

Colonel Puckett was the last living Medal of Honor recipient from the Korean war, and he was from my hometown of Tifton, Georgia.

Colonel Puckett was a warrior's warrior and one of the finest men I have ever met. He served as an Army Ranger in the Korean war where he, alongside his soldiers, fought off five assaults by enemy forces even while outnumbered by 10-1. His heroic actions earned him the Medal of Honor.

During his career, he received two Silver Stars, two Bronze Stars, five Purple Hearts, and the two highest awards for military valor: the Distinguished Service Cross and the Congressional Medal of Honor.

On April 29, 2024, Colonel Puckett laid in honor here in our Nation's Capitol Building.

Mr. Speaker, Colonel Puckett was a blessing to our country. It was an honor to know him. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the minute I had to honor Colonel Ralph Puckett.

AMERICAN-JEWISH SERVICEMEMBERS TO BE BURIED UNDER THE STAR OF DAVID

(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, every American who puts on the uniform deserves to be remembered with dignity and respect.

I was proud to introduce the bipartisan Fallen Servicemembers Religious Heritage Restoration Act to help ensure that hundreds of fallen American-Jewish servicemembers are buried under military grave markers that represent their true religion and heritage.

An estimated 600 American-Jewish servicemembers remain improperly buried under the Latin Cross, not the Star of David. Many brave servicemembers made the ultimate sacrifice while defending freedom in World War I and World War II, but due to clerical errors or concerns for their safety during service, their religious identities were not properly recorded.

This bill is a meaningful step to correct those errors and to ensure that these heroes are laid to rest with the honor and dignity that they deserve.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 294 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES 294

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. House Resolution 293 is hereby adopted.

SEC. 6. House Resolution 164 is laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 1 hour.

□ 1215

Ms. FOXX. 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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, last night, the Rules Committee met and produced a rule, House Resolution 294, providing for consideration of four measures: S.J. Res. 18, disapproving the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer 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 294 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 rank minority member of the Committee on Financial Services or their respective designees and provides each one motion to commit.

The rule further provides for consideration of H.R. 1526, the No Rogue Rulings Act of 2025, 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 American Voter Eligibility Act, 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 House Administration or their respective designees and provides for one motion to recommit.

Finally, the rule provides that H. Res. 293 is hereby adopted and provides that House Resolution 164 is laid on the table.

The rule before us today provides Congress with yet another opportunity to stand for consumer choice and business innovation in our Nation. It provides an opportunity to defend the integrity of our elections, and it provides for a historic opportunity to rein in rogue judges and return public policy decisions to their rightful branches of government.

H.R. 22, the Safeguard American Voter Eligibility Act, or SAVE Act, would amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to require proof of U.S. citizenship to register an individual to vote in elections for Federal office.

The only people who should vote in American elections are American citizens. There should be no debate or question about that. The SAVE Act adds additional layers of protection to elections right here in our own country. It is an opportunity worthy of bipartisan support.

H.R. 1526, the No Rogue Rulings Act of 2025, would limit the authority of district judges to provide sweeping injunctive relief on a nationwide or exceedingly broad scale.

As of late, we have certainly seen a slew of rulings by rogue judges that surpass their own constitutional authority. Americans are rightfully concerned about this very issue.

Let me be clear. This is judicial warfare in the flesh. Without question, exceeding constitutional mandates as a matter of judicial philosophy does nothing more than blight justice itself.

S.J. Res. 18, a Congressional Review Act resolution, would overturn a midnight rule issued by the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, CFPB, that undercuts the ability of lower-income Americans to access liquidity.

To put it very simply, this CFPB's rule hurts the very consumers that it purports to protect.

One of the likely outcomes of this rule being fully implemented would be low-income Americans being expelled from the financial system entirely due to lack of overdraft protection. It is time that we add this midnight rule to the burn pile.

S.J. Res. 28, another Congressional Review Act resolution, would overturn another CFPB rule that unjustly shackles private-sector companies that operate within the digital asset marketplace.

This rule is billed as a "consumer protection" mechanism, but what it really does is misclassifies an entire segment of digital products with the aim of regulating them straight into the ground. The CFPB overstepped its regulatory authority in its pursuit of subjugating the American economy in the name of consumer protection. This is another misguided rule that we must render null and void.

Mr. Speaker, before I reserve, I want to take a moment to recognize the good faith efforts of Speaker JOHNSON in helping maintain a strong family-centric posture here in the people's House.

Leading from the front and building consensus are not always easy endeavors. All of us understand this to be true. However, when done in the right ways and for the right reasons, like what the Speaker has done, we get positive resolutions.

It is obvious that we have a critical mass of Members on what I consider an existential question for this body and that the related discharge effort derailed our agenda for a short time. However, we are back at our post, and our objective right here and now is to move forward.

At the end of the day, our eyes must remain affixed to our very own North Star. Our North Star is governance, Mr. Speaker. Deviating from governing does not serve the American people, nor does it make good on the mandate they entrusted us with.

The compromise agreement of dead pairing that was formulated and led by the Speaker and others is grounded in existing precedents, practices, and, ultimately, common sense.

This is a viable pathway forward that meets two critical imperatives. It allows the clockwork and business of this body to remain unabated while extending due deference to our own majority's own governing principles.

It is not the prerogative of this Republican majority now, nor will it ever be, to use tools of the minority to secure legislative victories. Republicans are the ones manning the helm here, and we must act like it.

In addition, I will add that I firmly believe, as do many others, that Speaker JOHNSON's work in addressing the concerns raised last week and taking sizable steps to further intertwine rock-solid family values into the fabric of this House are very commendable.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I have to ask, Mr. Speaker: What the hell is the Republican majority doing?

I mean, last week, these guys canceled Congress and went home all because they don't want new moms or dads to be able to vote. So much for being the party of family values.

The gentlewoman just said that the Speaker is very much in support of family values, yet he has a problem with allowing new moms and dads to be able to vote by proxy. He seems to have no problem with Republican Members flying to the West Coast, filming comedy shows in Hollywood, and voting by proxy.

I mean, I don't get it. That is what family values mean to my Republican friends?

It took the Speaker a week—it took the Speaker a whole week—to buy off a few votes by offering a pretend deal. Now, Republicans are ready to move forward on the important legislative business of—wait for it—passing the same bills they rejected last week, not that these bills are any better the second time around.

These bills include a bill that will make it harder for women to vote, a bill to let the Trump administration break the law, and two resolutions that stick it to consumers.

Honest to God, Mr. Speaker, who asked for these? Which Trump donor wrote these measures?

Meanwhile, what aren't we talking about on the floor right now? We aren't talking about the tariffs, not a peep about the tariffs, not a peep about the chaos in the markets, not a peep about the uncertainty this is causing, not a peep about how this is going to screw over middle America.

Never in my life have I seen anything like this.

The President promised lower prices and a booming economy, and we are going to get higher prices and a recession. This is nuts.

Trump isn't using tariffs strategically. He is launching an economic nuclear war, and we are all in the blast zone. This is a disaster.

Even if you agree with these tariffs, which is nuts, put that aside. Even if you are a fan, can just one Republican admit that it is insane that one guy is making this call alone?

Our Founders fought a revolution to stop one person from having this much power, and so-called conservatives are rewriting the rules to dodge a vote in Congress. This is crazy.

They are totally fine giving Trump unlimited power to do whatever the hell he wants, and they won't even let us vote. They won't even let us vote.

A few minutes ago, I sought recognition for a motion allowed under the law to bring a joint resolution to the floor to end just one of Trump's tariffs, and that request was denied because Republicans have rigged the rules. Let me repeat that. Republicans have rigged the rules, and I will talk more about that during this debate.

This is all because Republicans know what is coming, and they are scared. They know people are going to lose

their jobs. They know paychecks are going to shrivel. They know prices will go up, retirement plans will go down, and businesses are going to stop investing.

They don't want to have to go home and explain it. They don't want to have to put their names on that. They are rigging the rules so we don't have a vote.

Guess what. They can run from accountability, but they can't hide from the consequences.

You guys own this. You own the tariffs. You own the fallout.

There is no plan here, no strategy, just economic self-sabotage. Regular Americans are going to pay the price for these tariffs. This is a disaster for our country, and you guys are too chicken to even vote "yes" or "no" on whether you support the tariffs.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. Roy).

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for yielding.

My friend was talking about rigging the rules. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle are all too happy to have district judges rig the rules to stop the President of the United States from being able to defend our country.

Just last week, within close proximity to my house in Dripping Springs, Texas, 47 individuals who are affiliated with the gang Tren de Aragua were found by ICE. Right down the road in suburban Austin, Texas, 47 people, including 9 children, were found in what was a stash house, moving narcotics through it.

This is the same gang that killed Jocelyn Nungaray last summer. This is the same gang that was torturing and driving fear into the hearts of the people in Aurora, Colorado, in the apartment complexes that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle refuse to acknowledge. These are all the same people who are being allowed to vote, the same people that we were elected in November to remove from the country.

The President of the United States as Commander in Chief in defending the United States and as the Chief Executive is carrying out the laws to remove dangerous individuals from the United States of America. Then, an activist district judge in the District of Columbia decided that, in his view, he had to step in. He had to step in to try to assert his jurisdiction where it did not belong to try to stop the President of the United States from removing dangerous gang members who are killing Americans.

□ 1230

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the United States Supreme Court said: Stop. You don't get to do that, Mr. District Judge in D.C. If you are going to do this, you have to do this in Texas.

Mr. Speaker, that was the whole point.

Just today, we had another ruling out of the Supreme Court slapping down yet another activist judge.

What are we doing, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGOVERN) asks. What are we doing as Republicans? We are putting forward language today that would stop rogue district judges from carrying out nationwide injunctions and temporary restraining orders and who are trying to effectively legislate from the bench.

Mr. Speaker, we are not alone in that position. The Biden administration's solicitor general in 2024 told the Supreme Court: "A court of equity may grant relief only to the parties before it."

In 2022, that same solicitor general asked the Supreme Court to address nationwide injunctions.

In 2022, Justice Elena Kagan spoke out against the ability of a single judge to stop implementation of a policy across the country.

Lo and behold, we are advancing bipartisan work to address a bipartisan problem that Democrats have very clearly identified. The only difference now is that Donald Trump is in the White House instead of Joe Biden.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for yielding additional time.

Mr. Speaker, again, Republicans have brought forward a rule containing a bill that addresses a problem that Democrats have identified as a problem, to say that the parties before the court are the only ones to whom it should apply and allows for a mechanism to achieve nationwide injunctions through a three-judge panel.

Mr. Speaker, we are also bringing to the floor a bill that will say that only American citizens should vote in American elections. The controversy—oh, my gosh—the bloodletting, that we might say in the United States House of Representatives that only American citizens should be able to vote in American elections. Yet, that is what we are doing.

Republicans are responding to an American people who are tired of the previous administration that was allowing illegals to come into our country, kill our citizens, vote in our elections, and undermine our country. We are addressing their concerns, and our colleagues on the other side of the aisle don't want to address it.

Mr. Speaker, I stand in support of the rule, and I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for yielding me time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY) will be happy to learn that it already is the law that only American citizens can vote in Federal elections. I am happy to send

him the law so that he can understand that.

Our problem with the SAVE Act is that it is an attempt to make it more difficult for women who are U.S. citizens to be able to vote.

Talking about rigging the rules, again, there are four closed rules in this rule. For those who are tuning in, that means that we can't offer any amendments, we can't change anything, and we just have to take it or leave it. That is called rigging the rules so that Democrats and Republicans can't participate in the process.

Then there is a fifth measure in here. The gentleman who was just screaming on the floor helped lead the effort to get the Speaker of the House basically to go against the will of the majority in this House who wanted very much to have an up or down vote on whether or not we could allow new parents to be able to vote by proxy, so that they could actually stay home with their new baby for a brief period of time and be able to represent their constituents at the same time.

What is in this rule is a fake compromise, they call it. It is a nothing burger. It doesn't change anything. It doesn't help anybody. Basically, we can't debate or vote up or down on that. It is deemed passed. Magically, it is deemed passed in this rule if this rule gets a majority vote.

Mr. Speaker, not to mention what I was saying at the very beginning that Republicans have basically shut off any attempts to bring legislation to the floor to deal with President Trump's tariffs, which, by the way, are going to result in enormous cost increases for consumers.

Mr. Speaker, this whole House is being mismanaged. This whole House is being run in a way that, quite frankly, would impress Vladimir Putin. Yet, then again, maybe that is who they want to impress.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. PETTERSEN), who led the effort, along with Ms. JACOBS of California, to grant new parents the ability to be able to be good parents, to be able to be with their newborns and still be able to represent their constituents.

Ms. PETTERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Massachusetts for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule that will kill our bipartisan effort to allow parents who have welcomed a new child to vote remotely.

I thank Representative LUNA for her unwavering commitment to giving moms and dads a voice in Congress. A large majority of the Members of the House support changing the way we do things here and making it more accessible to young families and more reflective of the American people.

Speaker JOHNSON pulled out all of the stops to prevent us from moving forward. We followed the rules and filed a discharge petition. We got the 218 signatures necessary to bring it to a vote

on the floor. Yet, he went to historic lengths to try to stifle our voices, including blocking our resolution today before we even had the opportunity to vote for it.

Even the President supports this and doesn't understand why it is so controversial, and neither does the rest of America.

Let's be clear that the changes agreed upon by the Speaker are not a win for us. They do not address the challenges that we have worked so hard to overcome. The Speaker turned his back on moms and dads in Congress and working families across the country.

Congress is stuck doing things the way that we did hundreds of years ago, and it is time that we move it into the 21st century.

For all of the people who have said that I should resign because I can't do my job, they are completely missing the point. I am absolutely capable of doing my job, but because I am a woman and because I chose to have a baby, I have been prevented from doing so.

Mr. Speaker, I thank all of the people who have come forward on both sides of the aisle in support of this effort, and I know that our fight is far from over. We are not going to back down. We stand with the people from across the country who have reached out, inspired to see somebody like them who is struggling to manage having a new baby, balancing work, and having a work environment that does not support their needs.

Once again, I thank Representative LUNA for being a champion, as well as Representatives JACOBS and LAWLER for all of their work on this. We won't stop until we finally get this done.

Before I am done, I acknowledge Sam, who has now made four flights across the country to change hearts and minds and also highlight the need for reform here in Congress.

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

Mr. Speaker, the solution we are going to vote on today to allow mothers and fathers to continue to represent their constituents and to be able to cast their votes is a great solution. It is one that existed in this Congress before. It is a tried and true method. It broadens the ability of people to vote when they cannot be here to vote. We have had situations where we have had people rolled in on gurneys to be able to vote.

Mr. Speaker, this is a much fairer way to do this in the way that we are doing it now.

I also remind my colleagues who are speaking against or saying we are not dealing with the tariffs issue is that former Speaker PELOSI, Senator SCHUMER, and other Democrats railed against Chinese tariffs years ago but did nothing about them. They even supported President Biden's preserving of the tariffs from the Chinese most recently, and they said nothing about it here.

President Trump is doing something about the tariffs. He is responding in ways that will strengthen the international economic position of the United States and protect American workers. He is showing leadership where the Democrats have shown none.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me correct the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX). We are not voting on any kind of compromise here. It is being deemed. Republicans have it tucked into the rule so that we don't have a separate vote on it. We are not going to have a separate debate on it. Yet, that is one of the tactics used so that we can't actually talk about it on the House floor.

Secondly, paired voting, if it was such a good idea, why did we get rid of it 25 years ago? Basically, it is a glorified way to highlight to people that Members are absent and not here voting. Ms. PETTERSEN's vote won't count if she is not here.

It is just a stupid, ridiculous way to try to deal with the issue at hand, which is that new moms and dads actually should be able to be good moms and dads, stay with their kids at home, and be able to still represent their constituents.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. PETTERSEN) for any additional comments.

Ms. PETTERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that my colleague, Representative LUNA, has done everything she can to try to find a path forward, and this is ultimately the only option that existed at the end.

Yet, this does not address the real barriers that people continue to face. This would be the last week that I could have been home, still working in my district, working as a Member of Congress and representing my constituents but making sure that I was not traveling across the country with my son.

Do my colleagues think that there would be one Republican here today who would stand on my behalf and vote "present" on the bills coming forward this week?

I don't think so. This is why this is not a workable solution. This is not going to address when people are unable to be here for medical reasons and for the well-being of their kid after giving birth. While I appreciate trying to find whatever common ground we can, this is not a deal. This does not solve our problem, and the work continues.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, Republicans should be ashamed of themselves.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we have nothing to be ashamed of. We are here solving problems for the American people every day. We are responding to what we were asked to do in the last election.

I just point out to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) that Republicans had a majority in the 118th Congress, the most recent Congress. We are now in the 119th Congress.

We deemed only two items that were passed in the Committee on Rules. In the 117th Congress, when the Democrats controlled the Congress, they deemed 38 different items as passed in the Committee on Rules.

There is an old saying, Mr. Speaker: "Those who live in glass houses shouldn't throw stones."

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

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

Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago, I laid out how Donald Trump's tariffs are causing chaos and hurting families. I will explain why we are unable to force a vote to block them here in the House, even though the International Emergency Economic Powers Act and the National Emergencies Act provide a process to terminate national emergencies through a privileged joint resolution.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the House Rules and Manual says here: "A privileged motion to discharge a committee from further consideration of a joint resolution terminating an emergency is available after the measure has been referred to committee for 15 calendar days."

A Member of this House, Ranking Member MEEKS, introduced H.J. Res. 72, terminating the national emergency imposing tariffs on Canada, 34 days ago.

Earlier, I offered a motion to discharge his joint resolution from committee and bring it to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, why wasn't it allowed?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman asking me?

Mr. MCGOVERN. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's inquiry is not relevant to the current proceedings.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, what I am just trying to figure out is whether it is in order in the House to move to discharge H.J. Res. 72 or H.J. Res. 73 from committee so that they can be considered on the floor.

I guess we are not going to get an answer.

Mr. Speaker, it wasn't allowed because Republicans changed how time itself works in the House to prevent a vote on tariffs that is allowed under the law.

Mr. Speaker, I will be clear here because the stakes are very high. We are

talking about whether this House has the authority under the current rules to stop the President of the United States from imposing disastrous, calamitous tariffs that are causing economic chaos, raising prices for regular Americans, and causing uncertainty for businesses.

A motion to discharge Ranking Member MEEKS' resolution is not allowed because Republicans literally changed the definition of what a day is to protect themselves from voting on tariffs.

□ 1245

Now, we should have been able to call it up after 15 days, but Republicans are pretending 34 days is less than 15 days. Republicans rigged the rules to protect Donald Trump, Mr. Speaker, and to protect themselves from voting on his tariffs.

H. Res. 211, which the Republican majority adopted in March, changed the operation of the calendar.

Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I have the resolution in front of me and it says that each day for the remainder of the first session of the 119th Congress shall not constitute a calendar day for purposes of section 202 of the National Emergencies Act with respect to a joint resolution terminating a national emergency declared by the President on February 1, 2025.

So that resolution changed the operation of the National Emergencies Act and the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, also known as the law, to make sure that Members of this House cannot force a vote on Trump's tariffs.

Is that right, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's inquiry is not relevant to the discussion.

Mr. MCGOVERN. In fact, that is right, Mr. Speaker. You may not want to opine on it, but the truth is, Republicans rigged the rules to prevent a vote on these tariffs, a vote that Members of this body would have been able to demand if we were following the law. I want to get to the bottom of why we can't vote on these tariffs.

Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the National Emergencies Act states that a joint resolution to terminate a national emergency passed by one House shall be referred to the appropriate committees of the other House at which point the 15-day clock would start if Republicans hadn't magically stopped time.

According to that provision in law, Senator Kaine of Virginia's resolution terminating the national emergency to impose tariffs on Canada which was

adopted by the Senate last week in a bipartisan vote, but according to that, that bill must be referred to committee.

Is that correct, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's inquiry is, again, not relevant to the proceedings before the House.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Well, it is not relevant to the discussion because Republicans won't let us discuss the tariffs, but that is certainly how I read "shall," Mr. Speaker. Senator Kaine's resolution to force a vote on Trump's tariffs has been sitting on Speaker Johnson's desk since last week.

Mr. Speaker, if a measure is held at the Speaker's desk, it is not subject to a discharge petition and we can't have an up-or-down vote on these tariffs. The Speaker of the House right now is singlehandedly preventing Members from forcing a vote on these tariffs, again, a right that is in the law.

Further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I just want to make sure I understand this. Why are Republicans rigging the rules to prevent a vote on Trump's tariffs?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not stating a proper parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, you might not want to answer and you might not like that I am pointing it out, but that is exactly what is happening here.

Republicans have rigged the rules by literally redefining the definition of a day to prevent us from voting on Trump's tariffs, and the Speaker of the House is locking the Senate resolution in his desk.

These are the types of procedural tricks that Republicans try to bury in the rules and hope that no one ever notices because they are too confusing or too in the weeds. Not only did we notice, Mr. Speaker, but we are going to make sure that the American people notice, too. One way or the other, the American people are going to render a verdict on what is happening here in this Chamber, and if it doesn't happen on this floor, you can be damn sure it is going to happen at the ballot box.

These tariffs are going to be a disaster and the fact that Republicans are too scared to stand up and vote for or against them just proves my point.

This is a disgrace. This is the people's House. We are supposed to debate serious issues on this floor, and the Republican leadership of this House is rigging the rules so we can't do that. That is absurd and that is a national disgrace.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we are not afraid to debate tariffs, but we have four bills to debate here today. That is the business that we need to be dealing with.

I will point out to my friends, again, people who live in glass houses should not throw stones.

The Democrats love to claim foul on Republicans shutting off national emergencies, but perhaps they should reconsider given their own record when it comes to tolling day counts.

They want to claim that Republicans are stopping time, but perhaps they forget just a few short years ago, in the Democrat-controlled 117th Congress, their own House rules package, H. Res. 8, conveniently stopped time for both legislative and calendar days regarding a myriad of processes.

Let me read, Mr. Speaker, from their rules:

"Each day during the period addressed by paragraph (1) shall not constitute a calendar day for purposes of section 7 of the War Powers Resolution, 50 U.S.C. 1546.

"Each day during the period addressed by paragraph (1) shall not constitute a legislative day for purposes of clause 7 of Rule XIII.

"Each day during the period addressed by paragraph (1) shall not constitute a calendar or legislative day for purposes of clause 7(c)(1) of Rule XII."

Now, what is this, the pot calling the kettle black? I am just not sure of that. I do think it is important, though, to remind our colleagues on the other side of the aisle that this happened. Mr. MCGOVERN wants the country to know what is going on here. We want the country to know what is going on here, too.

Let me say that this is a package that all four minority members of our committee voted in favor of, by the way. These manipulations were maintained for nearly 18 months in subsequent rules with continued support by the committee's minority counterparts.

Similarly, when it comes to the National Emergencies Act, in a rule they permanently blocked votes terminating the COVID national emergency, despite Mr. GOSAR introducing two separate disapproval resolutions.

Mr. Speaker, be careful what you accuse us of because we have the facts and the record on our side.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, what you just heard from the distinguished Chairwoman of the Rules Committee is basically that the Republicans are too afraid to debate and vote on tariffs. That is what we just heard. What is really interesting is that in this rule that they are bringing to the floor, they have a bill that will actually raise bank fees on consumers, believe it or not. They want to give banks the authority to charge more for overdrafts. That is in this bill.

They are too busy to talk about the fact that Donald Trump is raising the cost of living and the cost of everything for average people in this country, but they are not too busy to talk

about having banks raise bank fees on citizens of this country.

This is so messed up it is hard to believe. Right now, if you talk to anybody in your district, if you did townhalls, which I know Republicans don't want to do anymore—but if you did townhalls, people are really nervous about not only the stock market and the uncertainty there, but they are really nervous about rising prices.

People are trying to make ends meet and they are really concerned about what is happening. Yet, Republicans are just too busy to talk about the impact of these tariffs on their constituents here in the House of Representatives?

Let that sink in, Mr. Speaker. This is ludicrous.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that we defeat the previous question. If we do, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.J. Res. 91, a joint resolution to terminate the reckless tariffs that President Trump has put in place.

These tariffs are the largest middle-class tax increase in the last 50 years. Consumers are worried because their prices are skyrocketing and iPhone prices could go up as much as \$350. Every American with a retirement account is worried because they are seeing their savings evaporate. The S&P 500 registered its worst week since March 2020 when Donald Trump, by the way, was also President.

Farmers are worried because the tariffs might put them out of business. Some of them are already renting out their land since they know they likely won't be able to make anything in 2025.

The result of all this needless chaos: less money in consumers' pockets, less confidence in our country, and less certainty about our future. That is why we must bring up H.J. Res. 91 to put Republicans on record, to let Congress do our jobs, and to keep our constituents' hard-earned money in their pockets.

Mr. Speaker, I ask 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 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) to discuss our proposal.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for allowing me to speak. I thank the ranking member for all of his hard work because for sure what the President of the United States has done was lied to the American people and broke a promissory note.

That promissory note was that he told the American people on day one, inflation would go down. Prices would go down on day one, he said. Instead, what the President has done is, unleashed an economic chaos on the

American people. Recessions are normally caused by complex factors like oil price shocks, overleveraged financial markets, or global pandemics.

This new economic disaster isn't caused by war or by an act of nature. It is the result of one man who lied to the American people. His name is Donald J. Trump.

With no coherent plan, he is imposing the largest peacetime tax increase in American history. That is what tariffs are: taxes that will increase the cost of living, your food, the car you need to drive to work, your appliances, and your electronics. All of it will increase what the average family will spend by more than \$5,000 a year.

Trump has launched a trade war that has united our allies and our adversaries against us. I could go on and on about the absurd incompetence underpinning Trump's trade war: the pseudo emergency used as an authority, the nonsense methodology used to justify the tariff rates, or the ever-changing rationale about the reasons for starting this tariff tantrum.

The tariffs have already triggered a stock market plunge, wiping out trillions of dollars in value. That is the hard-saved money for your children's education, for your 401(k), and for your dreams of retirement. It is only going to get worse.

As prices go up, people will have less money to eat at their local restaurants, see a movie, enjoy a family vacation. That means lower demand, slower growth, job losses in every sector of our economy from Main Street shops to factory floors.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MEEKS. While Trump may have started this, if this Republican majority chooses to duck a vote on my resolution ending these tariffs, then they will own this, too. They will own the higher prices. They will own the jobs lost. They will own the retirement savings erased. They will own all of it.

Mr. Speaker, join us, sign on, and stop this tax of American people. This is what should be happening for us to continue to be the greatest Nation on the planet and make sure that things are affordable for the American people. Let's join together in defeating the previous question and put an end to this self-imposed economic wrecking ball.

□ 1300

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the Reading Clerk told us what we were here to do today. In my opening remarks, I read out what it is we are here to do today. We have a rule, and then we are going to have four bills to vote on. That is what we are here for.

Our Democratic colleagues are desperate. They do not want to talk about this rule and what it does or the underlying bills. They want us to try to look at shiny objects over here, Mr. Speaker, that have nothing to do with what we are here to do today.

What Republicans want to do is focus on what we are here to do today. We could talk about tariffs sometime, yes. We are happy to do that, but let's talk about what we have to do here.

The Democrats don't want to talk about these because they correct issues that the Biden administration did wrong, these midnight rules of the CFPB. They don't want to talk about the rogue judges who have been overruled by the Supreme Court. They don't want to talk about what is happening here and now. They want to try to distract the American people with other issues.

Mr. Speaker, let's deal with the issues at hand. Let's focus on those, do our job as Members of Congress, and get on with our business today.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, I talked about all these issues last week. I talked about how I was opposed to the bill that raises bank fees on regular people. I talked about how their bill to make it more difficult for women to vote was a bad idea. I talked about the importance of helping new parents be able to vote by proxy.

Forgive me if I am not following your made-up rules, but we already discussed all this stuff last week.

When is the time that we are going to actually talk about the tariffs and about the fact that Donald Trump is raising prices on average people in this country? When are we going to have time to do that?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. STANSBURY).

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Speaker, I want to start by saying welcome back to my friends across the aisle. It is really nice to have them back here in the people's House, especially after last week.

Their leadership shut down the United States House of Representatives rather than accommodate new moms voting remotely with a newborn child. Stellar work, my friends. You have simultaneously managed to shut down the House and enrage millions of moms across America.

The American people actually want a government that represents them, and that is why they are also outraged by the agenda that Republicans have in this rule and are putting on the House floor this week, including the SAVE Act, which would disenfranchise millions of Americans, including millions of married women. You refuse to take up an amendment that would protect them, so congratulations to my friends.

How about the No Rogue Rulings Act that is also being heard this week? It would undermine the courts.

There are a couple of bills to roll back consumer protections to keep banks from ripping them off.

Is that your agenda? That is it? You are going to rip off American consumers, undermine their voting rights, undermine the judiciary, and insult moms? Cool. Yes, this sounds like a great agenda.

Oh, I forgot, you are also going to tank the economy while Donald Trump is playing golf, and you are going to try to pass a budget that literally will cost the American people \$37 trillion over the next 30 years while gutting their Medicaid and their food and housing assistance.

Now, luckily, the American people are not falling for it, and millions of Americans are speaking out and marching in the streets. It is because of their actions that Elon Musk—thank you very much—is finally leaving the building.

Make no mistake, this agenda will continue, as we see here this week. That is why it is vital that the American people continue to speak up and speak out, keep marching, keep showing up, and keep telling these folks that we reject their agenda and its harmful impacts to the American people, and we will not allow it to continue.

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

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

I am going to take a little time to address the importance of the No Rogue Rulings Act and why the American people are demanding action against this unchecked abuse of nationwide injunctions.

The fact is activist liberal judges have been utilizing nationwide injunctions in an unprecedented fashion. There have been 17 identified cases in which Federal courts issued nationwide injunctions between January 20, 2025, and March 27, 2025, against the Trump administration.

Compare this to the 19 injunctions issued during the entire Obama Presidency, 8 years, Mr. Speaker. Fifty-five such injunctions were issued against the first Trump administration, 4 years, Mr. Speaker. If we look back to the Presidency of George W. Bush, only 12 nationwide injunctions were issued in 8 years. Some estimate that only 27 nationwide injunctions were issued in the 20th century. This exponential increase demands action.

Nationwide injunctions frequently extend far beyond the immediate parties in a lawsuit, affecting entire populations and jurisdictions not involved in the original dispute. These overreaching rulings create significant uncertainty about Federal policies, drain taxpayer resources, and embolden unelected judges to subvert the will of the American people by thwarting the democratically elected President and Congress.

Article III authorizes Congress to determine what types of cases inferior

courts have jurisdiction to review. In some past cases, Congress has exercised this power by stripping Federal courts of jurisdiction to hear certain classes of cases, but that drastic action is avoided in this legislation. Instead, it takes a very measured approach. The bill would curtail the scope of injunctive relief but still allow for nationwide injunction under the appropriate circumstances.

Injunctions would still be permitted. What won't be permitted is having an activist judge from a liberal enclave in the country impose a decision that goes far beyond the subject presented before him or her in the courtroom.

The American people shouldn't be robbed of exercising their policy preferences by judicial extremism, and it would apply evenly to future Democratic and Republican administrations alike.

The policies being put forth by the Trump administration are novel, creative, and bold. That is what the American people expected when they voted for President Trump. Just because a policy is untested or unprecedented doesn't mean it is illegal. Democrats may impugn President Trump all they want, but these fundamental constitutional concerns are best settled at the appellate level.

This legislation does nothing to affect the proper avenues for constitutional challenges. Congress has always reserved this power to bring order to the judicial branch. We simply want to impose some order on the chaotic episodes unfolding in our courts.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, gee, I wonder why this administration more than any other administration has so many injunctions against it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to explain why new moms cannot proxy vote. The issue is very simple, and the answer is even simpler to understand. It is because men don't have children.

If men had children, there would be proxy voting. After all, it was over 100 years that this facility was in place, and we did not have a facility for ladies, a ladies' room.

Men have taken for granted the needs of women, and if women would but only stand up across the board in this House, if all the women would, we could get this done, but there are some women who are still siding with men, who don't want women to have the right to vote when they are new moms.

I am saying "new parents" now, but I am talking about moms. I think every man has a good reason to want to do this because you ought to respect the person who carried you for 9 months, labored with you, and gave you the breath of life. It is time to make a change.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 2½ minutes remaining.

The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 6½ minutes remaining.

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

It is unbelievable, Mr. Speaker. The entire world is watching in astonishment as Donald Trump lights the American economy on fire.

Our voters deserve to know where their Members of Congress stand on these tariffs. I just tried to force a vote. I was shut down because the truth is they know this will be a disaster, and that is why they are blocking Democrats from demanding a vote.

Republicans don't want to lower costs anymore. They want to lower the standard of living, and that is exactly what these tariffs will do.

Now, let's be clear. Foreign countries don't pay the tariffs. We do. American businesses, American farmers, American families, that is who pays the tariffs, and unfortunately, the damage has been done.

Our trading partners are abandoning us. Our allies don't trust us. Our adversaries are laughing at us. The cherry on top is that Trump can't even explain the goal. He is slapping tariffs on everyone, including uninhabited islands but not on Russia, no tariffs on Russia. There are tariffs on Ukraine, but not on Russia. I am sure Putin is thrilled.

This is a gut punch to middle America. This is a tax on every single family in America. This is a disaster for our future. Congress needs to do its job. It is time for every Republican to put their name on this mess or finally stand up and stop it.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I have to respond about the fact that we are denying new mothers and prospective mothers the opportunity to vote with this legislation. That is just not true. It is going to need to be refuted over and over again.

What we have done is accommodate not only prospective and new mothers but we have also accommodated other Members who might need that accommodation. Let me be clear about that. That is absolutely true.

Mr. Speaker, House Republicans remain laser focused on governing and advancing legislation that addresses pertinent issues across the Nation. Our foot is placed firmly upon the gas pedal of solving problems the American people want us to solve.

The four pieces of legislation that will be considered under this rule are part of our governing efforts and are in alignment with the mandate that Americans gave us last November. Shielding consumer choice, protecting consumer choice, and combating foreign influence within higher education in America are issues that Americans care about. We have heard their concerns, and we are addressing them yet again this week.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on the previous question and “yes” on the rule.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 294 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 7. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 91) relating to a national emergency by the President on April 2, 2025. 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 Foreign Affairs or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 8. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.J. Res. 91.

Ms. FOXX. 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.

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 13 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 2 p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1414

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MORAN) at 2 o'clock and 14 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 294; and

Adoption of House Resolution 294, 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 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

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. 294) providing for consideration of 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”; providing for consideration of 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”; providing for consideration of 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; providing for consideration of 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; 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 213, nays 211, not voting 9, as follows:

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

NAYS—211

Adams	Casten	Davis (NC)
Aguilar	Castor (FL)	Dean (PA)
Amo	Castro (TX)	DeGette
Ansari	Cherfilus-	DeLauro
Auchincloss	McCormick	DelBene
Balint	Chu	Deluzio
Barragán	Cisneros	DeSaulnier
Beatty	Clark (MA)	Dexter
Bell	Clarke (NY)	Dingell
Bera	Cleaver	Doggett
Beyer	Clyburn	Elfreth
Bishop	Cohen	Escobar
Bonamici	Conaway	Espallat
Boyle (PA)	Connolly	Evans (PA)
Brown	Correa	Fields
Brownley	Costa	Figures
Budzinski	Courtney	Fletcher
Bynum	Craig	Foster
Carbajal	Crockett	Foushee
Carson	Crow	Frankel, Lois
Carter (LA)	Cuellar	Friedman
Casar	Davids (KS)	Frost
Case	Davis (IL)	Garamendi