or replace a headstone, marker, or medallion for the grave of an eligible Medal of Honor recipient regardless of the recipient’s dates of service in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(z) of House Resolution 5, the House stands adjourned until 1 p.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon (at 1 o’clock and 41 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, November 22, 2024, at 1 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

EC-6112. A letter from the Program Analyst, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Food Distribution Programs: Improving Access and Parity [FNS-2023-0026] (RIN: 0584-AE92) received November 7, 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-6113. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Office of Head Start, Administration for Children and Families, transmitting the Administration’s final rule — Head Start Program CLASS Implementation Date Delay (RIN: 0970-AD09) received November 6, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

EC-6114. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Program, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final action — North Carolina: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions [EPA-R04-RCRA-2024-0116; FRL-11972-04-R4] 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-6115. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Program, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s direct final rule and correction — Hazardous and Solid Waste Management

System: Disposal of Coal Combustion Residuals From Electric Utilities; Legacy CCR Surface Impoundments; Correction [EPA-HQ-OLEM-2020-0107; FRL-7814.1-02-OLEM] (RIN: 2050-AH34) 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-6116. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Program, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Decabromodiphenyl Ether and Phenol, Isopropylated Phosphate (3:1); Revision to the Regulation of Persistent, Bioaccumulative, and Toxic Chemicals Under the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2023-0376; FRL-9145-02-OCSP] (RIN: 2070-AL02) 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-6117. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Program, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; New Hampshire; Regional Haze State Implementation Plan for the Second Implementation Period [EPA-R01-OAR-2023-0187; FRL-11554-02-R1] 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-6118. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Program, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Reconsideration of the Dust-Lead Hazard Standards and Dust-Lead Post-Abatement Clearance Levels [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2023-0231; FRL-8524-02-OCSP] (RIN: 2070-AK91) 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 Energy and Commerce.

EC-6119. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Program, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Air Plan Approval; Wisconsin; SIP Alignment Revision [EPA-R05-OAR-2023-0540; FRL-11835-02-R5] 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 Energy and Commerce.

EC-6120. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Program, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Regional Office Address [EPA-R04-OAR-2023-0519; FRL-12260-01-R4] 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 Energy and Commerce.

EC-6121. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Program, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Extension of Time-Limited Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [EPA-HQ-OPP-2024-0413; FRL-12300-01-OCSP] 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 Energy and Commerce.

EC-6122. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Program, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Glufosinate-P; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2020-0250; EPA-HQ-OPP-2020-0533; FRL-12339-01-OCSP] 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 Energy and Commerce.

EC-6123. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Program, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Air Plan Approval; Mississippi; PSD and Air Quality Modeling

Infrastructure Requirements for the 2015 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R04-OAR-2024-0186; FRL-12250-02-R4] received October 30, 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-6124. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Program, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s interim final rule — Federal “Good Neighbor Plan” for the 2015 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards; Response to Judicial Stay [EPA-HQ-OAR-2021-0668; FRL-8670.4-03-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AW30) received October 30, 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-6125. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Program, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Integrating e-Manifest With Hazardous Waste Exports and Other Manifest-Related Reports, PCB Manifest Amendments, and Technical Corrections; Correction [EPA-HQ-OLEM-2021-0609; FRL-7308-04-OLEM] (RIN: 2050-AH12) received October 30, 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-6126. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Program, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Outer Continental Shelf Air Regulations Update To Include New Jersey State Requirements [EPA-R02-OAR-2024-0277; FRL 12035-02-R2] received October 30, 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-6127. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Program, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Air Plan Approval; Delaware; Motor Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance Program [EPA-R03-OAR-2024-0016; FRL-12094-02-R3] received October 30, 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-6128. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Program, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Air Plan Approval; Forsyth County, North Carolina; Removal of Excess Emissions Provisions [EPA-R04-OAR-2023-0466; FRL-12179-02-R4] received October 30, 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-6129. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Program, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Mefenoxam; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2023-0397; FRL-12201-01-OCSP] received October 30, 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-6130. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Program, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Air Plan Revisions; California; San Diego County Air Pollution Control District and Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2024-0418; FRL-12225-02-R9] received October 30, 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-6131. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Program, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s interim final determination — Interim Final Determination To Stay or Defer

Sanctions; California; San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District [EPA-R09-OAR-2024-0338; FRL-12118-03-R9] received October 22, 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-6132. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Program, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plan; Delaware; Regional Haze State Implementation Plan for the Second Implementation Period [EPA-R03-OAR-2023-0301; FRL-10191-02-R3] received October 22, 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-6133. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Program, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Removal of Affirmative Defense Provisions From the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for the Oil and Natural Gas Production Facility and Natural Gas Transmission and Storage Facility Source Categories [EPA-HQ-OAR-2023-0406; FRL-10652-02-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AV97) received October 22, 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-6134. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Program, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; California; South Coast Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2023-0568; FRL-11558-02-R9] received October 22, 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-6135. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Program, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Quality Plans; California; San Diego County Air Pollution Control District; Permit Program [EPA-R09-OAR-2024-0100; FRL-11790-02-R9] received October 22, 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-6136. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Program, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD); Paragraph Designation Corrections [EPA-HQ-OAR-2024-0234; FRL-11945-01-OAR] received October 22, 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-6137. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Program, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Fluindapyr; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2023-0062; FRL-12158-01-OCSPP] received November 7, 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-6138. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Program, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval and Attainment Date Extension; 1997 Annual Fine Particulate Matter Nonattainment Area; San Joaquin Valley, California [EPA-R09-OAR-2024-0250 and EPA-R09-OAR-2024-0301; FRL-12006-02-R9] received November 7, 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-6139. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Program, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the

Agency's final rule — Other Solid Waste Incinerators; Air Curtain Incinerators Title V Permitting Provisions; Technical Correction [EPA-HQ-OAR-2003-0156; FRL-7547.4-02-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AW27) received November 7, 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-6140. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Program, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Wisconsin; Nitrogen Oxide Emissions Control Requirements [EPA-R05-OAR-2024-0184; FRL-11968-02-R5] received November 7, 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-6141. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Program, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Inflation Adjustment References for Civil Monetary Penalty Amounts in Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations [EPA-HQ-OECA-2024-0208; FRL 11265-02-OECA] (RIN: 2020-AA55) 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 the Judiciary.

EC-6142. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Program, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Vessel Incidental Discharge National Standards of Performance; Correction [EPA-HQ-OW-2019-0482; FRL 7218-04-OW] (RIN: 2040-AF92) received October 30, 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.

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. MCHENRY: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 5535. A bill to prohibit the Federal Insurance Office of the Department of the Treasury and other financial regulators from collecting data directly from an insurance company; with an amendment (Rept. 118-759, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL PURSUANT TO RULE XII

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII, the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 5535. Referral to the Committee on Agriculture extended for a period ending not later than December 19, 2024.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. MCCLELLAN:

H.R. 10191. A bill to extend Federal recognition to the Nottoway Indian Tribe of Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. WATERS (for herself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CARSON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. THOMPSON of Mis-

issippi, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. BROWN, Mrs. MCIVER, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mrs. HAYES, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, and Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida):

H.R. 10192. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to authorize grants for training and support services for families and unpaid caregivers of people living with Alzheimer's disease or a related dementia; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. WATERS (for herself, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. CARSON, Ms. TLAIB, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. THANEDAR, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Ms. LEE of California, and Ms. GARCIA of Texas):

H.R. 10193. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants to provide treatment for diabetes in minority communities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GOOD of Virginia (for himself, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BABIN, and Mr. CLINE):

H.R. 10194. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development from finalizing, implementing, or enforcing the proposed rule entitled "Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing", which was published on February 9, 2023; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOOD of Virginia (for himself, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. BURLISON, Mr. BABIN, and Mr. WEBER of Texas):

H.R. 10195. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to disallow the low-income housing tax credit to taxpayers that have diversity, equity, and inclusion initiatives; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KIM of California (for herself and Mrs. BEATTY):

H.R. 10196. A bill to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 to exclude certain financing from the calculation of the default rate for purposes of determining when the lending cap under such Act applies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. BEATTY (for herself and Ms. BROWN):

H.R. 10197. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to enter into an arrangement with the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine to conduct a comprehensive study on the health care impacts of the use of kinetic impact projectiles in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. BEATTY:

H.R. 10198. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to require the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to establish goals for the use of diverse investment advisers, brokers, and dealers in investment management agreements related to the Board of Governors unusual and exigent circumstances authority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BEYER (for himself and Mr. PETERS):

H.R. 10199. A bill to require warning labels on sugar-sweetened foods and beverages, foods and beverages containing non-sugar

sweeteners, ultra-processed foods, and foods high in nutrients of concern, such as added sugar, saturated fat, or sodium, to restrict junk food advertising to children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. BICE (for herself and Ms. HOULAHAN):

H.R. 10200. A bill to improve parental leave for members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BOST (for himself, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. COLE, Mr. KEAN of New Jersey, and Mr. CISCOMANI):

H.R. 10201. A bill to amend title 36, United States Code, to move the place of incorporation and domicile of the National Woman's Relief Corps to Illinois, to move the principal office of such Corps to Murphysboro, Illinois, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. DESAULNIER):

H.R. 10202. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to require group health plans and health insurance issuers offering group or individual health insurance coverage to provide benefits for lung cancer screenings for certain individuals without the imposition of cost sharing; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BUCHANAN (for himself, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. FERGUSON, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. DUNN of Florida, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. LEE of Florida, Mrs. LUNA, and Mr. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida):

H.R. 10203. A bill to provide tax relief for damages relating to Hurricanes Helene and Milton; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. CARAVEO:

H.R. 10204. A bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to modify the conservation reserve enhancement program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CARSON:

H.R. 10205. A bill to amend the Consumer Product Safety Act to ensure amusement rides permanently fixed to a site are treated as consumer products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CASE (for himself, Mr. MOYLAN, Ms. PORTER, Ms. TITUS, Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, and Mr. VARGAS):

H.R. 10206. A bill to support the strengthening of civil society organizations in the Pacific Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CASTEN (for himself, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PINGREE, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. TLAIB):

H.R. 10207. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act to require that impacts to climate stability, consumer energy costs, and environmental justice be considered in a determination of whether proposed exportation of natural gas is in the public interest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. CHU (for herself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. VARGAS, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 10208. A bill to strengthen student achievement and graduation rates and prepare children and youth for college, careers, and citizenship through innovative partnerships that meet the comprehensive needs of children and youth; to the Committee on

Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CONNOLLY (for himself and Mr. STRONG):

H.R. 10209. A bill to amend the Cybersecurity Enhancement Act of 2014 to make improvements to the Federal Cyber Scholarship for Service Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. COSTA (for himself and Mr. MURPHY):

H.R. 10210. A bill to establish a national plan to coordinate research on epilepsy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CROW (for himself and Mrs. KIM of California):

H.R. 10211. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make grants to States, territories, and Indian tribes to support local resiliency offices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 10212. A bill to direct the Federal Communications Commission to provide an online tool that uses artificial intelligence to identify likely scams for the public, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FLOOD (for himself and Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia):

H.R. 10213. A bill to establish a whole-home repairs program for eligible homeowners and eligible landlords, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GALLEGO:

H.R. 10214. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to carry out a public awareness campaign to increase awareness of the importance of father inclusion and engagement in improving overall health outcomes during pregnancy, childbirth, and postpartum, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois (for himself, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Ms. SCANLON, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. POCAN, Mr. TONKO, Mr. DELUZZO, Mr. CASTEN, Mr. SOTO, Mr. LIEU, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. STANSBURY, and Ms. BARRAGÁN):

H.R. 10215. A bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to treat the lease for a dwelling unit under certain federally assisted housing programs as a simultaneous application for voter registration in elections for Federal office, to designate owners of dwelling units under certain federally assisted housing programs as voter registration agencies for purposes of such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GROTHMAN (for himself, Mrs. LUNA, Mr. OWENS, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. NORMAN, and Mr. GOOD of Virginia):

H.R. 10216. A bill to end preferences for disadvantaged individuals and businesses in Government contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability, and in addition to the Committees on Small Business, Transportation and Infrastructure, 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 Ms. HAGEMAN (for herself, Mr. HUNT, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. MOORE of Alabama):

H.R. 10217. A bill to require all aliens applying for a nonimmigrant visa who are unlawfully present in the United States to submit to an in person interview with a consular officer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana:

H.R. 10218. A bill to prohibit the transfer of Army Tactical Missile Systems to Ukraine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. CASTEN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. BEYER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. BROWNLEY, Ms. STANSBURY, and Mr. CARBAJAL):

H.R. 10219. A bill to assist in the conservation of critically endangered species in foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 10220. A bill to establish the National Institutes of Clean Energy; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. HUIZENGA (for himself, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. HOYLE of Oregon, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Mr. LAWLER, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BACON, and Mr. JOYCE of Ohio):

H.R. 10221. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 with respect to the eligibility of youth sports facilities for certain grants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself and Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina):

H.R. 10222. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to the application of the excise tax on tobacco to pipe and waterpipe tobacco; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE:

H.R. 10223. A bill to enable incarcerated persons to petition a Federal court for a second look at sentences longer than 10 years, where the person is not a danger to the safety of any person or the community and has shown they are ready for reentry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KIM of New Jersey:

H.R. 10224. A bill to require nominees for certain senior positions in the Department of Defense, the Department of State, the Department of the Treasury, and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence to publicly disclose information about recent financial transactions with foreign governments; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Financial Services, Ways and Means, and Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LAHOOD (for himself, Ms. CRAIG, and Mrs. FISCHBACH):

H.R. 10225. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to adjust allowable direct and indirect costs for nursing and allied health education programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAGAZINER (for himself and Mr. KELLY of Mississippi):

H.R. 10226. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to ensure that members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces

who perform duty other than active duty for a period of more than 30 days receive appropriate credit toward public service loan forgiveness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself and Mr. LEVIN):

H.R. 10227. A bill to direct the Secretary of Energy to establish a program for the interim storage of high-level radioactive waste and spent nuclear fuel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCCAUL (for himself, Mrs. LEE CARTER, Mr. NADLER, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. HUNT, Ms. VAN DUYN, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. CARTER of Texas, and Mr. MOYLAN):

H.R. 10228. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to increase the punishment for certain offenses committed in a school zone, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCGARVEY (for himself and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky):

H.R. 10229. A bill to amend the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act to extend the authorization of appropriations for the Clean Energy Demonstration Program on Current and Former Mine Land; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Ms. MENG (for herself, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. BROWNLEY, Ms. BUSH, Mr. CASTEN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. CROCKETT, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. EVANS, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. TORRES of New York, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN):

H.R. 10230. A bill to encourage the donation of menstrual products to nonprofit organizations for distribution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MFUME (for himself, Mr. HOYER, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. TRONE, and Mr. IVEY):

H.R. 10231. A bill to establish the Justice Thurgood Marshall National Historic Site in the State of Maryland and provide for its administration as an affiliated area of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. NEGUSE (for himself and Ms. STRICKLAND):

H.R. 10232. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to incentivize certain preparedness measures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. NEGUSE:

H.R. 10233. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to clarify that noise abatement and lead abatement are not unjust discrimination for purposes of project approval for certain airport improvement program project approvals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. NEGUSE:

H.R. 10234. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out activities to control the movement of aquatic invasive species into, across, and out of Federal land and waters, to provide for financial assistance from the Commissioner of Reclamation to Reclamation States for watercraft inspection and decontamination stations, to amend the Nonindigenous Aquatic Nuisance Prevention and Control Act of 1990 to make certain technical corrections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for

consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H.R. 10235. A bill to require the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to carry out a pilot program to enhance the mapping of urban flooding and associated property damage and the availability of that mapped data to homeowners, businesses, and localities to help understand and mitigate the risk of such flooding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Financial 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. RADEWAGEN:

H.R. 10236. A bill to permanently extend the American Samoa economic development tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. RAMIREZ (for herself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. NOR-TON, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Ms. BUSH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. CORREA, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. OMAR, Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California, Mr. THANEDAR, Mr. SOTO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, and Ms. ESCOBAR):

H.R. 10237. A bill to require the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to develop and disseminate guidance for the handling of personal property of individuals who are under arrest, restrained, or confined by U.S. Customs and Border Protection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Ms. OMAR):

H.R. 10238. A bill to authorize the collection of supplemental payments to increase congressional investments in medical research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SPANBERGER (for herself and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska):

H.R. 10239. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to expand drug shortage notification practices to include surges in demand for a drug, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. VAN DUYN (for herself, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, and Mrs. TRAHAN):

H.R. 10240. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage of portable ultrasound transportation and set up services under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 10241. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to optimize the operations of the microloan program, lower costs for small business concerns and intermediary participants in the program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 10242. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to modify requirements relating to certain employee-owned businesses, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 10243. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to establish requirements relating to the submission of tax returns or tax return transcripts for a disaster loan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 10244. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to improve outreach and education on employee ownership, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 10245. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to allow the Administrator of the Small Business Administration the authority to increase amount of commitments to qualified State or local development companies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 10246. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to improve the loan guaranty program, enhance the ability of small manufacturers to access affordable capital, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 10247. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to enhance the Office of Credit Risk Management, to require the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to issue rules relating to environmental obligations of certified development companies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. JACOBS:

H.J. Res. 226. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the Government of the United Arab Emirates of certain defense articles and services; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EVANS (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, and Ms. NOR-TON):

H. Res. 1591. A resolution recognizing November 2024 as "National Family Caregivers Month"; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GOMEZ (for himself, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, and Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California):

H. Res. 1592. A resolution congratulating the Los Angeles Dodgers for winning the 2024 Major League Baseball World Series; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Ms. OMAR (for herself and Mr. BURCHETT):

H. Res. 1593. A resolution expressing support for the designation of December 16, 2024, as the "National Day of Awareness for Missing and Murdered Black Women and Girls"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. TOKUDA (for herself, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mr. BALDERSON, Ms. BALINT, Mr. BERGMAN, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. BUDZINSKI, Ms. CARAVEO, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. CLINE, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Mr. EZELL, Mr. FINSTAD, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Ms. HOYLE of Oregon,

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KILMER, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. LEE of Nevada, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Mr. MANN, Ms. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MEUSER, Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. POCAN, Mr. ROSE, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. SALINAS, Ms. SCHOLTEN, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. SORENSEN, Ms. SPANBERGER, Ms. STANSBURY, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TRONE, Mr. VAN ORDEN, Mr. VASQUEZ, Ms. WILD, and Mr. LAMALFA);

H. Res. 1594. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of "National Rural Health Day"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

ML-155. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of New Hampshire, relative to House Resolution No. 24, that the New Hampshire legislature reaffirms its ratification of the Child Labor Amendment to the United States Constitution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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 Ms. MCCLELLAN:

H.R. 10191.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:
To extend Federal recognition to the Nottoway Indian Tribe of Virginia, and for other purposes.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 10192.

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

Article 1 of the U.S. Constitution.
The single subject of this legislation is:
Health Care.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 10193.

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

Article 1 of the U.S. Constitution.
The single subject of this legislation is:
Health Care.

By Mr. GOOD of Virginia:

H.R. 10194.

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 prohibit the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development from finalizing, implementing, or enforcing the proposed rule entitled "Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing", and reinstating the Trump Administration's final rule titled, "Preserving Neighborhood and Community Choice."

By Mr. GOOD of Virginia:

H.R. 10195.

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

Article I Section VIII

The single subject of this legislation is:

To prohibit the low-income housing tax credit from being distributed to entities with a diversity, equity, and inclusion initiative.

By Mrs. KIM of California:

H.R. 10196.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To strengthen the Export-Import Bank's financing capabilities to advance U.S. innovation and export competitiveness against China, and for other purposes.

By Mrs. BEATTY:

H.R. 10197.

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

Article I, Section 8, clause 1 (Taxing and Spending Clause)

The single subject of this legislation is:

Appropriations

By Mrs. BEATTY:

H.R. 10198.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Financial Services

By Mr. BEYER:

H.R. 10199.

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

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Improve information about food.

By Mrs. BICE:

H.R. 10200.

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

Clause 14 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Military Evaluations

By Mr. BOST:

H.R. 10201.

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

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To change the headquarters location of the National Woman's Relief Corps.

By Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 10202.

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

Spending Clause, Article I, Section 8, Cl. 1 and the Necessary and Proper Clause, Article I, Section 8, Cl. 18.

The single subject of this legislation is:

This Act requires private health insurance plans to cover, without cost sharing, screenings for the detection of lung cancer for individuals 40 years of age and older without regard to such individual's smoking history.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 10203.

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

Article I, Section 7, Clause 1, also known as the Origination Clause. It states:

"All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with Amendments as on other Bills."

The single subject of this legislation is:

The Hurricane Helene and Milton Tax Relief Act of 2024

By Ms. CARAVEO:

H.R. 10204.

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

Constitutional Authority—Necessary and Proper Clause (Art I, Sec 8, Clause 18)

THE U.S. CONSTITUTION

ARTICLE I, SECTION 8 POWERS OF CONGRESS

CLAUSE 18

The Congress shall have power . . . To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill would provide flexibility to family farmers and ranchers ability to conserve water on working lands while fairly compensating them for retiring their water rights or limiting their water use.

By Mr. CARSON:

H.R. 10205.

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

Clause 18 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

The National Amusement Park Ride Safety Act will investigate accidents, develop and enforce action plans to correct defects, help improve safety training for roller operators, and act as a national clearinghouse for accident and defect data.

By Mr. CASE:

H.R. 10206.

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

Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To support the strengthening of civil society organizations in the Pacific Islands, and for other purposes.

By Mr. CASTEN:

H.R. 10207.

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

Article I, Section 8, clause 3 of the Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Natural Gas Act to require that impacts to climate stability, consumer energy costs, and environmental justice be considered in a determination of whether proposed exportation of natural gas is in the public interest, and for other purposes.

By Ms. CHU:

H.R. 10208.

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

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill authorizes the Department of Education to award grants to states and, through them, subgrants to consortia of local educational agencies and community partners to address school readiness and achievement. Subgrants may be used for activities including early learning, academic support services, parent-education programs, and teacher training.

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 10209.

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 Cybersecurity Enhancement Act of 2014 to make improvements to the Federal Cyber Scholarship for Service Program, and for other purposes.

By Mr. COSTA:

H.R. 10210.

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

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To establish a national plan to coordinate research on epilepsy.

By Mr. CROW:

H.R. 10211.

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

Article I, Section 8, clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make grants to States, territories, and Indian tribes to support local resiliency offices.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 10212.

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

Article I Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To instruct the FCC to create an AI-enabled platform to identify likely scams for the public

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 10213.

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

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

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill creates a pilot program for the purpose of providing funds for the repair of homes,

By Mr. GALLEGRO:

H.R. 10214.

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

The Constitutional Authority to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Healthcare

By Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois:

H.R. 10215.

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

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

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill facilitates voter registration for eligible and interested tenants of certain federally assisted housing for the purpose of federal elections.

By Mr. GROTHMAN:

H.R. 10216.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

The single subject of this bill is eliminating racial preferences in contracting within the federal government.

By Ms. HAGEMAN:

H.R. 10217.

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

Article I Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

to require all aliens applying for a non-immigrant visa who are unlawfully present in the United States to submit to an in person interview with a consular officer

By Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana:

H.R. 10218.

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

Under Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution,

Congress has the power "to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any Department or Officer thereof"

The single subject of this legislation is:

To prohibit the transfer of Army Tactical Missile Systems to Ukraine until January 20, 2025.

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 10219.

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

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Endangered animals conservation

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 10220.

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

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Clean energy development

By Mr. HUIZENGA:

H.R. 10221.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 with respect to the eligibility of youth sports facilities for certain grants, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 10222.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to the application of the excise tax on tobacco to pipe and waterpipe tobacco.

By Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE:

H.R. 10223.

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

This bill is introduced pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under the General Welfare Clause (Art. I Sec. 8 Cl. 1), the Commerce Clause (Art. I Sec. 8 Cl. 3), and the Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. I Sec. 8 Cl. 18).

Further, this statement of constitutional authority is made for the sole purpose of compliance with clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives and shall have no bearing on judicial review of the accompanying bill.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To enable incarcerated persons to petition a Federal court for a second look at sentences longer than 10 years, where the person is not a danger to the safety of any person or the community and has shown they are ready for reentry.

By Mr. KIM of New Jersey:

H.R. 10224.

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

Article I, Section 8, clause 14

The single subject of this legislation is:

National Security Officials' Foreign Employment Disclosure Act

By Mr. LAHOOD:

H.R. 10225.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution—Congress has the power "to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

The single subject of this legislation is:

The bill would amend the Social Security Act to adjust allowable direct and indirect costs for nursing and allied health education programs.

By Mr. MAGAZINER:

H.R. 10226.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To ensure that part-time Reserve and National Guard service members qualify for Public Service Loan Forgiveness

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 10227.

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

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Authorizing a Consolidated Interim Storage Facility for Nuclear Waste

By Mr. McCAUL:

H.R. 10228.

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

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

The bill increases the punishment of those convicted of human trafficking, transferring of obscene material to minors, aggravated sexual abuse, and sexual exploitation of children within a school zone.

By Mr. McGARVEY:

H.R. 10229

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

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Energy

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 10230.

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

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Liability for charitable contributions

By Mr. MFUME:

H.R. 10231.

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

Article IV, Section 3

"The Congress shall have the Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States."

The single subject of this legislation is:

Public Lands

By Mr. NEGUSE:

H.R. 10232.

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

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Improve disaster recovery and community resilience through FEMA's public assistance programs.

By Mr. NEGUSE:

H.R. 10233.

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

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Airplane noise.

By Mr. NEGUSE:

H.R. 10234.

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

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Strengthen prevention efforts against the spread of invasive aquatic mussels.

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H.R. 10235.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Flood mapping

By Mrs. RADEWAGEN:

H.R. 10236.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To permanently extend the American Samoa economic development tax credit.

By Mrs. RAMIREZ:

H.R. 10237.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

The single subject of this legislation is:

This legislation would require the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to develop and disseminate guidance for the handling of personal property of individuals who are under arrest, restrained, or confined by U.S. Customs and Border Protection, and for other purposes.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 10238.

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

Section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

The bill amends the Public Health Service Act to require certain drug manufacturers to make payments to fund research supported by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and the National Institutes of Health (NIH).

By Ms. SPANBERGER:

H.R. 10239.

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

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to expand drug shortage notification practices to include surges in demand for a drug, and for other purposes.

By Ms. VAN DUYN:

H.R. 10240.

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

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Health

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 10241.

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

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with Foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian Tribes.

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill optimizes the operations of the SBA's Microloan Program.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 10242.

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

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with Foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian Tribes.

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill modifies program requirements for the SBA's 504 Program.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 10243.

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

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with Foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian Tribes.

The single subject of this legislation is:

The bill requires the SBA to establish requirements relating to an individual's federal tax returns or tax return transcripts for an SBA disaster loan.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 10244.

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

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with Foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian Tribes.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Requires the SBA to improve outreach and education on cooperatives and employee-owned businesses through Federal agencies and offices.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 10245.

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

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with Foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian Tribes.

The single subject of this legislation is:

The bill amends the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to allow the SBA Administrator to increase the amount of commitments of guaranteed loans to qualified State or local development companies.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 10246.

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

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with Foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian Tribes.

The single subject of this legislation is:

The bill improves SBA's loan guaranty program for small manufacturers in order to make it easier for them to access capital.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 10247.

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

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with Foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian Tribes.

The single subject of this legislation is:

The bill requires the SBA Administrator to make changes to the SBA's Office of Credit Risk Management.

By Ms. JACOBS:

H.J. Res. 226.

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

Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the Government of the United Arab Emirates of certain defense articles and services.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 152: Mr. ARRINGTON.

H.R. 681: Mrs. TORRES of California.

H.R. 1491: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 1719: Mr. MRVAN.

H.R. 1839: Mr. PENCE.

H.R. 2402: Mr. MENENDEZ.

H.R. 3808: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 3940: Mr. GUEST, Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. FINSTAD, and Mr. RUTHERFORD.

H.R. 4769: Mr. MRVAN.

H.R. 4896: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 4911: Mr. MENENDEZ.

H.R. 4942: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 5074: Ms. SANCHEZ.

H.R. 5761: Mr. FEENSTRA.

H.R. 5820: Ms. SEWELL.

H.R. 6001: Mr. BAIRD.

H.R. 6751: Mr. PFLUGER.

H.R. 7035: Mr. CRANE.

H.R. 7142: Mr. VAN DREW and Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 7214: Mr. CROW.

H.R. 7384: Mr. BACON.

H.R. 7450: Mr. BACON.

H.R. 7458: Mrs. DINGELL.

H.R. 7596: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 7752: Ms. MENG.

H.R. 7849: Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 8147: Mr. ESTES.

H.R. 8331: Mr. PANETTA.

H.R. 8977: Mr. GOLDEN of Maine.

H.R. 8989: Ms. SPANBERGER.

H.R. 9096: Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 9099: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 9211: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 9228: Ms. OMAR.

H.R. 9268: Mr. GOLDMAN of New York.

H.R. 9273: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 9274: Mr. PENCE and Mrs. TRAHAN.

H.R. 9408: Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 9448: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 9496: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 9522: Mr. MAST, Mr. VAN ORDEN, Mr. HUDSON, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. CARSON, and Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 9528: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 9691: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 9849: Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California and Ms. TOKUDA.

H.R. 9865: Ms. UNDERWOOD.

H.R. 9885: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Ms. SCHOLTEN.

H.R. 9950: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. CAREY, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. KEAN of New Jersey.

H.R. 9987: Mr. RYAN, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 10084: Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Mr. COHEN, and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 10097: Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 10139: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 10165: Mr. NICKEL.

H.R. 10172: Mr. DESAULNIER and Mr. GOLDMAN of New York.

H.R. 10180: Mr. FRY.

H.J. Res. 72: Ms. UNDERWOOD.

H.J. Res. 193: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.J. Res. 224: Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. CLYDE, and Mrs. LUNA.

H. Con. Res. 41: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H. Con. Res. 132: Mr. EVANS.

H. Res. 1394: Mr. EZELL.

H. Res. 1456: Mr. BAIRD.

H. Res. 1485: Mr. CASE.

H. Res. 1577: Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. NUNN of Iowa.

H. Res. 1589: Mrs. RAMIREZ and Ms. NOR-

TON.