

County now—but sometimes when they start high-speed chases in D.C., they go into Prince George's County, Montgomery County, or Northern Virginia, and we lost someone during a high-speed chase on the Baltimore-Washington Parkway; another stolen car case.

When we make these decisions about when a chase is permitted or should be permitted or not, we need to keep in mind that there can be deadly consequences from when this happens, and it frequently occurs. It is not like this is unusual. The Washington Post just did a piece about the Park Police. There have been 10 of these instances in recent weeks.

I have a couple last points. One is liability. The Federal Government is going to put this burden on the city.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOST). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARCIA of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. IVEY. When that liability arises from a car chase ending in death that didn't make any sense to a jury, the city could be on the hook for millions of dollars. I guarantee they are not going to step in and have the Federal Government cover that for them. When we think about these things, we need to keep all of those things in mind.

The last point I will make, a variation on the home rule argument. D.C. is not a rural jurisdiction. In fact, its roads aren't even as straightforward as Manhattan. We have got diagonal roads that cut across, we have circles, and we have very dangerous intersections. I wish my colleagues knew how tricky it can be out there. A high-speed chase in the middle of the District of Columbia, even during the middle of the day is almost, by definition, dangerous almost under any circumstances, so you better have a really good reason to engage in a pursuit like that.

That is not the balance that is drawn by this bill. That is not the balance that was drawn by the people of the District of Columbia. It should be the balance, and they should make the call because when the deaths happen, my colleagues won't be anywhere to be found.

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

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

I strongly oppose this bill. D.C.'s elected leaders have set clear, commonsense limits on high-speed chases and limits that save lives. I just remind folks that States like Texas, Florida, and Tennessee recognize the danger and restrict pursuits to violent crimes or imminent deaths, and D.C. follows that same practice.

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

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense legislation to allow police offi-

cers in the District of Columbia to pursue and apprehend criminals to keep residents and visitors in the District safe. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 707, 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. The question is on passage of the bill.

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

Mr. GARCIA of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1631

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DESJARLAIS) at 4 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5371, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS AND EXTENSIONS ACT, 2026; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 719, HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF CHARLES "CHARLIE" JAMES KIRK; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 722 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 722

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5371) making continuing appropriations and extensions for fiscal year 2026, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 719) honoring the life and legacy of Charles "Charlie" James Kirk. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform or their respective designees.

SEC. 3. Sections 9, 10, and 11 of House Resolution 707, agreed to September 16, 2025, are each amended by striking "March 31, 2026" and inserting "January 31, 2026".

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

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, last night, the Rules Committee met and produced a rule, House Resolution 722, providing for the House's consideration of two pieces of legislation.

First, the rule provides for H. Res. 719, Honoring the life and legacy of Charles "Charlie" James Kirk, to be considered under a closed rule. It provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

Second, the rule provides for H.R. 5371, the Continuing Appropriations and Extensions Act, 2026. H.R. 5371 would be considered under a closed rule, and it also provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their designees, and provides for one motion to recommit.

Finally, the rule tolls the day counts until January 31, 2026, regarding joint resolutions terminating the national emergencies declared by the President on February 1, 2025; April 2, 2025; and July 30, 2025.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and in support of the underlying legislation, beginning with H. Res. 719, honoring Charlie Kirk.

It is really quite unbelievable that we are here today honoring the life of Charlie Kirk, taken from us far too soon. This is the kind of tribute you would give after a lifetime of service, not usually at the young age of just 31, but Charlie Kirk made a lifetime's worth of impact in his short 31 years on this Earth, and we are grateful for it.

Charlie Kirk was a generational leader and a cultural icon. He was dedicated to engaging young people, defending our constitutional freedoms, and calling on Americans to live with courage and conviction.

Whether you agreed with him or not, he showed up, he listened, and he engaged in respectful dialogue. He never backed down from the belief that ideas should be debated in the open.

Charlie Kirk believed that freedom is worth defending, that faith has a rightful place in the public square, and the next generation deserves leaders who tell the truth and invite honest debate. He believed that every human life had value, even those who vehemently disagreed with him.

What happened last week was evil, but we can't fear it because if we do, then evil wins. Therefore, we will not back down, and we will not allow hatred to intimidate us or to silence our speech.

He leaves behind a loving wife and two children. He was a child of God, a son, a husband, a father, and a conservative leader who, even in death, still inspires millions around the world.

I hope the whole House will join me in praying for Erika and his precious children and the family and friends he leaves behind. May God surround them with love, comfort them with His presence, and provide a peace that surpasses our understanding.

We will never forget Charlie Kirk. Let us carry on his legacy and always defend the ideals he lived out.

I was proud last night to be a member of the Rules Committee, and I thank Ranking Member MCGOVERN and the other Democratic members of the committee for recognizing that many of us on this side of the aisle knew Charlie personally. I also thank Representatives DEBBIE DINGELL, TOM SUOZZI, DON DAVIS, JOHN LARSON, JIMMY PANETTA, MARIE GLUESINKAMP PEREZ, and CHRIS PAPPAS, who joined our prayer vigil for Charlie earlier this week.

I was and am glad that we condemned political violence together and were able to share compassion for one another.

Moving on to H.R. 5371, this rule also provides for consideration of the continuing resolution. Passing a continuing resolution is never our first choice, but as Chairman COLE said last night, real progress is being made, and he is encouraged by this year's appropriations process.

The House has already approved 60 percent of government spending, and the Appropriations Committee has finished its work at the committee level. Chairman COLE and every member of the Appropriations Committee deserve credit for the long hours of work that have already been done and the progress that has been made.

Following this good example, under the leadership of Leader THUNE and our Senate Republican colleagues, they have also advanced appropriations

measures on the Senate floor, something Senate Democrats failed to do in the last appropriations cycle when they controlled the Chamber.

Though a CR, a continuing resolution, is not ideal, this year we are further ahead than we have been in a long time. We cannot allow a government shutdown to derail the important work of the Trump administration.

As Chairwoman FOXX said last night, this short-term CR gives our Appropriations colleagues the time they need to keep negotiating and work toward bipartisan funding bills that fulfill our priorities to the American people.

There has been plenty of debate about what is and isn't in the CR, but our priority must be keeping this process moving forward and avoiding the chaos that a government shutdown would create.

If our colleagues on the other side of the aisle really care about our military, about law enforcement, about our Federal workers, they will join us in keeping the government open.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the consideration of these important pieces of legislation, and I urge the passage of this rule. I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1640

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

Mr. Speaker, first, I think it is important to say that we all condemn the murder that occurred last week in Utah, and I know that some of my colleagues knew Mr. Kirk and are experiencing a personal loss as well. His family is certainly in our prayers, and violence is never ever the answer.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to the CR that is before us today, here is the deal. Republicans have three choices. One is to work with Democrats on a bipartisan CR that ensures millions of Americans don't lose health insurance or see their premiums skyrocket; two is for Republicans to do what Donald Trump said and pass the CR themselves—Republicans are in charge after all; or, three, Republicans can shut down the government.

If they choose door number two or door number three, make no mistake about what will happen. ACA tax credits will expire, and nearly 24 million people will see their premiums skyrocket by 93 percent, on average.

Let me paint a picture. A mom and a dad in their early sixties both have jobs and make \$80,000 a year combined. Right now, they can afford their healthcare—barely. If these ACA credits expire, their bill jumps more than \$17,000 a year. That is like a house mortgage. That is \$1,400 a month, every month, just for the privilege of not going bankrupt if they get sick. Or, take a family of four making \$64,000. Their premiums rise by \$2,600 a year. That is groceries. That is car payments.

It might not sound like a lot of money to my friends on the other side. Maybe the billionaires don't think \$2,600 a year is a lot, but my constituents do, Mr. Speaker. My guess is that millions of Americans will think that is a high cost to pay.

Mr. Speaker, if these tax credits disappear, it is a five-alarm fire, and Republicans are acting like they don't even smell the smoke. Should we be surprised? Of course not.

The American people are already drowning in a cost-of-living crisis, one fueled by Donald Trump and the Republican economic policies. Their big, ugly bill didn't just raise costs for housing, groceries, and utilities. Its cruelest blow was to healthcare.

They made the largest cut to Medicaid and the Affordable Care Act in American history, kicking millions of working people off their coverage. That means hospitals closing, nursing homes shuttering, preventative care denied, and, by the way, families going hungry because food assistance was ripped away, too.

While families are trying to stay afloat, while farmers are struggling with tariffs, and while regular people suffer, Donald Trump decided to take an ax to medical research. He slashed the NIH, shut down cancer research, stopped clinical trials, and torpedoed vaccine programs. I mean, what the hell is wrong with him? What is he thinking?

But don't worry about healthcare. Don't worry about ACA tax credits. We will deal with this later. That is what the Speaker said. Kick the can down the road. Well, guess what. We have reached the end of the road. Later is too late.

The Congressional Budget Office says that if we don't act now and instead wait until December, an additional 1.5 million people will lose their coverage. That is a lot of people. That is a lot of people, I say to my colleagues. That is people in every single city and town in America. Premiums will climb even higher. Families will start getting cancellation notices in weeks, and open enrollment starts November 1. This is something we need to deal with now.

Here is the message to Republicans: Work with us. Fund the government. Protect healthcare. Stop writing bills for the rich and powerful. Start working on solutions to the everyday problems that people have. The choice is yours.

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

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. DE LA CRUZ).

Ms. De La CRUZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Indiana for yielding her time.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I rise with a heavy heart. We should not have to debate this legislation this evening. This legislation is the result of a horrific decision to assassinate a man of faith, a husband, a father, and a friend, Charlie Kirk.

My heart aches for his wife, Erika, and their two beautiful children, his loved ones, and all those who looked up to him, including my own two kids. They looked up to Charlie as well. My prayers are with his family and the entire Turning Point community, who lost a leader and a friend.

Charlie was taken from us in a cowardly act while exercising our most sacred American right, the right to free speech. He was sharing his values with young people on campus, inspiring them and debating them at a university, a university that should be a safe place where ideas should be debated, not silenced.

I am absolutely heartbroken over this evil act. I stand with many of my fellow Americans today mourning this deep, deep loss. I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this rule and the passage of the resolution to condemn the attack and honor the life of Charlie Kirk.

Mr. Speaker, may God bless the Kirk family and the entire Nation that is mourning this deep loss.

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

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Indiana for yielding me her time.

Mr. Speaker, just days ago, Charlie Kirk was assassinated by an act of deranged cowardice. His death was not only the loss of a husband, but a father, and a friend to many. It is also a sobering reminder that the very rights he spent his life defending must never be taken for granted, rights endowed to each of us by our creator and effectuated by our Constitution.

This resolution officially honors Charlie Kirk's commitment to the constitutional principles of civil discussion and debate between all people of the United States, regardless of political affiliation.

From the beginning of our Nation, freedom of speech has been a foundational liberty for the American people. The architects of our Republic enshrined the right to speak one's mind without fear as a first principle, knowing that if the people were silenced, then every other freedom would be in peril.

Throughout our history, Americans have disagreed fiercely and vigorously about politics, morality, and the course of our Nation, but history shows that responding to words with hatred or violence only sets us back. Instead, generation after generation, we have chosen the harder path: to keep the conversation going and to answer speech we oppose with more speech and with reason, civility, and conviction, rather than be intimidated by violence or dragged down into vengeance.

The Founders placed their faith in the power of truth and discourse. They knew that in a free republic, the solution to false or harmful ideas is to

counter them in the light of public discussion.

As Thomas Jefferson reminded us, "error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it." We must hold fast to that principle. We will turn more hearts with calm truth than with angry thunder. We will not let violence intimidate us, and we will not let violence drown out truth.

Every great struggle for justice, every step forward for our Nation, and even its very survival has relied on the ability of courageous voices to speak out and enlighten the people.

Charlie Kirk was more than just a prominent political leader. He was a devoted husband, father, and man of deep convictions. As a father myself, I cannot begin to imagine the pain of such a loss. He leaves behind his beloved wife, Erika, and two amazing young children.

Mr. Speaker, we offer our heartfelt condolences to Erika and those children, and we hope they find comfort and peace in this time of unimaginable grief.

Charlie lived with purpose and a clear understanding of what matters most. He loved his family and pursued truth, and he shared those values boldly with the world. He gave young Americans the courage to believe their voices mattered, that they, too, could take part in shaping the future of this Nation.

Just last week, I sat with students who told me they first found their way into political engagement because of Charlie's example. That is his legacy, not only the words he spoke, but the lives he touched, the movement he built, and the spirit of civic courage he inspired.

Mr. Speaker, let us pray that God bless and receive Charlie Kirk, and may He grant comfort and strength to Erika and their children. May God bless our Nation and unite us against violence, unite us in the fight for free speech and truth. I pray that we lift one another up and resolve to leave our children a brighter future and more free than the one we inherited.

□ 1650

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to take a few minutes to talk about what will happen if we defeat the previous question.

If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to strike the sections of yesterday's and today's rules, which together block privileged considerations of measures ending the administration's global tariffs and tariffs on Canada, Mexico, and Brazil.

Speaker JOHNSON and this Republican majority are hell-bent on blocking us from even debating Trump's reckless trade policy, which is driving up costs for consumers, for businesses, and for farmers.

Let's just take this week. On Monday, Republicans voted to block debate

on the tariffs that Trump slapped on Brazilian coffee, beef, and other goods. These are the tariffs that are forcing everyday people to spend more on a cup of coffee in the morning.

I think most Republicans in Congress were too scared of Trump to actually stand up and fight to protect everyday consumers. Then yesterday, Republicans barely passed a rule that blocked votes on all of Trump's illegal tariffs until March 31, 2026. I say "barely" because there were a few Republican holdouts threatening to vote against their party because they know how reckless Trump's trade policies are.

Mr. Speaker, it took only 45 minutes for them to fold. Here is what they reportedly got in return. They got an agreement to create a new trade working group. Really? They got a new working group, I mean, to get a meeting? Are my Republican colleagues aware that the House of Representatives already has a working group on trade? It is called the House Ways and Means Subcommittee on Trade.

These brave rebels also apparently want a provision tucked into today's rule that says votes on tariffs will only be blocked until the end of January instead of March. I mean, wow, what a victory.

If my colleagues object to Donald Trump's trade policy, which is raising costs on everyday Americans right now, I can't for the life of me figure out how they were won over by an agreement to keep his policies in place for at least 4 more months.

President Trump promised to lower prices "on day one," but his disastrous trade war is increasing the prices that Americans are paying for food, gas, and everyday goods.

According to independent estimates, Trump's tariffs are resulting in a \$2,300 tax increase in 2025 for the average American household. The August inflation report, put out by Trump's own Bureau of Labor Statistics, said inflation is increasing at the highest rate since January.

Mr. Speaker, I serve on the House Committee on Agriculture, and we are hearing day in and day out from farmers who are being crushed by Trump's erratic trade policies. They are losing markets abroad. Input prices are going up. Farm bankruptcies are up 95 percent this year compared to last.

Back when I was on a farm tour in my own district, a coffee roaster told me tariffs are hurting his business. He and countless others in his position can't wait while House Republicans hide their heads in the sand for another 4 months.

Give us up-or-down votes on Trump's reckless tariffs. Stop hiding. This body, this House of Representatives has a responsibility to do oversight and to vote on whether or not we should have tariffs. It really is disappointing to me that so many of my friends on the other side of the aisle have not chosen to step up to the plate.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the text

of my amendment, along with any extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would be willing to sacrifice making a few cheap political points, he might find that we are making bipartisan progress toward the goal that he has set forth. I, for one, am glad the Democrats have finally found a tax they don't like.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday we considered a resolution that altered the law by extending the authority of the President to impose tariffs by 6 months, from September 30 until March 31.

I agree with the gentleman that our Constitution entrusts Congress with the power to set tariffs but that that responsibility has unwisely, and perhaps even unconstitutionally, been delegated over the years to the President. I think it is time we did revisit that issue. Yesterday, the Speaker committed personally to two things.

First, he promised that the next rule resolution would reduce the extension of this authority from 6 months to 4 months, expiring on January 31 rather than March 31. The gentleman says that is not soon enough. Some of us would agree. This resolution fulfills that promise.

Second, the Speaker promised to convene a working group within the Republican Conference to establish a clear and coherent congressional policy on the use of tariffs to report before the end of January. This is important because there are increasing signs of tariff-related damage to the economy—the gentleman is absolutely right on that point—and because the courts may be moving to restore the guardrails between the executive and legislative branches with respect to tariffs.

I would hope he would support this resolution and thank the leadership for being responsive to those of us who fervently believe that free trade is an essential foundation of a healthy, growing, and thriving economy.

As Bastiat warned nearly two centuries ago, tariffs, by definition, raise prices and reduce resources. They are a tax. This is the first time I have ever found the Democrats to be in opposition to a tax. I think they will find willing and enthusiastic outliers on our side of the aisle as this discussion moves forward.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that every producer is a consumer. Every consumer is a producer. No producer has ever benefited by scarcer resources. No

consumer has ever benefited by higher prices. Yet this is the bitter fruit of protectionist policy down through the ages.

Mr. Speaker, we need to have a serious and sober discussion on this issue and bring it to a resolution. The Speaker has committed to do this. For that, I thank him, and I suggest that the gentleman across the aisle thank him, too.

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman just said that these tariffs are harmful to our economy and to working families in this country. He could work with us right now to do something about it. We could bring a bill to the floor. We could bring an amendment to the floor. We can block them. We can stop them.

The gentleman said that he is working in a bipartisan way to try to deal with this issue. It is funny, but this working group that they have all agreed on is just a Republican working group. Democrats are not part of it. It is kind of a crazy way to be bipartisan.

Then he says that he gets this great deal in terms of when we will next be able to have a vote on this stuff. They moved the deadline from the end of March to the end of January. That is 4 months from now.

What will happen in 4 months? I will tell my colleagues what will happen in 4 months. We will get a rule that comes to the floor that will extend the prohibition on us being able to debate any kind of tariff legislation, to be able to have a debate or an up-or-down vote.

All I can say is: Where I come from in Massachusetts, we call that being a cheap date because I don't think we get very much, to be honest. Meanwhile, the American consumer, the American people, will suffer with higher prices as a result of these tariffs.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA), who will speak on this topic.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member MCGOVERN for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the previous question, which includes a detrimental and damaging provision that abdicates, that gives up, and that capitulates Congress' constitutional authority over this administration's disastrous tariff policy.

□ 1700

I think we all know Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of our Constitution clearly states that Congress has purview over foreign commerce. Now, more than ever, with the high prices that Americans are experiencing, our communities, our constituents, and this country, need us. They want us. They demand us to reclaim our constitutional powers over trade and fulfill our responsibilities as a check and as a balance over this executive branch.

This administration's incoherent, inconsistent, and incompetent tariff policy is causing Americans to get

crushed by high prices. These are people and businesses who don't have the margins to survive these tariff policies and who don't have access to the Oval Office to cut a backroom deal for relief. These are people and producers who are having to personally pay the high prices that are directly being affected by the high costs.

The tariffs not only have caused high prices, they have caused uncertainty that has destroyed what was once a strong jobs market. When it comes to manufacturing, it is getting tanked as the costs of inputs are increasing and markets are becoming impossible to predict.

Diplomatically, the President's tariff policy is causing consternation amongst our biggest trading partners and our allies and contributing to diplomatic crises.

Legally, the President's tariffs are hanging by a thread after a Federal court found that their claims of emergency power is dubious at best.

The reality is the President's trade policies that are based on his 40-year fetish with tariffs is bad for Americans. It is bad for American foreign policy, and it is bad for our American Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, for what?

Details of any trade deals remain fuzzy and unenforceable, and there is an unstable dynamic that he is creating in which markets are either swinging wildly or fail to react, expecting the President to chicken out.

Yet, in the 119th Congress, this majority is allowing this President to not just bulldoze over not just the well-being of our constituents, Speaker Johnson is allowing the President to run roughshod over our constitutional authority.

Now, more than ever, with these high prices, our communities and our constituents need us to reclaim these constitutional powers over trade and, yes, live up to our responsibilities as an Article I branch of our government.

It is time to repeal these various tariff powers that Congress has granted the executive branch over the past few decades. I am not just talking about IEEPA, but also the many other sections that we have afforded the President. Mr. Speaker, because of those authorities that the President is using capriciously and whimsically to impose his tariffs, it is causing great damage to our economy, and they are creating a crisis with these high costs that all of us are facing.

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

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

Mr. PANETTA. That is exactly why Congress, that has purview over trade, should defend that jurisdiction, should defend our independence, and we should defend our duty to the American public. It is our job, and it is our responsibility.

Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that is the least we can do for our country, for this Congress, and for our constituents.

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

Mr. Speaker, what is more hurtful to working families is unfair trade practices that have undermined the American worker for decades. The tariffs imparted by President Trump are proving necessary to ensure fair trade, protect American workers, and reduce trade deficits by bringing other nations to the negotiating table.

Access to the American economy is a privilege. President Trump is taking decisive action to comprehensively renegotiate the tariff posture of the United States and the rest of the world for the first time since World War II.

His efforts are focused on achieving global free trade, decoupling developing countries from competitive nations like China, and for national security purposes.

From what we have seen, President Trump is winning.

According to an article from NPR on August 11, tariffs are adding tens of billions of new dollars to Federal revenue, with Treasury bringing in more than \$29 billion in customs and excise taxes, a category that is overwhelmingly tariff revenue. Countries like India, China, and South Korea are among the newest nations across the world flocking to the negotiating table.

This comes on the heels of a successfully negotiated trade deal with President Trump like with the EU, Japan, the U.K., Indonesia, the Philippines, and Vietnam.

President Trump is utilizing all available tools in his pressure campaign to make good on his promises to secure the border, protect our communities, and level the global playing field to ensure fair trade for American producers and the American worker.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just say to the gentlewoman that that is a lot of words to justify the biggest tax increase on the American people, an average of \$2,300 a year more because of these tariffs.

However, I would just say to the gentlewoman, as well, that if she thinks that these policies are great, if she wants these tariffs to continue, then she shouldn't be afraid to vote for them. Have the debate on the floor and let people vote up or down on them.

I don't understand why that is such a controversial thing to want to advocate for, especially in the House of Representatives where we are supposed to be able to debate important issues. If the majority has the votes, if everybody thinks this is a great policy, then they will all vote "yes," and they continue.

I am glad the gentlewoman brought up the economy because I want to speak about the economy just for a couple of minutes here.

Mr. Speaker, the consequences of Trump's economic policy are being felt

in communities across the country. Prices on fruits and vegetables, meat and poultry, and dairy are all up. They are likely to climb even higher as Trump's tariffs ripple through the supply chain.

President Trump and Republicans promised to reduce grocery prices. Instead, grocery prices spiked at the fastest pace in 3 years last month. They have promised to cut electricity prices in half. Instead, August electricity prices were over 6 percent higher than they were 1 year ago. They promised to reduce inflation. Instead, we saw the largest monthly increase in inflation since January. They promised to create jobs, and instead for the first time in nearly 4 years, the economy lost jobs in June. We lost jobs in June, and job growth has been stagnant for months.

Mr. Speaker, the Trump economy is not working for the American people.

Do you know whom it is working for, Mr. Speaker?

It is working for the millionaires and billionaires who contributed to his campaign.

Hardworking Americans deserve a hell of a lot better than a rigged economy that only works for the ultra-wealthy. People are hurting. Do townhalls, I would say to my Republican friends, and they can hear it firsthand. Go to the grocery store and watch as people are putting items back because the prices have gone up so much.

This is not sustainable. At a minimum, the Republican leadership here should not be afraid of debate and votes. We ought to bring these important items to the floor. We have a constitutional responsibility when it comes to trade and tariffs and to debate and to vote on these items. We ought to bring them to the floor. Let's have a thoughtful debate. Then people can vote accordingly, and then they can defend that vote when they go back to their districts.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, it is a little bit disingenuous to criticize the President on tariffs when every single Democrat voted for the largest tax increase in American history just recently.

In the Working Families Tax Cuts Act under the One Big Beautiful Bill Act, the typical family now, because of House Republicans, is going to get up to \$10,900 in additional take-home pay. Workers will see increased wages up to \$7,200. Households earning less than \$100,000 a year will get a 12 percent tax cut compared to today.

Up to 7.2 million jobs have been protected and created, and 1 million new jobs annually will be created by small businesses. No tax on tips, no tax on overtime, car loan interest relief, and tax relief for seniors will put more money annually into Americans' pockets. Mr. Speaker, that is \$1,300 per tipped worker specifically, and \$1,400 for hourly workers. We lock in and fur-

ther boost the double child tax credit to \$2,200 for more than 40 million American families.

To put it quite simply, we are starting to build the financial future for this country after years of Democrat mismanagement.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I don't know what the gentlewoman is talking about, but the Yale Budget Lab finds American households could pay \$2,300 more, on average, as a result of the current tariff policy, nearly three times the average roughly \$800 benefit from the OBBBA's new tax provisions in the big, beautiful bill, or whatever they call it. We call it the big, ugly bill, which, by the way, is the most unpopular piece of legislation I think in history.

Do you know what, Mr. Speaker?

Don't take my word for it. Talk to regular people. Go to a grocery store. Go to a coffee shop. Do a townhall and talk to people about how they are feeling. They are not feeling good. They are not feeling good, Mr. Speaker. They are going to feel even worse if you don't address the healthcare cliff that we are about to confront.

□ 1710

Mr. Speaker, across the country, children, families, grandparents, small business owners, teachers, and veterans are about to receive the unwelcome news that their healthcare premiums are skyrocketing to record highs. Millions of Americans face an awful decision on the horizon as they sort through their bills and are forced to decide which ones to pay.

Republicans could have spent the summer working with Democrats to reach a bipartisan agreement. Instead, they spent it slashing Medicaid and the ACA by a trillion dollars.

Make no mistake: Republicans are kicking 15 million off their healthcare coverage. Republicans are jeopardizing access to prenatal care. They are cutting NIH's budget and taking food benefits away from families, all basically to help pay for tax cuts to the ultrarich.

Mr. Speaker, nearly 24 million people in this country have health insurance through the Affordable Care Act. With Republican inaction, their premiums will increase by an average of 93 percent. A 60-year-old couple making \$80,000 per year would see their premiums increase by over \$17,000 per year. That is like over \$1,400 per month. A family of four earning \$64,000 will owe an extra \$2,600 in healthcare premiums every year.

Where on Earth are families supposed to find this kind of extra money?

Five million Americans, including 2 million with chronic conditions, will lose their healthcare coverage due to the Affordable Care Act cuts alone, not to mention the 10 million more who will lose coverage due to the already

enacted Medicaid cuts in the Republicans' big, ugly bill.

In each of the districts we represent, Americans will have to choose between paying rent, buying groceries, or affording healthcare.

Mr. Speaker, 26,000 Americans in the gentlemans' district in Indiana will face higher premiums or lose their healthcare altogether. That is a lot of people. We live in the richest country in the world, and Republicans have no problem forcing families to go without food because healthcare premiums are sky-high. This is crazy. Healthcare ought to be a right in this country. It ought not to be a privilege.

When people lose their healthcare, what do they do? They get their healthcare at emergency rooms. That is the most costly and inefficient form of healthcare.

Honest to God, Mr. Speaker, I don't know how my Republicans friends can talk to people back home in their districts and somehow justify what they are doing. Do Republicans actually think that denying healthcare coverage is good for someone? Seriously, is that popular in Indiana? Is it popular in any State in this country? This is shameful, Mr. Speaker. The American people deserve better.

Congress must address this healthcare cliff now. When the Speaker of the House says: Oh, well, we will deal with it in December; we will talk about this in December—first, we have no guarantees that they will want to deal with it—but let's push this discussion out to December. December is too late. The crisis is about to occur. We have an opportunity to do something, and we are doing nothing. We are doing nothing. This is so wrong. This is immoral, Mr. Speaker. This cannot be justified. There is no way to be able to explain this back home.

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

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

What the American people know, what I hope they know, is that this is a lot of political theater going on today, and I am sorry about it. I really am.

Premiums are high because of ObamaCare. The un-affordable care act did nothing to lower healthcare costs and instead raised costs. Subsidizing the failed policies of the Democratic Party is not a solution. It is a Band-Aid at best, and it perpetuates the problem.

Republicans are focused on fixing healthcare, on reducing costs, on raising reimbursement rates, and reforming the system which Democrats broke in the first place. They are fighting for their constituents against a problem that they created. This is a crisis created by the ObamaCare plan in the first place, and we can't just keep throwing money at the problem. That can't be the only answer. We need to have conversations about how to make these programs work for the American

people, and it is House Republicans that are leading that charge.

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

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

The central issue right now is healthcare. Let me repeat: Healthcare, healthcare, healthcare.

I love it. I don't know how—I am surprised they didn't blame Bill Clinton. Now we are going back to Obama to blame him for the current crisis in healthcare. Give me a break.

Look at the polling. The ACA is pretty popular. What is not popular is the big, ugly bill that the Republicans passed just a few months ago. People are outraged over the fact that Republicans are cutting Medicaid by a trillion dollars and cutting moneys for NIH. The National Institutes of Health is where we fund research to find cures to diseases and to sicknesses.

You want to save money? Let's find a cure to Alzheimer's. Let's find a cure to Parkinson's disease. Let's find more cures to cancer. That is a way you can save money.

I think what the Republicans are doing right now is they want to say that the Affordable Care Act is not working by defunding it, by dismantling it.

My Republicans friends are doing nothing to address the central issue at hand right now, which is healthcare. People are going to lose their healthcare. People are going to see their premiums skyrocket. All the while, we are trying to help here. We are saying we will work with them and let's address this so people don't suffer.

I mean, the whole point of what we are doing here should be about improving the lives for people we represent, improving the lives of people in this country. An all-out assault against their healthcare is coming down the road, and we can do something about it. We want to work with them to do something about it, and my Republican friends keep on saying: No, we are not interested.

What are my Republican friends interested in? If you look at the big, ugly bill, it is tax cuts for the multimillionaires, tax cuts for multibillionaires, and all these giveaways to the fossil fuel industry. It is like the Republican prescription for healthcare is take two tax cuts and call me in the morning.

The bottom line is a crisis is about to happen in this country. We are right at the cliff, and we can do something about it. We can help our constituents. We are urging them, and we are begging them to work with us so we can address these concerns in healthcare, and we are being told no way, no consultation, no cooperation, no collaboration, no negotiation, no nothing.

Remember, it was Democrats who capped the price of insulin for Medicare. It is Republicans who cut Medicaid by a trillion dollars. That is the difference here.

Again, we ought to be addressing this crisis now before our constituents are

hurt in a way that, quite frankly, they are not prepared for.

They don't even know this is coming. We all know it is coming. There is no excuse to not know what is about to happen. Every major organization—CBO, everybody, the insurance industry—has already told us what is about to happen. My Republican friends are like: No, business as usual. Let's just kick the can down the road. We will fund the government for 7 weeks and no promise of anything.

This is not the way this Congress should be run.

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

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, here is the bottom line. Congress must act now to prevent one of the most staggering healthcare premium hikes in history—not in November, not in December, but now.

Let's be honest. Donald Trump and his billionaires he has surrounded himself with won't feel an ounce of this pain. They have got the best doctors on speed dial, concierge care, and private chefs. They don't worry about grocery bills. They don't sit at the kitchen table with a stack of medical bills and wonder which one of them they can afford to pay this month.

Regular people, working families, and seniors on fixed incomes do. That is who Democrats are fighting for: regular people who buy their own food, who worry about the rent, and who pray that the car doesn't break down because they can't handle another bill.

□ 1720

If Members want to stand with the billionaires, by all means, vote for the CR. Let a million people get kicked off of healthcare. It won't impact Members of Congress. We all have great healthcare. Republicans don't have to worry about that.

Guess what. Democrats are not going to stand by and watch while Republicans make healthcare more expensive and less accessible for millions of our friends and neighbors. Stop the cuts and fund the government, or own the shutdown that is coming. Protect people's healthcare, or own the consequences when millions lose their coverage.

That is what the choice is for this Republican-controlled government. Right now, Mr. Speaker, it sure as hell looks like Republicans are choosing to shut it down instead of working to keep people insured.

Again, we live in the richest country in the world. Healthcare ought to be viewed as a fundamental right for people in this country. People shouldn't have to worry about going bankrupt if they get sick.

Mr. Speaker, this is one of the top issues on the minds of people all

throughout this country right now. The price of groceries and the price of healthcare are what they are worried about. People are deeply concerned that they are not going to be able to afford both, and they are in for a rude awakening when they start to see their premiums go up this November.

Here is the kicker: This Congress can do something about it. All we need is for our Republican friends to work with us. Let us make the necessary adjustments, and let us protect millions of people from losing their healthcare. Let us protect countless people from seeing their premiums go sky-high.

We can do this. This is solvable. We can do it, but for whatever reason, Republicans are not interested. That is what is particularly sad at this particular point, Mr. Speaker.

Prohibiting health insurance companies from denying coverage because of a person's medical history, that is what Democrats did. We have prohibited health insurance companies from denying coverage because of a person's medical history.

We prohibited health insurance companies from charging sick people more.

We prohibited private health insurance companies from denying coverage because of preexisting medical conditions.

We prohibited health insurance companies from denying coverage to pregnant women.

We prohibited private health insurance companies from charging sick people higher premiums than healthy people.

We required health insurance companies to cover the cost of most preventative services.

We prohibited health insurance companies from setting a lifetime limit.

We gave States the option of expanding their Medicaid programs.

We provided financial help to low- and moderate-income Americans to help them purchase coverage.

We prohibited private health insurance companies from setting an annual limit.

We also allowed young adults to stay on their parents' insurance plans until they were 26.

When we think of helping people with healthcare, that is the kind of stuff that we think of. I mentioned before the capping of the cost of insulin in Medicare. We ought to be making it easier for people to get good, quality healthcare. We ought to make sure that it is more affordable and more accessible, and we are going in the opposite direction under this Republican leadership.

Mr. Speaker, again, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule for a whole bunch of reasons, but mostly because healthcare is important to people in this country, and they are about to get screwed. We have an opportunity to do something, and I regret that under this rule, nothing will be done.

Mr. Speaker, let's defeat this rule. Let's go back to the drawing board.

Let's sit down in a bipartisan way. Let's figure out ways to avert this crisis. Let's do what is right for the American people, not what is right for the big contributors in this country and for the well-off and the well-connected.

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

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time for the purpose of closing.

Mr. Speaker, this rule is pretty straightforward. With respect to the continuing resolution, it is simple. It is a clean, short-term continuing resolution to prevent disruptions to national security and programs that our constituents depend on. It is a bill that extends government funding until November 21.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle are trying to argue and insist that a healthcare discussion is inserted into this, but that is not a debate for a September funding matter. They are really trying to insert unrelated matters into the middle of a clean government extension.

I don't think that is going to work because if the government shuts down because they are making this last stand, which is something that we will be addressing in the future, it will solely be blamed on Democrats if the government shuts down because we are not playing politics with this at all. We are just trying to keep the lights on.

What they are trying to do is insert a last-ditch effort to regain their footing because their party is reeling right now.

Mr. Speaker, this clean extension of government funding will ensure that the government remains open and working for the Nation. It shouldn't be partisan. If Democrats force a shutdown, it could cost the American taxpayer billions due to back-paid furloughed workers, increased costs from delayed starts, and constrained economic growth.

No matter how hard the Democrats try to characterize this CR as a partisan maneuver, always claiming that we are hurting every special interest group, it doesn't make it true.

Remember, virtually every single House Democrat for the last 4 years under the Biden administration voted "yes" on every continuing resolution. In fact, over the last several years, many Democrats, including Democratic leaders, have made comments about the harm a government shutdown would cause.

The minority leader says it is about the harm. Families will be hurt. Farmers will be hurt if the government shuts down. Others have said: Let's take a moment to see what is truly at the center of this story. It is about the servicemembers who will work without a paycheck.

Some House Democrats accused House Republicans of leading the country toward a reckless government shutdown that will take food off the table for mothers and children and force servicemembers to work without pay.

Make no mistake, if Democrats vote against this simple government funding bill that will extend funding to November 21, they are the very people who are hurting those whom they have claimed that Republicans have perpetually tried to hurt, unfairly and untruly.

Mr. Speaker, again, this rule is straightforward.

First and foremost, we are here to honor the life of a husband, father, and friend. Charlie Kirk was a proud American and this country that he loved. Charlie was the kind of person who inspired millions to engage in our democracy. It is right that we take the time as a body to honor him and condemn political violence in all forms.

Finally and secondly, we must keep the government open and allow the appropriations process to continue. While CRs, continuing resolutions, are never ideal and, by definition, are not all-encompassing, if we are truly to address the many issues before this body as a country, we cannot do that under a government shutdown. We must let the appropriations process continue.

I look forward to moving these bills out of the House this week, and I ask my colleagues to join me in voting "yes" on the previous question and "yes" on the rule.

Mr. MANNION. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to unequivocally condemn the act of political violence that ended the life of Charlie Kirk. Violence has no place in our democracy, and no American, regardless of political beliefs, should ever be the target of an assassination.

I send my sincere condolences to his wife Erica, his children, and all who mourn his loss.

But condemning violence is not the same as endorsing a legacy. In fact, it is a sign of the strength of our republic that we can both mourn Mr. Kirk's death and openly acknowledge that he was a polarizing figure in American politics. Many Americans justifiably find his words and actions divisive and offensive.

It is entirely legitimate to say that Mr. Kirk's legacy is controversial. To present his life and work in only heroic terms fails to acknowledge his promotion of misinformation and the harmful impact his words have had on marginalized communities. Having these conversations openly, without fear of recrimination or harassment is part of what it means to live in a free society.

As we condemn political violence in the strongest possible terms, let us also reaffirm our commitment to honest debate, to teaching the totality of our history, and to preserving a democracy where it is safe to disagree.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 722 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS
Strike section 3 and add the following:
SEC. 3. House Resolution 707, agreed to September 16, 2025, is amended by striking sections 9, 10, and 11.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1730

DELIVERING DIGITALLY TO OUR VETERANS ACT OF 2025

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 3481) to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide for electronic communication relating to educational assistance benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 722;

Adoption of House Resolution 722, if ordered;

Passage of H.R. 5125; and

Passage of H.R. 5143.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5371, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS AND EXTENSIONS ACT, 2026; H. RES. 719, HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF CHARLES "CHARLIE" JAMES KIRK; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 722) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5371) making continuing appropriations and extensions for fiscal year 2026, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of

the bill (H. Res. 719) honoring the life and legacy of Charles "Charlie" James Kirk; and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 213, nays 207, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 272]

YEAS—213

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

NAYS—207

Adams	Beatty	Brownley
Aguiar	Bell	Budzinski
Amo	Bera	Bynum
Ansari	Bishop	Carbajal
Auchincloss	Bonamici	Carson
Balint	Boyle (PA)	Carter (LA)
Barragan	Brown	Casar

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

NOT VOTING—12

Beyer	Grothman	Rutherford
Costa	LaMalfa	Smucker
Evans (PA)	Lucas	Stutzman
Gray	Morelle	Titus

□ 1757

Messrs. TORRES of New York and CARBAJAL changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

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

Stated for:

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was at an event out of the building. Had I been present, I would have voted yea on Roll Call No. 272.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 272.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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