

□ 1215

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION
OF H.R. 77, MIDNIGHT RULES RE-
LIEF ACT

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 122 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 122

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 77) to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for en bloc consideration in resolutions of disapproval for “midnight rules”, and for other purposes. 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 the Judiciary or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Alabama). The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. 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

Mrs. FISCHBACH. 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 gentlewoman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, we are here today to debate the rule providing for consideration of H.R. 77.

The rule provides for H.R. 77 to be considered under a closed rule with 1 hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking minority member of the Judiciary Committee or their designees. The rule provides for a motion to recommit for the bill.

The Midnight Rules Relief Act addresses an inefficiency in the government and allows Congress to retain its current authority, overseeing administrative rulemaking without bogging down the legislative branch when we have so much work to get done.

In 1996, Congress enacted the Congressional Review Act, which requires agencies to submit rules to Congress and the Government Accountability Office before they can go into effect. This gives Congress an important legislative veto option over the agencies.

However, this legislation requires Congress to introduce separate joint

resolutions for each agency rule it wants to disapprove. Members at the time had no idea how out of control the administrative state would become. Since the Congressional Review Act passed, agencies have issued around 2½ times more regulations during the last year of each President’s term. Moreover, under the Biden-Harris administration, Federal agencies expanded their power at an alarming rate, undermining the legislative authority granted to Congress by the Constitution.

The Midnight Rules Relief Act empowers Congress to review and potentially disapprove several regulations that Federal agencies may attempt to implement in the last days of an administration by allowing Congress to disapprove multiple rules through one joint resolution if those rules were issued during the last 60 legislative days, the midnight hours, of a President’s term. This would allow Congress to quickly regain control and oversee agency rulemaking during a time when there is consistently a huge increase in executive overreach.

I sincerely hope my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will support this bill. Just last week, we brought a bill to the floor that combats this country’s fentanyl epidemic, something I know all of us care deeply about. Rather than debate the merits of the bill, my Democratic colleagues spent most of their time talking about what they believed has been executive overreach by President Trump. Comments were made that my colleagues are concerned that President Trump will try to do through executive order what he can’t do through the legislative process.

Today, we present a bill that will help return authority to Congress and curb executive overreach. If my colleagues are truly concerned about executive overreach, then they should vote for this bill and start with the overreach that occurred in the final days of the last administration.

I thank Congressman BIGGS for introducing this legislation, and I look forward to supporting this bill on the floor.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Minnesota for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

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

As the gentlewoman pointed out, this rule would bring H.R. 77, the Midnight Rules Relief Act, to the floor for debate and consideration.

The underlying bill is a bad bill. It was a bad bill back when we considered it in December, and it is still a bad bill now. This is a bad bill that is all about Republicans gutting protections that ensure the safety, health, and well-being of each and every American. It is a blatant power grab that was ripped right out of the pages of Project 2025.

Why would Republicans want the ability to roll back protections en

masse with very little debate and in a way that could threaten the lives and livelihoods of regular people? Why would they want to do that? I will tell you why, Mr. Speaker. The answer is simple. It is so they can deliver big for their billionaire donors and special-interest friends, and it is so they can make it easier for greedy corporations and Wall Street CEOs to make a few extra bucks while they screw the rest of us.

Billionaires don’t want workplace protections. They don’t want rules that keep them from dumping toxic chemicals into our food, water, or air. They don’t want restrictions on their corporate greed. Why would they? That digs into their bottom lines, and Republicans are happy to give the billionaires exactly what they want.

We have seen it in every policy coming out of the Trump White House. We have seen it in almost every bill that this majority brings to the floor.

They don’t want to talk about that here on the floor, but, Mr. Speaker, Democrats are going to talk about it. We are going to expose it. We are going to highlight all the ways they are trying to steal from the American people so they can give more handouts to those at the top.

The American people deserve to know the truth about what is really happening here, and I am going to use my time on the floor today to continue to expose it all on behalf of House Democrats.

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

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, all I can say is wow. There is a lot going on on the other side talking about this being a bad bill. This is a bill that will attempt to recover the Congress’ ability and authority to overrule rules that are written in the last few days of a President’s term. We should have that ability.

One of the things that we hear about when we are talking to our constituents is overregulation. Congress, the elected Representatives, needs to be able to deal with the overregulation and the rules, particularly in those last 60 days during an administration while they are on their way out the door and see it as a last-ditch effort. I see this as making sure we are responding to our constituents.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I want to inform the gentlewoman of the fact, which I hope that she knows, that the CRAs are already the law. We already have this authority to go after regulations that this body doesn’t like. Multiple CRAs have been introduced by Republicans in this Congress, and to the best of my knowledge, not a single committee has held a hearing or a markup on any of them, not one. Not a single one has been brought to the floor for a vote or debate. What Democrats object to is Republicans bringing

en masse all these different things that they don't like, limiting debate so that we can't talk about them individually, and just shoving them down the throats of the American people. What-ever happened to single-issue bills that you all said you wanted?

This doesn't even require you bringing CRAs to the floor that are under the jurisdiction of one committee. It could be multiple committees.

You say you needed some emergency authority. You have the authority. What you don't want to do is you don't want to go through the debate. You don't want the American people to know what you are doing. You don't want them to know that you are going after things that ensure their safety and their well-being. I think that is shameful.

Mr. Speaker, I will say one thing here: I get why Republicans are so anxious to get more tax breaks for billionaires. I now get it, and I will urge the American people to follow the money. Follow the money, and you will understand why politicians are beholden to billionaires, why they want to do things like what we are talking about here today on the floor.

To anyone watching this debate who actually thinks that Elon Musk cares about them, all I can say is that it takes an extraordinary amount of self-delusion to believe that billionaires like Elon Musk are fighting for working-class people. I don't even blame Elon. He is just doing what greedy billionaires do. I do blame the Republicans here in the Congress who are letting him add to his billions by stealing from the American people.

Just this week, Trump and Elon started to dismantle the CFPB. Do you know what CFPB stands for, Mr. Speaker? The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

They messed up now because they are now showing their hand. It was never about waste, fraud, or abuse. It is about enriching themselves.

This is not just some random government agency that has no purpose. This is an agency designed to protect American consumers from unfair, deceptive, and abusive corporate practices.

Why would they want to do that? Why would Elon want to gut the CFPB? I did my homework and found out that Musk recently announced a partnership with Visa to enable payments on his social media platform, X. That means it would be subject to, you guessed it, CFPB oversight. Once Elon realized that, he wasted no time in declaring, in his own words, that the CFPB would soon "RIP," rest in peace.

As if on cue, Trump listened to his boss, and he froze the CFPB's critical work. Nearly 2,000 employees were ordered to stay home and sit on their hands.

Mr. Speaker, the CFPB has been on the front lines of unrigging our economy, handling over 5 million consumer complaints, refunding \$20 billion to the American people, and imposing over \$4

billion in penalties on Wall Street for breaking the law.

This is not about waste or fraud or abuse. Every dollar spent on the CFPB returns twice as much to the American people. So then what is it about, Mr. Speaker? What is it about? It is about greed. It is about billionaire greed. They are shutting down the agency that stops billionaires from ripping off people. It is that simple. It is that simple.

Beyond that, Republicans will use this bill, the so-called midnight rules bill, to make it easier for banks to charge predatory fees that will adversely impact the people we represent.

Democrats support the CFPB, which protects people from these predatory big bank fees. Republicans, the big banks write their damn checks.

CFPB passed rules that stopped banks from charging predatory overdraft fees, passed rules that reduced expensive credit card fees, and passed rules to limit medical debt from credit card reports. Plain and simple, Mr. Speaker, the CFPB stands up to corporate greed, and that is exactly why Republicans, who are beholden to billionaires like Elon Musk, want to freeze it, want to gut it, and want to ultimately destroy it.

No one wants to talk about that on the other side of the aisle, but I must remind my colleagues the people of this country elected us to represent them, not to give billionaires and corporate profiteers free rein to rob working families blind.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an article from Reuters titled: "Fed's Powell: No agency other than CFPB tasked with consumer protection enforcement."

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

There was no objection.

[FROM REUTERS, Feb. 11, 2025]

FED'S POWELL: NO AGENCY OTHER THAN CFPB TASKED WITH CONSUMER PROTECTION ENFORCEMENT

(By Reuters)

Feb 11 (Reuters)—No U.S. regulator other than the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau is tasked with ensuring that banks abide by rules guarding against deceptive practices regarding consumers, the head of the Federal Reserve said on Tuesday as he was pressed by a senior Democratic senator to ensure the CFPB remains funded.

The Trump administration has told the agency's staff to stay home and cease enforcement activities as part of Elon Musk's government efficiency drive.

"If the CFPB is not there, examining these giant banks to make sure they are following laws on not deceiving consumers, who is doing that job?" Senator Elizabeth Warren of Massachusetts asked Powell during his appearance before the Senate Banking Committee.

"I can say no other federal regulator," Powell said.

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

□ 1230

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I truly understand that the Democrats are very upset about losing the election, but the American people voted to change the direction of government.

They voted to end overregulation, voted to end growing government agencies and growing government in general, and they voted to end the growing deficit. They are done, and we need to move forward. We need to answer to the American people about what we are doing to make sure that we get these things under control.

I will also quickly address that it is incredible that my Democratic colleagues are trying to claim some moral high ground about single-subject bills. House Republicans have worked hard to bring single-subject appropriations bills to the floor and pass them individually.

When was the last time my Democratic colleagues did this?

Instead, my colleagues have passed massive omnibus spending bills when Democrats were in the majority, along with omnibus packages like the American Rescue Plan and the inflation expansion act. If Democrats would please spare us the false outrage at the idea of omnibus bills.

The truth is that this bill prevents the House from bundling CRAs with similar topics into smaller, single-subject packages.

There is also nothing that prevents the House from continuing to consider CRAs on a case-by-case basis, but we have to have the option. When an outgoing administration dumps rules in the last 60 days, we have to have that option to make sure that we are addressing issues.

I think our efforts toward single-subject bills demonstrate why Republicans can be trusted to use this tool responsibly, and I look forward to my Democratic colleagues abiding by their newfound commitment to single-subject bills the next time Democratic Members are in the majority.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

Mr. BIGGS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I do find it really interesting that, if Members follow the logic of those who oppose this bill, what Democrats are suggesting is that, for the 1,406 rules that the Biden administration passed since August, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want us to do one bill for every one of them.

Let's do one bill for every one of them. We could. We could do that. I am happy to work. If that is what Democrats want to do, let's do it. We can come back next week. I am happy to

work every Saturday and Sunday. That is our job.

The minority doesn't really mean it. Mr. Speaker, Democrats don't really mean it because the reality is that, if my colleagues on the other side of the aisle meant it, then my Democratic colleagues wouldn't stack 50 bills into one at a time when the minority does their omnibus spending packages the way House Democrats always do.

That is really interesting. The value to our economy and the budget of the rules that were implemented by the Biden administration, those 1,400, this isn't ANDY BIGGS talking. This isn't some outside group. Democrats claim it is Project 2025. This isn't those guys.

It is not any of those folks that said that the cost to the economy and the budget is \$1.34 trillion. No. That was the Biden administration's own admission. That is what the imposition of their rules would cost, and we would love to get at that.

Democrats want us to do 1,400 separate bills. That way, none of their suspension bills where they are naming the post offices after their friends are going to get named. That is just what will happen. There won't be enough time.

Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is this: Democrats don't want us to consider the rules of the outgoing administration because we are going to see some absurdities when we do.

How about the heat rule? How about the heat rule? Up in the New England States, they might get 10 days a year where the high temperature is over 86 degrees.

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

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. BIGGS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, let's consider Arizona, where I am from. Do Members know how many days are above 86 degrees when people are working outside? It is about 300 days a year.

Democrats want the rule, set up by some person in a little cubicle—if they even came into work, they might be working from home—to put a nationwide rule in place so that Phoenix, Arizona, basically is knocked out of being able to actually work and make it meaningful because we have 300 days a year above 86 degrees.

That is their heat standard. That is the rule.

Mr. Speaker, if my colleagues look into some of their antipollution stuff, guess what? Guess what the number one particulate is for just under 6 million people in Phoenix, Arizona, which is in Maricopa County. It is desert dust.

The EPA says to us: Hey, what you need to do is use water. You need to water that stuff down.

Guess what? The EPA also says that Maricopa County has a water problem.

Those are the kind of rules that my Democratic colleagues don't want

talked about because what the minority wants to do is, if that rule is in place and you throw in the the 86-degree heat rule, Maricopa County, a big red county that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle don't like, effectively would be shut down economically from economic growth and expansion and population-wise. That is why the rules need to be reviewed.

Democrats say: Let's review them one at a time. My Democratic colleagues don't want to review them one at a time because this bill does not prevent reviewing them one at a time. It doesn't prevent that.

It can still be done, but it makes it more efficient because guess what? We have about 1,400 rules, and maybe 6 of them were worth a tinker's damn, and it means the rest of them have to be reviewed. The only way they can be reviewed and debated is to aggregate them into different subsets.

That is what this rule allows. That is why it is important, and it is important for the American people to understand that that administration imposed about \$1.35 trillion worth of rules on them in the last year alone.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

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

Mr. Speaker, first of all, the gentleman has it all wrong. The gentleman said that we don't want to come down here and debate all of these one at a time.

Yes, we do. Yes, we do.

What we don't want Republicans to do is to pack 1,400 regulations into one bill where there is no debate and nobody knows what the hell they are voting on and the American people don't know the harm that my colleagues are about to do to them.

Mr. Speaker, with all the urgency that I hear expressed on the other side about all these regulations, a number of CRAs have been introduced, and not a single committee has held a hearing on any of them. There hasn't been a single markup, nothing.

Republicans have had a month. What the hell are my Republican colleagues doing? This is not a busy week. We haven't had any busy weeks. This is a very light legislative schedule. It is incredible how light it is. It is not like we don't have the time.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman doesn't want to talk about the fact that Trump and Elon, as we are speaking, are literally shutting the government down agency by agency and department by department.

I get that Republicans don't want to talk about that, but that is what is happening right now. The agencies and departments that are set up to work for the American people are being shut down. People are being told to stay home. It is illegal, and courts are now stepping up to the plate.

Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. FISCHBACH)—oh, my goodness, I don't even know where to

begin—says that the American people voted for this.

No. The American people didn't vote for higher bank fees. They didn't vote to have banks rip them off. Maybe they did in Minnesota, but nowhere else in the country do I think the American people voted for that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my Republican friends to do their job. We haven't even finished last year's appropriations bills. We are running up to a deadline in March on a continuing resolution to keep the government open for this year because my friends who were in charge can't seem to kind of get their act together.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 1101, the Taxpayer Data Protection Act.

In a matter of days after Donald Trump became President, Elon Musk and his DOGE minions gained full access to our government's central payment system at the Treasury Department.

For those watching at home, that is their data. It is their tax refunds, their Social Security benefits, veterans' benefits, and their bank account numbers. It is disturbing and alarming to hear House Republicans talk about unelected bureaucrats and the power that they wield.

That is Elon Musk. The people's data is in the hands of an unelected billionaire whose only actions thus far have served to help make him and his billionaire friends richer.

I don't even know what clearances these people have. Thank goodness a Federal judge, just days ago, blocked Musk's access to this data. Yet, Republicans and Musk are not stopping. This stuff can't be made up. Just this morning, Republican Representative ELI CRANE from Arizona says that he is going to impeach the judge who blocked Musk. Really?

That is why we must consider the Taxpayer Data Protection Act and ensure that our Nation's payment systems and the people's data are protected.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD along with any 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 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STEVENS), the sponsor of this legislation, to discuss our proposal.

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my profound and wise colleague, the ranking member of the Rules Committee and former chairman, JIM MCGOVERN, for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is absolutely right that H.R. 1101, the Taxpayer Data Protection Act, which I was so pleased to author and introduce last

week alongside my colleague, SEAN CASTEN, and alongside our Democratic leadership is where we need to move.

We need to ensure that we have some guardrails in our Treasury Department. I was a former Treasury Department official myself in the very beginning days of a new administration, the administration of Barack Obama, when actually a bipartisan group of us came together to respond to the economic and fiscal crisis of the time.

I was put on the auto rescue team, the team responsible for saving General Motors and Chrysler from liquidation. Again, it was a bipartisan effort, and it saved 200,000 Michigan jobs and millions of jobs across the country.

Nowhere in that process, when we were working with the troubled asset relief program dollars, did anyone dare to think about going into the Bureau of Fiscal Service and tapping the wires and the accounts of the American public and jolting and shaking the very foundation of trust.

This bill is a very simple measure saying: Let's make sure that we have true public servants, people who have passed protocols, people who have top security clearances, people who don't have conflicts of interest. The American people deserve that modicum of trust.

Mr. Speaker, what is even more outrageous, as we are talking about the rulemaking and the rolling back and the ways in which we choose to legislate here, is we are not talking about the costs that are impacting everyday Americans.

I got sworn in on January 3 into the 119th Congress.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, I am waiting for the bill to lower egg costs. I am seeing headlines that eggs are being stolen. I am hearing from constituents who are nervous about Elon Musk having access to their records and their payment system, and they are wondering why they can't go to the grocery store and find eggs. They are wondering about the high cost of everything. They are wondering why prescription drugs are about to go up because of an executive order.

Where are we working on that?

Mr. Speaker, let's pass the amendment, let's do H.R. 1101, and let's get back to business for the people of this country.

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

Mr. Speaker, again, I understand that the Democrats are very upset about losing the election, and I am glad that my Democratic colleagues are showing the American people where their priorities are.

For 4 years, President Biden issued executive orders without the consent of Congress that increased inflation—we

all saw that—created additional burdens for our small businesses—we heard about that—and limited consumer choices.

My Democratic colleagues said nothing, but when President Trump tries to stop our government from spending \$20 million of taxpayers' hard-earned dollars to create a "Sesame Street" show in Iraq, or \$2 million on transgender surgeries in Guatemala, then my Democratic colleagues howl and jump up and down about executive overreach.

The American people are sick and tired of being told that executive orders that put our Federal Government in the way of our businesses and our family budgets are responsible, but attempts like this bill to roll back these burdensome regulations are reckless.

The Democrats don't want government spending examined and don't want to address unnecessary programs. What my Democratic colleagues want to do is continue out-of-control spending, growing our deficit, and spending those taxpayer dollars—spending taxpayer dollars. These aren't our dollars.

We need to be responsible, and that is why they elected President Trump and Republicans. They want a change in the direction of this country.

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

□ 1245

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I really understand why my Republican colleagues don't want to talk about what is going on in this country. I really do get it.

They want to change the subject. If I were them, I wouldn't want to talk about their lousy and unpopular agenda either. Nor would I want to talk about the fact that they are robbing these incredibly effective programs that help the American people to basically pay for a tax cut that is going to end up resulting in a multitrillion-dollar debt. I get that they don't want to talk about that.

They want to eliminate programs to help working families in this country. They are defying court orders to choke off money for, get this, cancer research. They are trying to choke off money for consumer protection. I just came from an Agriculture Committee hearing. They are trying to choke off money for our farmers, for rural America. They go on and on about waste, fraud, and abuse, but they don't want to talk about how their MAGA buddy, Pete Hegseth, Trump's Secretary of Defense, wants to dip into taxpayer money like it is his own personal slush fund.

They don't want to go there, do they? Again, you can't make this up, but this guy wants to spend \$50,000 on an emergency paint job for his government housing. Mr. Speaker, \$50,000. This is an emergency.

I wouldn't want to talk about that either if I were them. I wouldn't want to

talk about that either if I were them, Mr. Speaker, but I have two words for Pete Hegseth: Home Depot. I can narrow it down to one word: Lowe's. You get paint at a much cheaper rate than \$50,000 to repaint your government housing. It is ridiculous, and that is perfectly fine with my Republican friends. It is perfectly fine.

I can only assume that it is luxury paint for that price tag. Maybe my colleagues can correct me. Meanwhile, they have the gall to come down here and lecture us about government efficiency and waste? It takes my breath away.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD an article from military.com titled: "Hegseth Wants \$50,000 for 'Emergency' Paint Job to Move into Military Family Housing, Lawmakers Say."

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

There was no objection.

[From Military.com, Feb. 7, 2025]

HEGSETH WANTS \$50,000 FOR 'EMERGENCY' PAINT JOB TO MOVE INTO MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING, LAWMAKERS SAY

(By Rebecca Kheel)

Defense Secretary Pete Hegseth is looking to live in military family housing and requested to use \$137,000 in taxpayer funding for repairs—including nearly \$50,000 for an "emergency" paint job—a pair of top Democratic lawmakers said in a letter Friday demanding more details.

While it is not unprecedented for a defense secretary to live in military housing, it is far more common for them to find private housing. And the reported price tag to fix up Hegseth's military house comes as rank-and-file service members continue to struggle with crumbling, unsafe living conditions and as the Trump administration has been looking to slash government spending elsewhere.

"We know that many service members and their families currently live in unacceptable housing conditions including houses with mold, lead paint, and other hazards," Democratic Reps. Debbie Wasserman Schultz of Florida and Rosa DeLauro of Connecticut said in their letter to Hegseth about his housing. "What commitment will you make to provide service members with a similarly high quality of housing for themselves and their families?"

DeLauro is the ranking member of the House Appropriations Committee, and Wasserman Schultz is the ranking member of the panel's subcommittee in charge of military construction funding.

Under the law, Congress must be notified if maintenance and repairs for housing meant for general and flag officers is going to cost more than \$35,000.

In that context, lawmakers were notified late last month that the Army was looking to spend \$137,297 on maintenance on an unoccupied family housing unit, according to Wasserman Schultz and DeLauro's letter. The total cost included \$49,900 for an "emergency" paint job, the letter added.

On Wednesday, almost a week after the initial notification, the lawmakers found out Hegseth will be moving into the house that's being repaired, the letter said.

The Pentagon did not respond to Military.com's requests for comment Friday on the claims in the letter.

The apparent urgency to fix up Hegseth's housing comes as service members have

struggled for years with subpar housing and an inability to get timely repairs.

A series of 2018 Reuters articles exposed systemic issues with privatized military housing for families such as mold, rodent infestations and shoddy repairs, and military families have continued to report similar issues in the years since.

Young enlisted troops in the barracks, too, have faced unsafe living conditions. A 2023 Government Accountability Office report found rampant problems with overflowing sewage, mold, bed bug infestations and squatters.

At least one defense secretary has lived in military housing before. Bob Gates lived in a home on a Navy compound in Washington, D.C., when he was defense secretary. Stars and Stripes reported in 2008. Gates was the first defense secretary to live in military housing, according to the news outlet.

Most defense secretaries find their own homes. For example, Hegseth's immediate predecessor, Lloyd Austin, lived in a nearly \$3 million, 8,700-square-foot house in Great Falls, Virginia, according to Task and Purpose.

When Gates lived in military housing, he paid more than \$6,500 in monthly rent. At the time, defense officials expressed concern that he was required to pay more than three times as much as an officer would to live in the same house, because officers only had to pay the amount of their basic allowance for housing, according to Stars and Stripes.

The Pentagon did not answer Military.com's question about whether Hegseth will pay rent and how much.

In response to the concerns in 2008, Congress passed a law in that year's annual defense policy bill saying rent for a defense secretary living in military housing must be 105% of the monthly BAH rate for a four-star general living with dependents in the same area.

"The Department of Defense requested this provision in the belief that housing the secretary of defense in established quarters on a secure military installation is far more cost-effective than installing, maintaining and protecting sensitive Department of Defense equipment, along with secure information facilities and security and detection systems, in private residences," a Senate report about that year's bill said.

The report also said DoD believed that it would reduce disruptions to the public and costs for security protection.

Under the law, the rent is supposed to cover "maintenance, protection, alteration, repair, improvement or restoration."

In their letter to Hegseth, Wasserman Schultz and DeLauro also asked about what rent he will pay and whether any other defense secretaries lived in military housing that needed funding to be repaired first.

The pair also asked why exactly there needs to be an emergency paint job, as well as for a list of available officers' housing that doesn't require as costly maintenance as the house Hegseth is choosing.

They requested a response by Feb. 21.

The first Trump administration had several scandals involving Cabinet officials and their housing or furnishings.

Scott Pruitt, who served as the head of the Environmental Protection Agency at the beginning of the first Trump administration, was forced to resign amid several scandals, including allegations that he got a sweetheart deal to rent a D.C. condo from an energy lobbyist.

Mike Pompeo reportedly lived in Army housing when he was secretary of state. According to Politico, he first tried to live in Navy housing, but lawyers for that service called the idea "problematic" and raised "factual, legal, fiscal and ethical" concerns.

And Ben Carson, who served as housing and urban development secretary, faced allegations that he misused funds for fancy office furniture, though he was cleared of wrongdoing.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of corruption and waste and fraud that people deserve to know about, the kind that Republicans want to keep hidden from the American people during our debate today.

Well, guess what? I want to expose it.

Democrats are demanding answers because we think everyone deserves to know why this administration wants to spend 50 grand on paint for their fancy new houses while many of our troops live in housing with black mold and lead paint and can't pay the bills or make ends meet. That ought to be the priority, not a \$50,000 paint job for the new Secretary of Defense. It is the same scam every single time. They do not care about efficiency or cost; they care about themselves.

This is about tax breaks for billionaires, giveaways for their friends, and making sure the rich and powerful never have to sacrifice a damn thing. These people don't buy their own groceries or pump their own gas. These are FOX News nepo babies that are fine with government waste as long as they are the ones doing it.

I am just so tired of this, Mr. Speaker. They are stealing from the American people. They do not care. They want to spend taxpayer money on luxury paint jobs for their fancy new houses while they screw over the rest of us, and Democrats are not going to put up with this BS.

This administration is corrupt, and we will call it out over and over and over and over again.

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I am not prepared to close yet.

Mr. Speaker, again, we are here during a rule debate talking about this majority's agenda for Congress, and it is funny because Republicans have a razor-thin majority. They have no mandate.

A mandate is like you won by 20 or 30 or 40 seats. Republicans lost seats in the last election. Republicans have the smallest majority in nearly 100 years, and so Republicans need every single vote to pass crummy partisan bills like this one. They can't afford to have any of their Members miss a vote.

Mr. Speaker, when Democrats were in charge, when I was the chairman of the Rules Committee, we actually put in place proxy voting in response to a worldwide pandemic. Anyone could cast their vote remotely if they had an excused absence. Mr. Speaker, because it is 2025 and not 1725, and we actually can use technology to vote remotely.

The backlash we got from Republicans on this was insane. They went

out to the press and said that proxy voting was illegal. It is unconstitutional. It is this. It is that. Then, guess what? They did it themselves.

Speaker JOHNSON voted remotely 39 times. Let me repeat that: Speaker JOHNSON voted remotely 39 times. He voted remotely so he could go home early. He voted remotely so he could visit school kids. He voted remotely for an entire week once. He just didn't show up.

Then, despite him voting remotely dozens of times previously, when JOHNSON became Speaker, he ended remote voting because he said it was "unconstitutional." Yet, he voted remotely 39 times.

Imagine my surprise, Mr. Speaker—it totally blew my mind this week—when I see that Representative BYRON DONALDS somehow voted, and he wasn't even here in this building.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts will state his inquiry.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, are Members allowed under House rules to vote by proxy?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 2 of rule III, a Member may not authorize another person to cast their vote, and Members are also prohibited from casting a vote on behalf of another Member.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts will state his inquiry.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, are Members allowed to vote by proxy if they have a TV appearance in California that they really want to go to?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 2 of rule III, a Member may not authorize another person to cast their vote, and Members are also prohibited from casting a vote on behalf of another Member.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, this is really interesting now because last week Congressman BYRON DONALDS was at HBO studios in California, not on the House floor, but somehow news reports say he also voted here on the House floor at the same time.

This is so interesting, Mr. Speaker, because I have a tweet here from 2 years ago when Representative DONALDS says: "Today, House Republicans will vote to END proxy voting once and for all. The House of Representatives isn't a tech company. Its Members should work IN PERSON in the people's House."

Yet, he voted by proxy after he voted to end proxy voting, and this is the kind of hypocrisy that appears to be a specialty with my Republican colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts will state his inquiry.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let's say a Member of Congress has a baby or they are undergoing treatment for chemotherapy or a close family member dies, is there a provision in the rules for them to vote remotely?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not provide advisory opinions or respond to hypothetical questions.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, this is not hypothetical, and I kind of get what is going on here, but we have a colleague, Representative PETTERSEN, who is currently home because she just gave birth. She can't vote because this majority has refused to put in place a bipartisan tool to allow it.

Meanwhile, Republicans are out here breaking the rules while they jet off to Hollywood.

Clearly, the rules apply and are held so sacrosanct by the majority that they can't be changed for new moms, but somehow they can be changed for interviews in Los Angeles.

Let it apply to thee and not me.

Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts will state his inquiry.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, were Representative DONALDS' votes recorded as if he cast them properly or has his absence been recorded?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will direct the gentleman to clause 2 of rule III.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, if I understand that correctly, they were recorded, even though he wasn't here in person?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is free to consult the Records of the House.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I have, and his vote was recorded, even though he wasn't here.

Let's just call this what it is: It is voter fraud under the rules that the Republicans have put into place.

Let's not even get started about who used DONALDS' card to vote for him. They are fraudulently casting votes on the House floor to make sure they win every time whether or not they have enough Members here, but apparently voter fraud is okay if they do it. This is unbelievable.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we have covered an awful lot today. We discussed how Trump, Elon, and their DOGE minions are trying to take down the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, an agency that has delivered more than \$20 billion, that is \$20 billion with a b back to consumers because Elon doesn't want his business to be regulated.

We talked about how former FOX News personality turned Defense Sec-

retary Pete Hegseth wants to spend \$50,000 in taxpayer money on a high-end house paint job all while Republicans cry about government waste.

We exposed how some Republicans are committing the equivalent of voter fraud in the United States Congress, and, yet, they still refuse to let new parents be able to vote remotely.

I have a name for all of it, Mr. Speaker: Corruption. Rule for thee, but not for me. It is hypocrisy.

Mr. Speaker, is there a single thing any of them, Trump, Elon, or any of the people on the other side have done or are doing to help regular people? Can they name a single thing?

They promised they would lower grocery prices. Egg prices are through the roof.

They promised \$1 a gallon gas. Gas prices are going up since Trump took office.

Don't forget, they promised to end wars. Trump is now talking about sending U.S. troops to Gaza so that Jared Kushner can build a Middle East Mar-a-Lago.

Did people really vote to send their sons and daughters to be deployed in the tunnels of Gaza?

They promised America first, and they want to put tariffs on Canada and Mexico that Americans would have to pay for. They backed down when the markets started failing, and they got nothing to show for it.

Not a single thing has been done for the American people, just broken promises after broken promises after broken promises.

Republicans have a three-vote majority. They do not have a mandate. They need to work with Democrats to get anything done, anything of consequence that is, but, instead, they are too busy handing out favors to billionaires and putting themselves first, all at the expense of the very people who sent them here.

They want a government that only serves the ultrarich. We want a government that puts people first. I came to Congress to help people, not to hurt people.

You are not helping people when you are dismantling important agencies and bureaus that actually are there to protect the health and well-being of the American people. You are not helping the American people when you try to cut money from NIH to do cancer research. You are not helping people when you try to gut consumer protection organizations that are all about making sure that big corporations don't trample over regular people and take away their rights or overcharge them.

For the life of me, I don't understand the silence on the other side of the aisle. We have been in a new Congress now for over a month, and, again, nothing has been brought to the floor to help improve the quality of life for regular people. Not a thing has been done.

I don't know how my friends go home and face their constituents and answer

the question: What did you do this week? We did nothing; nothing for you.

We did a lot of body blocking to help people like Elon Musk and other very well-off and well-placed people enrich themselves, but we did nothing for you, the American people. That is not what we should be focused on.

The underlying bill that this rule is about here today is just another in a string of pieces of legislation that are being brought to the floor that are about trying to pull a fast one here, to basically repeal all these consumer protections, all these things that are designed to help the American people, all at once so that nobody knows what is in them.

They can bring a bill that repeals a thousand regulations all at once, and we have no debate. That is not the way this place is supposed to work.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule and vote "no" on the underlying legislation. I urge my colleagues on the Republican side to start putting the people of this country first.

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

□ 1300

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

I am just so glad that my colleague across the aisle pointed out that we have covered everything today but the bill under consideration in front of us. I should stand here kind of surprised that my colleagues on the left don't support this legislation, but of course I am not. Their lack of support proves what we already know: They don't actually care about executive overreach the way that they claim to.

Unlike the Democrats, Republicans are not changing the subject. We are focused on making sure we do the job the American people elected President Trump and the Republicans to do. It is the Democrats who are talking about paint and not talking about the bill in front of us. They are not talking about what we are doing.

I very often find myself trying to refocus the Democrats on the bill we have in front of us, which happens in many committees, but the Democrats insist on sticking to their talking points, their pro-regulation, pro-government spending agenda.

A great example today is the rant about proxy voting. This has nothing to do with the bill in front of us. It is a bill that deals with rule writing and the ability of Congress to undo rules and overregulation.

They stood silently while Joe Biden used the power of the pen to dismantle our southern border and tell Americans what kind of cars, dishwashers, and water heaters they had to have. All of this was done without a single vote by Congress, yet my Democratic colleagues never cried out about executive overreach then.

My Republican colleagues and I are committed to streamlining Federal operations and holding the government

accountable. This bill accomplishes both of those objectives, and this is the bill that we are here to talk about today. The 1996 CRA requires Congress to pass a separate joint resolution for each agency rule to seek its disapproval, slowing Congress' ability to hold the administrative state accountable and block burdensome regulations.

This legislation restores congressional control and allows us to review agency rules swiftly if they are implemented in the midnight hours of an outgoing administration. This is a simple, effective solution to improve and expedite the work of Congress and takes a step forward to curb out-of-control overregulation.

One could argue that none of the orders that the Biden-Harris White House implemented in the final days in office should go into effect, given the signal he received loud and clear in November that the American people do not want what the Democrats are selling. Perhaps that is a debate for another time. Today, we are here to streamline congressional practices at a time when we are consistently bogged down.

Mr. Speaker, I support the rule and the underlying legislation.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 122 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 1101) to prohibit unlawful access to the payment system of the Bureau of the Fiscal Service within the Department of the Treasury, and for other purposes. 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 Financial Services or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1101.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair

declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1330

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BOST) at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 122; and

Adoption of House Resolution 122, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 77, MIDNIGHT RULES RELIEF ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 122) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 77) to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for en bloc consideration in resolutions of disapproval for "midnight rules", and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 210, nays 184, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 38]

YEAS—210

Aderholt	Burchett	Edwards
Alford	Burlison	Ellzey
Allen	Calvert	Emmer
Amodei (NV)	Cammack	Estes
Arrington	Carey	Evans (CO)
Babin	Carter (GA)	Ezell
Bacon	Carter (TX)	Fallon
Baird	Ciscomani	Fedorchak
Balderson	Cline	Feenstra
Barr	Cloud	Finstad
Barrett	Clyde	Fischbach
Baumgartner	Cole	Fitzgerald
Bean (FL)	Collins	Fitzpatrick
Begich	Comer	Fleischmann
Bentz	Crane	Flood
Bergman	Crank	Fong
Bice	Crawford	Foxx
Biggs (AZ)	Crenshaw	Franklin, Scott
Biggs (SC)	Davidson	Fry
Bilirakis	De La Cruz	Fulcher
Boebert	DesJarlais	Garbarino
Bost	Diaz-Balart	Gill (TX)
Brecheen	Donalds	Gimenez
Bresnahan	Downing	Goldman (TX)
Buchanan	Dunn (FL)	Gonzales, Tony

Gooden	Lee (FL)	Rogers (KY)
Gosar	Letlow	Rose
Graves	Loudermilk	Rouzer
Green (TN)	Lucas	Roy
Greene (GA)	Luna	Rulli
Griffith	Luttrell	Rutherford
Grothman	Mace	Salazar
Guest	Mackenzie	Scalise
Guthrie	Malliotakis	Schmidt
Hageman	Maloy	Schweikert
Hamadeh (AZ)	Mann	Self
Haridopolos	Massie	Sessions
Harrigan	Mast	Shreve
Harris (MD)	McCauley	Simpson
Harris (NC)	McClain	Smith (MO)
Harshbarger	McClintock	Smith (NE)
Hern (OK)	McCormick	Smith (NJ)
Higgins (LA)	McDowell	Smucker
Hill (AR)	McGuire	Spartz
Hinson	Messmer	Stefanik
Houchin	Meuser	Steil
Hudson	Miller (IL)	Steube
Hurd (CO)	Miller (OH)	Strong
Issa	Miller (WV)	Stutzman
Jack	Miller-Meeks	Taylor
Jackson (TX)	Mills	Tenney
James	Moolenaar	Thompson (PA)
Johnson (LA)	Moore (AL)	Tiffany
Johnson (SD)	Moore (NC)	Timmons
Jordan	Moore (UT)	Turner (OH)
Joyce (PA)	Moore (WV)	Valadao
Kean	Moran	Van Drew
Kelly (MS)	Murphy	Van Dwyne
Kennedy (UT)	Nehls	Van Orden
Kiggans (VA)	Newhouse	Wagner
Kiley (CA)	Nunn (IA)	Walberg
Kim	Obenrolte	Weber (TX)
Knott	Ogles	Webster (FL)
Kustoff	Onder	Westerman
LaHood	Owens	Wied
LaLota	Palmer	Williams (TX)
LaMalfa	Perry	Wilson (SC)
Langworthy	Pfuger	Womack
Latta	Reschenthaler	Yakym
Lawler	Rogers (AL)	Zinke

NAYS—184

Adams	Evans (PA)	Matsui
Aguilar	Fields	McBath
Amo	Figures	McBride
Ansari	Fletcher	McClain Delaney
Balint	Foster	McClellan
Barragan	Foushee	McCollum
Beatty	Friedman	McDonald Rivet
Bell	Frost	McGarvey
Bera	Garamendi	McGovern
Beyer	Garcia (CA)	McIver
Bonamici	Garcia (IL)	Menendez
Boyle (PA)	Garcia (TX)	Meng
Brown	Gillen	Mfume
Brownley	Golden (ME)	Min
Budzinski	Goldman (NY)	Moore (WI)
Bynum	Gonzalez, V.	Morelle
Carbajal	Goodlander	Morrison
Carson	Gottheimer	Moskowitz
Carter (LA)	Gray	Moulton
Casas	Green, Al (TX)	Mrvan
Case	Harder (CA)	Nadler
Casten	Hayes	Neal
Castor (FL)	Himes	Neguse
Castro (TX)	Horsford	Norcross
Chu	Houlihan	Ocasio-Cortez
Cisneros	Hoyle (OR)	Olszewski
Clark (MA)	Huffman	Omar
Cleaver	Ivey	Pallone
Clyburn	Jackson (IL)	Panetta
Cohen	Jacobs	Pappas
Conaway	Jayapal	Perez
Connolly	Jeffries	Peters
Correa	Johnson (GA)	Pingree
Courtney	Johnson (TX)	Pocan
Craig	Kamlager-Dove	Pou
Crockett	Kaptur	Pressley
Crow	Kelly (IL)	Quigley
Cuellar	Kennedy (NY)	Ramirez
Davids (KS)	Khanna	Randall
Davis (IL)	Krishnamoorthi	Riley (NY)
Davis (NC)	Landman	Ross
Dean (PA)	Larsen (WA)	Ruiz
DeGette	Latimer	Salinas
DelBene	Lee (NV)	Sánchez
Deluzio	Lee (PA)	Schakowsky
DeSaulnier	Levin	Schneider
Dexter	Liccardo	Scholten
Dingell	Lieu	Schrier
Doggett	Lofgren	Scott, David
Elfreth	Lynch	Sherrill
Escobar	Magaziner	Simon
Espallat	Mannion	Smith (WA)