

Knam, Officer Michael Foltz, and firefighter-paramedic Eli Bosler of the North Canton Police and Fire Departments responded to reports of gunfire and injuries at a local apartment complex.

In a remarkable act of bravery, Sergeant Dollinger and his team successfully rescued a wounded woman from the window of her apartment and brought her to the safety of medical professionals, all while the alleged assailant continued to fire shots from inside the apartment building.

In the end, without discharging their firearms, the Canton Regional SWAT Team successfully apprehended the suspected shooter.

Mr. Speaker, on October 9, before many of us had left the comfort of our homes or checked our emails or even had a cup of coffee, Sergeant Dollinger, Officer Knam, Officer Foltz, and firefighter-paramedic Bosler accomplished an incredible feat of bravery and heroism, reminding us how important they are for the safety and security of our communities.

Mr. Speaker, I, again, extend my sincere gratitude to Sergeant Dollinger and his entire team, as well as our North Canton and Canton First Responders who risk their lives every day to stop and battle evils only they can stop.

DESIGNATION OF CHRISTIAN SCHRANK AS ACTING INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 119-114)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I am hereby notifying the Congress that I intend to designate Christian Schrank (Deputy Inspector General for Investigations, Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Inspector General) as Acting Inspector General of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, in place of the current Acting Inspector General, James Lisle. Such designation will be effective no less than 30 days from delivery of this message.

The Constitution vests “the executive Power” in the President, who has a duty to “take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed.” U.S. Const., Art. II, §1, cl. 1; *id.* at §3. In exercising that power and duty, I have determined that, based on the qualities outlined in 5 U.S.C. 403(a) and the confidence I must place in my appointees, Mr. Schrank is the best available person to serve as Acting Inspector General of the Federal Housing Finance Agency at

this time. In my judgment, Mr. Lisle can better serve the Nation performing other duties (i.e., returning to his position as the Federal Housing Finance Agency’s audit director).

I am providing this notification as a courtesy, a show of comity and respect between the executive and legislative branches. It should not be interpreted as a concession that the Congress can limit my power to remove any officer. “Because no single person could fulfill [the President’s] responsibility alone, the Framers expected that the President would rely on subordinate officers for assistance,” *Seila Law LLC v. Consumer Financial Protection Bureau*, 591 U.S. 197, 203–204 (2020). And the Constitution gives the President “the authority to remove those who assist him in carrying out his duties.” *Free Enterprise Fund v. Public Company Accounting Oversight Board*, 561 U.S. 477, 513–514 (2010). “Without such power, the President could not be held fully accountable for discharging his own responsibilities; the buck would stop somewhere else.” *Id.* at 514.

Ultimately, I have determined that the priorities of my Administration will be better implemented with this individual in this office. Therefore, I am apprising you of my intention to designate Mr. Schrank as Acting Inspector General of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, effective no less than 30 days from delivery of this message.

DONALD J. TRUMP.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, December 1, 2025.

□ 1220

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4312, STUDENT COMPENSATION AND OPPORTUNITY THROUGH RIGHTS AND ENDORSEMENTS ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1005, COMBATING THE LIES OF AUTHORITARIANS IN SCHOOL SYSTEMS ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1049, TRANSPARENCY IN REPORTING OF ADVERSARIAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO EDUCATION ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1069, PROMOTING RESPONSIBLE OVERSIGHT TO ELIMINATE COMMUNIST TEACHINGS FOR OUR KIDS ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2965, SMALL BUSINESS REGULATORY REDUCTION ACT OF 2025; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4305, DESTROYING UNNECESSARY, MISALIGNED, AND PROHIBITIVE RED TAPE ACT

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 916 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 916

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4312) to protect the

name, image, and likeness rights of student athletes and to promote fair competition with respect to intercollegiate athletics, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendments in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committees on Education and Workforce and Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 119-14 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Workforce or their respective designees and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House any bill specified in section 3 of this resolution. All points of order against consideration of each such bill are waived. The respective amendments in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Workforce now printed in each such bill shall be considered as adopted. Each such bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in each such bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on each such bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Workforce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. The bills referred to in section 2 of this resolution are as follows:

(a) The bill (H.R. 1005) to prohibit elementary and secondary schools from accepting funds from or entering into contracts with the Government of the People’s Republic of China and the Chinese Communist Party, and for other purposes.

(b) The bill (H.R. 1049) to ensure that parents are aware of foreign influence in their child’s public school, and for other purposes.

(c) The bill (H.R. 1069) to prohibit the availability of Federal education funds for elementary and secondary schools that receive direct or indirect support from the Government of the People’s Republic of China.

SEC. 4. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2965) to require the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to ensure that the small business regulatory budget for a small business concern in a fiscal year is not greater than zero, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Small Business now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Small Business or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 5. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4305) to direct the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration to establish a Red Tape Hotline to receive notifications of burdensome agency rules, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Small Business now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Small Business or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

The Rules Committee met last night and reported out a rule providing for consideration of six measures: H.R. 4312, the SCORE Act; H.R. 1005, Combating the Lies of Authoritarians in School Systems Act; H.R. 1049, Transparency in Reporting of Adversarial Contributions to Education Act; H.R. 1069, the PROTECT Our Kids Act; H.R. 2965, Small Business Regulatory Reduction Act of 2025; and H.R. 4305, the DUMP Red Tape Act.

House Resolution 916 provides for consideration of H.R. 4312, the SCORE Act, under a closed rule. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate equally divided amongst and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Workforce or their respective designees, and the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees and provides for one motion to recommit.

The rule further provides for consideration of H.R. 1005, Combating the Lies of Authoritarians in School Systems Act; H.R. 1049, Transparency in Reporting of Adversarial Contributions to Education Act; and H.R. 1069, the PROTECT Our Kids Act, all under closed rules with 1 hour of general debate each, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minor-

ity member of the Committee on Education and Workforce or their respective designees, and provides each one a motion to recommit.

Finally, the rule provides for consideration of H.R. 2965, the Small Business Regulatory Reduction Act of 2025, and H.R. 4305, the DUMP Red Tape Act, both under closed rules with 1 hour of general debate each, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Small Business or their respective designees, and provides each one a motion to recommit.

This rule deals with several critical issues. There are three bills that all came out of the Education and Workforce Committee that would combat efforts by the Chinese Communist Party who meddle in our schools and universities. These bills include H.R. 1005, the Combating the Lies of Authoritarians in School Systems Act, led by Representative JOYCE of Ohio. The bill prohibits public elementary and secondary schools from participating in financial contracts with the People's Republic of China. Additionally, H.R. 1005 requires school systems that receive sizable funds of \$10,000 or more from foreign sources to disclose their agreements to the Department of Education.

Another bill being considered under this rule is H.R. 1069, the PROTECT Our Kids Act, led by Representative HERN from Oklahoma. Under H.R. 1069, Federal funding would be barred for elementary and secondary schools that have a partnership with a cultural or language institute funded by the Chinese Government, including a Confucius Institute. It would also bar any school that directly operates a learning center supported by the Chinese Government that receives support from an individual or entity acting on behalf of the Chinese Government.

On the outside, these seem like harmless educational organizations that seek to teach students Chinese language and culture. However, they are often used as tools by the CCP to steal American knowledge and/or indoctrinate children with anti-American ideas.

Lastly, H.R. 1049, the Transparency in Reporting of Adversarial Contributions to Education Act, led by Representative BEAN from Florida, empowers parents by giving them the right to know when a foreign government or foreign entity of concern, particularly the Chinese Communist party funds, influences, or provides curriculum for American students in public schools.

Upon written request, a parent is entitled to review any curriculum that was purchased by foreign entities for their children's classroom.

While I think we can agree that it can be beneficial to broaden our children's horizons with new ideas from across global cultures, we must ensure it is done properly without undue foreign influence.

There are also two Small Business Committee bills being considered under

this rule. H.R. 2965, the Small Business Regulatory Reduction Act, led by Representative VAN DUYNE from Texas, would ensure that any agency action taken by the Small Business Administration does not increase compliance costs on small businesses. The agency meant to be the promoter of small businesses shouldn't add to the already crushing regulatory burden facing these businesses.

H.R. 4305, the DUMP Red Tape Act, is led by Representative WIED from Wisconsin. This bill creates a dedicated hotline so small businesses can report to the Small Business Administration on any overly burdensome and costly regulations they must deal with. I think we can agree that we should do everything we can to help protect our small businesses in this country.

Finally in this rule, we also will be considering H.R. 4312, the SCORE Act, led by Representative BILIRAKIS from Florida and the chairmen of each subcommittee that has jurisdiction over this issue: Energy and Commerce Committee, Education and Workforce Committee, and the Judiciary Committee.

□ 1230

Mr. Speaker, this bill affirms the right of student-athletes to profit from their name, image, and likeness, or NIL. What the SCORE Act is trying to do is level the playing field for universities of all sizes and establish protections for student-athletes that all schools must abide by.

What we have gotten into is a race to the bottom with over 30 State laws and athletes jumping from team to team. The SCORE Act will make sure that universities that hit a certain threshold in athletics revenue are required to provide academic support, career counseling, and medical benefits.

As a longtime mediocre swimmer and a former swim coach, I am glad to see that the SCORE Act attempts to protect our Olympic sports. Under the bill, large universities must offer 14 to 16 different sports, which will ensure that non-revenue-producing sports are still supported. I personally hope this will include swimming, but the universities get to make that decision.

This bill would also protect athletes from unscrupulous agents. As I said before, the SCORE Act affirms the right of student athletes to make money by endorsing products and services. To protect the athlete, the SCORE Act caps agent fees at 5 percent of each contract's value.

The SCORE Act also allows for revenue sharing amongst student athletes. Under this bill, up to 22 percent of the average athletic revenue of the top 70 universities could be paid out to athletes by those universities.

The SCORE Act also requires NIL contracts to be examined to ensure that a contract is, in fact, payment for services rendered, as opposed to a payment to attend a certain institution. Without disclosure of NIL deals, there is a real possibility that the integrity

of competition could be called into question.

This bipartisan bill has received overwhelming support from schools and conferences across the country, including the NCAA. I believe this bill is the first step—not the last, the first step—in protecting college athletes and ensuring there is a national standard and an even playing field for universities across the country. Accordingly, I urge passage of this rule.

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 thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, it is December 2. The year is almost over. We are now only a few weeks away from new health insurance premiums skyrocketing. People's insurance bills are going to double, triple, and, in some cases, quadruple. I would think all of us would be on the floor here today addressing that, right?

We would think that, but we would be wrong because we have on the floor this week another embarrassingly pointless and irrelevant collection of bills that does absolutely nothing to help everyday people.

When Democrats first raised the alarm about healthcare premiums skyrocketing earlier this year, Speaker MIKE JOHNSON said: Oh, don't worry. This is a policy debate for December.

Here we are in December, and Republicans are doing nothing, zero. Actually, they are doing less than nothing. They took an 8-week vacation funded by the taxpayers, while people panicked about how they were going to afford their insurance premiums starting January 1. Families are going to see their bills go up and up, in some cases by nearly \$1,000 more a month.

Maybe that doesn't sound like a lot of money to Republicans because these guys might not get how much that means to regular people. I know how out of touch they are. They are building a fancy new ballroom at the White House with their billionaire donors. That is where their attention is. They eat caviar and drink fine wine at Mar-a-Lago while regular people suffer.

Maybe they don't understand how much \$1,000 a month is to the people I represent. Guess what. It is a lot. For most hardworking people, this is a catastrophic amount of money that suddenly needs to be added to a monthly budget. It is more than what a lot of people earn during a week of work.

Republicans have known that this crisis was coming for some time. Yet, they still have no plan on healthcare. They say they have one. Where the hell is it? We are still waiting. Their only answer so far is: Good luck, folks. Hope you like choosing between health insurance and food.

Here is the kicker, Mr. Speaker. If this House voted today to stop premiums from exploding, it would pass. It would pass easily. Democrats would

vote for it, and I know there is a chunk of Republicans who would vote for it, as well. The Republican leadership will not bring it up because they care more about tax breaks for billionaires than tax credits for working families. It is that simple.

Don't even get me started about the bills Republicans are bringing to the floor this week. There are two bills for small businesses. That sounds good, right? Do my colleagues know what those bills do? One of them creates a hotline that already exists. Wow, that is groundbreaking. Neither of them does anything about the number one issue that I hear from small businesses, and that is tariffs.

Every small business owner I talk to says the same thing: The tariffs are killing them. The tariffs are making prices skyrocket. The tariffs are slowing down business.

These guys don't care. They don't care. They just go along to get along. They don't want to tick Trump off.

I guess my question is: If Republicans want to help small businesses, why are they blocking a vote to overturn the tariffs? Why have they refused to let Congress vote on the tariffs for months and months, even though it is our responsibility? What is up with that? After all, it is our responsibility. It is our job. Are they afraid that if it comes to the floor for a vote, they will lose?

Then we get a bunch of bills about protecting public schools. Give me a break. My sisters are public school teachers. I talk to parents and students all the time. What do they tell me? We need to reduce class size, support teachers, and make schools safer. We need to fund education.

These guys are bringing up a bill about foreign infiltration in third grade math class. Are my Republican colleagues kidding me? Is that a joke?

They are so concerned about China funding our schools. Well, here is a novel idea. Why don't we have America fund our schools? Why isn't funding our schools a bigger priority in this Congress? There is a crazy idea for my Republican friends. If they really care about public education, let's be the wind at the backs of our teachers and our schools.

Of course, they have a bill to help the NCAA take advantage of student athletes because what this Congress desperately needed was another billionaire organization empowered to squeeze young people. It is more of the same. It is more of the same.

They give more to those with the most, while taking away from those with the least. It is sick. It is sick. It is immoral. It represents the opposite of what I believe we are here to do, which is to help people, but that is their entire governing philosophy.

Republicans want to use their power to reward the billionaires and special interest donors. They want an economy where those at the top get showered in tax break after tax break, while work-

ing people get left further and further behind.

Mr. Speaker, it is shameful that this is what we are doing this week. It is shameful. It is outrageous, and it is wrong. I urge every Member of this body to vote "no" on this Republican rule.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, isn't it amazing that we come here to talk about these six bills and a significant portion of the debate from the other side of the aisle deals with bills that we are not addressing? They talk about some of those, and then they make allegations, Mr. Speaker, that are just not accurate.

I remember hearing the phrase just a second ago: Well, what are they doing to help small businesses? How soon we forget, Mr. Speaker, that just last summer we passed the working families tax cuts bill with lots of help for people on Main Street in Abingdon, Virginia, and Marion, Virginia.

In every small town that I represent in the Ninth Congressional District, those businesses are benefiting from what we did because we made major adjustments for taxes that would have burdened our small businesses and made it more expensive for them to compete against the big companies. Actually, what we did was we kept everything that we already had that was going to expire.

□ 1240

Now, it is true, the big companies get some of these tax cuts too. However, Mr. Speaker, the people who really need them are the small businesses. The people who need those breaks are the mom-and-pop shops. The people who need those breaks are people like my son, who is 18, and who is now getting tips. He is working tables at Mac and Bob's Restaurant, and he is getting tips.

Guess what, Mr. Speaker?

He won't have to pay income taxes on that. Now, maybe he is at a point where his money wouldn't be high enough that he would pay those taxes anyway, but for those families who rely on that tip money as a part of their income, that is a huge benefit to American families.

So I find it surprising that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to focus on saying that we are not helping small businesses when every single small business person in the United States knows that we have been fighting for them and knows that we have been helping them.

They know that these bills today in this rule—that is all we are doing, Mr. Speaker, is a rule on six bills—relate to small businesses and that what we are doing today will help a little bit.

They challenge us and ask: What are we doing to help small business? This is after we did a huge benefit on a number of different issues for small businesses, for mom-and-pops, and for people out there working.

Whether they are working overtime jobs where they are able to take a tax credit for that as well, whether they are doing tips, or whether they are just trying to buy some new equipment and want to be able to write that off in the first year instead of having to amortize it over a number of years—as used to be the law and it is what my colleagues on the other side advocated for last summer—they will start paying that again so that they can't take that write-off. That hurts small business.

So I ask you, Mr. Speaker, just to consider that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle really don't understand small business or they wouldn't make such a comment.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, let me just say that as the son of businessowners, I don't think the gentleman knows what he is talking about.

This is outrageous. I have the bills that we are considering here today, and the reason I am not spending much time talking about them is because they suck. They are awful. It is pathetic. One creates a hotline that already exists. Mr. Speaker, you can go online and call the hotline. They are just restating it. That is what we are doing here. There is nothing about the tariffs that are screwing over small businesses, nothing about the realities that small businesses are dealing with each and every day. My friends come up with these bills that are meaningless and that do nothing for anybody.

I am sorry that my Republican friends don't want to talk about the healthcare crisis. However, because of Republican inaction, millions and millions of people are going to see their healthcare bills skyrocket, and millions are going to probably go without healthcare. We have been warning my friends about this for months, and the Republicans have done nothing; not a damn thing. I don't know how they go home and face their constituents who are about to get screwed over with high healthcare premiums and bills and say: Oh, I know, I get it. People are going to lose their healthcare. My friends have been in charge all year, and they have done zero, nothing, not a damn thing.

So these bills that we are talking about today, I would encourage anybody who is viewing this on C-SPAN to google them and to look them up. It is pathetic. It is pathetic that this is what we are wasting our time doing. There is so much at stake. We have 2 weeks left to address the healthcare crisis, and my Republican friends have nothing, nothing that talks about that today.

The hotline already exists, by the way. You can google it. So you basically establish a hotline that already exists, Mr. Speaker. Boy, that is helping small businesses.

Yeah, but that is not a big problem, Mr. Speaker. The big problem is the

high cost of healthcare and these tariffs which are just basically putting many of our businesses out of business.

So my friends come here and defend this garbage that we are doing. It is pathetic. It is pathetic.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. SYKES).

Mrs. SYKES. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in opposition to the rule and H.R. 4312, the SCORE Act.

This legislation fails to address the rights of students to advocate for themselves, and that is why I introduced an amendment to allow for students to collectively bargain.

As a former gymnast and athlete, my allegiance will always be with athletes and with the underdog. It is undeniable that student athletes are not receiving equitable compensation for their labor, especially those in high-revenue sports. A student athlete constantly endangers themselves and risks great harm to their bodies for the entertainment of the masses, all while juggling classes, practice, and potentially a part-time job just to survive.

Their natural talents allow for universities to recruit on and off the field and raise money all while the actual revenue generators are left in the cold.

This issue was already addressed in the courts, and one thing that remains clear is the NCAA has been profiting off college students' labor and the students have not. For decades, students have not been paid for their participation in what is clearly a billion-dollar industry. This is not right.

Currently, the SCORE Act has not laid out an equitable revenue sharing model and leaves it wholly up to the interpretation of the school. Further, passing the SCORE Act as it stands would only eliminate students' ability to collectively bargain. That is why I introduced an amendment in the Rules Committee to strike the language from the bill and allow students to be properly compensated for their labor.

I thank my colleagues on the Democratic side for offering the amendment, but, unfortunately, the amendment failed on a party-line vote and was rejected by the Republicans.

Without my amendment, players at schools in my district, basketball players specifically, would not have the means of recourse to negotiate compensation and would be forced to simply shut up and dribble.

I understand that the needs of a Big 10 school are different from those in the MAC or the SWAC, and without the ability to collectively bargain, these athletes cannot negotiate with the university for their specific needs no matter the size of the program.

For those reasons and more, I am in opposition to the rule and the bill, and I encourage my colleagues to get back to the drawing board and do something that actually works for student athletes and allows them to be paid equitably and fairly and collectively bargain.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that some of my colleagues on

the other side of the aisle may have been involved in small businesses. I was too, not just family, but I ran a small business for many, many years. People may not consider a solo practitioner of law a small business, but I tell you, Mr. Speaker, when you have to pay the light bill and you have to pay the salaries, you are a small business.

Further, I have also been involved for many years in a swimming pool that some years makes money but most years may show a little bit of a profit but it is there mainly because we want it to be a community pool. However, it is a corporation that makes money occasionally—even if only on paper—and that corporation has to buy equipment. Shockingly, Mr. Speaker, you need new kickboards. You need new diving boards, and you need new swim blocks.

What we did last summer helps all of those small businesses, and every one of them knows it. So to say that we haven't done anything on that is really a misnomer and a mistake.

I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, that it is true that the bill, the SCORE Act, does not solve all the ills that some may see out there, but it is a step in the right direction. That is why in my opening I said that this was a first step but not the last step in trying to solve problems that we have in our college athletics.

It is true that the big sports make lots of money, but the gymnasts of the world and the swimmers of the world don't bring in a lot of revenue. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that when I would be swimming in the pool, even in my prime, it was never considered mass appeal entertainment. Nobody would have paid to watch our swimming meets. Now, we had a good time swimming for Emory & Henry College, now University, but it was not bringing in great revenues to the college.

That is why this bill says that if you are going to be doing this, Mr. Speaker, then some of these revenues have to be spent to keep other sports going as well. We are trying to make sure that there is some recognition of the Olympic sports, and we are trying to make sure that there is recognition of other sports. That also means women's sports. Mr. Speaker, you have to have some abilities to take some of the money that you make off the revenue sports, as they are called, and use them for the other sports.

Now, if we want to continue with the Wild Wild West, as my friend, GUS BILLRAKIS, likes to say, then we do nothing and we defeat this rule. We do nothing, and it will continue to be a crazy arena out there where students aren't looked at, and particularly, Mr. Speaker, if you are not the top-billed students on the football team or on the basketball team. If you are a student athlete in any other way, then you are getting harmed by what is starting to happen and what is happening in our larger universities where everything is going to pay the top-named athletes who

come to your school next year. This starts us down that path.

□ 1250

Is it a perfect bill? I will not claim that. The rule makes it so that we get this first step moving down the pathway to try to resolve some of these issues.

I fully expect that we will have bills in the future that will deal with some of the other issues. We will find that when we do this, we probably have solved some problems, and we will discover additional problems. Sometimes when you get an answer to a question, it raises more questions. That is what this bill is supposed to do. It is supposed to start us down the path.

If we find that there are other issues that Congress needs to step in and deal with, then we can do so. We are not limited to taking action only in December 2025. That is why we have a legislative body that will consider if this bill does good.

I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that the SCORE Act does good. Does it do perfectly? No. Does it solve everything that everybody might think of? No. Does it solve problems we have yet to think of? No.

It is a good start in an area where there is no guidance currently, where the NCAA has lost control of our college athletics completely, and where it is, in fact, a Wild Wild West where the vast majority of students, I submit, who are student athletes are being hurt and left behind.

We are trying to rectify it, to create a balance, so to speak. That is why, as a first step on this first-step bill, we need to pass the rule.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman wants to talk about the rule, so let's talk about the rule.

What is frustrating to me, I think many of us—not just Democrats, but a good chunk of Republicans—are at the end of our rope. The Republican leadership is running this House like an authoritarian dictatorship. It is their way or the highway.

There are six bills that are allowed to be considered under this rule. Every single one of them is completely closed. What does that mean? It means nobody can offer amendments. Democrats can't offer amendments. Republicans can't offer amendments. They didn't even ask for people to submit amendments. They like to say nobody offered amendments. Yeah, people did offer amendments.

The gentleman talks about the SCORE Act. A Republican came to the Rules Committee last night and offered five amendments. I think they were reasonable. I think they were reasonable enough to be debated and for us to vote on them. All five were blocked. They are blocking members of their own party. That is how they run this place.

A Democrat came up with an alternative, a good idea. You may not sup-

port it, but people like me thought it was a better way to approach this than the way the bill is written. That was blocked, too.

Everything is blocked. Everything is blocked. I think they are being blocked because my friends are afraid they might prevail.

By the way, all the players associations are against the SCORE Act the way it is currently written, every single one of them.

This year alone, Republicans have issued 86 closed rules. That puts them on track to obliterate their previous record of the most closed rules in a single Congress. That is 86 times that this Chamber was kept from even considering amendments to approve bills. There is no debate, no votes, nothing. That is what an authoritarian dictatorship is like.

Republicans have blocked nearly 8 out of every 10 amendments submitted to the Rules Committee. Get this: That is 2,700 amendments gone, tossed out by this leadership. They have blocked 60 percent of bipartisan amendments, most of their own party's amendments, and more than 90 percent of Democratic amendments.

Apparently, the only ideas welcome in this Congress are the ones written by special interests or the ones that Donald Trump personally signs off on.

We used to debate in this Chamber. We used to vote on amendments on the floor. Members had a voice. Legislation wasn't cooked up in the Speaker's office and rammed through with no chance to fix it.

Here we are. Republicans have made fewer amendments in order at this point in the year than any Congress going back a decade.

By decimating debate, House Republicans have turned themselves into a rubberstamp for Trump. They will fast-track giveaways to the wealthy and the well-connected, but they will block amendments that would protect care for millions or unrig our economy for working people.

The real scandal here is that we can do something to control the rising costs of healthcare. We have been begging—by the way, not just Democrats; some Republicans have, too—for them to at least put something on the floor that we can debate and vote on to help alleviate the terrible burden that is about to fall on millions and millions of families in this country. The answer is we can't do it. They won't do it. They won't do it.

You want to debate the rule? This rule is pathetic. Six completely closed rules on six completely different bills. Congress is supposed to work for the American people. I think my Republican colleagues have forgotten that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. STANSBURY).

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Speaker, it is always instructive to come down here to the floor and listen to the debate. I think it speaks for itself.

I rise today in opposition to the bills that are before us and in strong defense of the Department of Education, our students, and kids across America.

As a public school student myself, I can say unequivocally that these bills are fundamentally unserious and designed to distract from the fact that the Trump administration is currently dismantling the Department of Education right before our very eyes.

They have laid off thousands of employees, shuttered offices, carved up programs and transferred them to other agencies, declassified educators from getting student loans, threatened schools and universities, and given their friends contracts to not only rewrite educational curricula but to even rewrite American history itself.

Let me remind my colleagues: This is the agency that was born out of the civil rights movement, the agency that ensures kids with disabilities have opportunities and ensures that all kids, no matter who they are or where they live, have access to education.

Before the Department of Education, millions of children all across this country were denied access to schools and educational opportunities. Federal programs were duplicative and wasteful, and States regularly violated the basic civil rights of students.

If our colleagues want to stand with students, want to stand with schools, and want to stand with educators, then we should be fighting to protect our schools, fighting to protect them from an administration that is trying to dismantle education as we speak. My colleagues should be fighting to address housing, food, and healthcare and to fix our broken economy.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I am here today to stand to oppose these bills and to stand with every public school and every kid across America who is fighting for a fair shot. That is what we were elected to do.

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

Wow. I am going to talk about the rule. That is what I am supposed to talk about.

I will cede to my colleague, the ranking member of the Rules Committee, that it is absolutely a fair point of debate to bring up the number of closed rules, but he does so without providing all the context.

When accounting for closed rules in the rules package, CRAs and bills that received no amendments—this is for this Congress—less than 35 percent of closed rules have been at the discretion of the Rules Committee.

I know the ranking member will also say there was no formal deadline or call for amendments. Don't be misled, Mr. Speaker. He knows all too well that when he was chairman of the committee, the committee did not always provide a formal amendment deadline every week when they ran the show, either.

□ 1300

Mr. Speaker, it is true that this rule has six closed measures. It should be

noted that amendments were only submitted on three of the six. This means that, of the six bills, only three were closed at the discretion of the committee.

My friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), may also recall that Members can submit amendments, and the Rules Committee may make them in order, whether there is a formal deadline to submit them or not. That is a practice that both Republicans and Democrats have employed.

Mr. Speaker, sometimes we get down here and we get all riled up. Been there, done that. I have been riled up myself before, but I find it fascinating from a historical context that my colleague said that when you have closed rules, this is what it looks like in an authoritarian dictatorship.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the words “authoritarian dictatorship” must poll well because my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are consistently throwing it out there. Here is what is so fascinating: In an authoritarian dictatorship, you don’t get to claim that something that the majority is doing is like an authoritarian dictatorship because you would be banned from saying such things. You would not be allowed to say such things. You would not be allowed to have your time to debate the rule and then the bills. All of that would go by the wayside. That has not happened here.

Mr. Speaker, we can argue and, on some points, I might even agree with my colleague from Massachusetts. In the general running of the House floor, I might even be willing to go further than him on some issues because I would like to see us reform a lot of the things we do around here.

Mr. Speaker, we are nowhere near his so-called authoritarian dictatorship from a historical perspective. For those of us who study those movements throughout history, I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that to even say that is damaging to this great Republic, which is known throughout the world as the beacon of freedom and known as the United States of America.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, that is a lot of words to defend the most closed Congress in history. I say that this place is starting to look like an authoritarian dictatorship because this is what happens in authoritarian countries. People don’t get an opportunity to be able to offer amendments or change bills or change legislation. It is take it or leave it.

Mr. Speaker, people are silenced all the time, and the gentleman is trying to defend this process. Talk to the Republican Member who came to the Rules Committee and offered five amendments—all of them germane, all of them designed to improve the so-called SCORE Act—and he was denied not one, not two, but all five. Can’t do it.

Mr. Speaker, I will say again that when the gentleman says that, oh, people didn’t offer amendments to all of these bills, I think people are getting to understand what is going on here. My Republican friends don’t even ask for amendments anymore. They don’t give people time to write them. Everybody kind of knows that the system is rigged. It is take it or leave it.

People have had it. Every single Member here has ideas that maybe could improve some of this legislation, but the whole system is rigged in a way that you have to take it or leave it. This is not the way the House of Representatives should be run. There are a whole bunch of other issues that we should be dealing with.

Mr. Speaker, on Friday, The Washington Post reported an egregious abuse of power by the Secretary of Defense. Back in September, an order was reportedly carried out to eliminate all remaining survivors on a suspected drug trafficking boat sailing through the Caribbean.

Pete Hegseth, who now calls himself Secretary of War, issued an order to kill everybody who survived the first strike. Kill everybody.

Those are the alleged words from the leader of our Defense Department. Just to be clear, killing defenseless people, regardless of whether they had been engaged in armed conflict, is a war crime, plain and simple. The administration is trying to brainwash the American people into thinking that cruelty and murder and war crimes are normal.

Mr. Speaker, I have news for the Trump administration. This is not normal. Even if we were at war, attacking survivors of an airstrike, whether or not they pose a threat to the United States, is a war crime. It is unconscionable. It is an unconscionable act of aggression that violates the Department of Defense’s own guidelines, U.S. law, and international norms and laws.

Even President Trump is trying to distance himself from this unlawful attack, saying that he “wouldn’t have wanted that, not a second strike.”

Let me be clear. Secretary Hegseth has blatantly carried out illegal acts of violence and, right now, he is trying to convince the American people that these actions are okay. Mr. Speaker, the American people know better, and they deserve better.

Mr. Speaker, in case anybody tuned in to the President’s little press conference before we gathered here today, he said that the issue of affordability is a “hoax.” It is a “scam,” he said.

Really? Anybody who is watching these proceedings, do you really think that the issue of affordability is a “scam”? Prices are higher than ever. People will be paying more for their healthcare because of the inaction of the Republicans in the House, the Senate, and this White House. They will be paying so much that many of them are going to drop their health insurance.

Mr. Speaker, he said that the issue of affordability is a “scam,” a “hoax,”

and is not real. I mean, come on. Come on. I would urge my Republican colleagues to stand up for their constituents. Do the right thing. Say “no” to these closed processes that don’t allow you—even you—to be able to offer amendments, and stand up for policies that are going to make life easier for all people in this country.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EZELL). Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

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

Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Massachusetts and I agree on one thing in his comments: Killing defenseless people is wrong.

I don’t know whether that happened or not, but, as he knows or ought to know, Mr. Speaker, both the Senate and the Armed Services Committee in the House are looking into these allegations. Again, let me unequivocally state that I agree: Killing of defenseless people is wrong.

Let’s talk about affordability. I do agree that the affordability of healthcare is an issue. It is a complex issue. It is not in any of the bills that we are dealing with today, and that is his complaint, it is that there ought to be something in there.

Mr. Speaker, let me remind folks how we got here. We got here with a bill that came out of the Speaker’s office, Speaker PELOSI’s office, called the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare. It was going to make everybody’s world much better.

Mr. Speaker, it did take care of pre-existing conditions. I wasn’t here then. It is something that Republicans should have fixed. They should have fixed that. Other than that, it did not make healthcare affordable.

In fact, the biggest complaint that my colleagues have had throughout the course of the last few weeks about the enhanced premium tax credits was due to a temporary program that they said would end December of 2025, and now they claim nobody can afford it without this temporary program that was brought in because of COVID. Nobody can afford insurance in the exchanges. They have, in fact, admitted that healthcare costs and health insurance costs in this country are a problem because of ObamaCare.

Mr. Speaker, we have talked about everything. I have thought about maybe getting up here and giving a speech on the National D-day Memorial. People are talking about everything that has nothing to do with this rule. I believe that I have exhausted all of my comments that are directly related to the rule, so I am prepared to close at the appropriate time. If we keep bringing up new issues, I may feel compelled to respond.

Mr. Speaker, if we are just talking about the rule that deals with these six bills that we are considering this week, then I am prepared to close.



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

□ 1310

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

Mr. Speaker, I have to tell you, I love my Republican friends. They just reach back. Now, we are going back to Obama.

What they don't tell you is that Donald Trump has been in public life as President for 4 years, and he has been around for 10 years now. Yet, he has no responsibility for anything. It is always somebody else's fault. Donald Trump never had a plan to make healthcare more affordable or accessible. He didn't care about any of that stuff.

I just want to point out, for the record, because I think it is important, that one-half of adults with the Affordable Care Act healthcare coverage are small business owners, small business employees, or self-employed people. We are talking about millions and millions of Americans. Many of them are going to see their healthcare costs rise so high that they are not going to be able to afford it. They will lose their healthcare. Many of them will have to choose between healthcare and paying their rent or mortgages and basically putting food on the table.

The idea that that is not an urgent issue, that we are not addressing that, that it is kind of an afterthought, and, instead, we have a rule here that brings up a bill that creates a hotline that already exists, I mean, I would say to my Republican friends: Are you serious? Really, is this serious legislating?

Again, despite Republicans spending years attacking the Affordable Care Act, it has gotten only more popular. Support for the ACA consistently polls at or above 60 percent. In September 2025, in fact, 64 percent of the people viewed the ACA favorably.

Maybe support for it is so overwhelming because the ACA extended coverage to millions and millions of Americans, and its provisions help everyone, including people who were previously insured and many who were never insured.

Currently, the Affordable Care Act stops health insurance companies from charging sick people more on premiums than healthy people. It keeps those same health insurance companies from denying coverage to pregnant women, people with preexisting medical conditions, or because of the person's medical history. It prohibits the health insurance industry from setting an annual or lifetime limit. It demands that insurance companies cover most preventative services. It gives States the flexibility to expand their Medicaid programs, which 40 States have done. It provides financial assistance to working people to make healthcare coverage more affordable. It allows young adults to stay on their parents' insurance plans until they are 26.

These are just some of the provisions within the ACA that make it so pop-

ular with the American people. These are provisions that literally have saved people's lives and livelihoods.

In addition, the last time Democrats were in control, we built on the progress we made in the ACA. We allowed Medicare to negotiate prescription drug prices for the first time in history, saving both Medicare and the American people billions of dollars. We capped the cost of insulin at \$35. We made signing up for healthcare coverage easier and more affordable. We lowered premiums by an average of \$800 per person.

In over 4 years, nearly 12 million more Americans signed up for insurance in the ACA marketplace, bringing the total up to nearly 24 million in 2025.

Taken together, Democratic policies brought the uninsured rate to a record low.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know if we may have some other people coming in, so I will wait. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide the consolidation of H.R. 6074, which would extend the Affordable Care Act enhanced premium—

Mr. Speaker, I am going to hold on. I am going to reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this is a terrible bill, and I urge everybody to vote "no." Again, this is an important topic. This is about whether or not people basically have their basic rights upheld and respected in this country.

We are in the midst of a healthcare crisis, a crisis that Republicans are refusing to address, and more than 20 million Americans who get their healthcare on the ACA exchanges are going to see their premiums skyrocket in less than a month.

There are only 12 legislative days left for this House to fix this problem before disaster strikes millions of American families. What are the Republicans focused on? They are focused on nonexistent foreign influence in kindergarten classes. You can't make this up.

It is not for lack of an opportunity to do the right thing. Over and over, Democrats have offered the Republican majority in the House and the Senate a lifeline to vote to extend these credits and to get out of their own way. In fact, we have given them 19 separate chances to vote to extend the ACA credits. They have voted "no" on each and every one.

This PQ vote today will be congressional Republicans' 20th opportunity to

vote to prevent the health insurance costs of millions of Americans, their constituents, my constituents, from rising significantly.

It is past time for them to do the right thing. For the sake of millions of Americans and their healthcare, I urge my Republican colleagues to support this extension and to vote on the previous question.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to insert the text of my amendment into the RECORD, along with any extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 3 minutes left.

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

Mr. Speaker, make no mistake, this Republican majority is failing spectacularly, and the American people know it.

They have now had 12 months, a full year to do something, anything, to bring down prices, to lower costs, and to focus on housing, healthcare, food prices, or transportation. That is what I hear about when I talk to people back home. They want the government to focus on housing costs, healthcare, childcare, food, transportation. They want a Congress that makes it easier to buy a home, raise a family, and build a life. Instead, we get a bunch of absurd bills that nobody asked for.

Republicans want to bring up legislation addressing foreign influence in our kids' classrooms. How about they start addressing foreign influence in the Oval Office? How about Qatar gifting a new Air Force One to Trump? What was that in exchange for? How about the \$20 billion Trump gave to his friend in Argentina? How about the lavish dinner he just held for the Saudi Prince who murdered a U.S. journalist?

No, no, no. Republicans don't want you to ask about that foreign interference. You need to worry about the Chinese Government getting involved with your kids' math class. That is what they say. Is this Republican majority for real? This is insane.

These guys have had a full year to do something for working families, to bring down food prices, to reduce healthcare costs for regular people, to take on corporate greed, and to lower everyday expenses. They have done nothing.

Instead, they have defended Trump's tariffs, passed tax cuts for billionaires, and protected the special interests while regular families are getting screwed. They have shoveled subsidies and giveaways to greedy CEOs while

families struggle to pay for groceries and rent.

Quite frankly, we don't share the same values. Democrats want a very different government. We want a government that stands up to corporate greed, a government that uplifts workers, powers consumers, and fights on the side of everyday people. We want a Congress that takes on special interests and doesn't reward them.

We believe in passing big, bold, consequential bills that make life better for everyday people, not creating hotlines that already exist and certainly not going on a taxpayer-funded vacation for 8 weeks like Republicans did in October and November.

The American people deserve so much better. They deserve leaders who fight for them, not a Republican majority that worships Donald Trump and rewards his wealthy friends.

I urge a "no" vote on this rule, Mr. Speaker. It is pathetic that we are here talking about this stuff and not talking about ways to keep the government open and to make sure that people can afford their healthcare and can afford other things.

There is too much attention being showered on those who are well-off and well-connected, those who are connected to this President, who give him gifts, and who write big checks to this administration. We have to put regular people first.

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

□ 1320

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

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I am going to surprise you. I am actually going to talk about what we are supposed to talk about, and that would be the rule.

I am not going to talk about everything that is out there that I think ought to be changed in the world, and I am not going to say that if you don't do everything I want done that we shouldn't pass anything. If you vote this rule down, you are basically saying if you are not going to do what I want, you shouldn't do anything. I don't believe that is the way a legislative body ought to operate.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this rule in order to bring more transparency and oversight into our children's schools, to ensure that our children are not being improperly influenced by foreign actors or that foreign actors aren't using contributions to our schools to benefit themselves.

One of our colleagues on the Education and Workforce Committee did a whole hearing on the Chinese Communist Party back in 2023, and part of what this bill is addressing are issues that were brought out at that time, one of which struck home.

Fairfax County's Thomas Jefferson High School for Science and Tech-

nology, which at one time was the number one high school in the United States of America, has apparently slipped to number five. I did some checking before I came here today. They received over \$3 million from Chinese entities. In return, the top-ranked high school in the United States gave them all the techniques that we are using to teach our students to be better scientists, to be better in the technology field, to be better in mathematics, and to be able to compete better with the United States. It doesn't make any sense.

That is why some of these bills are great bills that make sure that we are reining that in, that we know about it, that the parents know about it, that the government knows about it. We should know if we are getting foreign money influence in our schools, our students, or maybe stealing our ideas.

These bills help our small businesses. On top of that, we take the first step, as I said in the beginning and in the debate, not the last step to bring integrity into the name, image, and likeness, NIL, process in college sports by setting up a Federal framework—not possibly 50; we already have 30—but a Federal framework to ensure that we have fairness across the board on college athletics.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of this rule so that we can bring about these good policies and we can debate all the other things that ail the world another day.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 916 OFFERED BY  
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 6. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 6074) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the enhancement of the health care premium tax credit. 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 Ways and Means or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to reconsider.

SEC. 7. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 6074.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further pro-

ceedings on this question are postponed.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1330

AFTER RECESS

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER  
PRO TEMPORE

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

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 916; and

Adoption of House Resolution 916, if ordered.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4312, STUDENT COMPENSATION AND OPPORTUNITY THROUGH RIGHTS AND ENDORSEMENTS ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1005, COMBATING THE LIES OF AUTHORITARIANS IN SCHOOL SYSTEMS ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1049, TRANSPARENCY IN REPORTING OF ADVERSARIAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO EDUCATION ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1069, PROMOTING RESPONSIBLE OVERSIGHT TO ELIMINATE COMMUNIST TEACHINGS FOR OUR KIDS ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2965, SMALL BUSINESS REGULATORY REDUCTION ACT OF 2025; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4305, DESTROYING UNNECESSARY, MISALIGNED, AND PROHIBITIVE RED TAPE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 916) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4312) to protect the name, image, and likeness rights of student athletes and to promote fair competition with respect to intercollegiate athletics, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1005) to prohibit elementary and