

funding opportunities for critical mineral development touching every part of the supply chain, including mapping, mining, refining, and even recycling.

This bill mirrors the administration's momentum on critical mineral policy and will further focus the Department of Energy on developing that very sector.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 3617. I think it is important to provide a little perspective here. At a time when Americans are struggling to afford their electricity bills, we are wasting floor time debating a bill that will not even meaningfully improve our critical mineral supply chains.

In fact, this bill is just a retread from last Congress. That is right. The Securing America's Critical Minerals Supply Act, so-called, was included in House Republicans' polluters over people act last Congress, a bill that sold the American people out to corporate polluters.

Here we are again, debating the same old bill because Republicans have no new ideas. H.R. 3617 is merely a distraction from the fact that they have no real plans to address issues that are important to Americans, like their increasingly unaffordable electricity bills.

My Republican colleagues need to start taking the affordability crisis facing the American people seriously. Eighty million Americans are struggling to pay their utility bills. Electricity prices are rising more than twice as fast as inflation across the country. Families are having to choose between paying for housing, medicine, food, or keeping their lights on. It is just unacceptable.

As elected officials, we have a responsibility to address this issue. We must address this because hardworking Americans are in desperate need of relief.

Yet, to President Trump and his Republican accomplices, the affordability crisis is just a made-up scam. That is what the President says. I have said it before, but it is worth repeating: Republicans' big, ugly bill will raise electricity prices by a staggering 61 percent, and the American people are hurting because of President Trump's policies.

We should be focused on advancing bipartisan legislation to end this affordability crisis, not a bill that seeks to provide additional support for the fossil fuel industry under the guise of supporting critical minerals. Republicans would rather spend precious floor time on a bill to support their fossil fuel friends instead of supporting the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I urge opposition to the legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3617 is important. You can't make this stuff up, what they are saying across the aisle.

H.R. 3617 is important to securing our critical energy resource supply chains and eliminating our dependence on foreign adversaries like we have been talking about, Communist Red China.

This bill takes a holistic approach, Mr. Speaker, in ensuring vulnerable supply chains, impacting absolutely every single corner of the United States' energy sector, are addressed by the Department of Energy, and its passage is vital to their success.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 3617 and vote "yes."

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

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 1057, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. LANDSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Landsman of Ohio moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3617 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

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

Mr. Landsman moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3617 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 4. CERTIFICATION.

This Act, and the amendments made by this Act, shall not take effect until the date on which the Secretary of Energy publishes a certification that tariffs issued after January 20, 2025, are not increasing costs and contributing to supply chain disruptions for critical energy resources.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. LANDSMAN. 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.

RELATING TO A NATIONAL EMERGENCY BY THE PRESIDENT ON FEBRUARY 1, 2025

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of February 10,

2026, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 72) relating to a national emergency by the President on February 1, 2025, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 10, 2026, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 72

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled. That pursuant to section 202 of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622), the national emergency declared by the finding of the President on February 1, 2025, Executive Order 14193 (25 Fed. Reg. 02406), is hereby terminated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The joint resolution shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAST) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

□ 1500

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, we are about to have a debate apparently for about an hour. We are going to have that debate for one reason and one reason alone. Democrats in the House and in the Senate as well, refuse to recognize that there is a crisis because of fentanyl entering the United States of America.

Whether on our northern border, on our southern border, through the Caribbean, or other places, they refuse to recognize that threat anywhere. Specific to the debate today, they would like to end an executive order relating to the crisis of fentanyl coming across our northern border.

Democrats don't recognize that there is a crisis and that it is killing thousands of Americans, tens of thousands of Americans, each and every year. They are trying to literally end that executive order that identifies the national emergency, an emergency that is literally agreed upon by our northern neighbor, Canada. Even Canada acknowledges that they have this as a national emergency.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I think I have heard that story before that this is all about drugs. If I recall correctly, the former President of Honduras probably put more drugs in the United States than Canada has combined. The President of the United States didn't say that was an emergency. He pardoned him. I have heard it before. It is all about drugs. That was the case.

What is the case and what is a fact is that in the last year, tariffs have cost American families nearly \$1,700. That cost is expected to increase in 2026. That is the case. Since these tariffs were imposed, U.S. exports to Canada have fallen by more than 21 percent.

When I go home, my constituents aren't telling me they have an extra \$1,700 to spare. They are asking me to lower grocery prices, lower the price of healthcare, and make life more affordable. That is what this is about. It is about the American people and making things affordable for them.

Today's vote is simple. It is very simple. Will my colleagues on the other side of the aisle vote to lower the cost of living for American families, or will they keep prices high out of loyalty to Donald J. Trump?

That is what this vote is. That is why we pressed for this vote today. That is why a day is a day, and we finally get our chance to have the Members of the House vote their conscience. Do they vote for the President and his ways, or do they vote for their people, their constituents?

Let's be clear about this so-called emergency Donald Trump declared on Canada and so many other countries where no emergency exists. For over 50 years, emergency authorities have been declared. What have they been? Yes, they have been for civil wars. Pandemics? I think that is an emergency. A massive human rights crisis could be an emergency.

Canada is none of those things. Canada isn't a threat. Canada is our friend. Canada is our ally. Canadians have fought alongside Americans, whether it was in World War II or the war in Afghanistan, where 165 Canadians gave their lives after our country was attacked. There is no national emergency. There is no national security threat underpinning these threats.

In an interview just last night, Donald J. Trump admitted he placed tariffs on Switzerland. Why? I will tell my colleagues why. It is simply because he didn't like the way their leader spoke to him. He put tariffs on Switzerland.

That is not a strategy. That is impulse. That is a person who is just trying to say that he is the king. Mr. Speaker, guess what. That impulse, who is going to pay the price for it? Who is going to pay the price for that impulse? I will tell my colleagues who. It is the American people.

Our morning coffee, our kids' chocolate, lifesaving medical devices, those are the Canadian goods that are being

hit by 35 percent tariffs. Americans are paying more for healthcare and their daily essentials during an affordability crisis, all because of a manufactured emergency and one person's ego.

The damage doesn't stop there. What about American products? They are being boycotted across Canada. Don't believe me? Just look at the President's social media posts from just 2 days ago where he said:

"Ontario won't even put the U.S. spirits, beverages, and other alcoholic products, on their shelves."

Tourism from Canada is down 30 percent. People in the hospitality industry—Las Vegas, my home State of New York, and the chairman's home State of Florida—are losing their jobs because Canadians do not want to come to the United States of America.

What are the people getting in return? I will tell my colleagues what they are getting. They are getting higher electricity costs during one of the coldest winters in modern history. They are getting higher food prices and higher costs for industrial goods and healthcare.

Mr. Speaker, this is heads, we lose; tails, we lose.

Tariffs are bad for American workers. They are bad for businesses. They are bad for working families. Instead of addressing the affordability crisis, which the President has called a hoax, Republicans have spent a year blocking this vote to protect Donald Trump, rather than doing their job to help the American people and what the American people did send us here to do, which is to lower costs. That ends today.

Every Member now has to go on record. Do they stand with the disastrous trade war or with their constituents who are demanding relief? It is time we end this so-called national emergency because the only emergency here is the economic one created by Donald J. Trump's tariffs.

I urge the adoption of the resolution and the termination of these unnecessary and harmful tariffs, which are just taxes on the American people.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, there is a lot to correct from that diatribe I just heard. I am going to start to go through some of that.

Number one, who will pay the price? That was a question begged by my colleague. Who will pay the price? It is a very sad thing to have been asked this by my colleague.

It is important to remember what this resolution is. This resolution ends an emergency related to fentanyl. I would say to the gentleman over here that 5,000 people a year die in his State alone from fentanyl.

If he wants to beg the question of who is going to pay the price for him

trying to end an emergency that actually for the first time has Canada dealing with fentanyl because of the pressure being put on them, who is going to pay the price? It is going to be 5,000 more of his State's residents. That is who is going to pay the price.

I think the gentleman next to me mentioned as well, when he goes home, this is what he sees when he goes home. When he goes home each and every year, because they don't want to address fentanyl, they are going to see 5,000 less faces because they don't want to deal with fentanyl.

He said it himself. He sees no emergency. The "so-called emergency" were the exact words used, the so-called emergency. There is no emergency that exists, to quote my colleague. If 5,000 people were dying in my State every single year from one thing and one thing alone, I think that is an emergency. His people will pay the price.

Let's be clear again about what this resolution is and what it is not. It is not a debate about tariffs. We can talk about those, but that is not really what it is. This is Democrats trying to ignore that there is a fentanyl crisis. Again, they just ignored it. They just literally said it doesn't exist.

□ 1510

I will read again directly from the bill: "... the national emergency declared by the finding of the President on February 1, 2025, in Executive Order 14193 . . . is hereby terminated."

That is their language. They are terminating the executive order, and it is an EO on the fentanyl crisis at the northern border.

It matters to talk about that it is the northern border. Why? That is because my Democratic colleagues don't believe that there is a crisis there, but my Democratic colleagues don't believe there is a fentanyl crisis under any circumstance. Any fentanyl that flows into the country, they don't see any of it as a national emergency.

We have yet to find a place where Democrats say that drugs are a national emergency. They made it clear that there is not one single circumstance where they see the deaths of millions of Americans due to fentanyl as a crisis. They don't see that anywhere.

Mr. Speaker, let's look again at my colleague's own State. This is a report. Last report, almost 5,000 deaths, or just under that.

Mr. Speaker, we can talk about the largest fentanyl lab found in Canada. Where was that found in Canada that was recently shut down because of the pressure that President Trump is putting on Canada? It was 30 miles from the New York border. They didn't close it down 2 years ago or 3 years ago. Why not? It was because Canada didn't have the pressure put on them to do so. That is not a coincidence.

Mr. Speaker, again, do you know who is going to pay the price for taking the pressure off of Canada? It is going to be

the constituents of my colleague, where 5,000 people a year die from fentanyl overdose. If I were him, I would think that is a pretty big emergency.

Mr. Speaker, I lost 2,500 brothers and sisters in Afghanistan over the course of 20 years. Our country took that extremely seriously for every single one of them. Mr. MEEKS' State is losing double that from fentanyl alone every single year, and he says that he sees no emergency. That is sad for the people of New York.

The administration is doing everything that they can to defeat fentanyl, while my Democratic colleagues are willing to do everything that they can to have those deaths continue. They don't support striking drug boats. We know that much. They don't support removing cartel leaders. We know that. Apparently, they don't support tariffing a country that acknowledges that they have a drug trafficking crisis but weren't doing anything to fix it.

I am going to suspect that my colleague over here doesn't know this as well: Last year, Justin Trudeau, former Prime Minister of Canada, himself addressed the fentanyl problem and said that it needed to be eradicated. That is the Prime Minister of Canada, or former Prime Minister.

It was so bad that Canada created a fentanyl czar, who admitted that they underestimated—Canada underestimated the toll of the fentanyl crisis and what it had taken, and they literally called it, according to the Canadian fentanyl czar, a national security threat.

The northern border, for whom this emergency exists, is acknowledging that there is an emergency, a national security threat, but I guess my colleagues think that they know better.

Mr. Speaker, take the Chinese-run fentanyl lab that I mentioned being shut down, or one of them being shut down, of many. There was over 800 pounds of fentanyl confiscated. Why is it being shut down now and not before? It is being shut down now because the administration had the stones to put economic pressure on them, but my colleagues want to take that pressure off because they don't worry about their people dying in their State.

It is simple. Whether you are a Republican or a Democrat, if you care about the U.S. Government responding to millions of Americans being killed by fentanyl, this is the policy that addresses that. Even our northern partner acknowledges that.

The truth is that Canada hasn't wanted to put effort into cracking down on drugs. They didn't want to close the Chinese fentanyl labs. They didn't want to increase their spending on border patrols, but they have to do it because President Trump is putting pressure on them.

Tariffs get more attention than strongly worded letters, and millions of Americans' lives are being saved because President Trump has declared

this national emergency and is actively forcing our neighbors, like Canada, to act. It is saving lives.

My colleague wants to make sure that that no longer happens because he doesn't see an emergency, even though 5,000 people from his State are dying every single year. That is pretty sad. That is where the price is paid.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we have had some time from the last time that we were on this floor. If he were so serious about drugs, I asked the chairman previously: Why would the President of the United States pardon one of the biggest drug dealers who was killing Americans, Juan Orlando Hernandez. The last time, the gentleman said that he hadn't spoken to the President and didn't know why.

Mr. Speaker, if he is so interested in stopping drugs, maybe he could have and should have had a conversation.

Let me just tell you something about drugs, how much drugs are coming in from Canada, because that is what this is about. As a former special narcotics prosecutor—that is me—I know a little bit about that. Saying that you are going to focus and stop certain things from coming across the border of Canada, as if it is coming across in a cluster like it is an emergency, is just an out-and-out lie.

The fact of the matter is that if you look at the Federal prosecutions—this just came out not too long ago—for narcotics in the United States of America, it just came out that, under the Trump administration, Federal drug prosecutions fell to the lowest level in decades. It talked about that Federal drug prosecutions dropped 10 percent in 2025 as agents changed their focus to immigration, that the number of new cases being filed is the lowest in decades according to a Reuters analysis. High-priority drug investigations have stalled since Donald Trump took office. It doesn't sound like the President of the United States is really concerned about drug prosecutions.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), an individual who really knows about taxes and tariffs, the ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I led the negotiation on USMCA, and 195 Republicans voted for USMCA and 197 Democrats voted for USMCA. It was a bipartisan effort.

Tariffs, as threatened or imposed, can have an outcome, but not when we look at Brazil and say that we don't like the result of the Presidential election and that we are going to impose 50 percent tariffs, or that we are going to close a bridge as it goes to Canada, like Canada is an enemy. I have not met anybody in America who was ever mad at Canada for anything. They have

been a great friend, great ally, and a great neighbor.

Let's have a tariff on NATO because of Greenland. Let's have a tariff on South Korea because of who they talk to in an international arena. Let's impose tariffs on our NATO allies or on European Union because we don't like this or that. We won't negotiate. We will just arbitrarily impose tariffs.

Mr. Speaker, do you know what the most ironic thing is in this debate? Heretofore, I have never met a Republican in Washington who was in favor of tariffs.

The party of Ronald Reagan embracing these tariffs is unheard of. The party of George Bush, Sr., embracing tariffs, part of their existence was to break down trade barriers everywhere. If you want to target a tariff based upon a particular product, gotcha. That is understood, but not the way that these tariffs are being imposed. The ranking member is on the right path.

□ 1520

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to my colleague, Mr. ISSA, I would ask my colleague—I am happy to yield a moment—would you like to say 5,000 deaths in New York is an emergency?

Crickets.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Would you like to respond: 5,000 deaths in New York is an emergency.

Mr. MEEKS. Have you found out yet why Mr. Hernández has been pardoned?

Mr. MAST. Do you want to answer?

Mr. MEEKS. I want to find out right now because I would prosecute him.

Mr. MAST. I gave you my speculation. It might have been making room for Maduro.

Mr. MEEKS. Have you had a conversation with the President about it?

Mr. MAST. We didn't have that talk, but he might be making room for Maduro.

Mr. MEEKS. Well, you should. If you consider—why aren't you prosecuting cases now?

Mr. MAST. I asked you a question. Would you like to say 5,000 deaths are an emergency in New York?

Mr. MEEKS. It would not be coming from Canada.

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

Mr. MAST. Can we engage in a colloquy? Is that something we can do?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Even in the colloquy, the comments are to be directed to the Chair.

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, then, in this colloquy, I would present the opportunity again: Would my colleague like to deny or admit that 5,000 deaths in New York related to fentanyl is an emergency?

Mr. MEEKS. Did the fentanyl come from Canada?

Mr. MAST. Much of it did. Would you like to hear some stats?

I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. I guess you need to direct your—

Mr. MEEKS. What source is that?

Mr. MAST. You have to direct your remarks to the Speaker.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, what source is the gentleman talking about?

Mr. MAST. I would point to just Canada, number one. Canada, in the last year, had an additional 8,000 fentanyl-related arrests because they finally started cracking down on it. There was an increase of 80 percent that was seized at the U.S.-Canada border because of the actions taking place, so, yes, there were deaths going on in New York.

Mr. MEEKS. No, I think that is Canada is doing law enforcement on its side, and we are not doing now law enforcement on our side.

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I am going to end this colloquy and reclaim my time.

Mr. MAST. I note for the record, again, ample opportunities have been given for my colleague, who represents New York, to just say 5,000 fentanyl-related deaths in New York is an emergency. Silence, crickets, no response, because the death of 5,000 of his constituents apparently means nothing to him.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA).

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to slightly drift off, but not really leave this point.

Fentanyl kills 5,000 in New York. It kills 100,000 in the U.S. It kills thousands in Canada and thousands in Mexico. Those numbers are staggering, but those numbers are a small part of the tragedy to families.

For every fentanyl death in our countries, there are families who are suffering. For every fentanyl death, there is somebody who goes to the hospital multiple times. For every fentanyl death, there are three or four people who are living homeless, drug addicted, and their families are suffering. For every death, there is, in fact, a broken relationship somewhere. That is not 100,000 in America. That is millions in America.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know of an American that you talk to about fentanyl who won't tell you that they know someone whose family, their health, or their child has been destroyed by fentanyl, many of them being destroyed as we speak.

There are about 1,900 miles of Mexican border between the United States and Mexico. I represent about 80 of those miles right there outside of San Diego. I have seen the border closed as best it possibly could in an amazing way. I have seen submarines still coming in the Pacific to try to circumvent it. I know we will never get to zero.

All the President has asked Canada to do is show the kind of effort they can afford as a First World country,

and that effort should be far greater at all of their borders than Mexico's, which is a relatively poor country. That effort should be shown. If it is shown, the President has made it clear that these tariffs will immediately go away.

This isn't a tariff that is just because you don't like someone. It is a tariff that says this behavior, this leverage, is being used for one purpose: to get you to live up to a standard that is in your own best interests.

By the way, the 5,500 miles of land border between the U.S. and Canada is our longest by far. The thousands of miles of sea border that Canada needs to also patrol is huge. This President stands with Canada to help them do it, to help in technical ways and every other way, but we cannot allow millions of Americans and countless other Canadians and Mexicans to continue to suffer without us having the real empathy to do something about it.

The chairman said: What about the 5,000? We got this answer: How do you know that they came from Canada? I am sorry, but every time we have a major bust on the Mexican border, my agents tell me that we are getting maybe 10 percent, maybe 20 percent in certain areas. We are never getting 80 or 90 percent. The reality is that those are indications of a small amount of what is getting in through Buffalo and other borders into the United States.

Although the gentleman from New York is from a fairly populous State, he is not from a State without a large rural border, one that you can simply walk across with impunity normally, which has been used to smuggle drugs successfully.

The point I make here today—and I thank the chairman for the time—is: Every life matters. If the President of the United States cares about his 5,000 or 500 or 5 or 1 enough to use the power of the executive office to get the right thing out of our neighbors to the north and the south, then I want to stand with him. I would never take away a tool being used to save even one life, much less hundreds of thousands of lives and millions of families.

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative ISSA for his remarks, and I believe there will be another Representative from California speaking on the other side. I will be curious if that Representative will acknowledge the thousands of deaths from fentanyl in California being an emergency.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, Canada plays virtually no role in the United States' fentanyl influx, especially compared to other countries targeted by the Trump administration. Canada contributes less than 1 percent to our southern neighbor's border of street fentanyl, less than 1 percent. That is not according to me, because I don't know where he gets his facts, but that is according to

the DEA, as well as the Canadian Government, 1 percent.

We do a lot of trade with Canada, and in Florida's 21st District, the chairman's district, exports to Canada support 1,650 jobs. Many of them will begin to lose their jobs. This is about affordability. This is about job creation and the economy. I wonder what he is going to say to those 1,650 people in Florida's 21st District.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this resolution rejecting President Trump's illegal tariffs on Canada—our friend, our neighbor, and our ally.

The truth of the matter is that the arguments on the other side of the aisle are to distract. The vast majority of fentanyl that comes into the United States comes from China and comes in via boats in our ports of entry.

They want to distract to take away from the real issue, which is that the Constitution is very clear that the power to levy tariffs and regulate trade belongs to the Congress, not to the President. Yet, too many in this body are willing to give up that authority because President Trump demands blind loyalty from them.

The fact is, we already have a trade agreement with Canada. President Trump negotiated it, and this body ratified it. There is a lawful review process that goes into effect next year to find ways to improve it.

That is how responsible governments handle trade disputes, by following the law, not through weird social media tantrums about bridges and hockey trophies or through childish threats to annex a sovereign nation and make it the 51st State.

His daily barrage against Canada does not make him look tough. It is certainly not strategic. It is just reckless. Frankly, it is bizarre.

We are now seeing the consequences of allowing the President's unhinged behavior go unchecked. American families, small businesses, and farmers are paying the price for these endless trade wars.

Trump's tariff tantrums have cost households more than \$1,600 a year in higher prices. Families in the United States are paying more for groceries, cars, housing, utilities, the basic necessities. What about the deaths from families that are struggling from food insecurity? Do those not matter?

It is pushing our allies closer to our adversaries. Last month, Canada announced it was lowering its 100 percent tariffs on Chinese electric vehicles. Those tariffs were imposed in coordination with the United States during the leadership of the Biden administration.

□ 1530

That cooperation strengthened our position against China.

Now, because of this administration's chaotic trade policies, that progress is

unravelling. Rather than target the real bad actors, the President is picking fights with our friends. Instead of standing up for their constituents and defending Congress' constitutional authority over trade, most Republicans in this Chamber are surrendering it to the President choosing blind allegiance to him over the people that they are supposed to represent.

I commend the few Republicans who have the courage to break with the President and join with Democrats to force this vote. Reasserting our constitutional authority over trade should never have been a partisan issue.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution. Let's restore sanity and stability to our American trade policy.

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I would let my colleague know that just one—because he said Canada plays almost no role in fentanyl deaths—one 70-pound bust of fentanyl alone was enough to kill every single person in New York City. Again, my colleague is unwilling to acknowledge that this is about fentanyl, because that is literally what the executive order says, and unwilling to acknowledge that 5,000 deaths in his State is an emergency, certainly in 1 year.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON), the chair of the Budget Committee.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the Democrats fought Republicans to require voter ID to protect the integrity of our elections, the cornerstone of our democratic Republic. Now they stand here today on the floor of the people's house, fighting the President in his effort to protect the lives of the American people against what is the most imminent threat and the number one cause of accidental deaths and drug overdoses.

We know where the drugs are coming from, pouring into our country and our communities, killing our friends, killing our families. I can't think of a greater security concern than this. The President has effectively and appropriately promoted and defended America's economic and security interests by the use of tariffs.

Today, Mr. Speaker, as a result, we have a lower trade deficit than we have had since 2009. By the way, the top 20 economies in the world that we do business with had twice the tariffs on our products, three times the tariffs when you measure agriculture products, and the deficit is going down. We have quadrupled revenue to strengthen America's balance sheet and pay down the tax on our children, which is the deficit. We have gone from 6.3 percent to 5.9, and exports are at an all-time high.

Now, what is the issue here? It is not about 301, unfair trade practices, although there are plenty of grievances against our northern neighbor in that regard. This isn't about USMCA. The USMCA products flowing from Canada to the United States are exempt.

Eighty-five percent of the products, we are not talking about that. It is not about 232.

This is about one particular authority that this Congress empowered our commander-in-chief with to deal with unusual threats outside of the U.S. that would impact our national security, our foreign policy, and our economy.

Now, I can't think of anything more unusual, and I can't think of a bigger threat than a chemical warfare waged against the United States of America. Any President worth his salt, any commander-in-chief, would be derelict in their duty if they didn't use every tool at their disposal to stop it.

For my President to expect our neighbor from the north to have the same vigilance and the same urgency as he has because of the American people's mandate to stop this madness and protect our children, God bless him. God bless him.

For my colleagues to run to the floor, to raise their hands, and to scream foul that this President is somehow using tariffs in a way that has nothing to do with our interest, to talk about food security, we could go down the list. We wouldn't have food insecurity if we didn't have a cost of living crisis where the fuse was lit by unbridled spending. We could go down the list. Yes, we are doing something about that. We are bringing interest rates down. We are bringing real wages up. We are also preserving food stamps so they are not being defrauded or being spent on people here illegally.

Mr. Chairman, I would love to keep debating all day long. God bless America, and go West Texas.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, the talk time is soon over because of what I am hearing from the other side. Basically what this is about is the American people having a chance to see where their Members are, whether they want to—they will judge ultimately—believe that this is an emergency from what they hear and know of the President or whether they are concerned about their cost of living, whether they are concerned about that hot chocolate, whether they are concerned about that coffee, or whether they are concerned about life-saving medical devices.

What this will do—which has been blocked for almost a year—is simply to have a vote on the House floor so that the American people can see because then ultimately, we will know which way is the right way for them.

We are here to represent the citizens of the United States of America, not a President. We soon will have a vote because that is what is going to happen, which is what I have been asking for for over a year. If you think this is an emergency, if you believe the Presi-

dent, you are going to vote that way. If you think this is going to be accountable to the American people, if you think that the American people will say that the cost of living, the cost of electricity, the cost of food every day they go to the market is of concern to them, they will be watching how you vote on this bill. They will be watching. Vote how you want. This is for the American people to see where you stand, with them or the President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Ms. SALINAS).

Ms. SALINAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose President Trump's disastrous tariffs and shine a light on the real harm they are causing families and businesses in my district.

My district is home to some of the best wineries in the world, and Canada is our single largest foreign market. After Trump imposed his tariffs, Canada responded with their own tariffs that lasted for months. Many Canadians continue to boycott our products, all while our growers and producers pay the price. They are facing higher costs, shrinking export opportunities, and real economic pain for real families.

In October, wine sales to Canada were down 84 percent when compared to last year. If we fail to act, this Congress will be complicit in enabling President Trump to destroy the hard-fought relationships my community has brokered. Wineries in my district built their relationships across the border over decades, and in one day, President Trump destroyed them.

□ 1540

These tariffs hurt American farmers and American consumers alike. We must act and protect the American people from the volatile whims of the petulant President.

Mr. Speaker, I urge an "aye" vote.

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, it is amazing to me we are talking about the deaths of thousands of Americans, tens of thousands of Americans, and somebody is talking about wine. We are talking about the lives of tens of thousands of Americans, and my colleagues are talking about wine. Let's get some perspective here.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FINE).

Mr. FINE. Mr. Speaker, we have heard the opposition to this take on two things: number one, that this has somehow raised the cost of living and that, somehow, the fentanyl crisis is not a national emergency. I would like to disassemble those two arguments.

A long time ago, long before I came to Washington, one of my first jobs was I taught economics. I would say to my colleagues that they need to get beyond Karl Marx's "The Communist Manifesto" to understand how the world actually works.

When Joe Biden was President, prices went up 5 percent a year. Under the

Trump trade regime that is supposedly making things so expensive for people, it has gone up one-half that amount, 2.7 percent. Obviously, tariffs are not the problem.

Economic results: The last quarter, our economic growth as a nation was 4.4 percent. The economy is booming. That is almost double what we saw the previous year under Joe Biden. His number started with a two.

These tariffs, rather than hurting America, have brought \$15 billion, that is just from Canada, that we can use to pay down our debt and pay down our deficit, again, as we have lower inflation and higher economic growth. It has worked. The chairman talked about the cost of 5,000 lives a year in New York, almost 100,000 nationwide, but those statistics are 1 year old.

Under President Trump's tariff regime where he has cracked down on it, last year, fentanyl deaths in this country dropped by 21 percent. That is 20,000 Americans who did not die because of a fentanyl overdose. That is 20,000 national emergencies diverted. That is 20,000 families that aren't destroyed, and that is 20,000 futures that still get to be in our country.

We should not be criticizing the President for what he has done, because the last thing I will say is this: When I taught economics, we had a concept called Pareto optimality. It is something where everything is good and nothing is bad, and that is exactly what is happening here.

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

Mr. Speaker, one thing that I will say, yes, the economy is booming. Mr. Speaker, if you are a billionaire, the economy is booming. However, when I go home and I talk to my constituents, what they tell me is that the price of beef has risen 16.4 percent over the last year. The price of coffee is up a whopping 19.8 percent. The price of lettuce is up 7.3 percent. Frozen fish is up 8.6 percent. So for them, it is not booming.

As I said, this is just about a vote. It is just about a vote. I wish we could have had this vote 1 year ago. If, in fact, they believe this is an emergency, I don't know why it was held up for 1 year and tried to be prevented again.

It is a vote. Let the American people know where you stand, Mr. Speaker. They see it with your vote.

Do you stand with them, Mr. Speaker, trying to fix the affordability crisis, or do you stand with Donald Trump and my Republican colleagues who are just taking care of those for whom the economy is booming, the billionaires of our country?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. MAGAZINER).

Mr. MAGAZINER. Mr. Speaker, President Trump's tariffs are raising costs on working people. Just like everything else that Donald Trump does, his tariffs are all about helping himself and his rich friends at the expense of everyday people.

The Big Tech companies and the Big Oil companies have been donating millions of dollars to Trump's ballroom and lavishing him with gifts like a golden iPhone.

Wouldn't you know it, Mr. Speaker, he exempted them from the tariffs.

Who is not exempt?

They are the small businesses, the farmers, the restaurants, and the small manufacturers who can't afford to go to Mar-a-Lago to ask for special deals. They are the builders who are paying thousands of dollars more for materials to build new homes, and they are everyday people who are stuck with higher costs, working themselves to the bone and who can't keep up with their bills.

In Donald Trump's America, the rich and connected are always taken care of, and everyone else struggles.

For what, Mr. Speaker?

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics' report that came out today, we lost more than 100,000 manufacturing jobs last year.

End these tariffs. Stop this madness, and lower costs for working people.

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

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues should educate themselves on what these tariffs are affecting. They are third-party goods coming in from countries like China. I don't think they are growing much coffee in Canada. They might want to look at the map and look at the temperatures and where these items grow.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. CRANE).

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman MAST for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this resolution which would terminate the President's national emergency in response to the flow of fentanyl across our northern border.

As an Arizonan, I am all too familiar with the destruction these weaponized opioids have caused, and I fully support President Trump's mission to rid our Nation of this poison.

Under the previous administration, fentanyl claimed the lives of approximately 73,000 Americans per year and became the leading cause of death among those aged 18 to 45. President Trump was elected in part to confront this catastrophic crisis.

Fentanyl affects constituents of every Member of this body, regardless of political affiliation. As someone who has met with individuals devastated by this deadly substance, maintaining our momentum to stop fentanyl must remain a top priority.

Over the past year, the Trump administration urged Canada to work in coordination with our law enforcement partners to help stem the flow of dangerous narcotics. Unfortunately, our neighbors to the north have failed to adequately respond, prompting the administration to use leverage to bring

them to the table. Now Democrats are on the House floor attempting to end the President's declaration, which would undermine efforts to prevent fentanyl-related deaths. It would be very unwise to tie the President's hands and remove this critical tool during an ongoing public health and national security crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the leadership of Chairman MAST, and I applaud the administration's commitment to preventing addiction and overdoses.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO), who is the ranking member of HFAC's Western Hemisphere Subcommittee.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.J. Res. 72, the resolution to terminate President Trump's tariffs on Canada.

Families in San Antonio and across this country are already struggling with the rising cost of living. The price of everything is going up: groceries, housing, childcare, and rent. When you go to the grocery store, Mr. Speaker, beef prices are up 16 percent, and coffee is up nearly 20 percent.

Instead of lowering costs, the President imposed tariffs on Canada, which is nothing more than a tax on American families, and started a trade war with one of our closest allies. Those tariffs don't just hurt American families. They threaten jobs in places like my hometown of San Antonio. Nearly one-half, 48 percent, of San Antonio's exports go to Canada, the highest share of any major city in the country.

Our economy is deeply tied to North American supply chains. Thousands of San Antonians work in aerospace, automotive manufacturing, energy, machinery, semiconductors, and medical devices, exactly the high-paying industries we want to be growing here in the United States.

These companies chose San Antonio because we are highly integrated into trade networks with Canada and Mexico. When tariffs go up, local businesses pay the price. When Canada retaliates, it becomes harder for our workers to sell their products abroad.

This trade war is making life more expensive, creating uncertainty and putting good jobs at risk, all while the world continues to move around us. Congress has constitutional authority over tariffs. We must use it here and now. Let's lower costs for American families, protect jobs in San Antonio and across America, and end this reckless trade war.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

□ 1550

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, Americans across the country agree, the unmitigated flow of fentanyl under the Biden administration now constitutes an emergency.

Let's discuss some facts. In 2023 alone, this crisis contributed to the deaths of 70,000 Americans—in just one year, 2023—a number that only worsened the following year, when the amount of fentanyl that crossed our border with Canada was actually enough to kill 9.5 million people, given that potential.

Given this context, it is no surprise that between 2024 and 2025, under President Trump, fentanyl seizures at the northern border nearly doubled. As the supply of fentanyl is so tied to trade through the movement of precursor chemicals, the President has utilized trade policy to spur progress.

While today's resolution is meant to debate the merits of the emergency created by the flow of fentanyl, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle will use this as a venue to debate trade policy. I have been watching.

I certainly welcome my Democratic colleagues' interest, relatively new interest, in the trade policy following what I would say was 4 years of neglect on trade policy under President Biden. However, if we are serious about engaging in real reform, I believe that my colleagues would not just resort to political maneuvers.

I am not a fan of tariffs. That is no secret. I am in favor, however, of robust engagement with our trading partners. Let me be very clear. In trade, there is no stagnation. If we are not gaining ground, I think we are losing ground, and data would show that.

During the Biden administration, the President and this body were way too passive on our trade agenda. Right now, President Trump obviously is taking a new aggressive approach in order to level the playing field and address supply chains that have put Americans at risk.

Beyond the gains made in addressing the fentanyl crisis and outside the scope of this emergency, the President's engagement has led to significant gains for fairness throughout the global trading system.

While Canada is one of our most important allies and trading partners, and a friend, there have been a number of irritants in our economic relationship. Under President Trump's leadership, we have seen this change, most recently when Canada removed its discriminatory digital services tax.

These productive—and I will say oftentimes uncomfortable—conversations must continue, though, as we strengthen and extend USMCA during this 2026 Joint Review.

The President has, at every turn, reaffirmed his commitment to use tariffs as a means to drive these conversations, and Congress has delegated a number of tariff authorities to the executive.

While we are ultimately debating the merits of the emergency, let me be clear: This approach will not change the President's tariff strategy, just the conditions. This body works best when engaging with the full context of the policy environment.

As we await the Supreme Court's decision on whether the tariffs lie within the authority of IEEPA, today's politically motivated vote, I believe, is premature. If my colleagues have full confidence there is no risk of fentanyl imports at the northern border, then they have more faith than I do.

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

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, if this resolution is instead driven by a newfound tariff skepticism, I urge them to allow the Supreme Court to first make its decision.

To overlook the very basis of the emergency in the hope of removing tariffs for which the President has other authorities to pursue only increases uncertainty in the short term.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the resolution.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, President Trump's repeated bullying of Canada and its eloquent Prime Minister Carney is both embarrassing and alarming. Our country could not have a better neighbor or trading partner than Canada.

Declaring emergencies where none exist, Trump delights in these executive decrees for tariffs. He can act like a king, and he is enabled to be a king-like figure on this issue by Republicans, even though it is costing American families thousands of dollars.

There have been 76,000 American manufacturing jobs lost amidst Trump chaos. Small businesses are losing out if they don't have a lobbyist who can go to Mar-a-Lago and bargain with Trump.

This vote is about reaffirming "no king," no rule by decree from the President when he has no authority to do this, and recognizing that our Constitution places responsibility for trade and tariff taxes where it should be, right here in this Congress.

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

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD).

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, President Trump loves tariffs. He calls them beautiful. He says they protect American workers, but here is the cold, hard truth: The American people are paying them.

Just today, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office confirmed what families already feel—American consumers are paying 95 percent of these tariffs. They pay at the grocery store. They pay in higher energy bills. They

pay when small businesses shut their doors.

These blanket tariffs on Canada are a slap in the face to one of our closest trading allies. Canada is Nevada's top international visitor. Tourism in Las Vegas is already down 7.5 percent. Nationwide, Canadian travel is down 23 percent, a \$4 billion hit to our economy.

Today, though, thanks to Congressman MEEKS, House Democrats, and Republicans who are willing to stand up, Congress can take back its power. We can give the American people real relief today. The families sitting around their kitchen tables tonight deserve a government that will lower their costs and that will end these Trump tariff taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I urge this body to vote "yes" on this resolution.

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

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STANTON).

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 72.

I thank Ranking Member MEEKS for his great leadership on this critical issue.

It is time to end Trump's illegal tariffs on Canada, his tariffs on United States' biggest trading partner, Mexico, and the so-called liberation day tariffs. Congress has the power of the purse, not the President. It is time that we take our power back from an executive who is out of control.

Trump's tariffs have been a massive tax on the American people, costing an average household \$1,000 per household just in the last year. These tariffs have led to slower job growth, a declining manufacturing industry, and less investment. They have hurt our farmers and increased food costs.

These tariffs have inflicted real damage on our relationship with Canada. Canada isn't just our neighbor. It has historically been one of our strongest military allies and biggest trading partners. Trump's constant insults, threats, and these punishing tariffs have turned one of our best friends away from us and toward the People's Republic of China.

Enough is enough. It is time that we end this. I urge my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats alike, send Trump a clear message that he can't unilaterally wage a trade war against one of our strongest allies and biggest trading partners.

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

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

The American people are watching. This is very simple. Why did we take a year to get this vote? It is because Trump's tariffs are unpopular—the majority of Americans know it—and a majority of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle don't want to be on the record. Well, they are going to be on the record.

They know that more than 60 percent of Americans disapprove of these tariffs. They know that the foreign governments don't pay these tariffs. They know that American families do. The farmers feel it. Small businesses feel it. Moms and dads feel it every time they see the prices at the grocery store.

What this is, we can go back and forth, but the American people are watching. They are the ultimate judges. They can see. They can hear. They know our friend. They know how Canada and Canadians are friendly to us in the United States of America, closest partners. Many Canadians have given their lives for us.

The American people can watch. What this simply does, this resolution, we will see. If you think that there is a crisis with Canada, then vote.

Still, the Constitution says it is the House of Representatives and the United States Congress, it is within our authority. Don't punt. Don't just hide behind somebody else. That is what this will do. If you believe that this is an emergency, vote that way, if that is what you really believe.

However, if you go to the grocery stores, if you see the price of beef, if you look at the price of coffee, if you feel that the economy is suffering as a result of these tariffs, if you think the economy for the average, everyday American is as good as those billionaire friends that the President has, then you vote with the President.

□ 1600

Give up, but don't give up your authority as a Member of this House to vote. The first fight here was the power to vote on this issue, which was blocked for 1 year. I choose not to give up that power. Whether I agree or disagree, I want to vote on it. That was prevented for over a year.

Today, we will vote on it. I thank some of my colleagues on the other side who have had the courage to stand up and say: Let's vote. Let's vote on this, and let the American people know how we stand. Let's vote on this to see if we believe that tariffs cause an affordability issue. Let's vote on this if we believe that Canada is not our friend, if Canada is an adversary, and you feel we should block a bridge like the President is talking about now, a bridge that Canadians paid for right across, block it, make them the 51st State, and insult them. If that is what you want to do, do it.

If you want to stand to bring down prices, if you want the average, everyday American to be able to raise their children and live the American Dream, if you want to make sure that families can afford to pay their rent, can afford to buy food, can afford to have healthcare, then you vote "yes" for this resolution.

The jury is really the American people. They ultimately will vote. They ultimately will tell us what is in their best interests. I have confidence in the American people. That is why I wanted a vote on this bill.

I didn't want to play the funny rules that were being played and were attempted last night. Fortunately, some of my colleagues on the other side did not want to play that game anymore either.

Those rules and those games that were played to prevent a vote on the floor in the United States Congress are over. That is what this is about, so the American people can see what we stand for. Do we stand for just going blindly with the President of the United States, or do we stand for the American people and making sure that their cost of living is cheaper and affordable so they can simply send their kids to school and be able to put a good meal on the table and a roof over the heads of their families? That is what this vote is about.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. My colleague over here is the ranking member, the top Democrat. It is important that when we use our voice, when we speak, we speak accurately.

Number one, they refuse to speak about the fact that this bill is about ending an emergency relating to a fentanyl crisis. Number two, every single item that they like to talk about on tariffs and Canada are literally items that are exempt from tariffs in Canada.

It is very important, certainly as one of 435 in the House of Representatives, that you know what you are talking about. It is especially important as the number two person on the Foreign Affairs Committee that you know what you are talking about when you talk about tariffs.

There are not Canada beef tariffs, not Canada potash tariffs or dairy or food or grain or fertilizer. The list goes on and on. They mentioned coffee I don't know how many times.

The only things that there are tariffs on are things that are coming in from third-party countries into Canada and then coming into the United States of America. If it is grown in Canada, there is not a tariff on it. It is very important that my colleagues know that and recognize that and speak accurately in the positions that they are in.

Mr. Speaker, I will go back to what this is about.

My colleagues say there is no emergency. In fact, my colleague Mr. MEEKS said that if you think there is a crisis, if you think this is an emergency, then vote. Those were his words.

I think the only person on that side who might be able to change the mind of Democrats is my colleague, Mr. MEEKS, who is, again, unwilling to acknowledge that the death of 5,000 people in his State from fentanyl alone in 1 year is an emergency. He is unwilling to acknowledge it.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to take the remainder of my time here, about 1

minute, and give my colleague the opportunity one last time to correct the record for his New Yorkers.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. MEEKS. I will say that the American people are the judges. They don't need to hear anything else. The American people will judge.

Mr. MAST. Would my colleague like to say that 5,000 deaths aren't an emergency?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida controls the time.

Mr. MAST. Would my colleague like to say that 5,000 deaths are an emergency? Five thousand deaths in his State in 1 year from fentanyl—preventable. The President is doing everything he can to stop it with drug boats, with the Caribbean, with the northern border, with the southern border. Crickets. You could hear a pin drop in here. Not a word from them.

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

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

Pursuant to the order of the House of February 10, 2026, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. MEEKS. 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.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Ms. Randall Holstead, one of his secretaries.

UNDERSEA CABLE PROTECTION ACT OF 2025

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1057, I call up 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, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BABIN). Pursuant to House Resolution