the desk a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 300

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND WORKFORCE: Mr. Fine.

COMMITTE ON SMALL BUSINESS: Mr. Patronis.

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE: Mr. Patronis.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NO ROGUE RULINGS ACT OF 2025

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 294, I call up 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, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. MALLIOTAKIS). Pursuant to House Resolution 294, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1526

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''No Rogue Rulings Act of 2025'' as the ''NORRA of 2025''.

SEC. 2. LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY OF UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS TO PROVIDE INJUNCTIVE RELIEF.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 85 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 1370. Limitation on authority to provide injunctive relief

''(a) Except as provided in subsection (b), notwithstanding any other provision of law, no United States district court shall issue any order providing for injunctive relief, except in the case of such an order that is applicable only to limit the actions of a party to the case before such district court with respect to the party seeking injunctive relief from such district court and non-parties represented by such a party acting in a representative capacity pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

''(b) If a case is brought by two or more States located in different circuits challenging an action by the executive branch, that case shall be referred to a three-judge panel selected pursuant to section 2284, except that the selection of judges shall be random, and not by the chief judge of the circuit. The three-judge panel may issue an injunction that would otherwise be prohibited under subsection (a), and shall consider the interest of justice, the risk of irreparable harm to non-parties, and the preservation of the constitutional separation of powers in determining whether to issue such an order.

''(c) An appeal of an order granting or denying injunctive relief pursuant to subsection (b) may lie to the circuit embracing the district or to the Supreme Court, at the preference of the party.''.

(b) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections for such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following:

''1370. Limitation on authority to provide injunctive relief.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 294, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary, printed in the bill, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees.

The gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1526.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, in recent years it has become glaringly obvious that Federal judges are overstepping their constitutional bounds under Article III of the Constitution which applies that lower courts are created under statute by Congress. Pursuant to congressional action, district judges are limited to the plaintiff before them that has nexus in their district.

Madam Speaker, in short, that means that a district judge needs to be confined to their district and to people who are in their district. Case after case, over decades, has shown that when they fail to do so, the cases are thrown out.

More importantly, if they were to continue to do what is generally called nationwide injunctions, then, in fact, there would be no need for a 5–4 or 6–3 decision by the High Court. The High Court of nine must reach a majority in order to make something the law of the land, and yet a single district judge believes they can make the law of the land.

□ 1530

Since President Trump has returned to office, left-leaning activists have cooperated with ideological judges whom they have sought out to take their cases and weaponized nationwide injunctions to stall dozens of lawful executive actions and initiatives.

Proof of that occurred just yesterday when, by a majority of the U.S. Supreme Court, yet another judge's national ban was overturned.

These actions touch on many of the most critical issues facing our country, such as securing our borders, reforming insufficient and ineffective government bureaucracy, and strengthening our military.

Let me be absolutely clear. These sweeping injunctions represent judicial activism at its worst. Don't just take my word for it, Madam Speaker. As late as October of last year, the Solicitor General of the Biden administration urged the end of these practices, stating that, in fact, the Biden administration has to win every time, but the opposition only has to win one out of even one dozen cases. That is exactly the problem we are facing.

The Supreme Court regularly considers cases that are done in the ordinary course where one district judge, and perhaps a jury, rules one way and another rules another way, and the courts, through the appellate process, come up with a single law of the land. However, they do so looking at the arguments of both winning and losing, and they do so while the administration is not nationally and internationally banned.

National injunctions are being used to halt executive actions and executive orders not just for plaintiffs before the court but across the entire country, including individuals and entities that are not even parties to the litigation and, in many cases, may not favor the outcome and would not have been willing plaintiffs.

This undermines the system of government. It empowers individual, unelected judges to dictate national policy and to thwart the Constitution to take rights reserved to Congress and the President of the United States.

NORRA, the No Rogue Rulings Act, puts an end to this type of abuse. Under NORRA, we reaffirm the principles that district court orders can only bind parties before the court and not nonparties across the country. This reform will also discourage the growing trend to forum shop, Madam Speaker. If you can go to Hawaii because you can find a judge who will rule against an action taken here in the District of Columbia, then you will do so if you can get a nationwide injunction. If you can only enjoin individuals who may not even be affected by it, then there is no incentive to do so.

Madam Speaker, there are 677 current judge positions not including those on senior status. There are 677 individuals, each of whom can exceed their authority and stymie the legitimate actions of government. In some cases, these judges have even ordered the payment of amounts when the administration has determined that there is great risk of fraud.

During the last administration, they objected to this. They tried to stop it. Even in the last days before the election, the Biden administration was doing everything they could to accomplish what we are doing here today. In fact, there was even legislation in the last Congress authored by Democrats to do it.

This is not a partisan issue. It may be a timely issue for this President, but that does not make it partisan. To do the right thing at this time is critical.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the No Rogue Rulings Act and restore the constitutional balance and respect for separation of powers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1526.

I heard the majority was bringing legislation forward to clean up a major policy crisis taking place within the first 100 days of the Trump administration, and that sounded pretty good to me because we are drowning in crises. The problem is that this bill does not address any of the real major policy crises of the first 100 days that Trump has caused for America. They are wasting our time with this bill by misdiagnosing and mislabeling the judicial response to these crises as a crisis itself.

The whole country is reeling right now from the economic disaster Trump has plunged us into. He destroyed more than $10 trillion in American wealth in 1 single week, and then he went golfing and bragged to America about winning the tournament at his own golf course. Madam Speaker, that is like bragging about being endorsed by your own campaign manager.

With so much winning, the country can hardly stand how much winning Trump is doing for himself, Elon Musk, and his billionaire Cabinet. Perhaps he could have yelled fore on the fareway so tens of millions of Americans could have taken our retirement savings out of the stock market before he hit us in the head with a golf ball.

Trump's ruinous tariffs have crushed our relationships with democratic allies and loyal trade partners like Canada, Mexico, the U.K., Germany, and France while delicately carving out an exception for Trump's friends in the home office back in Russia.

When asked why Putin uniquely escapes the wrath of Trump's global trade war, we are told it is because Trump doesn't want to interfere with the negotiations taking place between Russia and Ukraine for a cease-fire, an explanation that might have somewhat more force if Trump had not made sure that the tariffs do apply to Ukraine as they do.

The basis for this most imbecilic and destructive trade war in the history of the world is the profound economic research and policy writings of one Ron Vara, a completely fictional economist conjured up by Trump adviser Peter Navarro, a real person whom Elon Musk just called a moron and dumb as a sack of bricks.

Navarro's last name, delightfully, is an anagram for Ron Vara. Madam Speaker, you can try this yourself at home. Navarro turns into Ron Vara. Navarro figured that out himself. That is perhaps the greatest achievement of the Trump administration so far. What an enchanting and clever basis upon which to crash the economy of the United States of America.

Despite the fact that Congress, not the President, has the power to regulate international commerce and legislate tariffs, our GOP colleagues don't even want to have one hearing on the breathtaking economic folly and wreckage of this fling into the abyss of trade war with the world, much less do they want to do anything to reverse this policy nightmare for tens of millions of businesspeople, farmers, workers, retirees, and consumers being throttled by this historic, self-inflicted wound.

No, today they want to talk about the real emergency, which is the power of the United States district courts to issue universal injunctions rather than just injunctions that apply to the specific parties in the case.

It seems like a rather boutique and esoteric issue to raise in the middle of an economic catastrophe that they just foisted upon America, but there is a method to the madness. You see, Madam Speaker, Federal judges have issued at least 68 court orders that block or pause the administration's lawlessness to prevent irreparable harm in the country from his unconstitutional actions. The judges deciding here were appointed by five different Presidents, both Democratic Presidents and Republican Presidents, in 11 different district courts across seven circuits. The judges have explained in painstaking detail what is unlawful about Trump's executive orders and actions.

Trump has offered no substantive critique of their legal reasoning, but he and Musk still want the judges impeached. They say they should be removed from office simply for striking down the President's illegal policies, which is odd given that Trump and his party demanded for 4 years that Federal judges strike down President Biden's policies like student loan forgiveness or immigration policies or EPA action on climate change.

They seem to embrace Marbury v. Madison and judicial review of Democratic Presidential actions but not of Republican actions. They say that is because Trump just won an election. He beat Kamala Harris by 2 million votes.

Guess what, Madam Speaker. Joe Biden beat Donald Trump by over 7 million votes, and that didn't stop them from suing to stop numerous Biden policies they thought were unlawful. Sometimes they won, and sometimes they lost. It is the same now. Nearly 160 cases have been brought against Trump and Musk's actions. Trump has won some, and he has lost some.

However, our colleagues protest that Trump is different because the courts have issued relief in at least 57 different cases, a record number of cases in American history, at record speed. That is true, but if it seems like an incredible number of cases to lose in less than 100 days, recall that Trump is engaged in a record number of illegal actions at a breathtaking velocity never seen before in U.S. history.

As of today, he has already issued 111 executive orders in less than 100 days. Biden issued 162 in all 4 years. Trump can issue as many as he wants, but he has got to make them constitutional because if they are not, they are going to get struck down.

When Trump denounces the judges as radical left judges and lunatics who have gone rogue like Judge Boasberg, he is just advertising his complete ignorance of the Federal bench.

Judge Boasberg is the chief judge of the U.S. District Court, first nominated to the bench by President George W. Bush, who was Justice Kavanaugh's roommate at Yale and a pillar of the conservative bar.

We have impeached only 15 judges in U.S. history, always for serious misconduct like taking bribes, embezzlement, corruption, and habitual drunkenness on the bench. It was never because of a doctrinal disagreement and never because of a judge's legal ruling. As Chief Justice Roberts said a few weeks ago, the proper response in our democracy to a judicial decision that you disagree with is to appeal the ruling, not impeach the judge.

Donald Trump has gotten some relief in some of his cases already. The system is working. We don't need to turn the whole world upside down to distract from the economic calamities they have brought upon us.

All this would be fun and games except the rhetorical assault by Trump and Musk and our colleagues against the judiciary has turned into something far more sinister in some quarters: death threats, bomb threats, and online intimidation and harassment of judges. These judges are currently targets of an onslaught of social media taunts and attacks that call for their exile to GTMO or label them a national security threat or traitors. Even worse, this campaign of vilification has spread to their families, including attacks on a Federal judge's daughter who had her photo and place of work posted on a social media site by Elon Musk to his 290 million followers. These threats followed an actual bomb threat targeting the sister of Supreme Court Justice Amy Coney Barrett. It is a dangerous situation.

Now our colleagues want to pass the No Rogue Rulings Act which would effectively ban Federal district courts from providing nationwide relief against unlawful actions by the administration. Litigants could request injunctive relief only with respect themselves.

So, for example, if the President establishes a church or bans newspapers or imposes martial law, then each citizen in America would have to bring his or her own case because the courts would not be able to rule to strike down unconstitutional actions generally. That is patently absurd, and we are going to be able to explain how this legislation is a massive distraction

from the issues that are really facing America.

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

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

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the CBO estimate for this bill.

H.R. 1526, NORRA OF 2025 AS REPORTED BY THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY ON MARCH 25, 2025

	By fiscal year, millions of dollars—		
	2025	2025–2030	2025–2035
Direct Spending (Outlays) ..	a	a	a
Revenues	a	a	a
Increase or Decrease (−) in the Deficit	a	a	a
Spending Subject to Appropriation (Outlays)	a	a	a

a. CBO has no basis to estimate the budgetary effects of enacting H.R. 1526.

Increases net direct spending in any of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2036? a

Increases on-budget deficits in any of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2036? a

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

Mandate Effects

Contains intergovernmental mandate? No

Contains private-sector mandate? No

H.R. 1526 would limit the ability of U.S. district courts to issue broad injunctive relief that applies to nonparties. (Nonparties are individuals or entities not directly involved in a legal case.) Under current law, parties often seek injunctive and other forms of relief in federal courts to challenge federal laws, executive actions, and regulations. Injunctions and certain other forms of relief issued by judges in those cases can sometimes apply to nonparties.

Under the bill, district courts could only issue injunctions that provide relief to parties participating in the case (and to nonparties that are represented by parties in the case, such as in a class action). In a case brought by two or more state governments located in different circuits, H.R. 1526 would allow for a three-judge panel to provide injunctive relief that would otherwise be prohibited by the bill.

H.R. 1526 would not block district courts from issuing other forms of relief that can affect nonparties. For example, a district court could still vacate an agency action, such as by setting aside a new regulation, which could have similar effects on nonparties as injunctive relief.

Because many federal actions, such as executive orders and regulations promulgated by agencies, affect direct spending, revenues, and spending subject to appropriation, CBO expects that enacting the bill could have significant budgetary effects, depending on the extent to which judges choose to rely instead on other types of relief like vacatur. CBO cannot predict what actions will be litigated or the decisions that judges will make. Accordingly, CBO has no basis for estimating the budgetary effects of H.R. 1526.

The CBO staff contact for this estimate is Jon Sperl. The estimate was reviewed by H. Samuel Papenfuss, Deputy Director of Budget Analysis.

PHILLIP L. SWAGEL,
Director, Congressional Budget Office.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HARRIS).

Mr. HARRIS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, all across the country, at record levels, activist judges are impeding President Trump's America First agenda with nationwide injunctions, depriving the American people of the changes they demanded in November.

To put how unprecedented this is into perspective, President Trump has faced more than twice as many nationwide injunctions as Presidents Bush, Obama, and Biden combined. In addition, more than 90 percent of these nationwide injunctions have been issued by Democrat appointed judges.

I am calling this what it is: weaponized political lawfare.

There are 677 district court judgeships nationwide, and as of now, if just one of these judges decides to block an executive action, they can singlehandedly halt the President's agenda.

I am sure our Founders did not envision this extreme constitutional overreach from the judicial branch. Fortunately, Congressman ISSA's No Rogue Rulings Act will correct this discrepancy by ensuring that district court judges cannot issue nationwide injunctions.

The American people demand sweeping change from us. From cutting waste, fraud, and abuse in our bloated Federal Government to deporting the millions of illegal alien invaders, we need to make progress.

Right now, a single district court judge can impede this progress on a whim, essentially holding the America First agenda hostage indefinitely. This must end.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in voting ''yes'' on the No Rogue Rulings Act to stop this judicial tyranny from harming the American people.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

□ 1545

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1526, a bill that would prohibit district courts from issuing nationwide injunctions.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle want you to believe that somehow these nationwide injunctions being issued by courts across the country against Donald Trump's illegal and unconstitutional actions are unfair. Well, here is the message. If you don't like the injunctions, don't do illegal, unconstitutional stuff. That is simple.

Nationwide injunctions play an essential role in protecting our democracy and holding the political branches accountable. Without them, thousands or millions of people could be harmed by these illegal or unconstitutional government policies.

Just look at Donald Trump's attempt to end birthright citizenship. In a lawsuit brought in my home State of Washington, a Reagan-appointed Federal judge—not a Democratic-appointed Federal judge, a Reagan-appointed Federal judge—ruled that the order was blatantly unconstitutional because the 14th Amendment plainly states that all persons born in the United States are U.S. citizens.

What is next, stripping citizenship from U.S. citizens? That is in the Trump extremist playbook, as well. So is apparently kidnapping and disappearing people, including those with legal status, without any due process, as well as getting rid of entire departments established by Congress and suppressing freedom of speech and dissent.

These are the hallmarks of an authoritarian who wants to hold all power, and the courts are doing what they are supposed to do and issuing nationwide injunctions against this kind of abuse of power.

Somehow, my colleagues never complained about nationwide injunctions when dozens were issued against former Presidents Obama and Biden, but now that it is against Donald Trump, they want to rig the rules to give the President free rein to do whatever he wants, regardless of whether it is illegal or unconstitutional.

Well, get this: We do not have kings in America.

Vote ''no'' on this bill.

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

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ONDER).

Mr. ONDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the No Rogue Rulings Act.

Historically, district court rulings only applied to the parties before the court, but over the past 15 years, district courts have increasingly asserted that their rulings apply nationwide, interfering with the legitimate Article II powers of the President of the United States.

We are experiencing a constitutional crisis, a judicial coup d'etat. In February alone, district judges issued more nationwide injunctions against President Trump than against Bush, Obama, and Biden during their entire administrations.

District judges from Democratic jurisdictions are preventing the President from fulfilling his duty to keep us safe.

Last night, the Supreme Court called out judge shopping and reversed an order issued by a Democrat-appointed D.C. judge that blocked the Trump administration from removing violent Venezuelan gang members from our country. The Supreme Court said that this case should never have been brought in D.C. but rather in Texas where the individuals can file individual petitions challenging their individual cases.

The Supreme Court can and should rein in these rogue courts. In the meantime, the No Rogue Rulings Act rebalances the separation of powers as the Founders intended.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this critical legislation.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD ''The Lost History of the 'Universal' Injunction,'' a law review article by Mila Sohoni refuting what was just stated by the gentleman. The universal injunction, the nationwide injunction, goes back at least to 1913 and has been used repeatedly over the last century.

[From the Harvard Law Review]

THE LOST HISTORY OF THE ''UNIVERSAL'' INJUNCTION

(Mila Sohoni)

The issuance of injunctions that reach beyond just the plaintiffs has recently become the subject of a mounting wave of censorious commentary, including by members of Congress, a Supreme Court Justice, the Solicitor General, the Attorney General, and the President. Critics of these ''universal'' injunctions have claimed that such injunctions are a recent invention and that they exceed the power conferred by Article III to decide ''Cases[ ] in . . . Equity.'' This Article rebuts the proposition that the universal injunction is a recent invention and that it violates Article III or the traditional limits of equity as practiced in the federal courts. As far back as 1913, the Supreme Court itself enjoined federal officers from enforcing a federal statute not just against the plaintiff, but against anyone, until the Court had decided the case. If the Supreme Court can issue a universal injunction against enforcement of a federal law, then—as an Article III matter—so can a lower federal court. Moreover, lower federal courts have been issuing injunctions that reach beyond the plaintiffs as to state laws in cases that date back more than a century, and the Supreme Court has repeatedly approved of these injunctions. If Article III allows such injunctions as to state laws, it a fortiori allows such injunctions as to federal laws. Mapping these and other pieces of the lost history of the universal injunction, this Article demonstrates that the Article III objection to the universal injunction should be retired and that the unfolding efforts to outright strip the federal courts of the tool of the universal injunction—whether by statutory fiat or by a judicial redefinition of Article III—should halt.

But I would speak to the consciences of honorable men, and ask, how they can venture . . . to recommend changes, which may cut deep into the quick of remedial justice . . . . Surely, they need not be told, how slow every good system of laws must be in consolidating; and how easily the rashness of an hour may destroy, what ages have scarcely cemented in a solid form.

—Joseph Story, Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court (1812–1845)

INTRODUCTION

The Trump Administration and the Obama Administration do not seem to have much in common. But they have had one shared foe: the ''universal'' injunction. Across both administrations, federal district courts have issued a slew of injunctions blocking the executive branch from enforcing federal laws, regulations, or policies ''not only against the plaintiff, but also against anyone,'' even in cases not certified as class actions.

The federal courts' power to issue such injunctions—which are variously called ''national,'' ''nationwide,'' ''universal,'' and even ''cosmic''—is now under fire. In Trump v. Hawaii, Justice Thomas concurred separately to urge the Court to take up the question of the legality of such injunctions, suggesting that they are a modern innovation and that they might fall outside the judicial power of Article III courts. In 2018, the House Judiciary Committee of the 115th Congress released a markup of the Injunctive Authority Clarification Act, which would curtail the authority of federal courts to issue such injunctions.

In December 2018, the Solicitor General's Office called for the Court to ''arrest'' this ''disturbing but accelerating trend,'' which it cast as a ''rapidly expanding threat to the respect that each coordinate Branch of our Nation's government owes the others.'' In guidelines to Department of Justice civil litigators, former Attorney General Jeff Sessions referred to such injunctions as ''abuses of judicial power,'' a ''threat[ ]'' to ''the rule of law,'' a ''danger to our constitutional order,'' and a ''kind of judicial activism [that] did not happen a single time in our first 175 years as a nation.'' Several states—including states that earlier sought and won such injunctions—now contend that ''universal injunctions contradict the rest of Anglo-American jurisprudence.'' The Trump White House, in its characteristically measured tones, has hinted that the practice is perhaps not beyond criticism. A growing vein of scholarship concerning such injunctions has also developed.

This Article demonstrates that the universal injunction is a tool with a more venerable lineage than heretofore recognized. Surveying cases involving both state and federal law and drawing on decisions by courts at all three levels of the federal judicial hierarchy, this Article shows that Article III courts have issued injunctions that extend beyond just the plaintiff for well over a century. Building on this lost history, this Article argues that the Article III objection to the universal injunction should be retired and that legislative efforts to outright strip the federal courts of the substantive power to grant such injunctions should halt.

Let us begin with the history. The universal injunction against federal law did not ''emerg[e] for the first time in the 1960s,'' as many critics of the universal injunction have claimed. The Court itself issued a universal injunction in 1913, in the months preceding its opinion in Lewis Publishing Co. v. Morgan, when it temporarily enjoined a federal statute from being enforced not just against the plaintiffs but also against ''other newspaper publishers.'' In the following decade, the Court issued two other preliminary injunctions that barred a federal law's enforcement beyond the plaintiffs within a single judicial district, and in one of those cases it specified that similarly broad final relief should issue. Moreover, at least as far back as 1916, three-judge federal courts issued injunctions against the enforcement of laws that reached beyond the plaintiffs in those suits. The laws thereby enjoined were state laws, not federal laws, but the injunctions possessed the characteristic that matters most to the Article III debate over the injunctive power: those injunctions gave sweeping protection to nonplaintiffs who would otherwise have been vulnerable to the law's enforcement. When the state defendants in those suits appealed directly to the Supreme Court—as procedural law at the time allowed them to do—the Court on several occasions affirmed the lower courts' injunctions, and sometimes did so in single-sentence, unanimous, per curiam decisions. In one important (though not unique) instance—Pierce v. Society of Sisters—the Court affirmed a universal injunction barring the enforcement of Oregon's compulsory public-schooling law in a landmark precedent that remains good law to this day.

Not long thereafter, the universal injunction was brought to bear upon federal agency action. In 1939, the D.C. Circuit issued a universal injunction against federal agency action in Lukens Steel Co. v. Perkins. That highly consequential decree altered the federal government's purchasing activities with respect to the iron and steel industries for a whole year in the run-up to America's entry into World War II. When the Supreme Court took up the case in Perkins v. Lukens Steel Co., the Court held that the plaintiffs lacked standing and were thus not entitled to seek any kind of relief, the steel companies' suit, the Court held, ''contains no semblance of these elements which go to make up a litigable controversy as our law knows the concept.'' Crucially, Perkins left intact the propriety of injunctions reaching beyond the plaintiffs as remedies in cases brought by plaintiffs with standing, indeed, Perkins is bookended by decisions in which the Court continued to approve that practice. In Hague v. CIO, less than a year before Perkins, the Court affirmed an injunction that protected those who acted in sympathy with the plaintiffs from enforcement of a city law; in West Virginia State Board of Education v. Barnette, shortly after Perkins, the Court affirmed an injunction that reached beyond both the plaintiffs' children and the alleged plaintiff class to shield ''any other children having religious scruples'' from a state law requiring students to salute the American flag.

This history has important implications for how we should understand Article III. Today, critics of the universal injunction contend that Article III courts should adhere—or, as they sometimes frame it, revert—to the rule that injunctions must be solely ''plaintiff-protective.'' They have urged the Advisory Committee on Federal Rules to create such a rule by amending the Federal Rules of Civil Procedures. They have pressed Congress to institute such a rule by statute—and indeed, the 115th Congress lately considered doing just that, holding hearings on whether it should forbid what the bill at issue styled as ''orders purporting to restrain enforcement against non-parties'' in cases not certified as Rule 23 class actions. Justice Thomas, as noted, has suggested that Article III may forbid injunctions that reach beyond the plaintiffs.

We must be clear about one thing: it would be a sharp departure from precedent and practice to treat Article III as requiring the equitable remedial powers of federal courts to be cabined in that manner. Article III confers a singular power upon all federal courts to decide ''Cases[ ] in . . . Equity.'' It does not allocate different types of equitable remedial power to courts at different levels of the federal judicial hierarchy, and it draws no line between state and federal government defendants. That singular judicial power must be uniformly interpreted, and its scope cannot sensibly be regarded as hinging on the surmounting of hurdles to class certification that were not created until 1966. If the Supreme Court can issue a universal injunction against enforcement of a federal law in a suit by a single plaintiff, then so can a federal district court as an Article III matter. If a federal district court issue a universal injunction against enforcement of a state law in a suit by a single plaintiff, a federal district court must also have the power to issue such an injunction against enforcement of a federal law as an Article III matter. There is only one ''judicial Power,'' and that power includes the power to issue injunctions that protect those who are not plaintiffs.

Finally, some critics of the universal injunction have invoked a strict form of originalism in support of their case against that remedy. But the logic of that argument would extend well beyond the universal injunction. At the time of the Founding,

English officers were kept to heel not with injunctions issued by the Chancellor in equity, but instead with common law damages suits or ''prerogative'' writs (mandamus, quo warranto, and so on) issued by the King's Bench—a common law court. And American federal courts did not issue ''Young-type'' injunctions against enforcement suits brought by state and federal officers until well after the Founding. A strictly originalist approach to the judicial power in equity would therefore jettison not just the universal injunction—it would equally undercut the propriety of an injunction that protected just a single plaintiff from enforcement of even an egregiously unconstitutional law by a government officer. Such a straitened conception of the equitable power of Article III courts cannot be squared with either a century-plus of practice or with ''the implicit policies embodied in Article III'' itself. Nor, fortunately, is that result demanded by Grupo Mexicana de Desarrollo v. Alliance Bond Fund, Inc., for that decision rested not only on the meaning of equity in England in 1789, but also on how American federal courts treated that concept in decisions extending through the twentieth century. Measured by that yardstick, the universal injunction against federal law is constitutionally legitimate.

At bottom, the current debate over the universal injunction is as much a debate over the proper role of the federal courts as it is a debate over the arcana of equitable remedies. May courts decide disputes only for the parties before them, or may they declare the law for nonparties, too? This Article's contribution to that evergreen debate is to show how, in the period from 1890 to 1943, the law-declaration model animated and guided the actions of federal courts as they issued decrees on myriad questions of public law. Expanding the frame of our inquiry even by this much reveals that the injunction reaching beyond the plaintiffs—and the law-declaration model of the judicial power that this remedy implies—is not some late-blooming efflorescence of post-Warren Court judicial hubris. Rather, it is a tool that developed in tandem with, and in support of, the regime of routinized judicial review of state and federal official action that we continue to live under today. Our government is not a monarchy, and our federal judges are not Westminster chancellors; in no small part, the one has followed from the other.

The Article proceeds in six Parts. Part I maps how the current discourse concerning universal injunctions has gerrymandered the analysis of judicial power and has thereby cast undue doubt on the propriety of this remedy. Part II explores how the Supreme Court in the 1890s endorsed an expansive view of the powers of federal courts to control the rights of nonparties through injunctive decrees. Part III describes injunctions against enforcement of federal statutes issued by the Court itself in the 1910s and 1920s and examines their implications for the Article III analysis. Part IV describes injunctions against enforcement of state law issued by lower federal courts from the 1910s through the 1930s and then similarly outlines their implications for the Article III analysis. Part V turns to federal agency action, focusing specifically on Perkins and two cases involving state and local laws that are important for understanding Perkins; this Part spans the 1939–1943 period.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, the link to the entire document can be found here: https://harvardlawreview.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/920-1009___Online.pdf.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property, Artificial Intelligence, and the Internet.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the judicial branch ensures that people, corporations, and even other branches of government follow the law, and if a President does something illegal, which this President is famous for, the only way for the courts to prevent thousands of people from being harmed is to order a nationwide injunction that stops him from doing that illegal thing.

It is essential to our democracy that the courts can serve as a check on a President who is trampling people's rights.

While proponents of the bill say that each aggrieved person should bring their own case, that just does not make sense. There is no way that each of the thousands of people harmed could pay for their own lawyer, get into a courtroom, and try their own case.

Aside from the difficulty and cost to everyone, our courts could never handle that volume of cases. With dockets already bursting at the seams, justice would be delayed. It would be so delayed that it would be denied. It would be inefficient, cost prohibitive, and unfair.

That is what Republicans want because Federal courts keep ruling against Trump's unlawful and unconstitutional executive actions. Therefore, they are trying to hamstring the courts so that Trump can't be stopped.

We need our courts to continue to serve as a bulwark of democracy against the Trump administration's flood of illegal actions. That is why I rise today in opposition to this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an April 2, 2025, letter addressed to Pam Bondi from 500 law firms and lawyers across the Nation.

APRIL 2, 2025.

Hon. PAMELA BONDI,
Attorney General of the United States Department of Justice, Washington, DC.

DEAR ATTORNEY GENERAL BONDI: We are members of the legal profession and entities that provide legal representation and work in law. We do not agree on all matters and, in fact, at times have been or are adverse to each other in court or other professional settings. Despite our differences, we all share a commitment to the United States Constitution, the rule of law, and the role of the legal system in protecting the rights of all people and ensuring all of us can have our day in court. This commitment to the Constitution and the rule of law requires that lawyers be able to operate with independence, without fear of retaliation for bringing lawsuits in good faith, and without attempts to deter recourse to the legal system.

We write to you, as the nation's highest ranking legal official, out of deep concern regarding a number of actions that the President of the United States and his administration have taken and a number of statements targeting lawyers and the legal profession.

The following are illustrative examples of the concerning actions and statements:

On February 25, 2025, the President issued a memo titled ''Suspension of Security Clearances and Evaluation of Government Contracts'' targeting Covington & Burling LLP.

On March 6, 2025, the President issued a memo titled ''Addressing Risks from Perkins Coie LLP.''

On March 11, 2025, the President issued a memo titled ''Ensuring the Enforcement of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65(c),'' aiming to make it harder for organizations, communities, and individuals to enforce their rights.

On March 14, 2025, at the Department of Justice, the President called his courtroom opponents ''scum,'' judges ''corrupt,'' and prosecutors ''deranged.''

On March 14, 2025, the President issued a memo titled ''Addressing Risks from Paul Weiss.''

On March 22, 2025, the President issued a memo titled ''Rescinding Security Clearances and Access to Classified Information from Specified Individuals.''

On March 22, 2025, the President sent a memo to Attorney General Pam Bondi titled ''Preventing Abuses of the Legal System and the Federal Court.''

It is your responsibility, as the lawyer ultimately entrusted with the representation of the United States in legal matters, to oppose attacks on the legal profession, on judges, and on the rule of law and to ensure that the Department of Justice uses its full power to protect the legal profession and equal justice under law for all people.

Attacking legal advocates based on the positions they take in good faith litigation or based on who their clients are or have been is inconsistent with our nation's values and with the Constitution's contemplation of the functioning of the judicial branch. Indeed before the founding of the United States, John Adams, an ardent supporter of American independence and someone who opposed King George III, famously represented the British crown's own soldiers involved in the Boston Massacre—driven by an unwavering commitment to fair process and equal justice.

During your confirmation hearings earlier this year before the United States Senate, you pledged to ensure that there was ''confidence and integrity'' in the United States Department of Justice and stated that you opposed the ''partisan weaponization'' of the Department. It is incumbent on you to use all of the tools available to you to preserve and protect the independence and integrity of the legal profession, including opposing the use of the federal government to attack lawyers, law firms, and legal organizations for engaging in good faith representation of their clients.

Respectfully yours,

ORGANIZATIONS AND FIRMS

Acacia Center for Justice; Access Justice Brooklyn; ACLU of Massachusetts; Advocates for Trans Equality; Aguilar Monett Law, P.L.L.C.; AH Law Firm, PLLC; Al Otro Lado; Ali & Lockwood, LLP; Alliance for Justice; Altshuler Berzon, LLP; Alyssa Rodriguez Center for Gender Justice; American Civil Liberties Union; American Constitution Society; American Gateways; American Immigration Council; American Immigration Lawyers Association; American Oversight; Americans United for Separation of Church and State; Amica Center for Immigrant; Rights; Amsale Aberra Law, PLLC.

Animal and Earth Advocates; Ann Fromholz, The Fromholz Firm, PLC; Ariel Law; Arseneault & Fassett, LLC; Asian Americans Advancing Justice-AAJC; Asian Law Caucus; Autistic Self Advocacy Network; Barbosa Group; Beckner Immigration Law, PLLC; Bendit Weinstock, P.A.; Bennett Law Firm; Bernard M. Resnick, Esq. P.C.; Blue Cedar Law, LLC; Bopp & Guecia; Bravo

Schrager, LLP; Brennan Center for Justice; Brown, Goldstein & Levy, LLP; Calderone McKay, LLC; Candy's Mobile Soup Kitchen; Caryn Groedel & Associates Co,. LPA.

Cascadia Cross Border Law Group; Center for Biological Diversity; Center for Civil Rights and Critical Justice; Center for Civil Rights and Equal Opportunity; Center for Elder Law & Justice; Center for Gender & Refugee Studies; Center for HIV Law and Policy; Center for Human Rights and Constitutional Law; Center for International Environmental Law; Center for Medicare Advocacy; Center for Public Representation; Center for Reproductive Rights; Chandler McNulty, LLP; Chiave Law, LLC; Children's Law Center; Christopher Pioch and Associates; Cipollone Legal Consults LLC; Citizens for Responsibility and Ethics in Washington; Clements Employment Law, PC; Collective Action Lab, LLC; Commisso Law, P.C.

Conklin Immigration Law, LLC; Constitutional Accountability Center; Council for Global Equality; Court Accountability Action; Courts Matter Illinois; Criss and Rousseau Law Firm, L.L.P.; Critical Legal Collective; Crossroads Highway Products, LLC; Dane Shulman Associates, LLC; Daniel Kramer, Kramer Trial Lawyers APC; Debski Law; Decision Point Strategy Group, LLC; Decisive Discovery; Del Camino Jesuit Border Ministries; Demand Justice; Democracy Forward Foundation; Derrick Law Group; Diehl & Weger, AAL, ALC; Dignidad; Disability Law United; Disability Rights Bar Association.

Disability Rights Education and Defense Fund; DK Global Consulting; DLGPA; Donahue, Goldberg & Herzog; Dryer & Peterson, P.C.; Earthjustice; Edward J. Ungvarsky, Ungvarsky Law, PLLC; Edwards, McLeod & Money, P.C.; Edzant Price LLP; Einstein & Habbeshaw P.C.; Electronic Frontier Foundation; Elias Law Group, LLP; Entre Hermanos; Environmental Integrity Project; Episcopal Churches of the Big Bend; Equal Justice Society; Equal Rights Advocates Equality California; Equality Legal Action Fund; Erie County Bar Association Volunteer Lawyers Project; Erin B. Shank, P.C.; Experience Justice.

Florida Immigration Law and Justice Center; Florida Justice Institute; Fred T. Korematsu Center for Law and Equality; Friedman & Associates P.C.; Friedman Gilbert + Gerhardstein; G. Allan Van Fleet, P.C.; GenDemocracy; Glad Law LLC; Gonzalez Law Offices, Inc.; Green Energy Law, LLC; Grimes Law Firm; Grossman Young & Hammond, LLC; Hartman Law Group; Hepworth Holzer, LLP; HLAS; Hopkins-Laster Law Office; Hull, PC; Human Rights First; Hykel Law, LLC; Immigrant, ARC; Immigrant Defenders Law Center (ImmDef).

Immigration Equality; Immigration Law & Justice New York; Impact Fund; Indivisible Tri-Valley (California/Bay Area); Innovation Law Lab; InReach (fka AsylumConnect); International Refugee Assistance Project; J. Pace Law, PLLC; Jahn Law Office LLC; James & Hoffman, P.C.; James E. Iñiguez; JLM Partners; Johnston George LLP; Journey's End Refugee Services; Julie King, King Business and Patent Law, PLLC; JustCause; Justice in Aging; Justice in Motion; Kakalec Law PLLC; Kaplan Law Firm, PLLC; Kat Bond Law; Kathy Perkins LLC; Keating Brown PLLC; King Business and Patent Law, PLLC; Klein LLC.

Krantz and Berman LLP; Lance Conklin, Conklin Immigration Law, LLC; Lane Law Associates; Langsley Mills Law LLC; LatinoJustice PRLDEF; Lauri Waldman Ross P.A.; Law Office Marcia Conrad; Law Office of Amanda L. Smith, PLLC; Law Office of Arnie Rodnick; Law Office of Andrea Marcus, APC; Law Office of David M. Goldman; Law Office of Denise Lanchantin Dwyer LLC; Law Office of James B. Cronon, LLC; Law Office of James F. Lentz; Law Office of Jeanett P. Henry; Law Office of John Oleske; Law Office of Judith Rosenberg; Law Office of Julie Low; Law Office of Kara Jennings, LLC; Law Office of Kathleen S. Lane; Law Office of Kenneth R. Ormes; Law Office of Kim McCormick, PLLC; Law Office of Leonard A. Englander, Esq., LLC; Law Office of Mary Ellen Sach; Law Office of Michele A. Santucci.

Law Office of Nancy Grim; Law Office of Patavee Vanadilok, P.C.; Law Office of Patricia M. Corrales; Law Office of Paul L. Spaulding, PC; Law Office of Paul O'Dwyer P.C.; Law Office of Peter W. Hill; Law Office of Sandra Gillies; Law Office of Suzanne Bryant; Law Office of Charles H. Montange; Law Offices of Dawson, Dawson and Dawson, PLLC; Law Offices of Diane J.N. Morin, Inc.; Law Office of Eric A. Greenwald; Law Office of John Kostyack, PLLC; Law Offices of Mark J. Yost, APC; Law Offices of Michael V. Kern, Chartered; Law Offices of Peter J. Crosby; Law Offices of Robert D. Richman; Law Offices of Robert P. Gaffney; Law Offices of Stuart Levine, LLC; LawQuant LLC; Lawyering Project Inc.; Lawyers Defending American Democracy; Lawyers for Good Government; Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights of the San Francisco Bay Area.

Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law; Legacy Estate Planning & Elder Law PLC; Legal Aid Bureau of Buffalo; Legal Aid Justice Center; Legal Key Partnership for Health and Justice; Leung Law PLLC; Long Beach Alliance for Clean Energy; Lyons & Salky Law, LLP; Lyons Legal Group; M. Ali Zakaria & Associates, PC; Margaret Mazanec Law Office, LLC; Margolis & Cross; Marshall & Saunders, P.S.; Martens+ Associates; MaryRose Ebos Law Professional Corporation; Mason LLP; McElfresh Law, Inc.; McGettrick Law, PLLC; McGill & Co., P.C.; McIfill Consulting LLC/La Maison Michelle Retreats; Mehri & Skalet, PLLC; Melnik Legal, PLLC.

MetroWest Legal Services; MHK Dispute Resolution Services, LC; Millennium Legal; Minority Business Enterprise Legal Defense and Education Fund (MBELDEF); MM Spencer Law Offices; Multiforum Advocacy Solutions; National Association of Consumer Advocates; National Capital Legal Services; National Center for Law and Economic Justice; National Consumer Law Center (on behalf of its low-income clients); National Consumers League; National Disabled Legal Professionals Association; National Employment Law Project; National Employment Lawyers Association/New York; National Health Law Program.

National Housing Law Project; National Immigrant Justice Center; National Immigration Law Center; National Immigration Project; National Lawyers Guild Los Angeles; National Legal Aid & Defender Association; National LGBTQ+ Bar Association; National Women's Law Center; Network for Public Health Law; New Counsel PLC; New York Lawyers for the Public Interest; Newman| McNulty LLC; Nguyen Lawyers, ALC; Nichols Law; North American Climate, Conservation, and Environment; Northeastern University School of Law; Oasis Legal Services; Oceana, Inc.; ORourke Law; Outten & Golden LLP; Owner-Attorney of Law Office.

Pathway for Immigrant Workers; Paul A. Nelson, PA; People For the American Way; Perrin Law Office; Peter Romer-Friedman Law PLLC; Planned Parenthood Federation of America; Prison Law Office; Professional Corporation; Progressive State Leaders Committee; Project On Government Oversight; Public Advocacy for Kids (PAK); Public Citizen; Public Counsel; Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility; Public Knowledge; Public Rights Project; Q, Esq. PLLC; Ramona Ortega, Rhia Ventures; Ratkowski Law PLLC; Ray Law International P.C.; Reid Levin, PLLC; Reilly Law, PLC; Relman Colfax PLLC; Represent.Us of New Jersey.

Ritz Clark & Ben-ASher LLP; Rivas Immigration Law PS; Robert F. Kennedy Human Rights; Roberto E. Quijano; Rocky Mountain Immigrant Advocacy Network; Roger Greenbaum Equity Law & Mediation; Romanette Legal PLLC; Rosen Bien Galvan & Grunfeld; Rosenblum Immigration Law, PLLC; Rourke & Rosenberg LLC; Rural Law Center of New York; Salazar Law & Mediations; Salvador Colon, PC; Sandven Consulting, LLC; Santulli Schudda Law Office, LLC; Sarah Ward Law PLLC; Schenck and Long; Shames & Litwin; Shames & Litwin; Sharma Law PLLC; Sharon Powell, Powell Law PLLC; Sharp Law Firm, P.A.; Sherry Jones, P.A.; Shreefer Law Firm, LLC; Silver State Equality; Silvix Resources.

Social Justice Legal Foundation; Society for the Rule of Law Institute; Solomon Law Firm, PLLC; South Carolina Appleseed Legal Justice Center; Southeastern Law LLC; Southend Indivisible, King County, WA; Souza Immigration Law PLLC; Standifer Law LLC; State Democracy Defenders Fund; Staton & Nolan, LLC; Steinhoff Law; Stellar 5 Legal, LLC; Steven M. Schneebaum, P.C.; Susan Brunner LLC; Susan M. Swan, Swan Employment Law; Swanson Law, PLLC; Systems Change Consulting; Tennessee Justice for Our Neighbors; Texas Civil Rights Project; Texas Immigration Law Council.

The Advocates for Human Rights; The Bricks Law Firm, P.C.; The Chandra Law Firm LLC; The Collaborative Law and Justice Center; The Coppola Firm; The Day Law Practice, LLC; The Disability Information Network; The Door Legal Services Center; The Law Office of Brett E Marston; The Law Office of Elliot P. Forhan; The Law Office of Leslie A. Butler, PLLC; The Law Office of Timothy J. Deffet; The Price Law Firm; The Public Interest Law Project; The Right to Immigration Institute; The Shattuck Law Office LLC; Third Act Lawyers; Towards Justice; Trager Law Firm, PLLC; Trine Law Firm LLC; Turner & Turner, Attorneys at Law; Tzedek DC.

Untiedt Dabdoub, PLLC; Urban Justice Center; Urofsky Legal Advisory Services, PLLC; VECINA; Vera Institute of Justice; Vermont Asylum Assistance Project; VIDAS; Virginia Poverty Law Center; VKV Law Group, LLC; Vogele Law PLLC; Volunteer Lawyers Project of CNY, Inc.; Walden Law, PLLC; Washington Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights and Urban Affairs; Weiner Law; Welch ADR; Western New York Law Center, Inc.; William E. Morris Institute for Justice; Women & Justice Issues; Women Lawyers On Guard Action Network, Inc.; Worksafe; Wynne & Wynne, Austin.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, a link to the entire document can be found here: https://democracyforward.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/04/Final-Letter-Regarding-Protecting-the-Legal-Profession___-4.2.25-Upd-1.pdf.

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

Both Democrats and some Republicans have assailed the clearly unlawful nature of this trade war instituted by President Trump based on tariffs against the entire world except for Vladimir Putin in Russia, and Congress has the power under Article I of the Constitution to regulate commerce internationally. We have the power over tariffs.

The President purportedly is asserting powers under a statute which applies to emergencies in extraordinary and unusual situations. Then he said this has been going on for decade after decade.

Well, then how could that be an emergency? How could that be extraordinary and unusual?

There will be a lawsuit on this, and what our colleagues are saying is that if there is a bipartisan lawsuit that goes to court which stops these tariffs that are crippling businesses and farmers and wiping out people's retirements across the country, and if they succeed in one district, say, in Minnesota or Wisconsin or New York, you have to go to every one of 94 different districts in the country to get the benefit of that. That is what they want to do.

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

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

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I did ask unanimous consent that all Members be able to place extraneous material in the RECORD. I guess they are taking me up on it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SCHMIDT).

Mr. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for bringing us this important piece of legislation.

I haven't been here very long in this body, but I have learned something, and it is amplified today. That is that this town has a remarkable ability to snatch disagreement out of the jaws of consensus. This is an issue that liberal thinkers and conservative thinkers have both said is a problem that we ought to address.

Justice Kagan has been quoted widely as having said that it just cannot be the case that a single district court judge can hold up Federal policy for the lengthy period of time nationwide that it takes for the ordinary appeals process to run.

On the other end, Justice Gorsuch has suggested that these nationwide injunctions bear a remarkable similarity to a step in the legislative, not judicial, process.

In our branch of government, we had Democrats in both bodies of the legislative branch who proposed legislation just a Congress ago saying this is a problem we ought to deal with. Their legislation looked a lot like part of this bill, three-judge panels. Now, we have Republicans saying the same thing.

We ought to agree this is just the right thing to do as a matter of public policy, not because of who is in the White House or who is the plaintiff bringing a particular lawsuit.

Look, district courts are supposed to resolve disputes between litigants. If we adopt this thing and make it law, there is no doubt any citizen who can walk into court today can still walk into court and get relief for anything they are entitled to relief for. What they can't do is get a district court judge to order that an entire Federal policy nationwide be disabled.

There is still a relief valve because we added an amendment in committee that allows States to go into court to seek that type of nationwide relief. Why? It is because States are unique. It is not the national association of people who lost last year's election. It is a State organized under our Constitution that has a unique role in our Federal system and an interest in nationwide relief.

We ought to adopt this bill and do what everybody agrees is the right thing.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, the Trump administration is the most lawless in American history. That is why so many of his policies are being blocked through nationwide injunctions.

Republicans see this as evidence of some liberal plot among the judiciary, but the judges who have ruled against him, some appointed by such noted liberals as George Bush and Ronald Reagan, are not part of some grand conspiracy to stop the Trump agenda. They are following the law and the facts wherever they lead them. In case after case, the law and the facts are squarely against Donald Trump and his administration.

Whether it be his efforts to rewrite the 14th Amendment to eliminate birthright citizenship or his scheme to deport immigrants without even the barest hint of due process, the courts have properly acted as a check on his power.

How do Republicans respond? They respond not by urging the administration to stay on the right side of the law and the Constitution. No, they simply want to make it harder for anyone to hold this lawless administration accountable.

This bill would prohibit district courts from issuing nationwide injunctions even when the policies they find unlawful or unconstitutional have nationwide effects. That would be as if Brown v. Board of Education applied only to Brown. To do so would mean that no one could ever effectively check any administration's power, and no administration could ever be held accountable. The President would be a real, not a would-be, dictator.

This bill is a dangerous threat to the rule of law. This bill is not intended to curtail rogue judges from issuing rogue rulings. It is intended to enable a rogue administration to continue to violate the law.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to oppose this legislation.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, perhaps you can just consider that every time the other side speaks, they will be speaking in violation of our rules about disparaging the President, and you need not say it each time, I trust.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, in order for the Supreme Court to issue a ruling that affects the entire Nation, at least five Justices of the Supreme Court must concur. Yet today, individual district court judges are asserting this authority by themselves. This is an outrageous abuse of public trust and judicial power, and it has opened a Pandora's box that threatens the fundamental constitutional order.

The Congress is elected to make law, and the President is elected to enforce it. The judiciary is appointed for the sole purpose of resolving cases and controversies brought to it by individual injured parties. Traditionally, that means an injured party seeks redress through his local district court. This simple process ensures decisions are limited to the unique circumstances of the individuals involved and are restricted to cases within that district, subject to appeal first to the circuit court and ultimately to the Supreme Court.

This ensures that multiple voices contribute to the development of a legal consensus before the matter reaches the Supreme Court. A single district judge seizing this authority for himself utterly short-circuits this process and does incalculable injury to our Constitution.

The fact that 92 percent of the nationwide injunctions blocking President Trump have been issued by district court judges appointed by Democrats, many with long histories of political activism, gravely undermines the public's confidence in the impartiality of the judiciary.

I am disappointed that the Supreme Court has not set its own house in order by restoring the judicial guardrails that protect us from judge shopping, from political activism masquerading as judicial deliberation, and from the usurpation of the constitutional powers conferred upon the elected President and Congress.

□ 1600

Four Justices have signaled their readiness to do so. Yet, without a fifth, Congress is left with no alternative but to act on its own authority. With this bill, it does.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, nationwide injunctions are something that my friends across the aisle not only endorsed but took liberal advantage of in the last administration.

Remember Judge Matt Kacsmaryk of the Northern District of Texas? They were lining up around the block to go forum shopping in his little district because he was the only judge to get cases against Biden there. Then Republicans praised the nationwide injunctions he issued.

The gentleman who just spoke signed a letter in praise of a nationwide injunction that was offered by Judge

Kacsmaryk. If the gentleman wants to change his position, fine, but please explain to us why the position has changed since the gentleman was praising nationwide injunctions in the last administration.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE).

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for his leadership, and I echo his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to listen to this debate and to hear the arguments peddled by my colleagues that are hypocritical at best and intellectually dishonest at worst.

Where were my colleagues when 14 Federal judges appointed by Republican Presidents issued injunctions against policies that the Biden administration was pursuing over the course of the last 4 years? Where were they? Nowhere to be found.

I don't remember my colleagues bringing this bill to the floor. Of course not. Spare me the feigned indignation.

Republicans talk of defending the Constitution when President Trump is running roughshod over provision after provision. The majority talks of judicial overreach as Republicans attack judges across the country.

Read the Constitution. Read the Federalist Papers. The majority should read about the importance that our Framers and Founders placed on judicial independence and reflect on what their conduct will do to the administration of justice in the United States of America and to the rule of law that has been sacrosanct for the better part of two-and-a-half centuries.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose I should, but I cannot believe that my colleagues would waste time on a dangerous bill like this instead of addressing the consequential challenges that our country faces.

Mr. Speaker, I urge every colleague of mine to vote ''no'' on this bill.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his astute observations there and say that Judge Kacsmaryk was reversed several times by higher courts.

We never came out and said, therefore, let's ban nationwide injunctions. We did say we should reform judge shopping and forum shopping. That is the real problem. Yet, it is not a problem if there is a nationwide crisis created by illegal action by an executive that a judge has the authority to counter that with an injunction and then it gets appealed up to the Supreme Court.

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

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN), the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, there are 677 Federal district judges, and they are just that, judges. They are not the President of the United States. They are not the person who put his name on the ballot and ran nationwide, got 77 million votes, won the electoral college, and is head of the executive branch. They are judges, district judges.

I said this in committee. The real question ultimately is who gets to decide: some district judge, or the guy who put his name on the ballot; some bureaucrat, or the guy who ran for the office and got elected by we the people?

That is the fundamental question. Guess what? We just got two decisions from the United States Supreme Court who seemed to reinforce that fundamental principle that the guy who runs and heads the executive branch makes the decision.

The Supreme Court said 2 days ago that they are going to put a hold on the time on this Judge Boasberg and this migrant issue that has been with us for the last 3 weeks.

Then, yesterday, this unelected district judge in California who thinks they get to decide how many probationary employees work in the executive branch, not the guy who heads the executive branch, the Supreme Court said ''no'' to that, those leftwing groups who were seeking standing in that case.

Both decisions are wins for the Constitution, wins for the rule of law, wins for the executive branch, and, maybe most importantly, wins for common sense.

I think I have been pointing this out since Judge Boasberg issued his order when he said: Turn the plane around. Bring back the bad guys. Bring back the illegal migrants in this terrorist organization. Turn the plane around. Bring them back. That makes no sense. It makes no sense, and the American people understand it.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. ISSA for this good piece of legislation that we passed out of the committee, I think, 4 weeks ago. I thank Representative SCHMIDT, who added the good amendment to it that I think makes a good bill even stronger.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, just to answer a couple of things raised by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN), my friend.

First of all, that is not what the Supreme Court said. The Supreme Court simply said that this was not a case that should be going through the Administrative Procedure Act under the Immigration and Nationality Act. It should be done through a habeas corpus in the district of confinement, in Texas.

Mr. Speaker, in fact, the Supreme Court affirmed that there must be due process for people who were illegally taken out of this country and sent to El Salvador.

Secondly, the gentleman gives us a false choice when he says: Who gets to decide? Is it the person who puts his name on the ballot and goes out and campaigns, or is it an unelected Federal district judge?

Decide what? If we are talking about deciding the constitutionality of a law, obviously it is the judge under Marbury v. Madison. I know that the distinguished gentleman from the Committee on the Judiciary knows that the fact that Donald Trump beat Kamala Harris by 2 million votes is neither here, nor there.

Joe Biden beat Donald Trump by 7 million votes, and they still went to court pretty much on a weekly basis to try to get Joe Biden's legislation and his programs struck down. The majority believed in judicial review then. We should understand that it is very convenient for Republicans to say, all of a sudden, that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle don't believe in judicial review just because they have the Presidency.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ROSS).

Ms. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, Article III of our Constitution vests judicial power of the United States in the Supreme Court and lower courts.

The Constitution says that this power extends to all cases arising under the Constitution or laws passed by Congress. This is a bedrock principle of American democracy, and it is not up for debate.

Yet, now that the courts are blocking his unconstitutional and unlawful actions, Donald Trump wants to claim the power for himself and his administration. Trump does not subscribe to the principle of judicial review, and he doesn't believe in the sanctity of the Constitution. He cares only about himself and getting his own way.

Mr. Speaker, Trump and his followers are threatening judges with impeachment and far worse. Bomb threats, harassing calls, and swatting all send the same terrifying message: We know where you and your family live, and you better get out of the President's way.

President Trump's attacks on the judiciary are clear violations of his oath of office to protect and defend the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, threats to judges and their families simply cannot be tolerated, and Members of this body have a profound responsibility to speak with one voice to condemn these reprehensible tactics. I implore my Republican colleagues to set politics aside and do the right thing.

For this reason, at the appropriate time, I will offer a motion to recommit this bill back to committee. If the House rules permitted, I would have offered the motion with important amendments to this bill.

My amendment would simply reaffirm the legislative branch's support for its coequal branch and condemn attacks on all members of the judiciary.

I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD the text of this amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in voting for the motion to recommit.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. BOEBERT).

Ms. BOEBERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the No Rogue Rulings Act, a bold and necessary step to rein in activist judges who have made it their sole mission to obstruct the agenda of President Donald J. Trump.

Let's be clear about what is at stake. In November 2024, the American people gave President Trump a mandate to secure our borders, shrink a bloated Federal bureaucracy, and put America first. He has acted swiftly, with over 100 executive orders in just 3 months, to deliver on those promises that he made to the American people.

Yet, what have we seen? Unelected judges have issued sweeping nationwide injunctions to stop him at every turn. There have been 53 lawsuits already halting deportations of dangerous criminal aliens, blocking cuts to wasteful spending, and tying the hands of a President doing his best to protect America.

This isn't justice. It is judicial tyranny. The No Rogue Rulings Act says that enough is enough. It is a simple, commonsense fix. No single district judge should have the power to grind the entire Nation to a halt with one rogue ruling.

Why should a single unelected judge override the votes of 80 million Americans? This is not how our Constitution was designed. The Founding Fathers gave Congress the power to check the courts, and it is time we began using it.

Take Judge James Boasberg's ruling last month halting deportations of Venezuelan gang members under the Alien Enemies Act. President Trump invoked a law from 1798 to protect our streets, and one judge decided that he knows better than the Commander in Chief.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to take our government back from the black-robed bureaucrats. I support this bill, and I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) for introducing it.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I note that what the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. BOEBERT) is referring to is what has now been affirmed as an inaccurate decision by the U.S. Supreme Court. My colleagues on the other side, in disparaging the President, keep using the word ''illegal.''

I ask that my Democratic Colleagues really reconsider. The minority may disagree with the executive actions of the President. From time to time, the court may disagree. Yet, in fact, not only are his actions not illegal, but they are well within the reach of what any President might well do in trying to defend the United States from enemies, foreign and domestic.

We can disagree about the meaning of a law that has been on the books for 225 years. We should not disparage the motives or the actions of the chief executive simply because we disagree.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court has already rejected at least two of the actions that Donald Trump has taken since he got in. One was firing the executive director of the Office of Special Counsel. He was reinstated.

The other was reinstating a $2.1 billion aid grant that was essentially impounded and diverted by the administration.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the very distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SUBRAMANYAM).

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. Mr. Speaker, let's take a step back and be clear on what is going on here.

This administration maybe didn't have the votes or will to get legislation through Congress, so it created these executive orders and broke the law in doing so. Some of these orders are unconstitutional, and that is why there have been so many injunctions to stop the lawbreaking.

These injunctions were celebrated by the other side when they stopped actions under the previous Democratic administrations. Yet, now that President Trump is in office, this bill exists to help the President do whatever he wants, even if it is unconstitutional.

I get asked a lot these days about what is going to happen when this President ignores the courts. Wouldn't we have a constitutional crisis on our hands?

Mr. Speaker, this bill makes it easier for the President's actions to go unchecked. By blocking nationwide injunctions, people will be powerless to quickly stop illegal and unconstitutional actions.

This bill is simply another loyalty bill for the President, up there with naming airports after him or putting his face on Mount Rushmore. Loyalty to the President should not supersede the rule of law or loyalty to uphold the Constitution. This bill doesn't just take power away from judges, but it takes power away from the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring down a little bit of the tone and remind everyone in this Chamber that the chief executive, since it was George Washington, has been charged by Congress to be the first to interpret the faithful execution of the Constitution and the amazing amount of laws that have been passed in our nearly 250 years.

□ 1615

During those decades, one after another, all the way back with Marbury v. Madison, there have been disagreements and the Court has interpreted, but those interpretations, including Brown v. Board of Education, historically became nationwide when the High Court by a majority ruled one direction or the other. That is the way our Founding Fathers intended it to be.

The ranking member of the full committee is a scholar and a teacher, a professor of this, and knows full well that we created under the Constitution a Supreme Court and then we gave to this branch, to Article I, to the Congress, the authority to create subordinated and specialized or limited courts. Those courts of any sort are under the Supreme Court because only the Supreme Court is to rule on the law of the land.

Now, my colleagues have noted the last administration and the fact that parties, including more than a dozen attorneys general, from time to time came and asked for and may or may not have been granted nationwide protection. This bill, as amended in committee, thoughtfully amended, in fact, takes into consideration that there may be times in which multiple States are represented before one judge. As long as that judge is the nexus of at least one, and in the case of the District of Columbia perhaps speaks for all, he or she should rule on behalf of all the plaintiffs represented in front of them.

Let it be clear: The work of the Supreme Court is not just to overturn one ruling by a judge. The Court most often in the 62 to 66 cases it takes per session, per year, rules primarily on when there is a difference between the ruling in one and the ruling in another. It rules very often because there needs to be a single voice for the law of the land.

There doesn't always have to be. The fact is, if a plaintiff comes and says they represent one of many unlawful aliens, criminals, or terrorists who have been deported under a law that has been on the books for more than 225 years, the judge has a right to rule if that defendant has a legitimate nexus in their court, has a right to rule as to that plaintiff or any others that come before him that have nexus, but to rule that the President must turn an airplane around with dangerous terrorists on it, why? Why would you do that?

The fact is, judges are shopped for. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle, rightfully so, said that venue shopping has become a problem. That is not limited to Republicans or Democrats. In fact, both sides do it.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, they do it in civil cases. They do it all over the place. Lawyers are very good at it, but as the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Courts, Intellectual Property, Artificial Intelligence, and

the Internet and with the ranking member of the full committee here today, it is our obligation to fine-tune the law so that, in fact, these kinds of injustices don't happen. We are here today to fine-tune the law to protect the Constitution and the intent of Congress for more than 225 years.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BELL).

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today not just as a Member of Congress but as the son of a police officer and as someone who spent nearly two decades working in the justice system as a public defender, defense attorney, judge, and as a prosecutor. I know what it means to uphold the law, and I know what it looks like when the rule of law is under attack.

This bill is not about judicial efficiency or fairness; it is about power, raw, political power. The people who once cheered nationwide injunctions when they served their agenda now want to eliminate them because judges had the audacity to hold this administration accountable.

It is a direct assault on judicial independence and many of my Republican colleagues know it, but too many won't say it out loud for fear of political retribution or a primary financed by Elon Musk. This is not conservative, it is not constitutional, and history will remember.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

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

Mr. Speaker, I will answer my good friend, the chairman of the subcommittee, about the remarks he just made.

He is correct that the President, of course, like Members of Congress, must also interpret and enforce the Constitution. In fact, that is the core part of the President's job, to take care that the laws are faithfully executed, says Article II, not distorted or rewritten, but to take care that the laws are faithfully executed. That doesn't negate the fact that under Marbury v. Madison, it is emphatically the province and the duty of the Judicial Department to say what the law is in the event of an actual case or controversy.

The gentleman invoked George Washington. There is a beautiful portrait of Washington, the Trumbull portrait, that we have in the rotunda and it is a picture of George Washington surrendering his commission as the general of the Continental Forces, which Napoleon said made him the greatest man ever, that he could have stayed on as a dictator forever, and he gave up his power. He could have been President forever, but he gave up his power.

When we compare that to Donald Trump who is saying he is going to run for an unconstitutional and, yes, an illegal third term, that would be an illegal third term for him to run again to try to take office, so that is why we have courts in order to cabin the potentially limitless ambitions of Presidents. That is why we don't have kings; we have Presidents here.

Secondly, there seems to be a myth on the other side that if a President campaigns on something, then it is constitutional and the courts can't strike it down. So if the President campaigns on running again for a third term, then it is okay. Where does it say that in the Constitution? That can't be right. We are all bound by the Constitution no matter what we say during the campaign. A person could run around saying, ''I am going to be king,'' or if President Trump said, ''I will be dictator on day one.'' No, you will not be dictator on day one under the Constitution of the United States.

Why did the judge tell the administration to turn the planes around? Because of the two most beautiful words in the English language, ''due process.'' Because what they can do to noncitizens, they can do to citizens. If they can sweep anybody off the street and say we are going to send you to a torturous prison in El Salvador without any kind of hearing at all, it can happen to citizens as well as noncitizens.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS of North Carolina). Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 7½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Maryland has 2½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, just yesterday the Court ruled against the district judge by a 5–4 ruling undoing this whole question of does the President have the right to deport aliens. Yes. They said that there was a possibility of bringing a case in Texas as to one or more of them. To be honest, we have said that for quite a while that, in fact, there was a procedure and that, in fact, the chief judge of the D.C. circuit assigned himself four cases and made a decision that a chief judge should know better than.

Now, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court said the right way to deal with a judge that makes a bad ruling is, in fact, appeal it. However, the right way to deal with judges who take cases, take another case, take a total of four cases so far, and seem to rule very predictably, even if inaccurately, against the Trump administration is, in fact, to rein in the excesses.

We try to do this in a measured way. I might note for the speaker that just today by a 7–2 overwhelming majority, the Court ruled, to no surprise to this Congressman, that the President has the right to dismiss probationary employees, even though an activist judge stayed that and said that he didn't have that right, that somehow everyone else can get rid of probationary employees, including the last administration that summarily dismissed immigration judges on the last days of the probationary period, and did so without seeing a nationwide injunction.

There were plenty of opportunities to disagree, but I hope that my colleagues, once again, as the speaker has so well stated, will stop claiming that these are illegal actions when we simply agree or disagree with the actions of the President and in many cases the Court finds the President is well within his rights in faithfully executing his obligations.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1¾ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GOLDMAN).

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this bill, which is simply an attempt by House Republicans to intimidate judges who issue rulings that they simply don't like.

My colleagues concede that it is the Supreme Court which determines what the law is. Well, in today's modern age, how do you get to the Supreme Court? You go first to the district court, then through the appeals court, and then up to the Supreme Court.

Now, there are many complaints that that takes too long. I agree, but we are citing rulings on the other side of the aisle of Supreme Court rulings on these very nationwide injunctions within a few weeks.

Even former Speaker Newt Gingrich, the Republican star witness at our committee hearing last week on this topic, conceded that nationwide injunctions are appropriate in some cases. That is why this bill is not about the substance. It is clear that the House Republicans have completely abdicated their own constitutional duty to be a check and balance on the President.

The only remaining check that is left in our separation of powers is the courts, but it is not enough for my colleagues to hand over all of their own authority to the President; they want to hand over the judiciary branch's authority, too.

A fundamental principle of our Constitution is that the courts decide what the law is, not Congress and not the President, even if he is elected, which I would note for our friends down at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue is true for every single President.

My colleagues complain about the high number of nationwide injunctions during the first 3 months of this Presidency. Rather than blame the judges for that, I have an idea: Stop breaking the law. This is a bad bill that gets us nowhere other than toward autocracy.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I suspect that the gentleman is prepared to close as am I, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, listening to the debate, it occurs to me that Bonnie and Clyde and Butch Cassidy and the Sundance Kid should have just denounced traditional activism and moved to change the Federal rules of civil procedure: Always better to blame the judge than to take responsibility for your own unlawful actions.

Mr. Speaker, I will close by quoting Thomas Jefferson who said during the time of the Alien and Sedition Acts: ''A little patience, and we shall see the reign of witches pass over, their spells dissolve, and the people, recovering their true sight, restore their government to its true principles.''

In the meantime, we are suffering the horrors and malignities of this period, but if the game runs against us sometimes as it will, we must have patience because it is a game where principles are at stake.

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

□ 1630

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, as I close, since the ranking member so aptly named a couple of famous quotes and famous movies, I might call attention to the line: What we have here is a failure to communicate.

The other side, just a few months ago, supported this legislation in a more radical form than, in fact, we bring today. Thanks to Congressman SCHMIDT and others on the committee, we have thoughtfully amended this to make it limited, for which the ranking member and others seem to claim that we were somehow being nefarious. No, we weren't.

In the last cycle under President Biden, yes, half a dozen or so attorneys general came and disagreed with the attempt to forgive $188 billion in student loans. There was a temporary injunction on behalf of those multiple States. Lo and behold, the High Court stated and ruled that, in fact, he didn't have the authority, saving us nearly $200 billion that was being given away by Joe Biden.

Not in any way deterred by that, President Biden bragged that he circumvented it and did give away billions more. That is still something being worked on by this body.

Presidents push the limits of their authority. President Biden certainly did. President Obama famously said he didn't have the authority to do things and then did them later and dared the Court to stop him.

I think we have to come here and realize if we do our job, we are drawing the appropriate balance on one of the two branches that we do have an obligation to keep an eye on. We keep an eye on the executive branch, and the minority being the branch not of the President generally calls the strikes, the balls, and not the home runs. That is okay. They do it, and they have been doing it for 250 years. I commend them.

We also have an obligation to come together, to communicate, to not have a failure to communicate, to realize that on behalf of the American people, on behalf of the best interests of the High Court not being swamped with an amazing amount of these, and not having future Presidents find themselves deterred from executing what they believe is best in a timely fashion, that we come together and vote this moderate and, quite frankly, modest piece of legislation. It won't stop all national injunctions, but it will define more narrowly when they can be done. I hope we would do that.

I will close simply by saying Teddy Roosevelt sent the Great White Fleet out not necessarily having the money to get them back. Franklin Delano Roosevelt pushed the bounds of the Constitution for what he thought was right, including the incarceration of threats to our democracy under this very act, and the Court affirmed that.

Presidents have seen reasons to do it. This President has seen an onslaught, more than 10 million illegals, many of them actually here from terrorist gangs, and he is trying to protect our Nation.

I would hope that instead of talking about Elon Musk and others, we would come together to do something that we know if the next President is of the other party, my colleagues will be supporting something that looks amazingly like what we have in front of us today.

I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that all who are watching and listening take heed that this is a bill supported by the last administration and should be supported by everyone in this body.

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

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 294, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 1526 is postponed.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Matthew Hanley, one of his secretaries.

CONGRATULATING BURBANK NATIONAL LITTLE LEAGUE

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

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate a cherished tradition in my district, the kickoff of the Burbank National Little League season. This year is special as it is the 70th year of its existence.

As a lifelong baseball fan, there is nothing quite like watching young players take the field. Their energy and determination fill me with joy and hope for the future.

Sports are more than just games. They are a powerful tool to help our children build confidence, discipline, and a strong sense of teamwork.

Burbank National Little League's mission is focused on core values, good sportsmanship, honesty, loyalty, courage, and respect for authority. These are the very principles that shape not just great athletes but great civic leaders.

It is all about teamwork, a true community effort. From dedicated coaches and supportive parents to local businesses and volunteers who maintain the fields and sponsor teams, everyone plays a role.

Congratulations to the Burbank National Little League on 70 incredible seasons and over 80 league local and national championships. Here is to many more.

Let's play ball.

HONORING DON ENSLEY

(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, I rise to honor the life of eastern North Carolina legend Don Ensley.

As a community health educator, advocate, and environmental champion, Dr. Ensley also represented the best of eastern North Carolina.

After graduating from North Carolina Central, he served in the United States Army during Vietnam. Upon completing degrees at Michigan State and UNC-Chapel Hill, he joined East Carolina's faculty in 1977 as an associate professor in the School of Allied Health and Social Professions' Department of Community Health and became chair. He acted as the assistant vice chancellor for community engagement.

Dr. Ensley was one of the first African-American health sciences faculty. He was also the first president of the North Carolina Coastal Federation.

Above all, I am grateful for his mentorship, friendship, and the legacy he leaves us.

Besides rural health, he loved his late wife, Ramona, and spending time with friends, fish, and politics.

He would end his messages to me with ''Don'' and the initial from his last name, ''E'': ''DonE.''

Well DonE, Dr. Ensley.

I extend heartfelt condolences to his daughter who he loved so well, Akilah.

WORLDWIDE TARIFFS

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

Mr. LATIMER. Mr. Speaker, 2 months ago on this House floor, I spoke