

It is something Kate Millett, the founder of women's studies classes, which are all over our universities—there are relatively few majors, but there are a lot of people who take one of those classes as an elective. These people are anti-man. They don't want men in the family.

It is not surprising with people following this group that there is—they would consider it successful to pass more and more programs that a family with a mother and father at home would not be eligible for. If they somehow get the man out of the home, they are eligible for it.

We are all familiar with these programs. One program is food stamps, what used to be called food stamps. We also have low-income housing where you may get an apartment that other people would have to pay \$1,200 for and you get nothing.

Earned income tax credit can easily be, if you don't work too hard, getting \$7,000 or \$8,000 and getting nothing if you are married to a person with an income.

There are Pell grants. As one young gal about 22 years old told me, she and her husband got married before they had a child; but she knew lots of friends who weren't getting married because they got free college.

Daycare is another program in which you can pay to have someone take care of your kids while at work if you don't get married to the other spouse.

We have talked a lot about the Medicaid program. Again, we use the program for healthcare and poor people to try to penalize those foolish people who get married first.

It is easy. It varies from couple to couple how much they lose if they get married. I think it is safe to say it is very easy to come up with hypotheticals of \$25,000 or more—a \$25,000 penalty in this country from getting married and frequently keeping the men out of the family.

Mr. Speaker, I have known about this for some time. In case anybody wants to look at this a little bit more, they can look at books written by George Gilder in the late 1970s, which at the time were bestsellers and everybody talked about during the beginning of the Reagan administration. Unfortunately, nobody ever did anything about it.

He looked at what at the time was referred to as "a ghetto" in Albany, New York. He followed around a young couple, and the gal had just gotten pregnant. At that time, given George Gilder's upbringing, he thought that would be cause for concern for the couple. They would have to get married right away. They would have to work harder to support the child.

It was to George Gilder's surprise and shock that, as he followed this young couple around, they were thrilled that the woman got pregnant out of wedlock because it allowed them to go from government office to government office to get free food, to get what at

the time was called the free AFDC check, to get free rent, and to get free medical care. They had it made in the shade.

Great, Mary is pregnant. We are not going to get married. We are just going to stop working now because of that.

Of course, what happened is over time Americans' behavior changed. We went from in the 1950s, before Lyndon Johnson was President, and in which about 4 percent of the children were born without a mother and father at home, to a steady increase for about 30 years to over 40 percent.

There are so many wonderful single parents out there. I know people who have done a great job of raising children as a single parent. Of course, we do have programs to help people who are widows or widowers in Social Security. That is not, I think, what is normally meant by a single parent.

Overall, when we go down this path, we have more and more people in a difficult situation who can be overwhelmed by this. It can hurt their children. I think studies will show various measures of success or failure, and it is much more difficult with a single-parent lifestyle. Something that is not publicized enough is it is horrible for the men.

George Gilder would tell us, if you look at a single-parent situation, the person who is penalized the most isn't the children or the single mom. The person who is penalized the most is the single man because his natural purpose in life is to support a family. The government has taken away his natural purpose in life. He, therefore, does not have a purpose in life.

In areas of high poverty, I think this is why we see so many single men having unhappy lives. If you pick up the paper and find out who is getting murdered, it is usually single men. If you look and see who is dying of drug overdoses, it is usually single men. Those who are not doing well education-wise are single men.

Of course, the reason the single men are doing so poorly is because of the great society programs which are designed to make those single men worthless. This is another reason why this body ought to take up these welfare programs.

Not only do we want what is best in the next generation for the children and not only do we want what is best in the next generation for the mothers, but we just treat the single fathers very poorly. We don't give them a purpose in life. As a result, so many are unhappy. So many wind up dying from murder, dying of drug overdoses, and just, in general, leading unhappy lives.

Mr. Speaker, these are some of the things that I hope we begin to take up next week. I hope our leadership team realizes that, while we are doing a good job on the economy, and we are growing private-sector jobs, and we are not having an artificial economic boom by hiring a bunch of IRS agents and calling it a welfare country, I hope we take up some of these other issues.

I hope our conservative opinion makers take up these other issues and educate the public that for America to become a great country again, we have to do something with all these unhappy Americans suffering from Greta Thunberg syndrome because they don't have a purpose in life and so they adapt the purpose of anti-Western, anti-American behavior.

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

□ 1200

COMMUNICATION FROM THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BEGICH) laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 12, 2026.

I hereby designate the period from Thursday, February 12, 2026, through Sunday, February 22, 2026, as a "district work period" under clause 13 of Rule I.

MIKE JOHNSON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DIRECTING THE CLERK TO MAKE CHANGES IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 5616, \$2.50 FOR AMERICA'S 250TH ACT

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be directed to make changes in the engrossment of H.R. 5616 that I have placed at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the change.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 3, line 17, strike "gold" and insert "gold;".

On page 3, line 21, strike "silver." and insert "silver; and".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the changes are agreed to.

There was no objection.

BLACK HISTORY: STOLEN LEGACIES

(Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, Mr. GREEN of Texas was recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.)

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, and still I rise, a proud, liberated, unbought, unbosser, and unafraid Democrat.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today because this is Black History Month, and I have been accorded the honor of presenting annually the original Black history resolution.

I am proud to do this in concert with a great organization. This organization has been bearing the torch, carrying the torch—the flame—of Black history now for so many years, founded by the Honorable Carter G. Woodson, who is widely known as the person who established this notion of a Black History Week, Black History Month. So I am

proud to recognize this organization. The organization is the Association for the Study of African-American Life and History.

This is the preeminent organization of its kind. It is the leader of the pack when it comes to Black history, and I am proud to be associated with them and proud to tell you that this year, for our Black History Month, there is a theme: A Century of Black History Commemorations. A century, 100 years.

Today, I have chosen the topic, one that I think embraces something that is a little bit more contemporary and something that gives us reason to understand why we have to celebrate Black history.

The topic is Black History: Stolen Legacies. Stolen legacies. Black History: Stolen Legacies.

Mr. Speaker, fear not, because I want you to understand that I understand that this theme could be applicable to people of color in this country. It could be applicable to persons who are Latinos. It could be applicable to people who are Asians because the complete history of the country has not been properly documented and recorded. However, since it is Black History Month, I think it appropriate that I take up the cause and explain it as it relates to Black History Month.

Before I go on, I think I should remind people that I am also the same AL GREEN who has been censured. Censured, but not silenced. Censured, but not silenced.

I am proud today to take up this cause of Black history in Black History Month.

Mr. Speaker, in speaking of legacies that have been stolen, we annually honor General Gordon Granger for going into Galveston and informing the enslaved persons there that the Emancipation Proclamation applied to them and that they were free people, liberated people.

When we do this, however, we do not acknowledge the people who made it possible for General Gordon Granger to go to Galveston. These persons were members of the 25th Army Corps, approximately 1,000 persons of African ancestry who went to Galveston prior to Gordon Granger.

They made it possible for Gordon Granger to stand in Galveston and deliver general order No. 3. These were the persons who ran the Confederates all the way to the Mexican border—legacies stolen because they have literally been minimized and had their histories somehow sanitized.

Today, we want to make sure that we talk about these persons whose legacies have been stolen: 25th Army Corps.

Let's bring this forward to the civil rights movement. In the civil rights movement, we honor—and we should honor—Rosa Parks, a Black woman who took her seat on a bus in a racist southern town. When she took that seat, she ignited a spark that started the civil rights movement.

Rosa Parks should be honored for what she did. She was incarcerated for what she did. She should be honored, and we do honor her. Yet, Mr. Speaker, the legacy is incomplete because the history of this has not been completely told.

If the true history is told, you have to mention Claudette Colvin—Claudette Colvin, a 15-year-old high school student, member of the NAACP. Claudette Colvin, she is a person who, 9 months prior to Rosa Parks taking that seat, did the same thing and was arrested. Legacy stolen, legacy denied.

Claudette Colvin, not only did she go to jail and suffer the same indignation and humiliation as the Honorable Rosa Parks, but she did something else. She filed a lawsuit. She was a plaintiff in the lawsuit *Browder v. Gayle*.

This is the lawsuit that brought the Montgomery bus boycott to a legal end because it was under the pen of the Honorable Frank M. Johnson, Jr., a Federal district court judge, who ordered that that bus line be integrated and no longer segregated.

This was the dispute that took place when Dr. King was promoted to the leadership of the civil rights movement. This is where he led the people in this bus boycott to make sure that, at some point, Black people could sit on any seat on the bus that they chose to, because they couldn't.

You could take a seat on the front or somewhere near the front, and people could simply say: Move back. There is a White person who needs your seat. Then you move back, and if another came on: Move back. There is another White person who needs your seat.

This is true history. This is the history that is untold.

So Dr. King led the boycott. Rosa Parks started the initiative, but it was Claudette Colvin who took the lawsuit to the Supreme Court, the lawsuit filed that eventually caused a judge, Frank M. Johnson, Jr., to rule that that line had to be desegregated.

Claudette Colvin has been denied her place in history. Very little is said about her.

□ 1210

Now, I would like to contemporize, and this is going to give people an understanding as to this pattern of denying Black people their proper place in history, this pattern of stealing legacies, of whitewashing history as it relates to Black people—and it happens to people of color, not just Black people—and people of color it has happened to in this country. So, let's now contemporize as it relates to Black history and talk about something that happened in the State of Texas.

We have a President of the United States who concluded that he had to have five more seats for the Republican side in Congress, five more seats to hold on to power, five more seats to continue to be the reckless, ruthless, lawless President that he is, five more seats. Because if he loses the House, he

loses his ability to do many of the things that the House can constrain him and prevent him from doing, because the House controls the purse strings.

He said: I want five seats. Four of the five that he actually identified were minority coalition seats, where minority people were electing the persons of their choice, and they were electing minority people. Well, he wanted five, four of the five being these seats that could elect minority people, minority people coalescing to elect people, a legitimate thing for people to do.

Well, in so doing, he ordered the Governor to do this. The Governor got with the attorney general. The two of them worked it out such that seats were taken in Texas.

I am just going to focus on one of them. In Houston, Texas, we had the 18th Congressional District, historic as it is called quite often—and I concur with the persons who would call it such; the historic 18th Congressional District—the 18th Congressional District, the district of Barbara Jordan, the district that had the great Craig Washington, Mickey Leland, Sheila Jackson Lee, Sylvester Turner, the 18th Congressional District, a historic Congressional District.

The 18th Congressional District was adjacent to the Ninth Congressional District. We will call it, for our purposes today, the old 18th Congressional District, and you will understand better why in just a moment, located adjacent to the Ninth Congressional District. In fact, if you look north and south, the 18th was at the top, and the Ninth was under the 18th. The Ninth Congressional District was one that elected a person of color, as well.

The President and the Governor decided that they would do something called crack. This is where you break a district, and then you pack—you take it and push the persons in those two districts together, but in so doing, you eliminate a district. In this case, that is what they did. So they cracked, and they packed. They stacked. They put the Ninth and the 18th together.

When they put the Ninth and the 18th together, they eliminated the possibility for a person of color to be elected in the Ninth District by moving the lines for it over to another area.

Now, I shouldn't say "eliminate." Anything can happen. My belief is that there are capable, competent, and qualified people running, but the prognostication is that the configuration of it in terms of the numbers is likely to elect a conservative person, probably a very conservative person. My hope is that won't happen.

In any event, coming back to the Ninth and the 18th, when they combined these two districts, they eliminated the possibility for the people of these two districts to have two Representatives in Congress. They eliminated that possibility, and they made it possible for only one to come from these two districts, only one person

from the 18th and the Ninth, only one. When they combined them such that only one person could be elected from the two, that eliminated the possibility of another minority person being elected.

Historically, a Black person has represented the Ninth, and Black people have represented the 18th in Congress.

When this was done, if you look at it just numerically, the people of the Ninth are losing a Representative if you look at numbers, but if you look at it deeply, within what happened, they put more of the people from the Ninth District in this new 18th than from the old 18th District. Approximately two-thirds of the people in this Ninth District are in the new 18th District. Now, you have a district with 18 on it as its number that is packed with people from District Nine.

Another way to look at it, to simplify, if you have two pies, and you take a slice out of one pie and you decide you are going to add it to another pie, but only take two slices from the other, and then you combine them to create three pieces of pie, there would be two pieces from the Ninth District creating this pie and one piece from the 18th.

That is almost what has happened here, if not exactly what has happened. Two-thirds of this 18th consists of people from the Ninth Congressional District.

Now, why is this such a dastardly thing? Because in Texas, we have struggled for minority people to have representation, from White primaries—and a person in Houston, Texas, took the case all the way to the Supreme Court. His name was Lonnie Smith. He was a dentist. He took it all the way to the Supreme Court to defeat White primaries. When the Supreme Court said, no, you can't have White primaries, what did Texas do? Texas decided to have White pre-primaries—true story, White pre-primaries. It had to go all the way back to the Supreme Court, which said, no, Texas, if you can't have White primaries, you can't have White pre-primaries.

This is something that is consistent in Texas, in terms of its behavior as it relates to people of color having proper representation in Congress.

We now have a circumstance where but one person of color will now be coming from the Houston area because of these two districts. But one will come from the two districts that have been combined.

Here is what I have done for our Black History Month. I believe that people who do such dastardly things ought to be recorded in history for their dastardly deeds. That is dastard with a d, not a b. They should be recorded in history as the dastards they are. That is with a b—no, excuse me. That is with a d. As the dastards they are, they should be recorded.

Let's talk about the dastards that have perpetrated this invidious discrimination on the people of the 18th and Ninth Congressional Districts.

The first dastard to be dealt with is, of course, the President of the United States, so I have a resolution that condemns President Donald Trump for ordering an unprecedented midcycle, racist redistricting effort in Texas—midcycle, racist redistricting in Texas, President Trump.

I have this resolution because a court concluded that it was racist. The court concluded under the leadership of the—I say "leadership," the judge who handed the opinion out, who penned the opinion, a conservative judge, I might add, a Federal judge. This conservative Federal judge concluded that the lines were racially drawn—racially drawn. With the lines being racially drawn, this means that they were using racist tactics.

We want to condemn what the judge found to be the case in Texas from the three-judge panel, that this is racist. This is what a three-judge panel concluded: This is racist.

So, we have a resolution condemning the President for this racist behavior, as we should. We want history to know who these dastards are: the President of the United States of America, five seats, and make sure that in Texas, you combine a couple of them. That is what was done. A couple of them combined so that one Representative is lost to a minority community.

Well, they didn't stop there. As I said, the Governor performed this dastardly deed. For doing this, Governor, you should be properly recognized in history for the dastardly deed that you have done. I have a resolution that will honor you as such, Governor. This is a resolution that condemns Texas Governor Greg Abbott for delaying the election in Texas, the 18th Congressional District, beyond a reasonable time. The President ordered it. The Governor followed through, but he didn't stop there. The Governor decided that he would delay the election for a Representative for the new 18th Congressional District. Remember, we have the old one that will no longer exist after this year, and the new one, which will then move forward, that has been—where we have two districts combined.

□ 1220

The Governor didn't just stop with combining the districts. He decided he would delay the election for almost a year.

Just recently, a person was elected to represent this old 18th Congressional District, and now we have an election coming up for the new 18th Congressional District. If it sounds confusing, it is.

On March 3, there will be an election for the new district, but the Governor delayed the election for the old district for almost 1 year. It was just recently that we had the election for the old 18th Congressional District.

For this Governor, for your dastardly deed, we made a record, and we are going to honor you for what you have

done in delaying the election for some unreasonable amount of time. History ought to know who you are and what you did.

But we are not going to stop there. We have to now recognize that there are some other dastards involved here. We already acknowledged the President as a dastard and the Governor of the State of Texas as a dastard.

Now, we have to talk about the Houston Chronicle. The Houston Chronicle, for whatever reasons, wittingly or unwittingly, has joined forces with these two dastards. The Houston Chronicle has published stories, many of them wherein they have indicated in the stories that two Members of Congress passed, and they did, and that, as a result of these two Members passing, the Houston Chronicle believes that ageism is an appropriate thing for them to express continually in their newspaper.

The Houston Chronicle has engaged in what I call ageism, and if you read the stories, I think you will come to the same conclusion. So, they decided they would engage in this ageism.

Here is what they have done. They continually write stories wherein they talk about the death of these two iconic persons, two great heroes in Texas history. We don't want their stories diminished in any way. That would be the Honorable Sheila Jackson Lee and the Honorable Sylvester Turner.

The Houston Chronicle, one of the dastards, the Houston Chronicle is engaging in ageism, and here is how they are doing it. The Houston Chronicle has concluded that ageism is appropriate because the two persons who preceded the person who is running now, they died while in office. Somehow, they have decided to charge their deaths with this monthlong, many months long, almost 1 year long delay in an election. They talk about their deaths and convince people that you have to be careful, that people can die. So, if the next person dies, the Governor would do the same thing. Rather than blame the Governor solely, they have now transferred some of this to the persons who died.

This is the Houston Chronicle. They are committing ageism by saying that people don't want to have another person who is of a certain age, because if you do that, then that person might die.

Who can guarantee life? No one knows for whom the bell will toll next. No one can guarantee life. Young people die every day. No one can know. But the Houston Chronicle has made it their mission to campaign on this issue.

Here is what is interesting about what the Houston Chronicle is doing. They only apply that theory to a person of color. Senator CORNYN is running. If Senator CORNYN wins, he gets a 6-year term. Senator CORNYN will be among the oldest in the Senate, but they don't apply that to Senator CORNYN. They have not tried to pressure Senator CORNYN out of a race. In fact,

they have endorsed Senator CORNYN. They have gone so far as to endorse Senator CORNYN.

Senator CORNYN has WESLEY HUNT running against him. He is a younger person. They haven't said that you ought to elect WESLEY HUNT. No, they have said to elect JOHN CORNYN.

Well, what is it about these two people that makes them different from the other scenario that I have called to your attention? What is it, *Houston Chronicle*? Yes, you are going to see this. You are going to see me. I do not fear the *Houston Chronicle*. What is it about this that allows them to do exactly what they have done?

Well, WESLEY HUNT happens to be a person of color. JOHN CORNYN happens to be a White man. The *Houston Chronicle* has a different standard when it comes to JOHN CORNYN.

Just think about that. Think about that, a different standard.

They have an all-out campaign going on. You might say they are the campaign. Well, for your dastardly deeds, *Houston Chronicle*, you, too, will be recorded in history with a resolution.

Now, I want to say just a few more words about these people that they have demeaned. First, you heard me mention Al Edwards earlier. He is the father of Juneteenth, the father of Juneteenth. We have a resolution honoring him as such. For Sylvester Turner, a person who united diverse communities in Houston for 8 years as mayor, we have a resolution honoring him for his being that person who created a symbiosis in Houston, having people of different hues, different ethnicities, from different places around the world come together.

Finally, we have a resolution honoring the life and enduring public service of Congresswoman Sheila Jackson Lee.

I—personal pronoun—will not allow their legacies to be stolen. I will not. And I will not allow dastards not to be recorded as they properly should be in history. They will not escape history.

Mr. President, you won't escape history.

Mr. Governor, you won't escape history.

Houston Chronicle, you won't escape history.

Now, I want to say just a word about the top culprit in the process, and that would be the President. The President is the biggest dastard in the country. President Donald Trump is dastard number one.

This says: "Countdown to Impeachment." This is the President of the United States of America seated here. I am proud to tell you that I stood right over there and told the President to his face that you don't have a mandate to cut Medicaid, Medicare, and Social Security. This was at a joint session of Congress. This dastard said that they weren't going to do it, and, lo and behold, the dastard did it. They cut about a trillion dollars out of healthcare. This is the dastard who perpetrated the

deed. He ought to be recognized in history as the person who did the greatest injustice to healthcare the country has ever seen, Donald John Trump.

But he has gone beyond this. His behavior is something that is difficult to codify, difficult to explain, but I will tell you this: He went too far just recently. He has gone too far on many other occasions, but recently, he went too far again.

This time, this dastard, Donald John Trump, sent out a meme wherein he had the gall, unmitigated as we say, where he had just the low-down, dirty instinct to send out, to post, a picture of the Honorable President Barack Obama and the First Lady Michelle Obama, to picture them as members of the primate family. That is what this dastard did to two of our heroes of Black history.

□ 1230

If he had his way, there would be no Black history. He is the person who has decided that Black history is going to be minimized because we talk too much about slavery. He wants slavery to be whitewashed. There are people in Texas who call it involuntary relocation.

Murder, rape, and 240 years of working without a paycheck is involuntary relocation?

This dastard supports these kinds of things, this dastard. That is why we have this across the top of this poster, three words, countdown to impeachment. Countdown to impeachment.

Yes, Mr. President, I don't speak for anybody but myself. I don't speak for any party. I don't speak for anyone, well, except myself and everybody who agrees with me. That is whom I speak for. Mr. President, not only are you a subject of impeachment, but now Ms. Noem is a subject of impeachment.

Yes, Ms. Noem, I have signed Articles of Impeachment against you. My hope is that you do what you should do, in my opinion, which is resign. I don't think the President would ever fire you, but you have blood on your hands. You have tried your best to cover up what happened when two American citizens, who were unarmed, lost their lives at the hands of the constabulary. You have blood on your hands. You should be impeached.

You also should go to jail because you tried to cover it up. There is a law that deals with this kind of behavior. When you know that a felony has been committed—you know that a felony has been committed—and you don't report that felony and then you try to cover it up, that is a crime.

Somebody ought to check out 18 U.S.C. section 4. Yes, you committed a crime. You ought to be locked up.

People on the other side are notorious for having said: Lock her up, talking about a Democrat. Here is your chance to repeat your chant: Lock her up. Lock her up.

Lock up Ms. Noem for what she has done. Impeach Ms. Noem is what we

should do. Aside from impeaching her, she gets her marching orders from this dastard; he has to be impeached too. We cannot allow this to go unnoticed and unchallenged. I cannot. I say we and all of the people who agree with me. There are a good many who do not, and I don't want to discredit them in any way, but I cannot.

So, we are in a countdown to another impeachment. I am going to call this the Black History Month impeachment because I am going to deal with the racism that this President perpetuates, the racism that he perpetrates, the racism that he places in policies that are harmful to the American public. I am going to deal with that. Then we will give people a chance to decide whether it is as bad as you say it was. You have been on television talking about how this horrible deed was perpetrated by this dastard.

Let's see if you really believe what you have said. Andrew Johnson was impeached in 1868 for speaking ill of Congress. So don't say you can't impeach for this kind of dastardly behavior from this dastard. Don't say that you can't do it, because we have seen it done. We have seen it done by people who were closer to the drafting of the Constitution than we were. So they probably had a better sense of what impeachment was all about than these so-called scholars who have decided that impeachment has to have so many lofty goals achieved before you should bring articles. That is not true.

Whatever the House says impeachment is, that is what it is. It is not appealable. It is a political question. It is not something that requires a violation of a statutory law. So if you believe what you have been propagating when you say that this was such a bad thing that the President did with these memes, then we will give you an opportunity to express that here on the floor of the Congress of the United States of America.

I just believe we have an obligation to do this. I don't think that we should stand by, we, meaning the people who agree with me. People who don't agree, they will do what they do. That is okay with me.

I am going to vote my conscience. I ask others to vote theirs. Just vote your conscience, that is all I ask. If we vote our conscience, I hope that in the end, maybe not today, but someday—Stevie Wonder has a song where he says: "someday at Christmastime."

Maybe someday in this near future, in my lifetime, this dastard will be impeached. I guarantee you this, the RECORD will show that at least one Member, one Member, stood right here in this House and read Articles of Impeachment to remove this dastard from office for the racism that he perpetrates and perpetuates.

For edification purposes, those who tolerate racism perpetuate racism. If you tolerate it, then you perpetuate it. I will not tolerate it. Of course, there are those who will always say: Al, you stand alone.

Mr. Speaker, on some issues, it is better to stand alone than not stand at all, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR DAYS

(Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, Mr. KILEY of California was recognized for 30 minutes.)

Mr. KILEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to discuss two votes that occurred this week that have been broadly characterized as relating to tariffs. However, the issues are a little more nuanced than they have generally been portrayed.

Let's start with the vote that occurred on Wednesday. It is always good to look at the actual text because that, at the end of the day, is the only thing that matters. This was a vote on a rule which is a kind of arcane procedural mechanism that we have here in the House for bringing bills to the floor for consideration and setting the terms of debate.

When you vote on the rule, Mr. Speaker, you are not voting on the bills themselves, you are just bringing them to the floor where they will eventually be voted on.

There is this norm of voting in favor of rules, which I have always done, because if you don't do that, Mr. Speaker, then the business of the House grinds to a halt.

The only times in which I haven't done that are when the form of a rule, the mechanism of a rule, is abused for some purpose that actually impacts policy.

That is what we had in this particular rule. At the end of it, which was a normal rule for most purposes, but at the very end, Mr. Speaker, you had tacked on this peculiar provision which starts by saying that each day during the period from February 10, 2026, through July 31, 2026, shall not constitute a calendar day.

So that is a little odd on the face of it, simply fiatting that somehow these days of the months in the calendar year, February 11, February 12, February 13, and so on all the way to July 31 are somehow now by legislative decree not days.

Now, I had actually voted against this very same provision in November when the only thing that was different were the dates. As a matter of fact, there were enough votes to stop that rule from taking effect when we originally voted on it in November, but then there was a huddle among House leadership and some of those who were opposed to it. I won't get into the nature of what was discussed, but you can sort of connect the dots because after this rule passed, there was then another one that changed the end date, in that case, from March 31 to January 30.

January 30 was set to be the agreed upon end day for this accounting trick. So I was pretty surprised when January 30 comes and goes, and then we get this new provision saying: No we are actually now going to extend this all the way out to July 31.

Let's go out further in the text here. It says that these months shall not constitute a calendar day for purposes of section 202 of the National Emergencies Act with respect to various resolutions declaring a national emergency. The National Emergencies Act is a statute that gives the President the power to declare a state of emergency. It also gives Congress not just the power but the obligation to evaluate every 6 months whether we are still in a state of emergency. Congress shall consider it, is what it says.

For example, a few years ago this is how we terminated the COVID state of emergency. I was the cosponsor of that resolution actually, and it got so much bipartisan support in the House that President Biden, even though he was initially opposed, signed it into law. That is how the COVID emergency was brought to an end.

In this case, Mr. Speaker, we were being asked with this language here to say that you are not allowed to do that, Congress will be cut out of its statutory role in evaluating whether we still have an emergency for these designated emergencies and for this designated period of time.

□ 1240

As such, it was limiting the power of our Members to weigh in on these very important questions. This runs contrary to everything I have ever believed when it comes to states of emergency.

When I was in the legislature in California, and even in the early days of COVID, I was very much opposed to the legislature having no role in determining whether we were in a state of emergency. I introduced a resolution many times on whether or not the state of emergency should continue. Therefore, of course, I would not support cutting Congress out of that process entirely here.

In effect, what we were being asked to do with this very peculiar provision was to abuse the procedural vehicle known as a rule to legislate a fiction that a day is not a day, to countenance endless emergencies, endless states of emergency without congressional oversight in defiance of every principle I have ever fought for and to surrender our own power as Members of the House in relation both to our own leadership and the executive branch. That is something I was not going to do. There was bipartisan support that this was not a good idea.

The rule did not pass, meaning that this accounting trick of a day is not a day is no longer in effect. As such, a resolution has now ripened regarding one particular state of emergency. This is to say, Congress playing the role

that is in law that every 6 months it should evaluate whether an emergency still exists. This is what we voted on yesterday. This was Congress exercising its statutory responsibility to determine whether an emergency declared by the President is still in effect.

Now, because we have had these delays in terms of Congress doing this, it has actually been a year since this particular emergency was declared by the President, on February 1, 2025.

If you look at the language of this—it this is the entire resolution—it simply says that the national emergency declared by finding of the President is hereby terminated.

The question on its face is not about whether tariffs are good or bad. It is not even about whether tariffs are a valid emergency power. That is the question that the Supreme Court is considering. Rather, it was about this particular executive order a year ago, which was titled as follows: "Imposing Duties to Address the Flow of Illicit Drugs Across Our Northern Border."

The national emergency declared by the President was about fentanyl coming into the United States from Canada. We can debate whether or not that was truly an emergency at the time that it was declared, given that a tiny fraction of the fentanyl that comes into our country—maybe 1 percent or so—does come from Canada. Fentanyl itself, of course, is the most severe of emergencies for our country, but the specific question is whether the fentanyl coming from Canada is.

Let's assume for the sake of argument that it was an emergency at that time. After all, the President does have broad discretion in terms of declaring an emergency. The question for us in Congress 1 year later in exercising our statutory responsibility to evaluate this question is whether there is still an emergency.

I listened to the debate on this issue with an open mind. I listened to the comments of our very capable chair of the Homeland Security Committee here in the House saying that actually Canada has taken significant efforts to crack down on fentanyl ever since this executive order was issued. They have devoted \$1.2 billion to it. They have stepped up internal enforcement. They have appointed a fentanyl czar. They have cracked down on precursor chemicals coming in.

There is way more fentanyl being seized at their border now. By some estimates, there has been a 97 percent reduction in fentanyl going over the border. It would appear that if the tariffs were designed to encourage Canada to take this issue of fentanyl crossing the border more seriously, they have been very effective in that respect. As such, the basis for the emergency that was declared does not appear to me to exist at this time.

Of course, it is also appropriate to consider the actual effect of the emergency power being asserted, which in