

family, especially his grandchildren, who were the light of his life.

Mr. Klein will be dearly missed, but his spirit will live on in the hearts of all who knew him.

#### HONORING WILLIAM STEINER

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

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of my good friend, Orange County Supervisor Bill Steiner.

Bill was a valued neighbor, constituent, and leader in Orange County whose work directly impacted the lives of so many in our community. As an Orange city councilmember and Orange County supervisor, he dedicated his life to serving others.

Out of the many issues Bill championed, his passion was child welfare advocacy. His work was the driving force behind the creation of the Orange County Orangewood Children's Home.

Today, Bill's 5 children and 16 grandchildren help keep his memory alive.

Mr. Speaker, we thank Bill for a lifetime of work for our community and for his leadership. He will never be forgotten.

#### CONGRESS MUST HELP FARMERS

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

Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, farmers across North Carolina have had extreme difficulty, especially over the past 2 years, due to increased input costs and lower prices for their crops and products.

Drought withered tobacco, corn, and other crops across eastern North Carolina, and farmers are still struggling after Hurricane Helene.

If that is not enough, our farmers have fed the American people for Thanksgiving, and in return, they received the new Adverse Effect Wage Rate for 2025. In North Carolina, we are talking about an increase of 2.17 percent.

Mr. Speaker, too many are hurting trying to find out how to keep their family farms operating.

Agriculture is North Carolina's leading industry. We must help our farmers.

I urge Congress to address the immediate need for disaster assistance for our agricultural community in North Carolina and to hit pause on the Adverse Effect Wage Rate.

#### CALIFORNIA VOTERS ARE CLEAR ON CRIME

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, California voters have made it very clear.

They are tired of the unchecked crime and soft-on-crime policies that have plagued our State for years.

With over 68 percent voting to strengthen penalties through Proposition 36 that just recently passed, the message couldn't be louder: Enough is enough.

What are California Democrats doing? Instead of focusing on this overwhelming mandate to restore public safety, they are pouring their energy into Trump-proofing California, an obsession with political theater while crime continues to rise and neighborhoods feel less safe.

Their so-called legislative solutions are more about optics than outcomes.

The voters wanted more action, but Democrats are too busy spinning excuses about pendulums and alternatives to incarceration to deliver real actual results.

Californians aren't asking for extreme swings. They are asking for accountability.

The people voted to reverse the disastrous criminal justice policies of the past. They want true action.

Sacramento Democrats need to stop ignoring that and wasting money on other things, like trying to stop an agenda here that will make the prices of food and energy go down and help their own citizens.

Enough with the distractions. Enough with the games. Let's get serious.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5349, CRUCIAL COMMUNISM TEACHING ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7198, PROVE IT ACT OF 2024

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1602 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1602

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5349) to develop and disseminate a civic education curriculum and oral history resources regarding certain political ideologies, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and the Workforce now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce or their respective designees; (2) the further amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be in order without inter-

vention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit.

Sec. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 7198) to amend title 5, United States Code, to require greater transparency for Federal regulatory decisions that impact small businesses, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees; (2) the further amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit.

□ 1215

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOST). The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

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

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

#### GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, last night, the House Committee on Rules met to report House Resolution 1602, providing for consideration of two pieces of legislation.

First, the rule provides for consideration of H.R. 5349, the Crucial Communism Teaching Act, under a structured rule, with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. It also provides for one motion to recommit.

Second, the rule provides for consideration of H.R. 7198, the Prove It Act, under a structured rule, with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority

member of the Committee on the Judiciary. It also provides one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, a report recently found that nearly one-half of Gen Z students are unaware that the Chinese Communist Party is responsible for more deaths than Nazi Germany. One-quarter of Gen Z students holds a favorable opinion of communism, and nearly 20 percent think that communism is a better system of government than capitalism.

Further, roughly 500 million copies of "The Communist Manifesto" have been sold since 1848, more than three times as many as "The Lord of the Rings," and more than twice as many as "A Tale of Two Cities." The ignorance is stunning given one-fifth of the world's population, over 1 billion people, lives under Communist control. Our youngest generations' view of communism is a failure of our educational system.

The Crucial Communism Teaching Act bolsters the Victims of Communism Memorial Foundation's ability to educate high school students on the facts, history, and dangers of communist ideology. According to the foundation, Communist governments have caused the deaths of over 100 million people and oppressed hundreds of millions more since the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917. I hope this body continues to show strong, bipartisan support for this important piece of legislation.

The second bill under consideration is the Prove It Act, which continues House Republicans' efforts to rightsize the Federal Government and eliminate unnecessary burdens on our job creators. For too long, Federal regulators have ignored or underestimated the cost that they impose on small businesses. The result is a regulatory state that is simply crushing small businesses.

Some estimates put the regulatory toll as high as \$14,000 per employee annually. This is on top of the cost of inflation, supply chain issues, energy unaffordability, and other burdens that the Biden-Harris administration has inflicted on our communities and our livelihoods.

Today, small businesses spend over seven times as much per employee as medium-sized businesses on regulatory compliance. When we disadvantage our small businesses, Communist governments like China fill the void with their own.

The Prove It Act will empower small businesses to hold regulators accountable and force them to consider the impact of the regulatory red tape that they impose. This commonsense legislation makes certain that agencies are complying with their statutory obligations and accurately account for the costs of their rulemaking.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bills, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for

yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today we are debating two bills that perfectly show who Republicans in Congress really work for, and, spoiler alert, it is not the American people. We are here today doing nothing to help regular people and families. Republicans just have us debating a bill to undercut our constituents' safety and a useless bill on communism.

One of these bills I call the corporate giveaway act. It will give massive trade associations the power to gut the very protections that keep workers safe, prevent kids from being poisoned by polluted air and water, and ensure that corporations don't cut corners on safety.

Republicans say this is all about freedom, but the only people who get more freedom under this bill are CEOs flying on private jets while the rest of us are stuck dealing with higher prices and unsafe products. If you are a billionaire, Mr. Speaker, then this bill works for you. If you are a mom or dad in Worcester, Massachusetts, where I am from, working two jobs to pay for rent and childcare, then this bill doesn't do anything for you. It sells you out.

Then there is H.R. 5349. Now, I guess the Republicans want us to spend time debating whether high school students should be taught that communism is bad. The last time I checked, most schools already do that, and I say that as a brother of two teachers, by the way. I actually read the bill, and I want to let everyone in on a little secret about their bill, a bill which claims to be about teaching kids about bad political ideologies.

Guess what, Mr. Speaker. They left out a really, really, really bad one. Here is a hint: It is what Adolf Hitler implemented in Germany and what Americans fought and died for to defeat in World War II. It is an ideology that idolizes racial purity and uses violence to suppress those who disagree. It is called fascism. For some reason, Republicans did not want to include it in their bill. I would love an answer as to why.

Can any of them tell me why they don't want to teach kids that fascism is bad?

Does anyone at all?

The silence is deafening right now, Mr. Speaker.

Let me help them out: Communism is bad, totalitarianism is bad, and fascism is bad.

Do you see how easy that is, Mr. Speaker?

All they had to do was put it in their bill, but they didn't and they won't because they feel they can't.

It is no oversight, by the way. I personally offered an amendment by Ranking Member SCOTT to include fascism as one of the ideologies we condemn, and they rejected it. Every single one of the Republicans in the Rules Committee, every single one, voted "no."

I can't think of a reason that they would do that, unless they don't agree and unless they don't think that fascism is a bad thing. My friends on the other side of the aisle literally take my breath away.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to say this again: Americans voted with their wallets in mind, and I don't blame them, but I do blame Republican leaders for bringing up this nonsense.

I go out in my district, and I listen to people.

Do you know what, Mr. Speaker?

They don't want to be talked down to by Republican leaders lecturing them about communism or telling us how to teach our kids. They want leaders who understand problems, leaders who understand we are not sent here to talk at people. We are sent here to work with them to make this country a better place.

On our side of the aisle, we are listening to the struggles of working families, and we are going to fight alongside of them.

Washington hasn't always worked the way it should, but we are committed to doing better because people in this country deserve better. That means lower costs, bigger paychecks, and building an economy that rewards hard work, not wealth. That is a fight that my colleagues and I will never ever stop showing up for.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues, and I plead with Republicans: Please, please, let's focus on the real challenges facing all of us as Americans.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ALFORD).

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for this opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, in the words of Yogi Berra, this is like *deja vu* all over again. It was just last year that I was here in this very spot debating the ranking member over the evils of socialism, and now we have graduated to communism.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, in strong support of my colleague, Congresswoman SALAZAR's, bill, H.R. 5349, the Crucial Communism Teaching Act.

Communism has a dark and dangerous history of political violence, oppression, and abuse that continues to be swept under the rug by foreign actors infiltrating the American education systems.

From the Soviet Union, Cuba, China, and beyond, communist regimes consistently demonstrate a callous disregard for human life and dignity.

The Chinese Communist Party is actively trying to dismantle American classrooms and cover up the atrocities of past regimes in K-12 schools and college campuses.

More than 500 K-12 schools across our Nation have allowed the CCP to creep into school hallways, making its way into our children's curriculums under the guise of Confucius Classrooms.

Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker. This is not education. This is indoctrination.

Nearly one-fifth of the world's population is still under this oppressive system of government, yet our youth are being manipulated to blindly follow this corrosive influence of communism.

It should be alarming to our friend from Massachusetts and to every person in America, especially parents, that 28 percent of Gen Z hold a favorable view of the term "communism." Nineteen percent of Gen Z are favoring dictatorship as the best political system.

It is no surprise communism's modern-day manifestation, TikTok, with Communist-backed owners, holds influence over Gen Z.

We cannot allow our schools to become breeding grounds for Communist and Marxist ideologies and anti-American sentiment, Mr. Speaker. As President Reagan once said: "Freedom is only one generation away from extinction."

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defend our Nation's values, reject the forces of oppression, and protect our children by supporting H.R. 5349.

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

Mr. Speaker, right before the gentleman spoke, I asked the question: Can anybody explain to me why fascism wasn't included in this bill as one of the ideologies that we should teach our young people is a bad thing?

The gentleman who just spoke went on for 4 minutes and never once answered that question.

The reality is that yes, communism is bad, totalitarianism is bad, and so is fascism, and we see fascist movements growing up and springing up all over the world, including in this country, and my friends on the other side of the aisle can't bring themselves to condemn it.

I don't understand this.

Does anyone remember World War II?

It seems that, for whatever reason, that is something that my friends can't seem to recall.

That is the point here. It is what you omit, Mr. Speaker. It is what you choose to protect and not include in this bill that is so disturbing in my mind.

□ 1230

Mr. Speaker, I urge that we defeat the previous question. If we do, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 12, a bill that would ensure that every American has full access to essential reproductive healthcare, including abortion care.

In this country, the United States of America, we now have States with almost complete bans on abortions, like the State of Idaho. Just this week, a circuit court upheld an "abortion trafficking" law, ensuring that anyone in Idaho who accompanies a young woman to receive abortion care in another State gets a prison sentence.

Thank God the judge will allow people in Idaho to simply talk with pregnant minors about abortion healthcare, which the original law prohibited.

This is where women in this country now find themselves, Mr. Speaker, but that is why House Democrats are fighting to protect women and doctors who simply want access and the ability to provide needed care. H.R. 12, the Women's Health Protection Act, will keep fundamental healthcare services available across this country.

What is happening in some States in this country is offensive. It is dangerous. Women are dying because of these overly oppressive Republican-led laws that are being put into place.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. LEE CARTER), one of our newest Members of the House, to discuss our proposal.

Mrs. LEE CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I think one of the best ways to protect children is to protect their mothers, and so I rise to speak on H.R. 12, the Women's Health Protection Act, a critical piece of legislation that we should be considering during these increasingly dangerous and tumultuous times for women and their reproductive healthcare.

There has never been a more appropriate time to discuss a woman's right to choose than today. Simply, but most impactful for our generation, the Women's Health Protection Act will reestablish a nationwide right to abortion in the United States.

The WHPA would create a statutory right for healthcare providers to provide abortion care and a right for their patients to receive the care free from bans and restrictions that single out abortion and impede access. It will save lives.

Reproductive rights have been constantly at risk since *Roe v. Wade* became the law of the land almost 50 years ago, but never have they been in jeopardy as much as they are in these current times. In the wake of the decision in *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization*, State restrictions and new limits or bans on abortion fractured women's healthcare access and dramatically affected the ability of providers to treat pregnancy complications.

With the overturning of *Roe v. Wade*, the Supreme Court has taken away the constitutional right to abortion, leaving millions without access to care due to restrictive and deadly State abortion bans.

In my home State of Texas, we have seen horrific cases of women being de-

nied access to care. In fact, Texas is now ranked the second worst State in the Nation for women with health issues, according to research conducted by the Commonwealth Fund.

The Commonwealth Fund developed the first-ever State scorecard to track trends in women's health over time and documents how policy choices and judicial decisions may impact women's access to timely healthcare.

The data came from sources including the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and evaluated States on 32 metrics across 3 areas: health outcomes; healthcare quality and prevention; and coverage, access, and affordability.

Texas ranked last in the country on healthcare coverage, access, and affordability for women according to the fund. The number of Texans seeking an abortion out of State more than quadrupled between 2021 and 2023, after a State law went into effect that banned the procedure in almost all cases.

Data from our own Texas Health and Human Services Commission shows at least 7,844 Texas residents received an abortion in a different State in 2023, up from 4,718 in 2022, and over 1,700 in 2021.

Still, the total abortions for Texas residents dropped by 85 percent compared to 2021. In 2023, just 62 abortions were reported in Texas, all due to medical emergency and/or to preserve the health of the mother. Between January of this year and June of 2024, 38 abortions were performed in the State.

Every day without congressional action means more people are being denied their human right to abortion. We need a Federal legislative solution. WHPA is the solution.

We must all continue to work together toward a future where all of us are free to make the personal decisions that shape our lives, our futures, and our families without political interference.

As we know and have seen, those hurt the most by abortion restrictions are those who already face discriminatory barriers to accessing healthcare, particularly Black, Indigenous, Hispanic, Asian-American, Pacific Islander, and other people of color; women; and those working to make ends meet, especially those in my district.

Ensuring access to abortion care is central to the pursuit of reproductive justice and the human rights to maintain bodily autonomy and live in safe and sustainable communities.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons, I ask my colleagues to defeat the previous question so we can bring up this important legislation.

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

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

One of the bills that is being brought before us, H.R. 7198, is a Republican partisan bill, but it violates their own CutGo budgetary rule.

Yesterday, in committee, when we pointed that inconvenient fact out to

our colleagues across the aisle, rather than Republicans saying they were going to try to find a way to pay for the bill, my colleagues spent about 40 minutes railing against the CBO Director that the majority themselves, by the way, helped appoint.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an article that reinforces what I just said.

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

There was no objection.

H.R. 7198, PROVE IT ACT OF 2024 AS REPORTED BY THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY ON NOVEMBER 22, 2024

	By fiscal year, millions of dollars—		
	2025	2025–2029	2025–2034
Direct Spending (Outlays).	1	5	10
Revenues .....	*	*	–7
Increase or Decrease (–) in the Deficit.	1	5	17
Spending Subject to Appropriation (Outlays).	6	40	not estimated

\* = between –\$500,000 and zero.

Increases *net direct spending* in any of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2035? <\$2.5 billion.

Increases *on-budget deficits* in any of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2035? <\$5 billion.

Statutory pay-as-you-go procedures apply? Yes.

Mandate Effects:

Contains intergovernmental mandate? No.

Contains private-sector mandate? Yes, under threshold.

The bill would:

- Allow small businesses, nonprofit organizations, and small local governments to request that the Small Business Administration (SBA) review a certification that a proposed rule would not have a significant economic effect on a substantial number of such small entities

- Require the SBA to declare a rule no longer in effect if the issuing agency fails to review that rule periodically

- Impose mandates on private-sector entities

Estimated budgetary effects would mainly stem from:

- Requiring some federal agencies to devote staff to meet new analysis and reporting requirements

- Increasing costs for agencies that are funded through annual appropriations to carry out the bill's provisions

- Increasing direct spending and decreasing revenues for several fee-funded, independent agencies and the Federal Reserve System to carry out provisions of the bill

Bill Summary: H.R. 7198 would allow small businesses, nonprofit organizations, and small local governments to request that the Small Business Administration (SBA) review federal agencies' certifications that proposed rules would not significantly affect a substantial number of small entities. The bill would require the SBA to establish a process for reviewing those requests and determining whether certifications merit further review. (Federal agencies currently evaluate proposed rules' economic effects on small entities and either certify that a rule would not significantly affect them or they prepare a detailed regulatory flexibility analysis for the rule. A regulatory flexibility analysis is an assessment of a proposed regulation on small entities.)

If further review is required, the SBA would consult the rulemaking agency, rep-

resentatives of the small entities, and the Office of Management and Budget to determine whether, in place of a certification, the rulemaking agency must prepare a regulatory flexibility analysis. If the agency does not complete that process, the final rule would not apply to small entities.

Additionally, under the bill, if an agency fails to update its analysis of a rule's effect on small entities within 10 years of the rule taking effect, as they are required to do under current law, the rule would no longer be in effect. That provision would apply to rules for which agencies should have provided updated analysis within the 5-year period prior to the bill's enactment. Under the bill, a rulemaking agency could seek to reinstate a rule by carrying out a new rulemaking process.

Estimated Federal cost: The costs of the legislation, detailed in Table 1, fall within multiple budget functions.

Basis of estimate: For this estimate, CBO assumes that H.R. 7198 will be enacted near the end of calendar year 2024, that the estimated amounts will be appropriated in each year, and that outlays will follow historical spending patterns.

If an agency fails to comply with the bill's requirements, the SBA would determine that the existing or proposed rule is no longer in effect or would not apply to small entities. Because CBO expects that federal agencies would generally comply with the bill's requirements, we estimate that any budgetary effects stemming from that change would be insignificant.

In addition, CBO estimates that implementing the bill would increase administrative costs for most agencies because they would need additional staff to carry out the bill's provisions.

TABLE 1.—ESTIMATED BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF H.R. 7198

	By fiscal year, millions of dollars—													2025–2029	2025–2034
	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	2034					
INCREASES IN DIRECT SPENDING															
Estimated Budget Authority .....	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	5	10		
Estimated Outlays .....	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	5	10		
DECREASES IN REVENUES															
Estimated Revenues .....	*	*	*	*	*	–3	–1	–1	–1	–1	–1	*	–7		
NET INCREASE IN THE DEFICIT FROM CHANGES IN DIRECT SPENDING AND REVENUES															
Effect on the Deficit .....	1	1	1	1	1	4	2	2	2	2	2	5	17		
INCREASES IN SPENDING SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATION															
Estimated Authorization .....	8	8	8	9	9	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.	42	n.e.		
Estimated Outlays .....	6	8	8	9	9	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.	40	n.e.		

n.e. = not estimated.

\* = between –\$500,000 and zero.

Direct spending: The administrative costs of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, National Credit Union Administration (NCUA), and Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC), are classified in the budget as direct spending. Two of those agencies, the NCUA and the OCC, collect fees from financial institutions to offset their costs; those fees are treated as reductions in direct spending.

Using information about the rulemaking activities of those agencies, CBO estimates that the increased administrative workload under H.R. 7198 would increase net direct spending for those independent agencies by \$10 million over the 2025–2034 period.

Revenues: H.R. 7198 also would affect revenues by increasing operating costs for the Federal Reserve System, which remits its

net earnings to the Treasury; those remittances are classified as revenues in the federal budget. Based on the costs of similar activities, CBO estimates that the increased costs under the bill would reduce revenues by \$7 million over the 2025–2034 period.

Spending subject to appropriation: CBO estimates that implementing H.R. 7198 also would increase spending for agencies that are funded by annual appropriations. CBO estimates that agencies that produce large numbers of rules affecting small entities would need more staff to meet the bill's requirements.

CBO expects that the agencies most affected by the bill include the Departments of Agriculture, Education, Health and Human Services, Homeland Security, Labor, and Transportation, and the Environmental Protection Agency and Securities and Exchange

Commission (SEC). Using information about similar activities, CBO estimates that the administrative costs for federal agencies to implement H.R. 7198 would total \$35 million over the 2025–2029 period; any related spending would be subject to the availability of appropriated funds.

Under current law, the SEC is authorized to collect fees sufficient to offset its annual appropriations. Therefore, CBO estimates that the net budgetary effect of that commission's activities to implement H.R. 7198 would be less than \$500,000 over the 2025–2029 period, assuming appropriation actions consistent with the commission's authorities.

Finally, the requirement for the SBA to establish and carry out a process for small entities to request certification review would pose additional costs to that agency. Using information from the SBA, CBO estimates

that those administrative costs would total \$5 million over the 2025–2029 period; any related spending would be subject to the availability of appropriated funds.

Pay-As-You-Go considerations: The Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 establishes budget-reporting and enforcement procedures for legislation affecting direct spending or revenues. The net changes in outlays and revenues that are subject to those pay-as-you-go procedures are shown in Table 1.

Increase in long-term net direct spending and deficits: CBO estimates that enacting H.R. 7198 would not increase net direct spending by more than \$2.5 billion in any of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2035.

CBO estimates that enacting H.R. 7198 would not increase on-budget deficits by more than \$5 billion in any of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2035.

Mandates: If federal financial regulators increase annual fees to offset the costs of implementing the bill, H.R. 7198 would increase the costs of an existing private-sector mandate on entities required to pay those fees. CBO estimates that the incremental cost of the mandate would be small and would fall well below the annual threshold established in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA) for private-sector mandates (\$200 million in 2024, adjusted annually for inflation).

The bill contains no intergovernmental mandates as defined in UMRA.

Previous CBO estimate: On December 2, 2024, CBO transmitted a cost estimate for H.R. 7198, the Prove It Act of 2024, as ordered reported by the House Committee on Small Business on September 10, 2024. The two pieces of legislation are similar, and CBO's estimates of their budgetary effects are the same.

Estimate prepared by: Federal Costs: Julia Aman (for the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the National Credit Union Administration, and the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency), David Hughes (for the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau), Aurora Swanson (for the Small Business Administration and for federal agencies funded by annual appropriations); Revenues: Nathaniel Frentz; Mandates: Rachel Austin.

Estimate reviewed by: Justin Humphrey, Chief, Finance, Housing, and Education Cost Estimates Unit; Kathleen FitzGerald, Chief, Public and Private Mandates Unit; Christina Hawley Anthony, Deputy Director of Budget Analysis.

Estimate approved by: Phillip L. Swagel, Director, Congressional Budget Office.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the CBO score for H.R. 7198.

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

There was no objection.

[July 27, 2023]

PHILLIP SWAGEL REAPPOINTED AS DIRECTOR OF CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE

BUDGET COMMITTEE CHAIRS LOOK FORWARD TO CONTINUED COLLABORATION

Today, House and Senate leadership reappointed Dr. Phillip Swagel to a second four-year term as Director of the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office (CBO). As required by the Congressional Budget Act, the appointment was made jointly by Speaker of the House Kevin McCarthy (R-CA) and President Pro Tempore of the Senate Patty Murray (D-WA), upon the joint recommendation of House Budget Chairman Jodey Arrington (R-TX) and Senate Budget Committee Chairman Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI).

"Dr. Swagel has the two key ingredients to faithfully execute the role as our nation's

budget scorekeeper—objectivity and integrity," said Chairman Arrington. "CBO's work product has tremendous implications on public policy, and I am committed to working with Dr. Swagel to ensure we improve the budget scoring process and achieve more timely and accurate outcomes. Additionally, I look forward to working with him and his colleagues at CBO to sound the alarm regarding our unsustainable fiscal trajectory in order to spur bipartisan leadership to address our runaway deficit spending and record debt before it's too late."

"I look forward to continuing to work productively with Dr. Swagel," said Senator Whitehouse. "He has been both a fair arbiter when scoring bills and responsive in explaining his agency's methodology. I especially look forward to working with CBO as it does further work to analyze the vast budgetary and economic costs of climate change and to estimate the potential savings from delivery system reform of our byzantine health care system."

Dr. Swagel assumed his position as the tenth Director of the Congressional Budget Office on June 3, 2019. His second term will end on January 3, 2027.

Prior to his appointment as CBO Director, Dr. Swagel taught economics at the University of Maryland's School of Public Policy, Northwestern University, the University of Chicago Booth School of Business, and Georgetown University's McDonough School of Business. He also served at the Council of Economic Advisers and as Assistant Secretary for Economic Policy at the Treasury Department under President George W. Bush. He earned his bachelor's from Princeton University and his Ph.D. in economics from Harvard University.

CBO was established in 1975 to produce independent, non-partisan analyses of economic and budgetary issues in support of the congressional budget process. The agency plays a key role in producing cost estimates for legislation proposed in Congress, but does not make policy recommendations.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, in the Rules Committee last night, Democrats tried to have an amendment to basically not protect this bill from a point of order. If Republicans believe that this bill costs nothing, then surely the chair would rule in such a way. Clearly, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle don't even believe their own rhetoric.

The bottom line is that this bill, among many of the bad things it is going to do, will add to our deficit. There was a time when I thought Republicans cared about the deficit and debt, but apparently those days are gone forever because I have never met a group of people who are more interested in passing legislation without pay-fors, tax cuts for millionaires and billionaires and well-connected people and well-off people at the expense of the middle class, and then Republicans bring bills like this, which will add millions and millions of dollars to our deficit.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague has talked a lot about the Victims of Communism Foundation and the bill that has been introduced to support their efforts. Unfortunately, he misses the

point of the bill. Congress specifically chartered the Victims of Communism Foundation to study the abuses of communism. This was actually signed into law in 1993 by President Bill Clinton.

We have no doubt that harmful political ideologies besides communism exist, but the point of this bill is to educate students specifically about communism. There is an acute need to educate students on the topic given how many students are ignorant to communism's abuses, and this is the work that the Victims of Communism Foundation is best equipped to conduct.

Mr. Speaker, if Democrats wish to expand, my colleagues are free to introduce their own bill covering other topics, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I am having trouble following this debate. I just raised an issue about the fact that one of the bills, H.R. 7198, is not paid for; that it is a violation of Republicans' own CutGo rules; and that this bill, as passed, will add to the deficit. Then the gentleman just started talking about communism.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat that the reality is that one of the bills here, H.R. 7198, needs a special waiver to protect it from a Republican point of order on CutGo because this bill adds to the deficit. Republicans could have paid for it or could have found an offset but chose not to. My colleagues chose to protect it from a point of order. That was my question.

I don't know what communism has to do with the CBO estimate that this bill will add millions of dollars to the deficit. Anyway, I make that clear in case people who are watching this are confused about the gentleman's response to the point I raised.

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire whether the gentleman wants to answer the CBO question or whether he wants me to close?

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared for the gentleman to close.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, let us talk about priorities. My Republican colleagues have theirs all screwed up, and I am being really kind here. Republicans are lecturing us about communism instead of talking about real struggles facing American families.

One of the speakers got up and complained that this is like *deja vu* all over again. The Republicans are in charge and set the agenda around here. These are their priority bills.

We are wasting time working on their bills. We are talking about studies to inform kids about communism in schools rather than talking about things that are going to lower healthcare costs or lower food prices or

help small businesses or do anything that is going to make any difference in the lives of average people in this country.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle are talking about what bathrooms people should use instead of talking about grocery prices. I think one Republican Member tweeted 326 times about bathrooms in a 72-hour period. My colleagues are just strange. It is weird what is going on around here.

If my colleagues go out and actually listen to people in this country, Mr. Speaker, they will say what they want. It isn't what my friends on the other side have us here debating today. They want politicians to stop catering to those at the top. Yet, look at who Donald Trump is empowering in his new administration. This is not what people wanted.

Mr. Speaker, it looks like the requirements to be in the Trump White House are that you either abuse women or are an out-of-touch billionaire. What is next? Are they going to replace FBI background checks with a FOX News screen test? Forget about a White House Cabinet. Donald Trump is making it into a junk drawer.

His Commerce Secretary is a billionaire. Big surprise. I don't think this guy is capable of understanding what average people in my district deal with.

His Education Secretary is yet another billionaire. What is her qualification? She ran WWE. I guess some schools have wrestling programs. It would be funny if it weren't so sad.

His new Attorney General pick is an election denier.

The person he tapped to lead Health & Human Services thinks tap water turns kids gay.

His Defense Secretary is probably dropping out momentarily. Apparently he drinks on the job and paid to cover up his sexual assault allegations. Even his mom doesn't like him.

These people don't shop at grocery stores. Do my colleagues think that they pump their own gas or cook their own food? Of course not. These are people who hop on helicopters to avoid traffic. They are poster children for the out-of-touch elites. The Republicans are bending over backward for them. It is unbelievable.

It is not just bad governance, Mr. Speaker. These fights matter because they are fundamentally about who we want working for us. These people are going to make important decisions that are going to impact all of us.

Mr. Speaker, do my colleagues want people who understand our struggles, people who will fight for regular folks, or do we want billionaire, trust-fund weirdos who just prop up the same broken, rigged system that helps themselves and screws over the rest of us?

Mr. Speaker, I can anticipate what my good friend, the chairman of the Rules Committee, is going to say when he closes. He is going to accuse me of Trump derangement syndrome, which

the gentleman usually always does, but what is deranged here is what is happening right before our very eyes: these crazy picks that have no interest in what average people in this country care about.

I will say it again: People in this country voted for lower food prices and cheaper rent, not whatever the hell this is.

Guess what. Democrats are listening. We are not lecturing, and we are going to fight for what matters: lowering costs, building an economic system that works for everyone, and taking power from corporations and those at the top and returning it back to the American people where it belongs.

□ 1245

We are going to fight for young people who can't afford a downpayment on a house. We are going to fight for parents taking items out of the cart at the grocery store in order to make ends meet. We are going to fight for workers who come home after a long shift, get in the shower, and wonder how in the hell they are ever going to retire if Republicans cut Social Security and Medicare.

Guess what. We believe everybody, no matter where they come from or who they vote for, should live with dignity and have hope for a better future.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that any of what my Republican friends are talking about on the floor today is in line with what the American people voted for. All this stuff that we are talking about here today is not what people voted for.

The people are probably scratching their heads and saying: What the hell is happening in the United States House of Representatives?

In January, Republicans will have the slimmest majority of any party in almost a century. I will make the American people a promise: Democrats will show up. We are not going to let them get away with taking away people's healthcare. We are not going to let them get away with rolling back the clock and taking this country backward.

We will show up. We are going to listen to the American people. We pledge to work with my Republican friends where we can, but I am going to tell you this: We are going to fight like hell for an economic system where all of us can succeed and nobody gets left behind.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on this rule, and I yield back the remainder of my time.

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

Mr. BURGESS, Mr. Speaker, I thank you for that admonition. I will try to be careful to keep that in mind during my closing remarks.

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts is correct. He has pro-

vided me ample opportunity to study the clinical and psychological materials for Trump derangement syndrome, and I do feel that I have got an advanced degree in that after spending these years on the Rules Committee with him, but let me bring us back to the focus of the bills before us.

On the Prove It Act, H.R. 7198, the gentleman bemoans the fact that the American people sent us here for lower prices at the grocery store and to pay more attention to how their lives have been affected by this out-of-control government that we have seen for the last 4 years.

I don't know where the gentleman has been for the last 4 years, but I have had trouble getting a phone call answered by a Cabinet Secretary for 4 years. I, unfortunately, am not going to be serving here any longer after this Congress, but I am actually excited about a time when Congress can interact with the heads of Federal agencies and get their calls returned. That will be a novel approach.

With regard to the Prove It Act, let's focus for a minute on what this bill does. This requires Federal agencies to provide transparency regarding the impact of Federal regulatory decisions on small businesses. That is so simple.

If you are worried about prices, might you also not want to consider the cost that the regulatory regime of this administration has imposed upon businesses and what happens to those costs? They are not just absorbed by the business. They are passed along to the consumer. That is the way it all works.

Providing regulatory relief for our small businesses will prevent small businesses from having to pass those costs on to their consumers.

The Regulatory Flexibility Act is not a new phenomenon. This was enacted back in 1980 and requires Federal agencies to consider the effects their regulations have on small businesses and other small entities.

The RFA's goal is to reduce the economic impact of agency regulation on small businesses. That sounds like a good thing to me. If you are trying to consider opportunities to lower costs to the consumer, it seems like that is just exactly the type of thing you would want to do.

In 1996, long before Donald Trump became President, Congress amended the Regulatory Flexibility Act to add judicial review relative to some of its provisions to require some agencies to hold small business advocacy review panels and mandate that Federal agencies produce regulatory compliance guidelines.

Congress has not amended the RFA since 2010 when it made technical corrections and mandated that the newly formed Consumer Financial Protection Bureau convene small business review panels when promulgating rules.

Again, all of that seems like good government and a good idea, especially in an environment where you want to control costs.



After Congress enacted the Regulatory Flexibility Act, some evidence suggests that fellow agencies seriously undertook the policy of reducing the regulatory burden on small businesses, but evidence shows that the burden on small businesses continues to increase.

Mr. Speaker, that is why we are here. That burden continues to increase. What happens then is the cost of goods and services increase and are passed on to customers, customers who are our constituents who sent us here to do something about the high prices that they pay.

Mr. Speaker, I urge this body to support the rule and the underlying pieces of legislation. These bills solve critical issues facing our country today. They are thoughtfully drafted and worthy of bipartisan support.

I thank the Committee on Education and the Workforce and the Committee on the Judiciary for their work on these bills. I urge a strong showing of support in this body.

Now, I will comment briefly on the ranking member's issue with the waiver provided in the rule before I yield back. I understand his role is to find shortcomings in what the Rules Committee produces. He is good at that. He does a fine job of that, but he also tends to have a very short memory of when he held the gavel. I will remind the ranking member that when he had the gavel, his committee waived paygo 25 times, which is more than the majority by several factors.

I am proud of the work we have done on the committee, even with the challenges that the ranking member can appreciate. Again, I urge this body to support this rule and support the underlying legislation.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1602 OFFERED BY  
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 12) to protect a person's ability to determine whether to continue or end a pregnancy, and to protect a health care provider's ability to provide abortion services. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 12.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, December 4, 2024.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on December 4, 2024, at 11:23 a.m.

That the Senate passed S. 1956.

That the Senate passed S. 2514.

That the Senate passed S. 3277.

That the Senate passed S. 4107.

That the Senate passed S. 4243.

That the Senate passed S. 4569.

That the Senate passed S. 5355.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 5536.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 7764.

Appointment:

Co-Chairperson of the Commission on the Future of the Navy

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KEVIN F. MCCUMBER,  
Acting Clerk.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered.

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

#### REVEREND HAROLD MIDDLEBROOK POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 9360) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 300 Macedonia Lane in Knoxville, Tennessee, as the "Reverend Harold Middlebrook Post Office Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 9360

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

#### SECTION 1. REVEREND HAROLD MIDDLEBROOK POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 300

Macedonia Lane in Knoxville, Tennessee, shall be known and designated as the "Reverend Harold Middlebrook Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Reverend Harold Middlebrook Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BURCHETT) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is a post office I hope we can name in honor of Reverend Harold Middlebrook. He is a well-known figure in our community and a civil rights leader. He was a close friend of Dr. Martin Luther King. As a matter of fact, he was part of the Memphis Sanitation worker strike in Memphis, Tennessee. He was arrested multiple times for alleged violations, but as we know, those weren't real violations. He was exhibiting his constitutional right. He was at the Lorraine Motel when King was assassinated.

In 1986, he founded the Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Commemorative Commission in Knoxville. For the record, every year they have the march, it is the coldest day in Knoxville. I always remember that because it is always cold.

Dr. Middlebrook has been a dear friend. I will say for the record that he has never voted for me, and he probably never will vote for me, but he is still my dear friend.

When I was mayor, I had him come to speak to the kids in my office, and we took him to lunch. I wanted them to know what they endured during the civil rights movement and what this country endured. I think it is more important than seeing it in black and white on TV or reading it in a magazine, but to hear it and see it from his eyes.

He spent his whole life befriending and mentoring folks in our community. He has been a dear friend to me and our Knoxville community, and he is a pretty dignified guy.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we can pass this, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support of H.R. 9360 for two reasons. One is the reason of process, which is,