

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House the approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1 of rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

SECURING AMERICAN ELECTIONS

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful that this week House Republicans, led by House Speaker MIKE JOHNSON, will vote on the SAVE Act. This legislation will work to ensure election security, restoring public trust in the electoral process.

The bill would protect valuable rights through common sense, such as mandating a valid photo ID for all Federal elections, requiring documentary proof of citizenship when registering to vote in Federal elections, and forcing States to identify and remove noncitizens from existing voter rolls.

As a former Lexington County election commissioner, I know firsthand these reforms are basic, and opposition sadly reveals opening the door for ballot fraud.

In conclusion, God bless our troops as the global war on terrorism continues. Trump is reinstating peace through strength, revealing war criminal Putin lies, insulting Trump and mocking Trump, as Putin destroys Ukrainian civilian utilities to freeze Ukrainians, murderously deprived of electricity, heat, and water with temperatures below zero.

HONORING BILL STURGEON ON HIS RETIREMENT

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

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the retirement of a pillar in a western Massachusetts community and a fixture in Berkshire County, my dear friend Bill Sturgeon.

Born to a firefighter and a nurse from Pittsfield, Massachusetts, Bill graduated from Pittsfield High School in 1966 before enlisting in the U.S. Army in 1969. He proudly served our country during the Vietnam war and was awarded the Bronze Star for his heroic achievements.

Bill continued that service upon his return home, working as a police officer in both the Lanesborough, Massachusetts, and Pittsfield, Massachusetts, police departments.

In 2008, Bill hosted his first radio show at WBRK radio, embarking on a remarkable journey to becoming one of the most iconic voices in the Berkshire community history. As a self-described Kennedy Democrat, Bill hosted guests from all across the political spectrum and from all walks of life on WTBR's "Morning Drive." He welcomed debate that was respectful, substantive, and grounded in a genuine desire to inform rather than inflame.

I can say with all confidence that he is the only reporter whom I have ever had the pleasure of interacting with who started the interview with me by saying: Hey there, handsome. Needless to say, Bill Sturgeon is truly one of a kind.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are forever grateful to Bill Sturgeon for his service to our Nation, and the people of Berkshire County are forever grateful to him for being part of their morning drive.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. AMODEI). I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for the dictionary that he sent to all of us who still believe in those things and not computers. Thank you very much, sir.

CELEBRATING CENTENNIAL OF MT. OLIVE PICKLE COMPANY

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

Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, let me tell you something that is a real "big dill." Mt. Olive Pickle Company in Mount Olive, North Carolina, is celebrating 100 years.

With more than 230 million jars of pickles, peppers, and relishes flying off the shelves every year, Mt. Olive has been a cherished favorite in kitchens around the globe. Pickles on your sandwiches, relish on hot dogs, mm-mm-good.

Founded in 1926 by Shikrey Baddour, George Moore, and a group of dedicated local leaders, the company was created with the spirit of community in mind, believing that their success meant success for their hometown.

Let's raise our jars and toast a century of tasty impact and a legacy that continues to enhance dinner tables.

□ 1210

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2189, LAW-ENFORCEMENT INNOVATE TO DE-ESCALATE ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 261, UNDERSEA CABLE PROTECTION ACT OF 2025; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3617, SECURING AMERICA'S CRITICAL MINERALS SUPPLY ACT; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1042 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1042

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2189) to modernize Federal firearms laws to account for advancements in technology and less-than-lethal weapons, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 119-18 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 the Judiciary or their respective designees and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means 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 the bill (H.R. 261) to amend the National Marine Sanctuaries Act to prohibit requiring an authorization for the installation, continued presence, operation, maintenance, repair, or recovery of undersea fiber optic cables in a national marine sanctuary if such activities have previously been authorized by a Federal or State agency. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources 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 Natural Resources or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3617) to amend the Department of Energy Organization Act to secure the supply of critical energy resources, including critical minerals and other materials, 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 Energy and Commerce 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 Energy and Commerce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 4. Each day during the period from February 10, 2026, through July 31, 2026, shall not constitute a calendar day for purposes of section 202 of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622) with respect to a joint resolution terminating a national emergency declared by the President on February 1, 2025, April 2, 2025, July 30, 2025, or August 6, 2025.

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

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE), 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. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, last night, the Rules Committee met and reported out a rule providing for consideration of three measures.

The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 3617, the Securing America's Critical Minerals Supply Act, under a closed rule, with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, or their designees, and provides for one motion to recommit.

The rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 261, the Undersea Cable Protection Act, under a closed rule, with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources, or their designees, and provides for one motion to recommit.

The rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 2189, the Law-Enforcement Innovate to De-Escalate Act, under a closed rule, with 1 hour of debate equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their designees, and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means or their designees, and provides for one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and in support of the underlying legislation. The rule before us once again exposes a fundamental divide in the House. Republicans are focused on

protecting American lives, American infrastructure, and American national security. Democrats are focused on protecting bureaucracies, activist pressure campaigns, and the broken systems they created.

For years, Democrats have governed by slogan instead of substance. They talk about safety, but undermine law enforcement. They claim to care about national security, but allow infrastructure critical to that mission of security to decay. They give lipservice to the need to reshore our supply chains, while time and again supporting policies and legislation that ensure that America remains dependent on our foreign adversaries.

Their opposition to the rule today undermines and underlines the stark contrast between the left's words and their actions, which threaten to undermine our country.

Mr. Speaker, the rule provides for consideration of H.R. 2189, the Law-Enforcement Innovate to De-Escalate Act. Every single day, law enforcement officers are asked to make split-second decisions in dangerous, unpredictable situations. In those moments, officers should have access to every appropriate tool available to de-escalate encounters, protect themselves, and save the public's lives.

Yet standing in their way is outdated Federal law. Under current statute, less-than-lethal devices like tasers are still treated like firearms. That classification no longer reflects modern technology, modern training, or modern policing. It creates unnecessary barriers for law enforcement agencies across this country.

These devices are designed to temporarily incapacitate an individual without causing serious or permanent injury. They play a critical role in real-world law enforcement encounters by giving officers a nonlethal option to defuse potentially violent situations and protect both officers and the public at large.

Because these de-escalation tools are misclassified under Federal law, the consequences are real. Law enforcement agencies and communities face higher costs, procurement delays, and unnecessary regulatory hurdles, including taxes and rules written over 50 years ago that were never intended to apply to modern, less-than-lethal technology.

At a time when departments are investing in better training, accountability, and modern technology to reduce fatal encounters, access to less-than-lethal alternatives should be expanding, not shrinking. Federal law should be keeping pace with innovation, not trapping law enforcement in the past.

□ 1220

Mr. Speaker, the Law-Enforcement Innovate to De-Escalate Act updates this outdated framework and acknowledges a simple fact. Law enforcement officers need access to better tools in

order to do their job safely and effectively.

The bill ensures less-than-lethal devices are treated for what they are, which are tools in de-escalation, not firearms. It draws clear lines, focuses on devices designed to incapacitate without causing serious injury, and explicitly prevents any device that would be converted into a lethal weapon from falling under the new definition.

Democrats will claim that this bill is dangerous. They always do. The real danger is forcing our law enforcement officers into a false choice between using deadly force or no force at all. If we are serious about reducing violent encounters and saving lives, we should be focused on giving officers more options to de-escalate situations when seconds matter.

Mr. Speaker, the rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 261, the Undersea Cable Protection Act of 2025. This bill is about infrastructure most Americans will never see but every single one of us rely on every single day. From sending an email to making a phone call to moving money across the globe, undersea cables are the backbone of the modern world.

In fact, undersea cables carry more than 95 percent of global internet traffic. They support military communications. They move trillions of dollars in financial transactions and keep the global economy functioning.

Protecting this infrastructure is not just about speed or convenience. It is about national security. Route diversity matters. When too many cables are forced into the same landing areas, vulnerabilities increase. Adversaries take notice.

Despite their importance, undersea cable projects face duplicative and unnecessary regulatory hurdles. Even after projects receive all required Federal and State approvals, agencies can still demand additional authorizations, slowing installation, maintenance, and repair work that is critical to keeping these systems secure.

We see this pattern far too often in Washington. Projects are approved, but delays pile up anyway. Timelines slip. Responsibility gets passed around. Bureaucracy grows, while real-world risks go unaddressed.

We saw the same pattern play out in upstate New York. Micron is making a historic investment in bringing advanced semiconductor manufacturing back to the United States, creating thousands of good-paying jobs and strengthening domestic supply chains critical to our national security.

Yet, even after clearing one of the most stringent State environmental review processes in the country, the project is subjected to duplicative Federal reviews that reached the same exact conclusions again and again. Those delays were not about environmental risks. They were bureaucratic duplication, years of lost time before construction could even begin.

That is not environmental protection. It is regulatory paralysis. It is

the same kind of post-approval delay and second-guessing that puts critical projects, including our undersea cable installation, maintenance, and repair, at risk.

At a time when adversaries are actively probing undersea infrastructure, Washington should be focused on protection, resilience, and readiness, not red tape.

That is exactly what the Undersea Cable Protection Act of 2025 does. It prevents agencies from piling new permitting requirements onto projects that have already been reviewed and approved. It allows installation, maintenance, and repair to move forward without unnecessary delay, while preserving coordination and oversight.

Nothing in this bill weakens environmental laws. Nothing strips oversight and accountability. It simply says that once the government has completed its review, it should not keep finding ways to slow down critical security infrastructure.

If Democrats were serious about national security, we could pass this on suspension. They would support protecting the infrastructure that carries our communications, our commerce, and our defense information. Instead, they will continue to defend a broken process that leaves critical assets exposed and America more vulnerable than it should be.

Mr. Speaker, the rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 3617, the Securing America's Critical Minerals Supply Act. Critical minerals are essential to modern life. They are used in defense systems, energy infrastructure, manufacturing, and the advanced technologies that power our economy and keep this country secure. Without reliable access to these materials, everything built on top of them becomes vulnerable.

Yet for years, Washington policies have discouraged domestic production and pushed our supply chains overseas. The result was predictable. The United States became dangerously dependent on foreign sources for critical minerals, often controlled by adversarial nations that do not share our interests or our values.

American jobs were lost and supply chains weakened. Foreign governments gained leverage over materials our economy and national defense rely on every single day. That is the damage this Congress is now working to reverse.

Energy security has been a core national security concern before. After the oil crises of the 1970s, Americans learned the hard way what happens when adversaries control the resources our economy depends on.

Today, we face a similar threat not just in energy but across the next generation of industries like artificial intelligence, advanced manufacturing, and defense systems that all rely on critical minerals.

After decades of degrowth policies that drove energy production, mining,

and refining all overseas, our adversaries exploited those vulnerabilities. The result is an economy that leaves American families exposed to decisions made in places like Communist China.

We have already seen this play out. Communist China has taken steps to restrict exports of key minerals including antimony, which is essential to defense manufacturing for systems like radar. That is not a theoretical risk. It is active leverage being used against the United States today.

Under President Trump, the United States has begun to change course by prioritizing domestic production, strengthening supply chain security, and treating critical minerals as a strategic national interest.

H.R. 3617, the Securing America's Critical Minerals Supply Act, builds on that effort. It forces the Federal Government to take a hard look at where America is vulnerable, improves coordination across agencies, and ensures securing critical minerals is treated as a priority, not as an afterthought.

The bill strengthens the Department of Energy's role in identifying supply chain risks and supporting responsible domestic production, refining, and processing, so America is not forced to rely on adversaries for materials essential to our economy and to our defense.

Let's be clear about what this bill does not do. It does not eliminate environmental review. It does not lower standards. It simply says America should be able to responsibly produce what it needs here at home instead of outsourcing our future to foreign powers.

Instead of trying to score political points, Democrats should support efforts to close the supply chain vulnerabilities that Communist China actively exploits to the detriment of the American people.

If Democrats were serious about supply chain security and national defense, this is exactly the kind of bill that they would support. Instead, they spent years defending policies that left America exposed. Republicans are choosing strength, security, and self-reliance. Democrats choose dependence and delay.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I listened to every word of my colleague from New York's very long speech regarding the bills that the House is considering today. I might perhaps offer a different picture that I think the American people ought to consider.

I think, as you know, Mr. Speaker, last month the U.S. economy shed over 100,000 jobs—100,000. It was the worst month with respect to job losses since the Great Recession in 2009.

Prices are going up across the board. Everything is getting more expensive. Orange juice is more expensive. Ground beef is more expensive. Countless

Americans across our country are struggling.

Last year, we experienced a 46 percent jump in farm-related bankruptcies. Rural America is struggling under this President's reckless policies. Americans across the country are struggling economically because of House Republicans' reckless policies.

For all those who wonder whether politicians in Washington might offer a solution to what ails our country economically, have no fear. House Republicans have come up with an answer. This week, they are focused on what really matters to the American people: Cutting taxes for tasers and making it easier for multinational tech companies, monopolies, to build undersea cables through marine sanctuaries.

□ 1230

Those are the bills that we are considering today on the floor. That is their answer to the economic crisis that has befallen the people of our great country.

It is absurd. It is absurd. It begs the question: Why? Why would House Republicans choose this course, again, given all of the challenges that I know that their constituents face, as mine do?

Unfortunately, it is a reflection of the core values of just too many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, who invariably, incessantly, and inherently have a predisposition to favor the ultrarich and the biggest corporations on planet Earth. Anyone who doubts it should consider the bills that we are debating today.

I have to tell you that I do a lot of townhalls in my district. I represent the great State of Colorado. I know the Speaker, being from Nevada, knows my State quite well. I represent a large district in western Colorado and northern Colorado. It is bigger than eight States, with no offense to my colleagues from New Jersey, Maryland, or Rhode Island. It is a huge district, which means that I am on the road a lot. I do a lot of townhalls.

A lot of issues come up at these townhalls. There are a lot of obstacles that Coloradans and Americans are facing that they would like to see their elected leaders help to solve.

I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, the one topic that has never come up at a single townhall that I have held in my career: undersea cables. It just hasn't come up.

Maybe my colleague in New York has a different experience. I don't know. I don't know if he hosts townhalls. I would encourage him to do it. Maybe undersea fiber optic cables are a big deal in his district. I can tell you that they are not in mine.

My constituents aren't really concerned with slashing permitting fees so that the largest technology companies on planet Earth can build fiber optic cables through marine animal sanctuaries. That just isn't something that they are spending a lot of time thinking about.

Who could blame them given all of the concerns that they have in light of the economic conditions that they are experiencing by virtue of this administration's cruel policies that the House Republican Conference has abetted at every turn.

Mr. Speaker, one could ask, as I suspect you would: What is the gentleman from Colorado's suggestion? Lucky for you, Mr. Speaker, I have one, because we know that one of the reasons that prices are going up across the board in the United States are tariffs. It is this President's reckless policies with respect to tariffs. We have some solutions in that regard. They are ways that Congress can finally stop abdication its authority and exercise its powers with respect to tariffs.

I think the Speaker knows that because Speaker JOHNSON decided to tuck into the rule that we are considering today a measure that would prevent the House from considering any changes to the President's tariff policies for yet another 6 months.

I am going to read you a quote: "It will be the fourth time this rule vote putting a gag on tariff debates has been done. I don't think tariffs are good for the economy, manufacturing jobs, and ag industry. American consumers pay the tariffs and thus it is a big tax. I support giving these authorities back to Congress."

These aren't my words. These are Republican Congressman DON BACON's words, your colleague, who agrees that what Speaker JOHNSON is trying to do is to, yet again, gag the United States Congress.

To Mr. BACON, I say: Thank you for your honesty.

To the rest of my colleagues, I say: Where is your backbone? Where is your spine? Stand up for the Constitution, as your colleague is doing. Stand up for the House of Representatives. Stand up for your constituents.

Shameful, Mr. Speaker.

I am hopeful that perhaps that political courage that Mr. BACON is showing will be contagious. Maybe a few more of my colleagues will join him.

In any event, I know that we have a lot of speakers who are eager to talk on this subject.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are advised to address their comments to the Chair.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. EZELL).

Mr. EZELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2189, the Law-Enforcement Innovate to De-Escalate Act of 2025, bipartisan legislation that modernizes our Federal firearms laws to better align with 21st century technology and the real-world needs of law enforcement officers and the communities they protect.

The bill does something straightforward but important. It creates a new classification for less-than-lethal

projectile devices and removes them from outdated regulatory categories that were never designed with today's equipment in mind.

For years, departments across the country have faced unnecessary hurdles acquiring proven less-lethal tools that can make a life-or-death difference in a very high-stress environment.

These tools, such as specialized projectiles intended to deescalate confrontations, have helped officers reduce injuries for themselves and for the public. Yet the lack of clarity in the current law has made procurement difficult and compliance confusing.

H.R. 2189 fixes that, establishing clear, commonsense definitions and regulatory pathways so that our law enforcement professionals can get the equipment that they need without unnecessary delay or confusion. That is not just good policy. That is good public safety sense.

This legislation represents a balanced approach. It upholds our commitment to the rule of law, supports law enforcement safety, and provides additional tools that encourages de-escalation and reduced violence wherever possible.

As a fellow law enforcement officer, I thank Congressman FITZGERALD for leading this valiant effort. I am proud to join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in advancing this forward.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on H.R. 2189.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STANTON).

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman NEGUSE for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, my Republican colleagues are trying to use today's procedural rule vote to sneak in a provision that would block a vote on Trump's tariffs for the next 6 months.

I have a bill to end Trump's tariffs on Mexico, the United States' number one trading partner, that Republicans have been stalling for months.

They have also blocked our bills to end the tariffs on Canada and the so-called liberation day tariffs.

These tariffs have been a disaster for American families and businesses. Domestic manufacturing is in a downturn. Farmers are suffering, and the tariffs cost the average American household over \$1,000 per household in the last year alone, according to the nonpartisan Tax Foundation.

Too many of our Republican colleagues would rather surrender their congressional authority than stand up to Trump. They would rather cross their fingers or pray that the Supreme Court settles this.

Let's be clear. A vote for this rule is a vote in favor of Trump's illegal tariffs. It is a vote for higher costs for the American people, and it is an abdication of our duty as Members of Congress.

I urge my colleagues, Republican and Democratic alike, to vote "no."

□ 1240

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

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues across the aisle would love to scapegoat everything on the President's tariff authority. The question of affordability, which they have all of a sudden gotten into their hands, is rich given that they presided over the worst inflation spike in 40 years.

Under President Joe Biden, families paid more for everything, for food, housing, transportation, and energy. It all exploded on their watch when they ran three Houses of government.

Energy prices surged roughly 20 percent. In many parts of the country, electricity rates rose 30 percent. Democrats didn't just miss the problem. They caused it, and then they put their hands over their face and pretended like everything was okay.

Those weren't abstract numbers. Those were kitchen table realities, and they remain kitchen table realities for working families, who are lectured by Democrats to be patient. Meanwhile, this transitory inflation—their claim—they just spent trillions of dollars more and inflamed the problem all the more.

The difference today could not be any clearer. Gas prices are coming down. They are at their lowest level in 4 years. Real wages are rising again. Regulatory costs are finally being rolled back after years of Democrats using regulations as a weapon against affordability.

President Trump and congressional Republicans are cleaning up the mess left behind, undoing the damage of the Biden economic policies, restoring confidence, and rebuilding an economy that works for people who actually earn a paycheck.

That brings us to the rule before us today. The three bills under this rule all address affordability in the real world. They reduce unnecessary delays that drive up costs. They protect the infrastructure Americans rely on every single day. They support domestic production, so families are not left paying more because Washington chose delay, dependence, and dysfunction.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, whenever I have an opportunity to listen to one of my colleagues' speeches in this august body, I can always count on them to do three things: to say a noun, a verb, and "Joe Biden." My colleague from New York does not disappoint with this myopic obsession that they have with Joe Biden.

Facts are facts. The price of beef has risen 16.4 percent since last year. The price of coffee is up 19.8 percent. The price of lettuce is up 7.3 percent. Frozen fish is up 8.6 percent. In total, families paid \$310 more for groceries during President Trump's first year in office compared to 2024, so spare us these ruminations about Joe Biden.

If they want to get serious about doing something about the cost crisis in our country, making life more affordable for Americans, there is an easy way to do it: Don't sneak in procedural roadblocks to considering tariff policies by the House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE), who has been a principled leader on this issue with respect to tariffs.

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, we find ourselves in an all too familiar situation. Speaker Johnson and House Republicans are trying again to prevent our ability to have an up-or-down vote on Trump's tariffs, like they have done multiple times over the last year.

The President's chaotic trade war has been crushing businesses and raising prices on families across the country. I am hearing from communities across Washington about the devastating impact of these tariffs. A small business owner in my district told me he is being tariffed out of business. I know my colleagues are hearing the same, especially from farmers who are often the first and hardest hit when countries retaliate against these tariffs.

Yet, despite all of this damage, Republicans have sheepishly fallen in line behind the President and gone along with avoiding a vote. They would rather bend the knee to the President than stand up for their communities.

Affordability is the number one issue facing families right now. Tariffs are taxes that raise prices, plain and simple. These illegal tariffs cost the average American family \$1,700 last year. Today is an opportunity to break this cycle, but Republicans need to be part of the solution. This is a chance to stand up for our constituents, who deserve to know that their elected Representatives really work for them.

If my colleagues think these sweeping tariffs are such a good idea, then vote for it, but stop hiding. We are not elected to dodge important issues just because we are afraid of the President. The Constitution gives Congress, not the President, authority over trade policy.

I am grateful for my colleagues who have been fighting with me against these tariffs since the beginning. I hope that more of them will find the courage to say enough is enough today. Vote "no" on the rule.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. FITZGERALD).

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution and in support of H.R. 2189, the Law-Enforcement Innovate to De-Escalate Act. This bill will put lifesaving, less lethal technology in the hands of more law enforcement and public safety officers.

When the Gun Control Act of 1968 was enacted more than 50 years ago, it was not written with the intent to regulate less lethal projectile devices such as tasers. Unfortunately, if a taser or

other device uses an explosive propellant to discharge a projectile, the ATF classifies it as a firearm. This makes it more difficult for law enforcement and public safety officers to obtain and use these devices.

For starters, many States prohibit public safety officers from using firearms. In at least 12 States, correctional officers are unable to carry firearms in the course of their official duties. Many State laws also prohibit or restrict the use of firearms in schools and hospitals, meaning security officers would be unable to purchase these devices.

For police departments, law enforcement officers could be unfairly subjected to higher levels of liability exposure for discharging a "firearm" than a less lethal device. This includes my own State of Wisconsin, which includes in its definition of deadly force the discharge of a firearm.

Mr. Speaker, that is why the Law-Enforcement Innovate to De-Escalate Act is both necessary and important. H.R. 2189 makes a small, but important, change to the Gun Control Act's definition of a firearm to appropriately define a less lethal projectile device.

It does so by instituting a five-part test, ensuring only those devices that are truly less lethal will pass ATF scrutiny. It also exempts these devices from the firearm excise tax, the simple logic being that police departments and manufacturers should no longer be paying a firearm tax on a device that is no longer classified as a firearm. It was never intended to apply to them in the first place. It should not apply to them now.

By making these simple changes, we are equipping our law enforcement and public safety officers with the best tools to keep our communities safe and our first responders out of harm's way.

Innovation should be rewarded, not stifled, and this bill does just that.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues, Congressman CORREA, Congressman SCHWEIKERT, and Congressman STANTON, for their leadership on this issue over the last two Congresses.

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

Mr. Speaker, again, I am not going to dispute my colleague from Wisconsin's sentiment here. If people are looking to not pay taxes on tasers, he has them covered. The Republican Conference has them covered.

If people are struggling to pay for their groceries or their rent, they are out of luck as far as the House Republican Conference is concerned. Taxes on tasers, don't worry. They have a plan for that. They are working really hard to solve that existential challenge facing the country as we speak.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to strike section 4, which would stop an attempt by Republican leadership to block the House from taking up-or-down votes on President Trump's disastrous tariff policies through the end of July.

As the country knows, since March of last year, Speaker JOHNSON and the Republican majority have blocked up-or-down votes on these policies. Our view is that these policies have been a disaster for the American people, and everyone knows it.

We all remember, with great fanfare, President Trump announcing liberation day. The only liberation that any of our constituents have felt is the money departing from their wallets as this President increases prices on everyday consumers.

□ 1250

It is wrong, and the Congress has a constitutional duty and responsibility to act. We know that these tariffs have cost the American people trillions of dollars. We know that according to the Joint Economic Committee, the average American family now pays an extra \$1,625 in basic expenses thanks to the economic policies of this administration.

The question is why are Republicans hiding from an up-or-down vote on these tariff policies?

In the Senate, multiple votes have been held on these policies. Joint resolutions to terminate the tariffs have been sent to the House, to the Clerk here on a bipartisan basis from the United States Senate four different times. But Republicans, four different times, have done the opposite. Republicans have delayed votes on these tariffs, essentially surrendering one of Congress' main functions to one man, one man in the White House.

During the September vote, several Republicans were apparently so frustrated by the process that they actually held out for about 45 minutes before they, of course, did what we all expect them to do: fold and strike a deal.

One of them—and I will quote from one of my Republican colleagues. One of the temporary holdouts said that under the Constitution, the power to impose tariffs is a congressional power and needs to be restored to Congress. Apparently, he switched his vote after issuing that statement because he got a commitment from the Speaker that this House would only block votes on tariffs until the end of January.

Well, here we are back again with the Republican Conference springing into action to do Donald Trump's bidding. He says: "Jump." Our colleagues say: "How high?" Well, not all of our colleagues say that. Maybe one of one or two of them, as I said, may show the courage tonight to vote their conscience.

Republicans are trying to ram through yet another rule to hide from taking up-or-down votes this time until the end of July. It is outrageous, outrageous, and it is why we are offering this amendment. Before yielding to the distinguished ranking member who has been a leader in this regard, I want to quote my colleague TOM MASSIE from Kentucky, a Republican, who I think said it best. "Why haven't we

voted on tariffs in the House of Representatives?" This is a Republican who said this. "Because Speaker JOHNSON is using Rules Committee Resolutions, consummated by majority votes of the whole House, to declare that 'a day is not a day' in order to AVOID THE U.S. LAW that requires Congress to vote." These are Republican Members of Congress, TOM MASSIE, DON BACON, all saying what we know to be true, which is that the House is abdicating its duty.

I would encourage my colleagues, those of whom may find some semblance of backbone, to defeat the previous question, and we can finally have an up-or-down vote in this body on whether to terminate President Trump's disastrous tariffs starting this week with Canada, my colleague from New York's neighbor to the north.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask for unanimous consent to include the text of my amendment in 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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS), the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, whose proposal we will be considering, who has fought against these disastrous tariff policies at every turn.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. NEGUSE for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is Groundhog Day again in Washington, D.C. You know, this week is an opportunity to drive down electricity costs, create jobs at home by bolstering our exports of goods made in America. It is an opportunity to lower the cost of groceries and healthcare for families around our great country. But this Republican majority never misses an opportunity to do the opposite of addressing affordability for the American people.

After all of the majority's procedural shenanigans last year, my resolutions ending President Trump's harmful tariffs on Canada and Mexico are due for a vote this week. But the Republicans couldn't let that stand. They are trying to change the rules again and again and again and again to do what? They are trying to change the rules again to avoid voting on ending Trump's tariffs.

Just this week, new research from the nonpartisan Tax Foundation showed that the President's tariffs cost the average American well over \$1,000. It will cost them even more now. That is what it cost them last year. It will be even more this year.

President Trump brags about the money generated from tariffs, but it is money ripped right out of the wallets of working families. Will this body listen to the affordability concerns of our constituents and retake our responsibility over Congress' Article I powers to tax and trade? No, they won't. Will

they lower the cost of utilities and groceries or medical devices around the United States that Americans need? No, they won't.

What we are witnessing is one of the most astounding displays of cowardice in the modern history of Congress. It is truly a spectacle. In all my years, I have never seen a group of Members so deeply afraid of just doing their job.

The American people sent us here to address their affordability concerns. I had to say to one member of the administration just last week: Do not continue to be a flunky of the President. Don't be a flunky of the President. Don't block for the President if he is not doing the right thing. Work for the American people. Don't be flunkies for the President when you know he is wrong. Work for the American people. Let's vote on this. Let's have the bravery to vote on this.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to remind my friends on the other side of the aisle that the Supreme Court heard arguments on November 5 on this very issue of whether the Trump administration has the authority to impose the tariffs under the debate right here. Our extension of the tolling days is something Democrats did themselves back in the 116th and the 117th Congress.

Unlike when they did it, ours has a clear end date, sunseting in a matter of months, unlike the blanket prohibitions of COVID NEA resolutions under Democratic rule.

This extension will allow the Supreme Court the time necessary to provide a ruling on this extremely consequential issue. It is just amazing to hear the arguments about affordability when they presided over an era of government that exploded our national debt, exploded prices, not to the tune of \$1,000 but tens of thousands of dollars on Americans across the board, and they still tried to convince people that their policies had nothing to do with it.

□ 1300

That is why this House is in Republican hands, the U.S. Senate is in Republican hands, and the White House is in Republican hands. That is because it was part of the mandate given by the American people to reset the global trade order and to renegotiate unfair trade deals that have happened over decades. Both Republican and Democratic administrations alike took advantage of the American worker, chased our jobs overseas, and ruined our supply chains. All of those things happened.

The tariffs have been an important tool that the President has been able to use to create real trade deals, opening up markets for American products. We have seen it firsthand. We have new trade deals around the globe. America has come from a position of strength because of this tool, not a position of

weakness. We can't allow that weakness to prevail.

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

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. FROST).

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the rule because it contains H.R. 2189, the Law-Enforcement Innovate to De-Escalate Act. This is a terrible bill and a billion-dollar giveaway to gun manufacturers wrapped in a deceiving title.

The corporate lobbyists pushing this bill claim it is an effort to prevent police violence, but, in reality, it would make everyone less safe. In fact, the words "law enforcement" aren't even found anywhere in the bill.

Even Gun Owners of America is not being shy about what the bill really does. They posted the summary online. Just today they posted it as a bill exempting certain weapons from all firearms regulation under the Gun Control Act and the National Firearms Act. There will be no background checks and no questions asked.

Nowhere in the bill text does it mention law enforcement because law enforcement already has and uses the power to purchase tasers. What the bill actually does is create a new loophole that will flood our communities with more weapons and new ghost guns.

Axon and other companies that make and sell weapons will benefit from this bill, but none of us will benefit from it. Our communities will be less safe.

Every time the government creates a new opening, the gun industry will take advantage of it. I promise you, Mr. Speaker, within weeks there will be files online to 3D print the parts you need to make this weapon you got without a background check into a gun that can shoot bullets, and within months you will be able to purchase those same parts online legally.

When gun violence remains the leading cause of death in the Nation for our kids, Congress must not hand unregulated weapons over to the public. We must not make Axon, a multibillion-dollar company, even richer. I am someone who has witnessed both police violence and gun violence, and I want Congress to consider real reform like the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act.

This bill was rushed to the floor. We tried to make changes, but our edits were rejected.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote "no" on this rule, and I urge my colleagues to do the same. Folks should know that voting "yes" on this is voting "yes" on more guns in our communities.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2189 does not allow felons or violent criminals to gain access to anything new. It does not override State or local law, and anyone barred from possessing these devices today remains barred tomorrow.

What this bill actually does is correct an outdated Federal classification that treats tasers like deadly firearms. That outdated and absurd classification has driven up costs, created delays, and made it harder for law enforcement agencies to access less-than-lethal tools designed to specifically de-escalate situations and to save lives.

Democrats are calling that clarity a loophole. In reality, the only thing that this bill closes is the gap between outdated law and modern policing. Instead of supporting officers who want safer alternatives to deadly force, Democrats are trying to scare the public with cherry-picked statistics and misleading claims.

Let's be honest. If Democrats were truly concerned about public safety, they would not oppose a bill that encourages de-escalation and reduces the likelihood of fatal outcomes and encounters.

Despite all this rhetorical nonsense about policing in the United States, Democrats are standing in the way of this commonsense measure. They cannot seem to support legislation that empowers law enforcement in any way, even when it keeps communities safe.

However, this pattern is not stopped with this bill. Across all three bills before the House today, the choice is the same. Republicans are offering practical solutions to strengthen public safety, protect critical infrastructure, and secure our supply chains that our national security depends on, and Democrats are choosing, again, to delay, to distort, and to defend broken systems and outcomes.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to respond to my colleague from New York because, again, I think this rule is largely a smokescreen to just avoid a discussion on the President's reckless tariff policies.

However, insofar as my colleague is obsessed with cutting taxes on tasers, I suppose I am compelled to respond to simply say that what was just stated with respect to violent felons not being able to access tasers by virtue of this legislation, that is untrue. It is just untrue.

Clearly, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are seeking to remove these particular weapons from the definition of firearm under Federal law, and as a result, the various protections and safeguards that exist under Federal law. They can make the argument that in certain States there may be protections. That is not true of every State.

In any event, the larger question that every American who is watching C-SPAN now ought to ask themselves is: Why is the U.S. House of Representatives spending so much time on debating cutting taxes for tasers?

How did that manage to become the top priority of the House Republicans in Washington, D.C.?

Inquiring minds would like to know.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES), who is the distinguished Democratic leader of the House of Representatives.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman who is my friend from the great State of Colorado, Representative NEGUSE, for yielding time and for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this rule, another reckless effort by the Republican majority to stop this House from doing something to stop the reckless Trump tariffs.

Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives, part of this Congress, is a separate and coequal branch of government. We don't work for Donald Trump. We don't work for J.D. VANCE, and we don't work for Republican billionaire donors. We work for the American people.

The Constitution, Mr. Speaker, gives this House the explicit authority with respect to tariffs. Yet because apparently my Republican colleagues have been ordered by the current President not to allow an up-or-down vote on whether his tariffs are harmful to the American people, once again, we find ourselves discussing a rule to limit the ability of this Congress to act on behalf of the American people.

This is consistent with what we have seen from the Republican majority, Mr. Speaker, from the very beginning of this Congress, which, unfortunately, continues to act like nothing more than a reckless rubberstamp for Donald Trump's extreme agenda, an agenda that is not helping the American people. It is hurting the American people.

Yes, we have a cost-of-living crisis in this country, and I know the President doesn't want to talk about it. He thinks it is a Democratic hoax.

No, the affordability crisis in this country is not a hoax. It is very real. Working-class Americans, middle-class Americans, and everyday Americans are suffering because of the failed Trump Republican economy.

Donald Trump, his words, promised to lower the high cost of living on day one. More than 1 year later in the United States of America, Mr. Speaker, costs haven't gone down. Costs have gone up. Housing costs are out of control. Healthcare costs are out of control. Childcare costs are out of control. Electricity bills are out of control, and the price of groceries and everyday goods are completely out of control.

One of the reasons why the cost of living continues to crush the American people is because of the Trump tariffs which have imposed thousands of dollars in additional costs on everyday Americans, making life even more expensive than it had been when this Presidency began.

Why is it so complicated for Donald Trump to keep his promise to the American people to lower costs and to focus on making life more affordable?

Instead, he has gone the opposite direction, imposing tariffs on our allies in Canada and Mexico, in Europe and across the world, without any clear strategy, having an adverse effect on the pocketbook of everyday Americans.

□ 1310

This Congress is charged constitutionally with the ability to say yes or no as it relates to tariffs that have been imposed. In fact, the President should have sought our authorization.

Instead, he is using a fake emergency authority that hopefully the Supreme Court will make clear he does not have, and we certainly await that decision. However, we don't need to wait for that decision. We don't work for the Supreme Court either.

The House is the Article I branch of government, the institution that the Framers decided should be the part of government that is closest to the American people, that reflects the hopes, the dreams, the aspirations, the fears, the concerns, the anxieties, the passions, and the life experiences of the American people, who are suffering right now in this failed Trump Republican economy.

That is not just my simple observation. FOX News, the President's favorite news source, in a recent public opinion survey concluded that more than 70 percent of the American people believe, correctly, the economy is a disaster under this President.

One of the reasons why it is a disaster is because of the reckless Trump tariffs. The Republican majority, Mr. Speaker, won't even allow an up-or-down vote. That is what this rule is about—silencing debate and the will of the people's Representatives to do something meaningful to make life more affordable for the American people.

I asked some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who know that this so-called mandate that Republicans apparently believe they had in the aftermath of the November 2024 elections—parenthetically, by the way, what mandate do they really think they have in this House when they have the narrowest majority that any party has had since 1930 during the Great Depression?

In fact, we also know they wouldn't even be in the majority right now had they not stolen three seats from the people of North Carolina with mid-decade gerrymandering in 2024. Therefore, we don't want to hear anything about mandate.

The only mandate we have collectively is to make life more affordable for everyday Americans, to drive down the high cost of living, to stop burying your head in the sand, to stop being a reckless rubberstamp for Donald Trump's extreme agenda, to stand up to him every now and then as part of a separate and coequal branch of government.

Stop the cult-like behavior, Mr. Speaker. It is hurting your very constituents.

We have an opportunity, if we vote down this rule, to actually take up for consideration the resolution put forward by Congressman MEEKS that would wipe out the unnecessary tariff imposed on our ally to the north in Canada. It is a step that should have been taken a long time ago, but Republicans have been blocking this vote.

I just hope that a handful of Republicans will join every single House Democrat in opposing this rule so we can get to a debate on the actual substantive effort to stop the reckless, dangerous, and harmful Trump tariffs as part of our commitment as Democrats to do what is necessary to lower the high cost of living and to make sure that every single American in this country, when they work hard, when they play by the rules, they should be able to live an affordable life, a comfortable life, and live the good life.

It is not too much to ask for in the wealthiest country, America, in the history of the world. Work hard. Play by the rules. Live the good life. Good-paying job, good housing, good healthcare, good education for the children, and a good retirement—which means backing off extreme attacks on Social Security and Medicare—that is a Democratic commitment.

In order to help bring about that good life, Mr. Speaker, one of the most meaningful things that we can do as a body is to stop the harmful Trump tariffs. Vote “no” against this rule.

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

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ).

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this Republican rule.

Republicans continue to give President Trump a free pass to damage our economy and punish our American families with his illegal tariffs.

The Constitution could not be clearer: Congress, not the White House, has the authority to impose tariffs. It does not belong to President Trump, no matter how many crazy rants he tweets out in the middle of the night.

Yet Republicans continue to fold like cheap lawn chairs by refusing to allow a vote on Trump’s tariffs. Instead of standing up for their constituents, they are acting as a cut-and-paste for Trump.

Why? It is because they are more afraid of his retribution than they are concerned about the budgets of their families back home, families who are paying for Trump’s endless trade wars.

According to the Joint Economic Committee, Trump’s tariffs cost American households more than \$1,600 last year—that is \$1,600—and that will continue to rise if Congress doesn’t take the keys away from Trump. Maybe that is pocket change for Trump and his billionaire buddies. Higher prices on groceries, cars, housing, utilities, and other basic necessities don’t impact them.

However, working families, small businesses, and farmers are certainly feeling the pain of these trade wars. Trump’s tariffs are increasing prices on everything for them, and Republicans are letting it happen on their watch.

My Republican colleagues have a choice. They can stop cowering to Trump and vote to strike down this rule because Americans want an end to Trump’s trade wars.

Let’s reclaim our constitutional authority and put an end to his abuse of tariffs once and for all.

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

Mr. Speaker, it has become impossible to ignore a defining feature of today’s Democratic Party, and that is Trump derangement syndrome, which is a real disease. No matter what legislation is before this House, no matter how unrelated it is to President Trump, Democrats find a way to twist the debate back to him—his personality, what they hate about him—not the text of the bill, not any of the real-world problems families are facing, just Trump over and over and over. Every time they do that, American people pay the price.

When inflation exploded in 2022, after trillions of dollars in Democratic spending overheated the economy, families were drowning in higher grocery bills, higher gas prices, and higher rents. All of it exploded, went out of control. It is a matter of fact. It is not a matter up for debate. It happened in this country.

Democrats were not focused on fixing those things. Instead, they are focused on their latest Trump obsession. When the border collapsed and millions of illegal immigrants poured into communities across our country, Democrats once again ignored the consequences of their own policies. Instead of securing the border or addressing affordability, they leaned harder into the same tired talking points and hysteria about President Trump.

Voters saw right through that in the last election, and Democrats lost the popular vote. They lost the electoral college. They lost every swing State on the map. Yet, even after that decisive rejection, Trump derangement syndrome remains completely untreated.

Instead of course correcting, Democrats continue to defend wasteful programs, failed policies, bloated bureaucracy, while reflexively opposing every effort that President Trump and House Republicans are making to clean up the mess that they created.

Here we are again today listening to the same theatrics. The American people are no longer entertained by those theatrics. They are focused on results: lowering costs, securing the border, strengthening energy independence, restoring accountability in Washington, reshoring American jobs, and bringing manufacturing here back to the United States of America that their failed policies over decades have chased away.

While Democrats remain stuck in the year 9—we are going on year 10—of Trump derangement syndrome, Republicans are focused on governing and delivering results for working families. Mr. Speaker, I would like to once again remind my colleagues of what is actually in the rule before us today.

The rule provides for consideration of three commonsense bills: the Law-Enforcement Innovate to De-Escalate Act, which we have talked about; the Undersea Cable Protection Act of 2025; and H.R. 3617, the Securing America’s Critical Minerals Supply Act, which will strengthen our domestic critical mineral supply chain so we can be stronger here at home and across the world.

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

□ 1320

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

“U.S. Manufacturing Is in Retreat and Trump’s Tariffs Aren’t Helping,” February 2, 2026, headline, The Wall Street Journal.

Apparently, The Wall Street Journal has Trump derangement syndrome, too, according to my colleague from New York. American consumers must also. Everyone apparently has it except for House Republicans.

By the way, my Republican colleagues talk enough about Joe Biden, one would be forgiven for thinking they miss him. As I said, noun, verb, “Joe Biden,” effectively the answer and retort on my colleague’s part to every question.

The reality is that my Republican colleagues, as has been displayed and demonstrated time and time again, work tragically for one person, and that person is Donald Trump. Lest anyone doubt that, let’s see if a few of them will have the audacity, the courage, to vote against the rule today.

I will say, it bears repeating. I have quoted a lot of DON BACON on the floor today. If he is watching, I hope he will forgive me in advance. I will read again this tweet, this post on X, from John Bresnahan of Punchbowl News, who quoted Mr. BACON: “It will be the fourth time this rule vote putting a gag on tariff debates has been done. I don’t think tariffs are good for the economy, manufacturing jobs, and the ag industry. American consumers pay the tariffs and thus it is a big tax. I support giving these authorities back to Congress.”

That is from Republican U.S. Congressman DON BACON, so spare us the stale and tired attacks about Trump derangement syndrome. These are your colleagues saying it, not me.

My colleagues ought to do the right thing: vote against this rule so that we can have an up-or-down vote on the disastrous Trump tariffs that are inflicting pain on the people who I represent in the great State of Colorado and across the country.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, for years, Democrats told the American people not to believe what they could see with their own eyes. They said that crime was under control, our infrastructure was secure, our supply chains were resilient, and our energy systems were just fine.

The legislation under the rule today takes real steps toward fixing broken systems, supporting our law enforcement officers, protecting critical infrastructure, and rebuilding supply chains right here at home.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the rule before us today.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1042 OFFERED BY MR. NEGUSE OF COLORADO

Strike section 4.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DESJARLAIS). 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. NEGUSE. 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.

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

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privilege resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1048

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

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY: Mr. Menefee, to rank immediately after Mr. Riley of New York.

Mr. AGUILAR (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

□ 2030

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. YAKYM) at 8 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 1042; and

Adoption of House Resolution 1042, 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. 2189, LAW-ENFORCEMENT INNOVATE TO DE-ESCALATE ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 261, UNDERSEA CABLE PROTECTION ACT OF 2025; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3617, SECURING AMERICA'S CRITICAL MINERALS SUPPLY ACT; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 1042) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2189) to modernize Federal firearms laws to account for advancements in technology and less-than-lethal weapons, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 261) to amend the National Marine Sanctuaries Act to prohibit requiring an authorization for the installation, continued presence, operation, maintenance, repair, or recovery of undersea fiber optic cables in a national marine sanctuary if such activities have previously been authorized by a Federal or State agency; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3617) to amend the Department of Energy Organization Act to secure the supply of critical energy resources, including critical minerals and other materials, and for other purposes; and for other purposes on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 216, nays 214, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 59]

YEAS—216

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

NAYS—214

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