

RECOGNIZING GREENE CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL BAND

(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, there is so much excitement in my home county, Greene County, North Carolina.

The Greene Central High School band received the highest marks at the North Carolina Bandmasters Association Music Performance Adjudication concert band festival. They earned a superior rating, which is the highest score. The band consists of 40 incredible students, led by an amazing band director, Mr. Andrew Howell.

Music education remains essential, not just in eastern North Carolina but across the Nation. I am so proud of the Greene Central High School band, and I thank everyone across America for joining in this exciting achievement. I look forward to hearing all the wonderful music they will make in their future.

Go Rams.

□ 1215

RECOGNIZING MEDINA COUNTY CAREER CENTER

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

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, you do not need a traditional 4-year degree to become a millionaire. In Ohio's Seventh District, we have some of the best career centers in the Nation, placing students in high-paying jobs right out of high school.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Medina County Career Center in Medina, Ohio, right in our district. The center opened in 1974 as the Medina County Joint Vocational School before changing its name to what it is today. The career center is a partnership with six public school districts in northeast Ohio and offers advanced career and technical education for approximately 1,200 high school students and nearly 3,000 adult students.

Additionally, the center offers secondary career development resources and student internship opportunities, preparing students to enter or to reenter the workforce.

I commend the Medina County Career Center and express my gratitude for the center's role in producing future leaders from Ohio's Seventh Congressional District.

PROTECTING AMERICAN FAMILIES

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

Ms. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, today I rise on behalf of all of the families who are being hurt by this administration's reckless trade wars.

Last week, I met with Minnesota families and childcare providers to talk about how expensive it is to raise a family and care for young children. I met Nana Renee. She is a mother and a grandmother from Brooklyn Park who loves her family more than anything in the world. She, like so many families, is struggling to make ends meet.

As a country, we should be doing everything we can to support our young families and make raising kids more affordable. These policies are doing the exact opposite.

With this administration's sweeping tariffs, families will be forced to pay even more for the products they need to care for their children such as high chairs, cribs, strollers, and car seats. Car seats are not an optional purchase. They are required by law.

That is why today my Democratic colleagues and I are calling on the administration to exempt essential childcare products from these tariffs. I challenge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to stand up for families and join us in this call. Families should not have to foot the bill for these reckless trade wars.

HONORING THE LIFE OF RAÚL GRIJALVA

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of the man I knew as Raúl, our dearest, fiercest, dedicated Chairman Grijalva. My heart is breaking over the loss of his voice in Congress.

The love he had for our planet was as deep as the Grand Canyon he helped protect. His commitment to those who needed it most was inexhaustible. He encouraged me to chair the Subcommittee on Indian and Insular Affairs, and his commitment to Native Americans meant we passed dozens of bipartisan bills on this floor.

We legislated together, we protested together, and we laughed together. His spirit will continue to guide my work and that of environmentalists, activists, Latinos, Native Americans, and people who love this beautiful place we call home.

"May he rest in peace with the love of a grateful people." "Que descanses en paz con el amor de un pueblo agradecido."

ACCESSING HEALTHCARE FOR 9/11 FIRST RESPONDERS AND SURVIVORS

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

Ms. GILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of representing thousands of 9/11 first responders and survivors who live in New York's Fourth Congressional District.

For years, they have fought to get access to the healthcare that they desperately need and unquestionably deserve. They have traveled to Washington countless times, even those that are sick and dying, to urge Congress to pass a permanent funding fix for the World Trade Center Health Program.

These heroes who saw us through one of the darkest days in our Nation's history have spent two decades begging Congress to act. No one in the 9/11 community should ever have to worry about accessing the healthcare that they require.

I was outraged to see this funding excluded from the yearlong spending bill that was just passed earlier this month. Our first responders and survivors can't wait for action.

I am proud to help lead the 9/11 Responder and Survivor Health Funding Correction Act, alongside a bipartisan group of my colleagues, to right this wrong.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation promised to never forget, but every delay in funding tells the 9/11 community something different. It is time to act.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S.J. RES. 18, DISAPPROVING THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION RELATING TO "OVERDRAFT LENDING: VERY LARGE FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS"; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S.J. RES. 28, DISAPPROVING THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION RELATING TO "DEFINING LARGER PARTICIPANTS OF A MARKET FOR GENERAL-USE DIGITAL CONSUMER PAYMENT APPLICATIONS"; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1526, NO ROGUE RULINGS ACT OF 2025; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 22, SAFEGUARD AMERICAN VOTER ELIGIBILITY ACT; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 282 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 282

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 18) disapproving the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to "Overdraft Lending: Very Large Financial Institutions". All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution 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 commit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 28) disapproving the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to "Defining Larger Participants of a Market for General-Use Digital Consumer Payment Applications". All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution 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 commit.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1526) to amend title 28, United States Code, to limit the authority of district courts to provide injunctive relief, 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; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 4. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 22) to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to require proof of United States citizenship to register an individual to vote in elections for Federal office, 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 House Administration or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 5. (a) House Resolution 23 and House Resolution 164 are laid on the table.

(b)(1) A motion to discharge a committee from consideration of a bill or resolution that, by relating in substance to or dealing with the same subject matter, is substantially the same as House Resolution 23 shall not be in order.

(b)(2) A motion to discharge the Committee on Rules from consideration of a resolution providing a special order of business for the consideration of a bill or resolution that, by relating in substance to or dealing with the same subject matter, is substantially the same as House Resolution 23 shall not be in order.

(c) A motion to discharge on the Calendar of Motions to Discharge Committees that is rendered out of order pursuant to subsection (b) shall be stricken from that calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the cus-

tomary 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. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee met and reported out a rule providing for consideration of four measures: S.J. Res. 18, disapproving the rule submitted by the Bureau of Customer Financial Protection relating to "Overdraft Lending: Very Large Financial Institutions"; S.J. Res. 28, disapproving the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to "Defining Larger Participants of a Market for General-Use Digital Consumer Payment Applications"; H.R. 1526, the No Rogue Rulings Act of 2025; and H.R. 22, the Safeguard American Voter Eligibility Act.

House Resolution 282 provides for consideration of S.J. Res. 18 and S.J. Res. 28, both under closed rules, with 1 hour of general debate each, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services or their respective designees and provides each one a motion to commit.

The rule further provides for consideration of H.R. 1526. This is the act relating to the U.S. District Court's issuing nationwide injunctions, and that is to be considered under a closed rule. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees and provides for one motion to recommit.

The rule further provides for consideration of H.R. 22, the Safeguard America Voter Eligibility Act under a closed rule. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration or their respective designees and provides one motion to recommit.

Finally, the rule provides that House Resolution 23 and House Resolution 164 are laid on the table.

Mr. Speaker, this rule deals with several issues. The underlying legislation included is essential. One of the bills included in this rule is H.R. 1526 led by the Representative from California (Mr. ISSA).

This bill limits the ability of U.S. District Court judges from issuing nationwide injunctions. I would like to be clear. This bill does not prohibit nationwide injunctions, Mr. Speaker. It

merely establishes a mechanism to issue nationwide injunctions under appropriate circumstances.

Under the bill, if two separate States from two separate U.S. judicial circuits are reviewing the same case, a panel of three randomly chosen judges would be convened to determine whether issuing a nationwide injunction is appropriate action. These injunctions would then have the ability to be appealed directly to the United States Supreme Court.

I believe that no one district court judge in the United States anywhere, whether it be the Western District of Virginia, the Northern District of West Virginia, or anywhere else in the country, should have the ability to make nationwide decisions as a district court judge.

This bill would prevent forum shopping and somewhat restore checks and balances to our judicial system in the country by providing that we have a randomly selected three-judge panel.

Also included in this rule is H.R. 22, the Safeguard American Voter Eligibility Act, or the SAVE Act, championed by the Representative from Texas (Mr. ROY). The bill prohibits noncitizens from voting. Let me get that through. There has been some confusion. It prohibits noncitizens from voting.

It does so by requiring States to obtain proof of citizenship when registering individuals to vote in Federal elections. Even though most States prohibit noncitizens from voting in their elections, these noncitizens are still registered to vote in some States and in some cities around the country.

□ 1230

Also noncitizens sometimes get registered by mistake. I am not saying this happens by design, but it happens by mistake, and it largely happens due to the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 known as the Motor Voter Act. This requires every person applying for a driver's license with their State's Department of Motor Vehicles to receive a voter registration application. Various States and their Departments of Motor Vehicles don't generally check citizenship status before giving out the voter registration application. Some do, and hopefully this legislation will encourage more to do so.

During the last election cycle, we even saw that some Federal agencies were instructed to hand out registration forms without the ability to discern whether the person receiving the form is a citizen or not. So the noncitizen shows up at a government office, and they are given a form. They fill it out. I am not saying they are doing it for ill purposes, Mr. Speaker, but they fill it out. They are given the form, and then they fill it out. As a result, they end up showing up on some voter rolls, and there is the potential that they may vote improperly in one of our Federal elections.

Last Congress, then-West Virginia Secretary of State Mac Warner testified before a House Administration

Committee hearing to discuss his efforts to protect West Virginia elections. His State has removed 400,000 names from voter registration rolls and implemented voter ID requirements.

This bill attempts to fix the various loopholes and ensure that only eligible United States citizens are voting in our country's Federal elections. Now, Mr. Speaker, I keep saying Federal elections. If a local government wants to have folks who are not citizens voting, then that is their right. It is the same thing with the various States. It can happen out there if that is what they want, but in the Federal elections, that is where Congress gets into the act.

Also, this rule includes two resolutions of disapproval that both passed the Senate. S.J. Res. 18 nullifies the rule finalized by the Biden administration in December of 2024, that would be roughly 4 months ago, that attempts to cap overdraft fees.

Overdraft fees are a necessary evil that I believe in most cases actually help the consumer. Now, I understand nobody wants to pay it, but transparency is certainly helpful for consumers on an issue like this, and I am not sure these caps are the way to go.

Traditionally, things like overdraft fees are regulated by State regulators. It is unclear whether the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, the CFPB, can do this rulemaking under its cited authority in the Truth in Lending Act.

I have serious concerns that if this rule goes into effect that it can potentially bring about a criminal charge and even perhaps criminal punishment. I don't think the CFPB looked at all the criminal laws of the States, but having practiced for many years in the criminal courts of the Commonwealth of Virginia and having discussed it with the patrons of the bill, the same is fairly much true in the State of Kentucky.

Mr. Speaker, if you use a draft or a check, and I know not a lot of people do that, but in the rural area I represent, they are still used frequently particularly by my senior citizens. Mr. Speaker, if you use a draft or a check to pay a merchant for something and that check comes back from the bank marked insufficient funds, then under Virginia law, you have created a presumption that the individual is attempting to defraud the merchant. That entitles, when the check is returned, the merchant to charge up to \$50 for a returned check fee and to seek criminal penalties. If the check is not made good then they can seek criminal penalties which carry with it up to 12 months in jail for most checks and up to a \$2,500 fine. That is certainly a whole lot more than the average fee for insufficient funds currently that are being charged by financial institutions, banks, and credit unions of about \$35.

Further, Mr. Speaker, if a criminal charge is brought, then you may have the cost of an attorney, and you have to spend a day in court trying to work it out. If you pay it off after the charge

is brought but before going to court, then you still have to pay all of the court costs associated with the charge being brought.

This is a significant problem that I don't think CFPB thought about when they were instituting this rule because if the banks and credit unions only allow a \$5 fee, many of them will discontinue the use of this service. They won't allow you to sign up for it any longer, Mr. Speaker, and you could face potential criminal penalties.

Mr. Speaker, you can have the overdraft protection fee and pay about \$35 or a \$50 merchant fee and potential criminal charges. I think this is one that really does need to go away. I am surprised that my Democratic colleagues aren't supporting this, but they have other reasons.

S.J. Res. 28 nullifies another Biden administration rule that was finalized in December of 2024 as well that would create burdensome regulatory requirements for certain non-bank digital payments and digital wallet companies. This rule expands CFPB's regulatory power and was another attempt by the Biden administration to rush a rule out of the door for the CFPB after President Trump had been elected but before the new administration had the ability to have any input or consultation on how to carry out a public rulemaking process.

I am concerned this will cut down on people's use of innovative money transfer apps.

All four of these legislative items are steps in the right direction to cut down on red tape, ensure fair elections, and restore the system of checks and balances in our country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of the rule to allow the House to debate the underlying bills, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, there is an awful lot of stuff in this rule before us. However, let's be clear about one thing that is happening with this rule today, and that is Republican leadership is trying to overturn the democratic process of majority rule.

Mr. Speaker, 218 Members of this House, a majority of us, signed a petition from Congresswoman LUNA, who is a Republican, allowing new moms and dads to vote remotely in Congress. When 218 of us sign a petition, the House rules say it can be brought up for a vote. However, a backdoor provision slipped into this rule is being used to shut down that process. This is an unprecedented step. Literally, it has never been done before in the history of the House—never.

Mr. Speaker, if you signed Representative LUNA's discharge petition, if you agree it deserves a vote, and if you agree that a majority of the House

should have the ability to bring up legislation through the discharge process, then you have to vote "no" on this rule. It is that simple.

Let's go back to the drawing board. Drop this provision.

By the way, this isn't remote voting for everyone. It is very simply about giving new parents the option to vote remotely if they so choose. That is it. That is what the Republican leadership is killing.

When we get to the actual bills Republicans are advancing here, Mr. Speaker, who wrote these Republican bills? A Wall Street lobbyist?

One of them is literally about letting big banks raise their fees. Who the hell asked for that, the CEO of Goldman Sachs?

People are getting screwed by big banks, by the Bank of America, by Morgan Stanley, and by Wells Fargo. This is about whose side you are on.

At least Republicans are up front about it. They want to help Wall Street. Democrats fought to make sure that overdraft fees are capped at \$5, and these guys come down here with a straight face telling America what? That letting banks raise fees is a good thing.

I mean, Republican math is that higher fees are good for you, Mr. Speaker. Really? Somehow we all should want to pay more fees to big banks? Is this a joke? Is this a bad joke?

This next measure that they have in this rule lets Big Tech off the hook when people get ripped off. Did Elon Musk write this one?

These guys are coming down here with a straight face and telling us that Big Tech needs less regulation and that they need less oversight. Is this an April Fools' Day joke?

Here is the contrast: Democrats actually fought to make sure Big Tech is held accountable when things go wrong on Apple Pay, Cash App, or Zelle and when people are hacked, scammed, or defrauded.

What do Republicans want to do? They want to let Big Tech off the hook. If you lose money, too bad, Mr. Speaker. If your data gets sold, too bad. Whose side are Republicans on?

I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, it is not yours.

Maybe for April Fools' Day they could really change things up and actually stand up for working people. There is a crazy idea.

We have another bill to block nationwide injunctions when the government breaks the law. Here is a better idea: Why don't Republicans call up Donald Trump and tell him to stop breaking the law?

What an idea. Of course, it is a day that ends in Y, so Republicans are bringing to the floor a bill to take away peoples' voting rights.

Get this, Mr. Speaker, if you are a woman who changed her name after marriage, you will now need a certified birth certificate. However, if your

name is different than on that birth certificate, then you are going to have to come up with a whole bunch more documentation. Some of it will be costly.

Only Republicans would think voter disenfranchisement is somehow a good idea. This is all about making it more difficult for American citizens to vote. That is the real fraud. Donald Trump actually had a commission on voter fraud, and he disbanded it because he couldn't find any.

Republicans are defrauding American voters by making it more difficult to register. This stuff is right out of the authoritarian playbook straight from China, Russia, or Iran.

Republicans are acting like they are above the law. They are putting the rich and powerful first, undermining an independent judiciary, and undermining the right to vote. This is the road to authoritarianism, Mr. Speaker. Republicans are putting us in the fast lane to a dictatorship, and you can be damn sure that I am not going to be silent and that people on this side are not going to be silent. I am going to fight against these bills. I am going to fight to protect and uphold our democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues here, both Democrats and Republicans, to vote "no" on this rule.

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

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. LUNA).

Mrs. LUNA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule. As many of you might know, for over 2 years now I have been championing the cause to allow new female Members of Congress the right to vote. Some of the American people might be surprised that if you are a female Member and you have a child, that you can't vote. This means you can't execute your constitutional authority.

For almost 2 years now in this cause I have met with leadership. I have exhausted all tools in my legislative toolkit to be able to bring this to the floor. As I was met with much opposition, I finally used the last tool that I had at my disposal which was something known as a discharge petition where I collected 218 signatures and expanded the ability to vote while recovering from childbirth not just to mothers but also to young fathers in our governing body.

Now leadership, because of the fact they don't like the fact that I was successful at this, is trying to change the rules, but I want to talk about how fundamentally dangerous this rule change is.

As of right now, they slipped language into this rule, and I will get to what they attached the rule to in a second, that would permanently kill any ability for new Members of Congress to be able to bring this up and allow those Members who just had a child to be able to vote. That is dangerous because

of the fact that, A, not only if I argue this from the Republican standpoint that we have a very slim majority, but also to think about the message that that sends, allowing female Members to be able to vote.

In addition to that, I would also like to add that for a while we have had the majority and we have had the ability to bring legislation to the floor on election integrity and also to call out rogue judges, and yet they chose at this point in time to tie this discharge petition killer to this rule that would also permanently paint me and the Members supporting it, and I would like to also share that I am one of the most conservative Members of this body, I would like to hold up my voting record to anyone else as not just being anti-election integrity but also enabling a position that I don't typically agree with.

That in itself, I would say, in this entire process has been the most disappointing especially from among my party. I would also ask my colleagues to remember that up until 1916, female representation was not a common thing in Washington, D.C.

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

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Mrs. LUNA. Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to give this a fair shot. Vote "no" against the rule and allow this to come to the floor so that we can address it for the first time, I would say, in congressional history and do the right thing. If we don't do the right thing now, it will never be done.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me just say that I respect the gentlewoman from Florida for her courage and for standing up on behalf of doing the right thing. I wish more people in this Chamber would do that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. PETERSEN), who is the author of the parental proxy resolution that is trying to be killed by today's rule. She is a new mom herself.

Ms. PETERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this rule which restricts moms and dads from doing their jobs after welcoming a new child. Like so many of our colleagues, it is one of my greatest honors to be a mom. I have two little boys, a son named Davis who is 5, and my little guy here, Sam, who is now 9 weeks old.

It is also one of my greatest honors to have been elected by my constituents to represent them in Congress. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, after being a mom here and being only the 13th voting Member to have ever given birth while serving in Congress, I can tell you we have a long ways to go to make this place accessible for young families like mine.

□ 1245

When I was pregnant, I couldn't fly toward the end of my due date because

it was unsafe for Sam, and I was unable to board a plane. I was unable to actually have my vote represented here and my constituents represented.

After giving birth, I was faced with an impossible decision. Sam was 4 weeks old. For all the parents here, we know that when we have newborns, that is when they are the most vulnerable in their lives. It is when they need 24/7 care, when taking them even to a grocery store is scary because you are worried about exposure to germs and them getting sick, let alone taking them to an airport, on a plane, and coming across the country to make sure that you are able to vote and represent your constituents.

I was terrified that no matter what choice I made, I would have deep regrets for the consequences. So, Sam and I made the trip out, and this is our third time now coming to the floor, for this vote.

I thank all the people who have stood by us. I thank Representative LUNA for being such a champion on this issue.

While Sam is the best baby, I apologize for the noises here.

I thank Representative LUNA for being such a champion on this issue, alongside the rest of my colleagues who have led this charge and supported us in our efforts to pass this resolution.

When I hear from Members about their stories, whether they are a mom or a dad doing this job, having a newborn who is in the NICU, and having to make the choice whether or not to leave their child or come here to vote, it is unfathomable that, in 2025, we have not modernized Congress to address these very unique challenges that Members face, these life events, where our voices should still be heard.

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 Colorado.

Ms. PETERSEN. Mr. Speaker, first of all, thank you for signing our discharge petition. We are asking you to continue to stand with us because no mom or dad should be in the position that I was in and so many parents have found themselves in.

It is antiwoman. It is antifamily. We need to come together to make sure that we kill this rule and have the opportunity to pass this resolution to make sure that new parents have the ability to continue to represent their constituents.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman apologized for the noises on the floor. I love the noises and greatly appreciate having babies around.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the gentleman from Virginia in supporting this important rule.

The rule would ensure the debate of important, commonsense legislation.

This includes additional CRAs to protect consumer choice and the ability of American businesses to continue to innovate.

It also provides for the consideration of the SAVE Act, legislation that fixes a broken provision of law by closing the loopholes that allow noncitizen voter registration and to enhance election security, minimizes the risk of foreign interference in U.S. elections, and restores Americans' confidence in U.S. elections.

It also includes important legislation by Mr. ISSA to provide for a common-sense approach in limiting the exponential spread of nationwide injunctions. These nationwide injunctions, when combined with forum shopping by activists, are circumventing the will of the public by turning courts into public policy determinants, completely upending our constitutional framework.

I would like to briefly echo my earlier remarks at the Rules Committee this morning.

I am proud to support the provision in the rule that safeguards this Chamber from a take-it-or-leave-it, nonamenable approach to authorize proxy voting.

According to the Merriam-Webster dictionary, "congress" is defined as the act of "coming together and meeting." I have never voted by proxy because I believe it undermines the fabric of that sacred act of convening.

I know there is a laptop class in America that seems to operate increasingly in a virtual space, but that is simply not a fact of life for most American workers, and I believe Congress should live by that standard.

Our Nation's construction workers can't build by proxy. Our Nation's police can't keep the streets safe by proxy. Teachers can't educate our students through the act of proxy. Doctors and nurses cannot treat the sick by proxy.

Let's not forget how dependent we were on service workers and delivery employees to get us the goods we needed during COVID. Where would we have been if they decided to "proxy" their responsibilities?

I understand that some of my colleagues are pinning their hopes on the fact that things will go according to plan, that proxy voting can be limited to select classes, and that those in authority can be trusted to enforce the rules. However, in the course of human events, things rarely ever go according to plan.

This isn't theoretical. The Democrats implemented proxy voting during COVID, and it was a disaster. We had one Member who was submitting his proxy letter so he could moonlight a second job.

We simply cannot throw this important decision to chance. It will take only slight reconfiguration of the deck chairs in this body to put Democrats back in charge and put us on a path to proxy voting without limitation.

Put simply, Members of Congress need to show up for work. I support

this rule and urge my colleagues to support it on the floor.

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

After listening to the distinguished chairwoman of the Rules Committee, my head is about to explode.

She talked about how disastrous it was when we had proxy voting during COVID. It was so disastrous that 162 Republicans actually voted by proxy.

She talked about how somehow it was unconstitutional, so unconstitutional that the current Speaker of the House, on multiple occasions, voted by proxy 39 different times.

She talks about people needing to show up to work. Well, people did show up to work and did participate in representing their constituents when we had proxy voting.

She doesn't seem to be that upset over the fact that Donald Trump conducts most of his business from the golf course in Mar-a-Lago. She doesn't seem to be very upset over the fact that the FBI Director, Kash Patel, is asking to work remotely from Las Vegas. She didn't seem that upset that there were people on the Rules Committee who used proxy voting to go to a CPAC convention to basically listen to political rhetoric from people on the extreme rightwing.

The bottom line is, Republicans love to talk about family values, but when given the chance to really support families, they turn their backs.

She talks about looking in Webster's dictionary, about the definition of "congress." While she is at it, she should look up the definition of "representation." There is nothing that says you shouldn't be able to represent your constituents because you just had a new baby.

The rule that we are considering right now is unprecedented because never in the history of the House has the Rules Committee tried to outright kill a discharge petition that was already signed by a majority of the House—never. This is precedent-setting.

Let me be clear: Discharge petitions are not a tool of the minority. That is true no matter how many times Republican leadership wants to say so.

In the past 30 years, before this month, a grand total of four discharge petitions have been sent by a majority of this House. Guess who introduced every single one of those four bills? Republican Members of a Republican majority. How did a majority of Republicans vote on those bills? They voted in support.

This isn't some Democratic tool that we use to make the other side take votes. This is a vital tool that has allowed Republicans with commonsense, bipartisan ideas to actually bring them forward against the opposition of their leadership.

By the way, even if you think this is a tool of the minority, once you set this precedent, that is it. Republicans are a few seats away from losing con-

trol of this Chamber. You might see this debate a lot differently in hindsight. If you want to protect your rights as Members of Congress, you should vote "no" here. You should especially vote "no" if you support the idea that new moms and dads should be allowed to vote remotely while taking care of a newborn.

Members worked across the aisle to draft a compromise version of remote voting for new parents. A bipartisan majority of this House signed a petition to bring this to the floor. Congresswoman LUNA followed the rules, followed the rules that you set, the same rules that were in place when I was chair of this committee, the same basic rules that have been in place for a hundred years.

A majority of this Congress supports the LUNA-PETERSEN rule to allow new parents to vote remotely because it is common sense and because this is 2025, not 1925.

Members who stand with new parents and young families, Members who recognize we live in a modern world and don't show up to work with a horse and buggy, Members who believe in the democratic process, things like majority rule—what a radical idea—must defeat this antifamily, antidemocratic power grab of a resolution.

If you signed this discharge petition, you need to vote "no" on this rule. If you think it is important for individual Members to have any ability to move commonsense, bipartisan ideas forward, you need to vote "no" on this rule. A "no" vote is the only vote that lets that happen.

Congresswoman LUNA convinced a majority in this House to support her idea. She deserves to get an up-or-down vote.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, Republicans are rigging the system to silence your vote and silence your power.

If you are a woman, a rural voter, an Active-Duty military member, or a Tribal member, the SAVE Act will cost you more time, more money, and maybe your right to vote, period.

Under the SAVE Act, if your birth certificate does not match your voter registration, you will have to pay to get a passport or jump through even more hoops to register to vote.

All of you married women out there, that is you.

The SAVE Act also requires you to show up in person to present your documents. Military members overseas can't do that, and rural voters may have to drive 2 hours if you are in Representative CISCOMANI's district and maybe more in Republican rural districts. That is a lot of gas money and lots of work that you have lost.

Republicans rejected my amendment to fix those two problems, but they don't like an easy fix. No, everything

under Trump and Republicans is getting more expensive, even the right to vote.

This rule also blocks the House from voting on Representative LUNA's bipartisan discharge petition signed by a majority of the House, including Republicans, to allow new parents to vote by proxy.

Speaker JOHNSON voted by proxy 39 times, and he didn't have a newborn. Earlier this year, they let a Republican go on a Hollywood comedy show and vote by proxy, but they won't let a pregnant colleague who cannot safely travel vote by proxy. Republicans are undermining family values yet again.

I hope my Republican colleagues who signed the discharge petition continue to have the courage to vote against this rule. You should not be silenced.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I rise for a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state the inquiry.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, are there any points of order that properly lie against this resolution we are currently debating?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman inquiring about the rule which he is managing?

Mr. GRIFFITH. That is correct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not provide an advisory opinion.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that.

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

I will say, the reason I raise that issue is because what we have in this rule is really just a different form of the classic motion to lay on the table or to postpone indefinitely.

□ 1300

Mr. Speaker, I understand that you have to go back to Jefferson's Manual and old practices to figure that out. Yet, that is, in essence, what this rule does in relationship to the resolutions that have been discussed being laid on the table and not being brought up.

Mr. Speaker, I will talk about proxies for a minute, if I might. I have always been opposed to proxy voting. I would say to my colleagues, both on the other side of the aisle and my side of the aisle, if I were to ever break that feeling that it is not the right way to run this body, this might be the one that would tempt me. Yet, we can't.

Even though we are looking now at a certain class that we are all sympathetic to, moms and babies and new dads, there are already discussions underway for expanding that. Now that this has started to be discussed, there are all kinds of discussions around Capitol Hill about other things that should be granted the ability to vote by proxy.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that if Members agree with me that Representatives shouldn't vote by proxy, this is an appropriate technique under the rules of this House to allow us to, in essence,

lay the issue of voting by proxy on the table.

I have heard people say: These folks followed the rules.

This is also a component of the rules, and oftentimes there is a clash of the rules.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to quit making it sound like it is some kind of a nefarious thing. I don't agree with voting by proxy. I didn't vote by proxy when it was allowed. I didn't vote for anybody else by proxy when it was allowed. I have always been opposed to it. I think it is bad for the Republic.

In the long term, individuals may have differences of opinion. Individuals may disagree. Individuals may have circumstances where they that cry out to us to say: Shouldn't we allow it in this case?

Yet, I think it is bad for the Republic to go down that path. Just because others have done it and they did it when it was legal or proper under the rules and because some have had inappropriate behavior and done it when it wasn't supposed to be done, it does not mean that we should change the ruling or the rules of this House to allow it.

I was sitting here thinking. We have all kinds of rules, rules of the road, et cetera. Just because not everybody stops at a stop sign or not everybody stops at a red light doesn't mean that we should suddenly change the law and say people don't have to stop. That is the circumstance that I think that we are in currently.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I don't blame the Speaker for not being able to answer the question of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH). I have been on the Rules Committee for a long time, and I, quite frankly, don't know what the hell he is talking about.

Mr. Speaker, none of us are saying that the rules can't be changed here. We are just saying they shouldn't be. In the House of Representatives, I don't know, but I thought the majority rules. I thought that was kind of an important standard that we all followed around here, but apparently not.

Apparently, according to my Republican colleagues who are now in charge, it is now the minority that should rule, that a minority of opinion who doesn't want to see things come to the floor can just block it and not even give people an opportunity to vote up or down.

I think this is a very dangerous precedent, and I think the majority is going to regret going down this road. Again, I hope that there are courageous people on the Republican side who will stand with Representative LUNA and all of us and vote "no" on the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GOMEZ).

Mr. GOMEZ. Mr. Speaker, I think Speaker JOHNSON doesn't get it.

First, what the Speaker is trying to do regarding this rule is to kill a process that has been in place for a very, very long time and really undermine the majority will of this body. The American people want us to work together. When we finally do work in a bipartisan way, the Speaker tries to use a procedural move to undo that.

Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of the Dads Caucus in support of Representative LUNA's and Representative PETERSEN's proxy voting bill that will allow new parents to spend a limited time, 12 weeks, with a newborn child. That is all we are asking.

The reason is it is not just about those new parents, but it is also about making a Congress that is representative of the people in this country, men and women who are starting a family and who are taking care of a newborn child, those who are struggling to make ends meet, those who are struggling to figure out how to take care of this new person that is living among us and to make sure that they have a healthy start in life. That is what this is about.

Mr. Speaker, when we make this body more representative and make it easier for people to serve, all of a sudden, we will make decisions that are more representative of our country.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask for a rejection and a "no" vote on the rule because this is about a democracy that truly represents working men and women and their kids.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY).

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH) for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would note for the American people that the Republican majority is bringing before the body two important measures this week.

The first measure is to ensure the integrity of our elections, to ensure that only American citizens can vote in American elections, a fairly common-sense principle, which enjoys 80 percent-plus approval among the American people, that would ensure in a straightforward way that noncitizens may not vote in our elections. It is that simple.

The second measure we are bringing forward is a piece of legislation that we are actively debating right now in a committee that I am co-chairing, the Committee on the Judiciary, and I will go back to that committee forthwith, in which we are having witnesses before the Committee on the Judiciary discussing the extent to which we have judges that are taking unilateral action under what are called temporary restraining orders, or injunctions, to thwart the efforts of the administration's actions as a direct result of the election in November to carry out the agenda for which the President was elected.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bipartisan problem that has been something

where you have judges that will act unilaterally as a single-district judge, and the question is: What do we do about it?

We have had Democrats who have said that we should change it. We have had Republicans who have said that we should change it. We are trying to change it. We are trying to say that a judge can take action on the parties before them, but nothing more, and then have that go up through another procedure, and then allow an appellate panel or a three-judge panel or the Supreme Court to fast track it, so if they decide there should be an injunction, there can be.

Mr. Speaker, let me put it in plain speak for the American people. We are putting measures on the floor to ensure that only American citizens vote in American elections and to ensure that judges don't make the policy for America but the elected leaders do, whether it is the executive branch, President, or the Members of Congress, and that there be a process to ensure that the Constitution, the laws of the land, are being protected.

That is what the majority in this body is putting forward. We can listen all day long about what we are hearing today regarding proxy voting. The American people who I know and represent and talk to expect us to show up. Right now, across this country, Americans are showing up to work. They are going in, and they are doing their plumbing work. There are electricians showing up to work. There are builders who are standing out in the sun. They are picking crops. They are working hard.

They don't get to take a pass. They don't get to not show up. Yet, we were elected to represent the 750,000-odd Americans each. We were elected under the Constitution of the United States, and we are supposed to show up in Congress; that is what it means. We are supposed to be here. It is why the institution exists. It is why this floor exists.

Mr. Speaker, there have been countless reasons why there would be cause for us to want to allow Members to have some sort of flexibility, such as people who are sick, or our friend, STEVE SCALISE, who was shot. He was shot, and he didn't ask for any special dispensation. He fought cancer, is still fighting cancer, and as majority leader is standing here on this floor every day doing the job.

New dads. I am a dad. My daughter and my son ask me to show up to things. I missed my son's 4-H presentation last week. I missed my daughter's 4-H event this last week. I have missed countless family engagements.

My wife carries the burden of making sure that our family can function back home in Texas, but I signed up for the job. That is what I did. I signed up for the job.

When Members let this happen, it will not just happen for mothers or fathers. It will be for everybody, and

then we will have proxy voting where you will have pressures brought to bear that will fundamentally change this institution.

No, we should not allow this to occur. No, we shouldn't have a discharge petition brought to the floor, which does violence to the Constitution, does violence to the body, and does it with no ability to amend it. The way the rule is drafted, there would be no amendments and no ability to debate it.

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

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friend from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH) for yielding additional time.

Mr. Speaker, what we are doing on the floor today is right and proper under our rules. It is to say that we should have a full-throated debate on something that would fundamentally change the people's House, nothing more, nothing less. We should do that.

This is something that has been debatable. It was debated by the Founders. It was debated by them and rejected. It was debated and rejected in the Articles of Confederation. It was debated and rejected in the Constitution. We are now staring at the result of having set aside tradition and precedent by embracing proxy voting during COVID. It is trying to be expanded beyond that. We should not do that.

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

Mr. Speaker, responding to the gentleman who just spoke, just because the gentleman yells doesn't make his vote count more. It certainly doesn't make him right.

Mr. Speaker, Donald Trump literally works from a golf course, and my friends on the other side of the aisle don't say anything about it. Yet, God forbid a pregnant mother be able to have her baby in the safety of her home and in her community and she votes by proxy. Somehow, the Republic will fall? Give me a break.

What the hell is wrong with the majority? This is ridiculous. This is ridiculous. This is coming from a group of people over there, many of whom voted by proxy during COVID, some of them multiple times. I don't have any patience for this.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JOHNSON).

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition today to the Republicans' voter suppression act. This bill is not about election integrity. This is not about ensuring that only citizens vote. This is about making it impossible for people and new voters to vote.

Mr. Speaker, this has played out in Texas and other jurisdictions across the country. Yet, in 2021, Texas has led the Nation in voter suppression, rejecting nearly 13 percent of mail-in ballots.

Texas rejected nearly 13 percent of ballots cast by rightful citizens of this country, people who are being disfranchised for exercising their right to vote.

The Republicans are really using this patriotic chest-beating moment of voting in an attempt to make it difficult for people of color, for seniors, for veterans, for persons with disabilities to be able to go and cast their vote.

I filed three amendments to make this bill better that were all rejected by the Republicans, one of which would have made it possible to provide documentation of citizenship through online means, to register online. There are millions of people in this country who cannot physically get to a polling place. There are men and women in our service branches who are stationed abroad who cannot physically get back to their polling place in their jurisdiction to register to vote.

We are basically telling these citizens of this country that their votes don't count. We don't care if they can vote. We don't care how hard it is, and we are going to make it impossible for them to vote.

Republicans categorically rejected that amendment.

Mr. Speaker, what about the accountability for making sure that election officials don't screw up and tell a citizen of this country that they don't get to vote? Where is the right to cure? I filed an amendment that would have said that, if citizens were wrongfully denied the right to vote, they would have 24 hours to get a hearing to have a judge take a look at it to prove that the election clerk got it wrong and that they are an American citizen and deserve to be able to cast their ballot.

Republicans categorically rejected that. It is an atrocity on the American public, and it is an atrocity for citizens who are trying to duly cast their vote.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia has 5 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 10 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to make in order Representative DEXTER's amendment to the SAVE Act, which prevents the bill from taking effect within a State unless that State certifies that the implementation of the bill would not lead to disenfranchisement of eligible married women voters.

I ask for unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment into 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 Oregon (Ms. DEXTER), the sponsor of this legislation, to discuss our proposal.

□ 1315

Ms. DEXTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding and for his actions today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on one of my eight amendments to the SAVE Act, which will be offered as the previous question today.

Let me be clear: The SAVE Act is an antiwoman, voter suppression bill. Under the guise of election integrity, the SAVE Act would penalize millions of women just for taking their spouse's name, requiring them to present additional documentation that many women don't have or don't have the resources to obtain to exercise their constitutional right to vote.

My amendment would prevent this bill from being implemented unless we get certification that it would not bar a single married woman in this country who is eligible to vote from the ballot box.

If this amendment fails, we are putting 70 million American women at risk of disenfranchisement. Seventy million is one in four voters in this country. This burden will fall hardest on women already forced to navigate broken systems with fewer resources and less time: working mothers, caregivers, women juggling jobs and families.

I cannot believe that in the year 2025, I have to stand here on the House floor of the United States to defend a woman's right to vote, but I will. I will continue to stand here every single day if that is what it takes because this isn't theoretical. This is personal.

It is for the mom in Gresham who can't take unpaid time off to track down new documents. It is for the woman in Hood River whose name no longer matches her birth certificate after marriage and who lacks the \$160 it costs to get a passport. Are we really going to tell her she doesn't have a right to vote?

I ask my Republican colleagues to show courage in this moment for your mothers, your daughters, and every woman in your life that you love. Please join your Democratic colleagues in defeating the previous question so that we can vote on my commonsense amendment.

American women cannot afford to go back.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I rise in full support of this rule. As I told my good friends in the Rules Committee today, you are not going to lecture me on compassion. You are not going to lecture me on being kind to the poor and the forgotten.

You are the party who let 15 million illegals in this country, wantonly and deliberately. You are the party who de-

fended a President who wasn't mentally competent.

One of the ladies mentioned that Donald Trump voted from a golf course. Donald Trump could read a thank-you note, unlike President Biden.

Donald Trump had 77 million people who wanted to reverse the course that this country was on for the last 4 years. To hear you all talk all of a sudden about disenfranchisement for females, you are always playing the victim card. Seventy-seven million people rejected that.

Now, on the proxy voting, every one of our friends in the back listening had to show up here. Every one of them had to physically come here. I am in the construction business. Do you think the electrician could vote by proxy to get the house wired? Do you think the dentist could vote by proxy to get the teeth fixed and fillings filled?

It is a joke. With all the problems this country has, here we are, arguing over proxy voting.

You brought up the Speaker voting by proxy. I voted by proxy. Speaker PELOSI put it in order a few times, and no one agrees with this.

The hardworking Americans go to work. When we sign up for this job, as has been said, we agree to come to this Chamber, 435 of us.

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

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. NORMAN. If you want to get into Members of your own party who voted coming off boats and just basically took a vacation, it ends today.

That is why I fully support this. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and to not refer to the occupants of the gallery.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I don't even know what the hell he is talking about.

Let me just say this: I never voted by proxy. I helped establish those rules during COVID, but I never did because I followed the rules.

The gentleman voted 63 times by proxy, including one time going to a rightwing Republican political convention. That was not following the rules. So much for being unconstitutional.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MOSKOWITZ).

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Mr. Speaker, the Speaker is a Member of this body. There are 435 of us, and the petition process exists so that the other 434 of us have a little bit of power so that if there is an idea that we want to bring to the Chamber, one person can't stop it.

The petition process is about us. It is about the Members, but people are feeling all sorts of kingly these days in D.C. It has been reported that leadership is bribing Members to vote "no" so they can have their bills moved and get spots on committees.

I don't understand. The Freedom Caucus just owns you guys. They just own the Republicans. The last time they took you hostage, they removed a Speaker.

Literally, the Freedom Caucus could teach a clinic on Speaker hostage taking. If you don't like the bill, vote against it. Is the Freedom Caucus the only one with power? Is CHIP ROY the only one who sits in these seats with power?

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman from Florida.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. GRIFFITH. I believe the gentleman is referencing a Member by name, and I don't believe that is proper.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. The Representative from Texas, Mr. Speaker. Is that all right?

Mr. GRIFFITH. There you go.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman withdraw his point of order?

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. I will refer to him as Representative of Texas. I didn't realize the snowflake thing was a problem.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know that anyone should lecture us on working. The American people work harder than us. We are here only 3 days a week. I mean, you want to talk about working, you guys are not even showing up for your townhalls, so I don't know that you should be lecturing us about working.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their comments to the Chair and not to engage in personalities.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. STANSBURY).

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Speaker, as we stand here today on the House floor, Donald Trump's Secretary of Health is announcing that he is firing over 10,000 healthcare professionals across America. These are the doctors, practitioners, experts, and scientists who keep us safe.

While we stand here today, Elon Musk is trying to buy an election in Wisconsin.

While we stand here, Donald Trump is bragging about tariffs across town while he is saying that he is going to run for President for a third term, which is unconstitutional.

What are Republicans trying to run on the House floor this week? The SAVE Act, which would undermine the voting rights of millions of Americans, and the No Rogue Rulings Act, which

would undermine the judicial branch and interfere with its rulings. It is trying to run two CRAs that would revoke administrative rules to keep banks from ripping off the American people.

Here they are, trying to sneak in a rule today that would take our power away as Representatives here in the House to ensure that our own Members can care for their children as new parents.

This is what abuse of power looks like: attacking the judiciary, attacking our elections, and attacking our democratic institutions.

We will not stand for it because American democracy is on the line.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to stand up, have a backbone, do what is right, and vote "no."

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 4¹/₄ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, let us not kid ourselves. This isn't just about overdraft fees, mobile apps, or voter registration requirements. This is about one political party, the Republican Party, which has made a deliberate choice to side with the rich and powerful over the people they were elected to serve.

Time and time again, Republicans have shown us exactly who they are.

They are not interested in lifting up working families. They are interested in protecting greedy corporations.

They are not interested or worried about making life easier for everyday people. They are worried about making life easier for the rich and the powerful.

The Republican vision for America is one where the rules don't apply to those at the top and the rest of us are left to fend for ourselves. That is very different from the Democratic vision for America because Democrats believe real freedom means economic security.

We believe opportunity means being able to pay your bills without being gouged by Big Bank overdraft fees. We believe consumers should be protected from fraud.

We believe that working people should come first, not Wall Street, not Silicon Valley, not MAGA billionaires who think democracy is optional.

We believe that this Congress ought to embrace the 21st century. Republicans are using this vote to block Representative LUNA from offering her resolution to allow new moms and dads to vote by proxy in this Congress. This is a huge change to centuries of precedent. They are taking power away from a majority, a majority of Members of the House, by blocking a bipartisan resolution.

Let me be crystal clear: A minority of this Chamber is upending what a majority in both parties wants.

I get it. Some of you are obsessed with copying authoritarian regimes, but guess what. We are not in a dictatorship, and Republicans and Democrats should reject this cowardly change.

The American people are watching. They, quite frankly, don't understand the rationale that my Republican colleagues put forward about why new mothers and new fathers have to be here in person while making comparisons to doctors who are operating on patients.

We are casting votes. We are casting votes.

Representative PETERSEN, having just given birth to a new baby, should be able to represent her constituents from her district in the safety of her community and in her home.

What the hell is the big deal? Do you think the world is coming to an end? The people who are complaining the loudest are the ones who abused proxy voting when we had it during COVID.

By the way, news flash, everybody: There is a Member of the Republican Party who voted by proxy to do a comedy show on the West Coast just a few months ago, and they all know about it. There is no accountability. There is no one holding anybody to account for that, basically, voter fraud, but they are here on the floor today complaining about new mothers and new fathers being able to vote by proxy.

This is absurd. This is absurd. The American people I know are disgusted by what they are hearing here today. The American people are watching.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this outrageous, anti-democratic rule. I ask my Republican colleagues to stand up and show some courage today because what you are doing today, what the leadership is doing today, is basically precedent setting.

This will come back and haunt you at some point. Don't ruin these precedents. Don't ruin these traditions.

Let's build an economy and a democracy that works for everyone. Vote "no" on this rule.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I have failed. I thought I made it very clear that when I talk about overdraft fees, I am talking about the little guy because the CFPB's rule doesn't recognize the laws of the States that make it a crime in some cases to have an overdraft. It makes it so that the little guy is going to pay more. CFPB didn't take that into consideration, in my opinion. They didn't understand that.

Yet, my colleague on the other side just talks about somehow Republicans are only looking out for the big businesses. No. No, this rule sets up the debate for overturning the CFPB rule and helping the little guy not face \$150 to \$750—that is in Virginia; I don't know about other States—in charges if they

have to deal with a criminal penalty. \$50 from the merchant, and they are worrying about a \$5 to \$35 fee. Yet, they are not paying attention to the real harm. That is it.

□ 1330

We have heard lots of arguments on all the issues included in this rule, and so I think it is important that we pass it. I urge everyone to vote "yes."

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 282 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

Strike Sec. 4 and insert the following and redesignate the subsequent sections accordingly:

SEC. 4. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 22) to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to require proof of United States citizenship to register an individual to vote in elections for Federal office, 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 House Administration or their respective designees; (2) the amendment specified in section 5 of this resolution, if offered by Representative Dexter of Oregon or a designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes 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. 5. The amendment referred to in section 4 is as follows:

Amend section 8 of the bill to read as follows:

SEC. 8. EFFECTIVE DATE

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall apply with respect to applications for voter registration which are submitted on or after such date.

(B) EXCEPTION.—This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall not take effect with respect to a State unless the State certifies that the implementation of this Act and the amendments made by this Act will not disenfranchise any eligible married woman voter.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Adoption of the resolution, if ordered; and

The motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 1491.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 215, nays 213, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 86]

YEAS—215

Aderholt	Goldman (TX)	Miller (IL)
Alford	Gonzales, Tony	Miller (OH)
Allen	Gooden	Miller (WV)
Amodei (NV)	Gosar	Miller-Meeks
Arrington	Graves	Mills
Babin	Green (TN)	Moolenaar
Bacon	Greene (GA)	Moore (AL)
Baird	Griffith	Moore (NC)
Balderson	Grothman	Moore (UT)
Barrett	Guest	Moore (WV)
Baumgartner	Guthrie	Moran
Bean (FL)	Hageman	Murphy
Begich	Hamadeh (AZ)	Nehls
Bentz	Haridopolos	Newhouse
Bergman	Harrigan	Norman
Bice	Harris (MD)	Nunn (IA)
Biggs (AZ)	Harris (NC)	Obernolte
Biggs (SC)	Harshbarger	Ogles
Bilirakis	Hern (OK)	Onder
Boebert	Higgins (LA)	Owens
Bost	Hill (AR)	Palmer
Brecheen	Hinson	Perry
Bresnahan	Houchin	Pfluger
Buchanan	Hudson	Reschenthaler
Burchett	Huizenga	Rogers (AL)
Burlison	Hunt	Rogers (KY)
Calvert	Hurd (CO)	Rose
Cammack	Issa	Rouzer
Carey	Jack	Roy
Carter (GA)	Jackson (TX)	Rulli
Carter (TX)	James	Rutherford
Ciscomani	Johnson (LA)	Salazar
Cline	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
Cloud	Jordan	Schmidt
Clyde	Joyce (OH)	Schweikert
Cole	Joyce (PA)	Scott, Austin
Collins	Kean	Self
Comer	Kelly (MS)	Sessions
Crane	Kelly (PA)	Shreve
Crank	Kennedy (UT)	Simpson
Crawford	Kigans (VA)	Smith (MO)
Crenshaw	Kiley (CA)	Smith (NE)
Davidson	Kim	Smith (NJ)
De La Cruz	Knott	Smucker
DesJarlais	Kustoff	Stauber
Diaz-Balart	LaHood	Steil
Donalds	LaLota	Steupe
Downing	LaMalfa	Strong
Dunn (FL)	Langworthy	Stutzman
Edwards	Latta	Taylor
Ellzey	Lawler	Tenney
Emmer	Lee (FL)	Thompson (PA)
Estes	Letlow	Tiffany
Evans (CO)	Loudermilk	Timmons
Ezell	Lucas	Turner (OH)
Fallon	Luna	Valadao
Fedorchak	Luttrell	Van Drew
Feenstra	Mace	Van Dwyne
Finstad	Mackenzie	Van Orden
Fischbach	Malliotakis	Wagner
Fitzgerald	Maloy	Walberg
Fitzpatrick	Mann	Weber (TX)
Fleischmann	Massie	Webster (FL)
Flood	Mast	Westerman
Fong	McCaul	Wied
Fox	McClain	Williams (TX)
Franklin, Scott	McClintock	Wilson (SC)
Fry	McCormick	Wittman
Fulcher	McDowell	Womack
Garbarino	McGuire	Yakym
Gill (TX)	Messmer	Zinke
Gimenez	Meuser	

NAYS—213

Adams	Boyle (PA)	Cherfilus-
Aguilar	Brown	McCormick
Amo	Brownley	Chu
Ansari	Budzinski	Cisneros
Auchincloss	Bynum	Clark (MA)
Balint	Carbajal	Clarke (NY)
Barragan	Carson	Cleaver
Beatty	Carter (LA)	Clyburn
Bell	Casar	Cohen
Bera	Case	Conaway
Beyer	Casten	Connolly
Bishop	Castor (FL)	Correa
Bonamici	Castro (TX)	Costa

Courtney	Keating	Quigley
Craig	Kelly (IL)	Ramirez
Crockett	Kennedy (NY)	Randall
Crow	Khanna	Raskin
Cuellar	Krishnamoorthi	Riley (NY)
Dauids (KS)	Landsman	Rivas
Davis (IL)	Larsen (WA)	Ross
Davis (NC)	Larson (CT)	Ruiz
Dean (PA)	Latimer	Ryan
DeGette	Lee (NV)	Salinas
DeLauro	Lee (PA)	Sanchez
DelBene	Leger Fernandez	Scanlon
Deluzio	Levin	Schakowsky
DeSaulnier	Liccardo	Schneider
Dexter	Lieu	Scholten
Dingell	Lofgren	Schrier
Doggett	Lynch	Scott (VA)
Elfreth	Magaziner	Scott, David
Escobar	Mannion	Sewell
Espallat	Matsui	Sherman
Evans (PA)	McBath	Sherrill
Fields	McBride	Simon
Figures	McClain Delaney	Smith (WA)
Fletcher	McClellan	Sorensen
Foster	McCollum	Soto
Foushee	McDonald Rivet	Stansbury
Frankel, Lois	McGarvey	Stanton
Friedman	McGovern	Stevens
Frost	McIver	Strickland
Garamendi	Meeks	Subramanyam
Garcia (CA)	Menendez	Suozzi
Garcia (IL)	Meng	Swalwell
Garcia (TX)	Mfume	Sykes
Gillen	Min	Takano
Golden (ME)	Moore (WI)	Thanedar
Goldman (NY)	Morale	Thompson (CA)
Gomez	Morrison	Thompson (MS)
Gonzalez, V.	Moskowitz	Titus
Goodlander	Moulton	Tlaib
Gottheimer	Mrvan	Tokuda
Gray	Mullin	Tonko
Green, Al (TX)	Nadler	Torres (CA)
Harder (CA)	Neal	Torres (NY)
Hayes	Neguse	Trahan
Himes	Norcross	Tran
Horsford	Ocasio-Cortez	Underwood
Houlihan	Olshewski	Vargas
Hoyer	Omar	Vasquez
Hoyle (OR)	Pallone	Veasey
Huffman	Panetta	Velazquez
Ivey	Pappas	Vindman
Jackson (IL)	Pelosi	Wasserman
Jacobs	Perez	Schultz
Jayapal	Peters	Waters
Jeffries	Petterson	Watson Coleman
Johnson (GA)	Pingree	Whitesides
Johnson (TX)	Pocan	Williams (GA)
Kamlager-Dove	Pou	Wilson (FL)
Kaptur	Pressley	

NOT VOTING—3

Barr Spartz Stefanik

□ 1356

Mses. KAMLAGER-DOVE and WILSON of Florida changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURPHY). The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 206, noes 222, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 87]

AYES—206

Aderholt	Arrington	Balderson
Alford	Babin	Barrett
Allen	Bacon	Baumgartner
Amodei (NV)	Baird	Bean (FL)

Begich	Griffith	Moore (AL)
Bentz	Grothman	Moore (NC)
Bergman	Guest	Moore (UT)
Bice	Guthrie	Moore (WV)
Biggs (AZ)	Hageman	Moran
Biggs (SC)	Hamadeh (AZ)	Murphy
Bilirakis	Haridopolos	Nehls
Boebert	Harrigan	Newhouse
Bost	Harris (MD)	Norman
Brecheen	Harris (NC)	Nunn (IA)
Bresnahan	Harshbarger	Obernolte
Buchanan	Hern (OK)	Ogles
Burlison	Higgins (LA)	Onder
Calvert	Hill (AR)	Owens
Cammack	Hinson	Palmer
Carey	Houchin	Perry
Carter (GA)	Hudson	Pfluger
Carter (TX)	Huizenga	Reschenthaler
Ciscomani	Hunt	Rogers (AL)
Cline	Hurd (CO)	Rogers (KY)
Cloud	Issa	Rose
Clyde	Jack	Rouzer
Cole	Jackson (TX)	Roy
Collins	James	Rulli
Comer	Johnson (LA)	Rutherford
Crane	Johnson (SD)	Salazar
Crank	Jordan	Scalise
Crawford	Joyce (OH)	Schmidt
Crenshaw	Joyce (PA)	Schweikert
Davidson	Kean	Scott, Austin
De La Cruz	Kelly (MS)	Self
DesJarlais	Kelly (PA)	Sessions
Diaz-Balart	Diaz-Balart	Kennedy (UT)
Donalds	Donalds	Kiggans (VA)
Downing	Downing	Kim
Dunn (FL)	Dunn (FL)	Knott
Edwards	Edwards	Kustoff
Ellzey	Ellzey	LaHood
Emmer	Emmer	LaMalfa
Estes	Estes	Langworthy
Evans (CO)	Evans (CO)	Latta
Ezell	Ezell	Lee (FL)
Fallon	Fallon	Letlow
Fedorchak	Fedorchak	Loudermilk
Feenstra	Feenstra	Lucas
Finstad	Finstad	Luttrell
Fischbach	Fischbach	Mace
Fitzgerald	Fitzgerald	Malliotakis
Fitzpatrick	Fleischmann	Maloy
Fleischmann	Flood	Mann
Flood	Fong	Mann
Fong	Fong	Massie
Fox	Fox	Mast
Franklin, Scott	Franklin, Scott	McCaul
Fry	Fry	McClain
Fulcher	Fulcher	McClintock
Garbarino	Garbarino	McCormick
Gill (TX)	Gill (TX)	McDowell
Gimenez	Gimenez	McGuire
	Goldman (TX)	Messmer
	Gonzales, Tony	Meuser
	Gooden	Miller (IL)
	Gosar	Miller (WV)
	Graves	Miller-Meeks
	Green (TN)	Mills
	Greene (GA)	Moolenaar

NOES—222

Adams	Clarke (NY)	Foster	
Aguilar	Cleaver	Foushee	
Amo	Clyburn	Frankel, Lois	
Ansari	Cohen	Friedman	
Auchincloss	Conaway	Frost	
Balint	Connolly	Garamendi	
Barragan	Correa	Garcia (CA)	
Beatty	Costa	Garcia (IL)	
Bell	Courtney	Garcia (TX)	
Bera	Craig	Gillen	
Beyer	Crockett	Golden (ME)	
Bishop	Crow	Goldman (NY)	
Bonamici	Cuellar	Gomez	
Boyle (PA)	Dauids (KS)	Gonzalez, V.	
Brown	Davis (IL)	Goodlander	
Brownley	Davis (NC)	Gottheimer	
Budzinski	Dean (PA)	Gray	
Burchett	DeGette	Green, Al (TX)	
Bynum	DeLauro	Harder (CA)	
Carbajal	DelBene	Hayes	
Carson	Carson	Himes	
Carter (LA)	Carter (LA)	Horsford	
Casar	Casar	Houlihan	
Case	Case	Hoyer	
Casten	Casten	Hoyle (OR)	
Castor (FL)	Castor (FL)	Huffman	
Castro (TX)	Castro (TX)	Ivey	
Cherfilus-	Cherfilus-	Jackson (IL)	
McCormick	McCormick	Jacobs	
	Chu	Jayapal	
	Cisneros	Figures	
	Clark (MA)	Fletcher	Johnson (GA)

Johnson (TX) Moore (WI)
Kamlager-Dove Morelle
Kaptur Morrison
Keating Moskowitz
Kelly (IL) Moulton
Kennedy (NY) Mrvan
Khanna Mullin
Kiley (CA) Nadler
Krishnamoorthi Neal
LaLota Neguse
Landsman Norcross
Larsen (WA) Ocasio-Cortez
Larson (CT) Olszewski
Latimer Omar
Lawler Pallone
Lee (NV) Panetta
Lee (PA) Pappas
Leger Fernandez Pelosi
Levin Perez
Liccardo Peters
Lioff Pettersen
Lofgren Pingree
Luna Pocan
Lynch Pou
Mackenzie Pressley
Magaziner Quigley
Mannion Ramirez
Matsui Randall
McBath Raskin
McBride Riley (NY)
McClain Delaney Rivas
McClellan Ross
McCollum Ruiz
McDonald Rivet Ryan
McGarvey Salinas
McGovern Sanchez
McIver Scanlon
Meeks Schakowsky
Menendez Schneider
Meng Scholten
Mfume Schrier
Miller (OH) Scott (VA)
Min Scott, David

Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Simon
Smith (WA)
Sorensen
Soto
Stansbury
Stanton
Steube
Stevens
Strickland
Subramanyam
Suozi
Swalwell
Swalwell
Sykes
Takano
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Tran
Underwood
Van Drew
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Velázquez
Vindman
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Whitesides
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)

Adams
Aderholt
Aguiar
Alford
Allen
Amo
Amodei (NV)
Ansari
Arrington
Auchincloss
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Balint
Barragán
Barrett
Baumgartner
Bean (FL)
Beatty
Begich
Bell
Bentz
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bice
Biggs (AZ)
Biggs (SC)
Bilirakis
Bishop
Boebert
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle (CA)
Brecheen
Bresnahan
Brown
Brownley
Buchanan
Budzinski
Burchett
Burlison
Bynum
Calvert
Cammack
Carbajal
Carey
Carson
Carter (GA)
Carter (LA)
Carter (TX)
Casar
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cherfilus-
McCormick
Chu
Ciscomani
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Cline
Cloud
Clyburn
Clyde
Cohen
Cole
Collins
Comer
Conaway
Connolly
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crane
Crank
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crockett
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davidson
Davis (IL)
Davis (NC)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier

[Roll No. 88]
YEAS—423
DesJarlais
Dexter
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donalds
Downing
Dunn (FL)
Edwards
Elfreth
Emmer
Escobar
Españillat
Kean
Estes
Evans (CO)
Evans (PA)
Ezell
Fallon
Fedorchak
Feenstra
Fields
Figures
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flood
Fong
Foster
Foushee
Foxy
Frankel, Lois
Franklin, Scott
Friedman
Frost
Fry
Fulcher
Garamendi
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gill (TX)
Gillen
Gimenez
Golden (ME)
Goldman (NY)
Goldman (TX)
Gomez
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez, V.
Gooden
Goodlander
Gosar
Gottheimer
Graves
Gray
Green (TN)
Green, Al (TX)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hageman
Hamadeh (AZ)
Harder (CA)
Haridopolos
Harrigan
Harris (MD)
Harris (NC)
Harshbarger
Hayes
Hern (OK)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Himes
Hinson
Horsford
Houchin
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hunt
Hurd (CO)
Issa
Ivey
Jack
Jackson (IL)
Jackson (TX)
Jacobs

James
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Kean
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy (NY)
Kennedy (UT)
Khanna
Kiggans (VA)
Kiley (CA)
Kim
Knott
Krishnamoorthi
Kustoff
LaHood
LaLota
LaMalfa
Landsman
Langworthy
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latimer
Latta
Lawler
Lee (FL)
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Letlow
Levin
Liccardo
Lieu
Lofgren
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luna
Luttrell
Lynch
Mace
Mackenzie
Magaziner
Malliotakis
Maloy
Mann
Mannion
Graves
Mast
Matsui
McBath
McBride
McCaul
McClain
Guest
McClain Delaney
McClellan
McClintock
McCollum
McCormick
McDonald Rivet
McDowell
McGarvey
McGovern
McGuire
McIver
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Messmer
Meuser
Mfume
Miller (OH)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Mills
Min
Moolenaar
Moore (AL)
Moore (NC)
Moore (UT)
Moore (WI)
Moore (WV)
Moran
Morelle
Morrison
Moskowitz

Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Murphy
Nadler
Neal
Neguse
Nehls
Newhouse
Norcross
Norman
Nunn (IA)
Obernolte
Ocasio-Cortez
Ogles
Olszewski
Omar
Onder
Owens
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Pelosi
Perez
Perry
Peters
Pfluger
Pingree
Pocan
Pou
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Randall
Raskin
Reschenthaler
Riley (NY)
Rivas
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Ross
Rouzer
Roy
Ruiz

Rulli
Rutherford
Ryan
Salazar
Salinas
Sánchez
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schmidt
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Self
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Shreve
Simon
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Sorensen
Soto
Spartz
Stansbury
Stanton
Staubert
Stell
Steube
Stevens
Strickland
Strong
Stutzman
Subramanyam
Suozi
Swalwell
Sykes
Takano

Taylor
Tenney
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Tran
Turner (OH)
Underwood
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Van Orden
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Velázquez
Vindman
Wagner
Walberg
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Westernman
Whitesides
Wied
Williams (GA)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NOT VOTING—3

Barr Fitzpatrick Stefanik

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1413

So the resolution was not agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded. Stated against: Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted NO on Roll Call No. 87.

DISASTER RELATED EXTENSION OF DEADLINES ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1491) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make the postponement of certain deadlines by reason of disasters applicable to the limitation on credit or refund, and to take postponements into account for purposes of sending collection notices, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 423, nays 0, not voting 8, as follows:

NOT VOTING—8

Barr De La Cruz Ellzey Miller (IL) Pettersen Scott (VA) Stefanik Weber (TX)

□ 1431

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTING A MEMBER TO A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Republican Conference, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 283

Resolved, That the following named Member be, and is hereby, elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS: Mr. McCormick (to rank immediately after Mr. Self).

The resolution was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING LIEUTENANT MALCOLM A. CHAMPAGNE

(Mr. CARTER of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the