

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EZELL). The Chair will entertain up to five further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

RECOGNIZING SWEET BRIAR
COLLEGE ON 125TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. MCGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today to recognize and celebrate the historic 125th anniversary of Sweet Briar College in Amherst County of Virginia's Fifth Congressional District.

Founded in 1901 by Indiana Fletcher Williams, Sweet Briar has spent more than a century preparing women to lead with integrity, resilience, and purpose in critical roles throughout America's workforce.

Sweet Briar's many notable alumnae, including Mary Pope Hutson, the current president of the college, hold true to the mission of guiding and inspiring the next generation of female leaders.

For 125 years, Sweet Briar has stood as a testament to academic excellence and preparing women for lifelong leadership. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating this extraordinary institution.

RECOGNIZING FRANKIE MUSE
FREEMAN

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

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about a woman who changed St. Louis and, in doing so, changed America. Her name is Frankie Muse Freeman.

In 1954, segregation was still the law of the land. Despite that, Frankie Muse Freeman walked into a St. Louis courtroom with her law degree. The result: the end of legal racial discrimination in public housing in Missouri. She was the lead attorney. She was a Black woman. She won.

She didn't wait for permission anywhere in her life. When law firms wouldn't write her back, she opened her own practice.

Mr. Speaker, during Women's History Month, when I think about what this administration is doing—gutting programs that Black women built careers and communities around, eliminating the pathways to economic stability—I think about what Frankie Muse Freeman would say.

I think she would say: Get back to work and, most importantly, win.

END WAR IN IRAN

(Mr. KHANNA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Speaker, this body needs to vote on THOMAS MASSIE's and my resolution to end the war in Iran.

The President has sent 2,000 more soldiers from the Army's 82nd Airborne Division to Iran. This is on top of the 4,500 marines we already have there.

We cannot afford to put ground troops in Iran. This body needs to say no to the \$200 billion request and vote to end a war that is causing gas to skyrocket. Gas is up to nearly \$4 a gallon, up 34 percent, and we have already lost 13 American servicemembers.

Let's end the war. Let's bring the troops home. Let's make sure we are putting Americans first.

REMEMBERING VICTIMS OF OLD
NATIONAL BANK SHOOTING

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

Mr. MCGARVEY. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to believe, but it has been 3 years now since my hometown of Louisville, Kentucky, was forever changed by the mass shooting at Old National Bank on the Monday morning after Easter.

It has been 3 years since we lost Josh Barrick; Deana Eckert; Juliana Farmer; Jim Tutt; and my good friend Tommy Elliott.

Mr. Speaker, 3 years have passed, and it is still shocking. It still hurts. We are still grieving.

I still haven't found the words to heal those wounds, but I want to read what Tommy's wife, Maryanne, courageously shared after this tragedy:

"May I continue to receive the gifts of grief to help heal my heart.

"May it offer me clarity, help me realize what matters and what doesn't, and then let the rest go.

"May I honor the unsolved questions and mysteries of life, the cracks; and look for the light that shines through them."

May we all.

□ 0910

HONORING MINARD DUNCAN

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

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of my very good friend, Minard Duncan, a devoted educator and public servant whose impact on our community will be felt for generations.

Before dedicating his life to education, Mr. Duncan proudly served our country in the U.S. Army during the Korean war from 1952 to 1954.

Later, he served at the Fullerton Unified School District for more than 40 years as an educator and principal, during which time he helped developed programs that strengthen student literacy and success.

After retirement, he wasn't over. He went on to work at Cal State Fullerton

in the area of education. Then he was elected to the Fullerton School District Board of Trustees for 8 years.

Beyond his profession, he was a man who cherished his family, friendships, and life's simple joys. He is survived today by his children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren who will carry on his legacy.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in celebrating the life of Minard Duncan, a man who served his country, his community, his family, all with distinction.

May he rest in peace.

HONORING BETTYE JEAN MASON
ODOM

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

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today during Women's History Month with both reverence and sorrow to honor the life and legacy of Bettye Jean Mason Odom, a trailblazer whose recent passing marks the loss of a visionary leader and beloved pillar of the Chicago community.

In 1978, after studying in Paris, France, Mrs. Odom returned home with an idea: the concept of total skin care for the African-American community. She founded Bettye O, Incorporated, which has since become Chicago's premier and most imitated day spa. For more than four decades, her Hyde Park institution provided world-class wellness services, skin care, and affirmed the beauty and dignity of people of color through her groundbreaking Skins of Colour products.

Mrs. Odom's life is a remarkable tapestry of service and achievement. A graduate of Fisk University and Meharry Medical College, she served our Nation as a First Lieutenant in the United States Army Nurse Corps.

She is also an accomplished actress, model, television host, author, entrepreneur, and educator inspiring generations of young people through her lectures on confidence, purpose, and professional ambition.

Even into her later years, Mrs. Odom's light never dimmed. We celebrate her extraordinary life. We mourn her passing and give thanks for the profound and lasting impacts of Mrs. Bettye Odom.

Mrs. Odom is survived by her daughter, Lori Odom.

Mr. Speaker, may her memory continue to inspire all of us.

DEFENDING AMERICAN PROPERTY
ABROAD ACT OF 2026

Mr. EZELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1131, I call up the bill (H.R. 7084) to amend title 46, United States Code, with respect to the types of vessels that may enter or operate in navigable waters of the United States or transfer cargo in any port or place under the jurisdiction of the

United States, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STUTZMAN). Pursuant to House Resolution 1131, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure printed in the bill is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 7084

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Defending American Property Abroad Act of 2026”.

SEC. 2. CONDITION FOR ENTRY INTO PORTS IN THE UNITED STATES.

Section 70022 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

- (1) in subsection (a)(2)(A)—*
- (A) in clause (i)—*
- (i) by striking “subsection (b)(1)” and inserting “subsection (b)(1)(A)”;* and
- (ii) in subclause (II) by striking “; or” and inserting a semicolon;*
- (B) in clause (ii)—*
- (i) by striking “subsection (b)(2)” and inserting “subsection (b)(1)(B)”;* and
- (ii) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”;* and
- (C) by adding at the end the following:*
“(iii) vessel described in subsection (b)(1) in the case of—
 - “(I) an emergency being experienced by a vessel or an individual on the vessel; or*
 - “(II) a vessel authorized by the owner, as described in subsection (b)(1)(C)(ii), to transit the facilities described in subsection (b)(1)(C).”;* and
- (2) in subsection (b)—*
- (A) in paragraph (2) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”;*
- (B) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B) (and by moving the margins of such subparagraphs accordingly);*
- (C) by striking “A vessel referred” and inserting the following:*
 - “(1) IN GENERAL.—A vessel referred”;* and
 - (D) by adding at the end the following:*
“(C) a vessel that has transited a port, harbor, or marine terminal, that at the time of such transit—
 - “(i) was located within the territory of a Western Hemisphere country that has in effect a free trade agreement with the United States;*
 - “(ii) was accessible only through land that is owned, held, or controlled, directly or indirectly, by a United States person; and*
 - “(iii) was designated by the President under paragraph (2), and has not had such designation removed under paragraph (3).*
- “(2) DESIGNATION.—The President may designate a port, harbor, or marine terminal under this subsection if an agency or official of the government of the Western Hemisphere foreign trade partner has—*
 - “(A) nationalized, or expropriated the port, harbor, or marine terminal, owned, held, or controlled, directly or indirectly, by a United States person; or*
 - “(B) taken any other action that has the effect of expropriating or nationalizing that port, harbor, or marine terminal, or land providing the exclusive access to that port, harbor, or marine terminal, as described in paragraph (1)(C)(ii), as long as the matter is not the subject of a currently pending arbitration under a free trade agreement described in paragraph (1)(C)(i).*
- “(3) REMOVAL OF DESIGNATION.—The President shall remove the designation of a port, har-*

bor, or marine terminal made under paragraph (2) if the President determines that—

- “(A) the conditions set forth in paragraph (2) are no longer met;*
- “(B) the Western Hemisphere country has restored ownership of the property of the United States person and terminated any measures that had the effect of seizing ownership or possession of that property;*
- “(C) the Western Hemisphere country has provided adequate and effective compensation for such property in convertible foreign exchange or other mutually acceptable compensation equivalent to the full value thereof, as required by international law; or*
- “(D) the dispute has otherwise been resolved to the satisfaction of the President.”.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. EZELL) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. EZELL).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. EZELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 7084.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 7084, the Defending American Property Abroad Act of 2026.

This bill provides the President with the authority to effectively address an unlawful taking of a United States citizen-owned port, harbor, or marine terminal by another government in the Western Hemisphere.

United States companies operate maritime facilities throughout North and South America. Their investments must be protected.

It is essential that the United States President be able to act quickly and decisively in response to another government expropriating or nationalizing a United States citizen-owned port, harbor, or marine terminal.

This bill establishes a new, narrowly constructed authority for a President to impose a consequence on a foreign government that illegally takes a maritime facility.

Sanctions are an accepted tool used in diplomacy and economic statecraft. The authorities that H.R. 7084 establishes are completely complementary to similar authorities that Congress has already granted the President.

Nothing in this bill precludes or preempts any other option for dispute resolution. It simply gives the President another meaningful, targeted tool that can encourage negotiations and resolution.

The Defending American Property Abroad Act builds on sanctions, legis-

lation previously passed over the past six decades, and provides the President with one or more options in a continuum for protecting overseas American investments.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this legislation and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in opposition to H.R. 7084, the Defending American Property Abroad Act of 2026.

As we have seen with recent vessel boardings and border operations, the Coast Guard has broad authority to enforce American laws on the water.

The Coast Guard routinely interdicts drugs and migrants, enforces fisheries laws, and ensures the safety of property and life at sea.

In fiscal year 2025, the Coast Guard set record breaking numbers. The service seized over 510,000 pounds of cocaine in the maritime domain, over triple its yearly average.

Even more impressively, the Coast Guard saved over 2,200 lives and over \$40 million of property by running over 6,700 search and rescue cases. They do all this while protecting global fish stocks and by enforcing domestic and international fisheries laws.

H.R. 7084 does not help the Coast Guard address violations of the law at sea. Instead, the bill inserts the Coast Guard into what is a property dispute between a U.S. company and the Mexican Government that, if anything, will only add to the Coast Guard’s burden.

The Coast Guard is already strained in its ability to effectively conduct its missions.

Just last week, the Vice Commandant testified before the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure that the Coast Guard is a \$20 billion organization operating on a \$13 billion budget.

H.R. 7084 prohibits vessels, commercial shipping or cruise vessels, from entering or operating in U.S. waters if that vessel made a port of call at a port that was nationalized or expropriated by another company from a U.S. citizen or company.

Now, requiring the service to identify and prohibit vessels from entering U.S. waters due to an international property dispute further strains the service’s resources.

This legislation is meant to only apply to one port in Mexico, but it is written so broadly it could encompass disputes in other countries and with other companies both today and in the future.

Now, Congress has many pressing issues that we should be considering today. The President himself has promised less war and lower prices. Instead, the American public is getting more war and higher prices.

I wish we were taking time today to discuss those lower costs for my constituents.

□ 0920

I wish we were taking time today to discuss those lower costs for my constituents. Instead, we are interjecting Congress into an international land dispute.

Now, I want to be really clear. I am sympathetic to the plight of this particular U.S. company involved in this dispute. This legislation doesn't solve their problem. That solution can be found, and opportunities are available through diplomacy and even trade agreements but not really legislation.

For those reasons I will be voting "no" on this legislation.

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

Mr. EZELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PFLUGER), the bill's sponsor.

Mr. PFLUGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 7084, the Defending American Property Abroad Act. I thank Chairman GRAVES for his support.

Let's be clear, American companies operating abroad should not have to fear arbitrary government actions that undermine their property rights, but right now, that is exactly what is happening. When countries violate trade agreements and illegally seize assets from U.S. companies, it puts American job security, economic security, and, quite frankly, our national security at risk.

H.R. 7084 ensures there are enforceable consequences for those actions. Specifically, it strengthens U.S. maritime security law to address these unlawful seizures. Through existing Coast Guard authorities, it also authorizes the President to deny entry into U.S. ports for vessels that operate through expropriated American-owned port infrastructure in Western Hemisphere countries with U.S. free trade agreements.

We know this is not just a hypothetical example. For years, the Mexican Government has targeted the U.S.-based Vulcan Materials Company.

In 1986, Vulcan Materials Company built the only deepwater port in Mexico's Yucatan Peninsula, and for decades this operation supplied crushed limestone to critical infrastructure projects across the Gulf and Atlantic Coasts, roads, bridges, housing, and energy facilities in States represented by Members on both sides of the aisle.

But starting in May of 2022, the Mexican Government launched an endless pressure campaign against Vulcan Materials and sent the military to forcibly shut down its operations.

In 2023, they invaded and occupied the property again just to hand it to a private Mexican competitor.

In 2024, they declared the port and a quarry adjacent to it a "naturally protected area" to complete the expropriation, and now Mexico is weaponizing its tax authority, pursuing billions in retroactive dollars in claims to seize what remains.

Meanwhile, Mexico has allowed a dozen unpermitted quarries in the

same exact region for Mexican companies to operate freely. Let me say that again. Mexico used its military to forcibly shut down an American company and created false environmental claims to do so. That is a direct violation of the USMCA.

We did not resort to legislation as a first option. In fact, for 4 years, the United States has pursued every available diplomatic tool, congressional letters, administration engagement, and bilateral pressure, and none of that worked.

This represents a coordinated multifront campaign by Mexico against an American company that undermines our diplomatic progress and threatens all U.S. investment in Mexico.

Now, my colleagues may ask: Why is this bill the right response? First, it is surgical. It targets expropriated port infrastructure only. It will not disrupt current, legitimate shipping operations. Second, it includes clear off-ramps. If the foreign government returns the property, provides fair compensation, and resolves the dispute, then the restrictions are lifted. Lastly, it includes exceptions for emergencies and maritime safety.

I am proud to have worked in a bipartisan way with Representatives CARBAJAL and SEWELL and Chairman GRAVES' committee staff on this legislation.

This isn't just about one company. We cannot allow a foreign government to steal American property and face zero consequences.

This is an opportunity for us to protect American investment abroad, to protect American companies, and to protect our own communities. If you are an American company operating abroad, we have vowed to protect you, and this legislation does just that.

I urge colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote "yes" on H.R. 7084.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CARBAJAL).

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding. I thank Representative PFLUGER for his leadership today.

I rise in support of the Defending American Property Abroad Act. This is a commonsense and targeted bill that gives the United States a real tool to respond when foreign governments unfairly seize property owned by Americans without due process.

The bill would look to identify foreign ports, harbors, and marine terminals where American-owned property has been expropriated or taken without due process.

Once identified, goods loaded at those facilities and passenger vessels serving them may be restricted from entering or operating in United States ports.

Let me be clear about what this means.

It means that if you take American property, you don't get to do business

as usual with the United States. We can identify those ports and terminals and restrict the ships that use them from entering our ports.

That is real consequences, not just words.

It is a targeted solution to support American innovation. This legislation focuses on one bad actor.

In recent years, an American company, Vulcan Materials, invested in port and terminal infrastructure in Mexico in good faith under the expectation that its property rights and contracts would be respected.

Instead, the Mexican Government took action that resulted in the seizure of that port facility, despite longstanding agreements.

What makes this even more frustrating is the justification that was offered. Mexican officials pointed to environmental and permitting concerns, but the same government that is accusing this company of environmental harm awarded six Clean Industry awards from PROFEPA, which is their environmental enforcement agency, for the company's environmental stewardship.

You can't speak out of both sides of your mouth.

And at the same time, the Government of Mexico has allowed for the use of Vulcan's deepwater port by another company.

That is not what good faith partnerships look like, especially from our largest trading partner.

Trade should not be a race to the bottom. It should support good-paying jobs, protect the environment and labor standards, and strengthen local communities.

And it should be grounded in mutual respect, where countries that benefit from access to U.S. markets also respect the rights of workers, investors, and communities tied to that trade.

This bill reinforces that principle.

Just like I have been willing to call out unfair practices by foreign governments, I have also spoken out when our own government does something similar, including under President Trump, who has imposed blanket tariffs without rhyme or reason, an equally reckless action.

This bill is a targeted solution. I urge my colleagues to also support this bill.

Mr. EZELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. MOORE).

Mr. MOORE of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, what we have seen happen to Alabama's own Vulcan Materials Company should concern every Member of this body.

A foreign government shut down an American company's operations, moved to seize its property, and ignored the rule of law. If it can happen to one American company, it can happen to any of them.

We must protect American jobs and American investments and stand on the principles that the United States will stand for its people and its companies wherever they operate.

The Government of Mexico's actions, shutting down operations, expropriating a deepwater port and quarry, and hiding behind environmental designations set a dangerous precedent that weakens trade relationships and threatens our national security.

The Defending American Property Abroad Act of 2026 makes it clear. If you target American businesses, there will be consequences.

It strengthens our trade enforcement rules, expands section 301 authority, and allows the United States to take real action against those who seize or interfere with American property.

We will not allow foreign governments to benefit from the access of our markets while violating the rights of American companies.

I urge my colleagues to stand with the American workers, stand with the rule of law, and support this bill.

□ 0930

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GARCÍA).

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong opposition to this bill.

First of all, this bill and the substance of the bill, this dispute, is undergoing consideration by the international bodies established by the U.S.-Mexico-Canada trade agreement. We really should wait until a decision is arrived at with respect to that mechanism, but there are other considerations.

First, let's consider other far-reaching implications. The bill gives the President the authority to prohibit vessels that travel through certain Western Hemisphere ports, which he designates, from entering U.S. waters. While supporters say that the bill is narrowly written to target a specific project in a specific country, the reality is that the President will be given broad authority that could be applied to other countries in the future.

Let's not forget who we are talking about here. This is the same President who used military force in Venezuela to force regime change, the same President who is now engaging in an illegal war with Iran without even consulting Congress.

Mr. Speaker, do we really want to entrust the President with this new authority granted under this bill?

Equally damaging, the bill ignores the objections of local people fighting for their right to safe drinking water in a surrounding environment free of contamination. That is what is in the dispute resolution matter being addressed now.

I have spoken to local community leaders who have suffered from the environmental damage caused by these mining operations. This bill limits the ability of foreign governments to adopt measures that protect their communities and their environment, essentially coercing those foreign governments to prioritize the interests of U.S. corporations over their people.

We should not be legislating to hinder a foreign government's ability to protect its citizens from environmental harm. We should not be granting the President a new authority that could have broad foreign policy implications.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join with me and to vote "no" on this proposal.

Mr. EZELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MCGUIRE).

Mr. MCGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 7084, the Defending American Property Abroad Act of 2026.

I am a proud cosponsor of this vital piece of legislation, and I thank my colleague, Chairman PFLUGER from Texas, for his leadership on this matter.

In 2022, the Mexican Government unlawfully took over and shut down a limestone quarry in Mexico operated by a U.S.-based company. This seizure violated the U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement, undermined American property values, and threatened U.S. economic growth and national security.

It is of the utmost importance that we protect American businesses and vessels from being unfairly targeted or having their assets unlawfully seized while operating around the world.

I am proud to support H.R. 7084, which ensures that there are real consequences when American property is seized abroad.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill and show the world that America stands firmly behind its workers, businesses, and investments at home and abroad.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. FIGURES).

Mr. FIGURES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Defending American Property Abroad Act because it is the right thing to do.

We have talked here today about this being a U.S.-based company. It is a little bit more personal than that to me, my colleague Congresswoman SEWELL, and a few of my other colleagues from the State of Alabama.

This is an Alabama-based company, and it is the right thing to do because, Mr. Speaker, when you have a company that is operating on land lawfully acquired nearly four decades ago that is performing lawful operations, paying taxes lawfully, and exporting the goods lawfully—many of which come through my hometown, the Port of Mobile, which is now the deepest port in the Gulf, which they are doing lawfully—then they should be treated lawfully.

What we have here is not really complicated. It is not complex in terms of what the Mexican Government did here. They came in and just took it and said: We are not abiding by a process. We are not abiding by any contractual terms or any other terms. We are just taking it, and by the way, we are not going to pay you for it.

When a foreign entity uses the full force of its military and government to take away property rights from an Alabama-based company, I am going to stand up for them.

We also have an obligation to make sure we are using the full force of our government in response to it. That is what this legislation does. I urge my colleagues to support it for that reason.

Not only that, we are here because it is an Alabama company today, but tomorrow it could be a Mississippi company or a Washington company or Oregon, Indiana, Illinois, or any other State. We cannot sit by quietly and not respond, and not respond proportionately, to what the Mexican Government has done.

I don't have anything against the Mexican Government personally, and I don't have anything, certainly, against the Mexican people. What I do have a problem with is that when we see a government, even our own government, mistreating businesses and people, we have an obligation to speak out and to stand up for that. For that reason, I stand in support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. EZELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. STRONG).

Mr. STRONG. Mr. Speaker, the question is: Do we support President Trump with this authority? Absolutely, we do.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 7084, the Defending American Property Abroad Act of 2026.

This legislation makes it clear: The United States will not stand for unlawful harassment campaigns against American companies and American workers.

For over 35 years, Vulcan Materials Company, based in Alabama, has lawfully owned and operated a limestone quarry in Mexico. Yet, since 2018, the Mexican Government has unlawfully restricted Vulcan's operations and wrongfully targeted them through coercion and intimidation.

In 2022, the Mexican President attempted to seize the property. When Vulcan refused to surrender, Mexico retaliated by issuing shutdown orders.

No American company should be pressured into accepting a fire-sale takeover or punished for standing up for its lawful rights. Vulcan followed the law, held up its end of the deal, and operated transparently. What they received in return was their property stolen and seized by the Mexican Government.

These actions have essentially left the only deepwater port on the Yucatan Peninsula—owned, constructed, and operated for years by Vulcan—and the surrounding land open for sale to our adversaries. This is unbelievable.

The Defending American Property Abroad Act gives the United States the tools to push back against foreign countries and trading partners when our companies are unlawfully targeted and harassed.

America owes Mexico nothing. This is about fairness and accountability. The United States will no longer sit by and allow foreign nations to profit from stolen American property.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 7084. I thank Congressman PFLUGER for his leadership in advancing this important legislation.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL).

Ms. SEWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Defending American Property Abroad Act. This narrowly tailored bill will target vessels that attempt to enter the U.S. after moving through a seized American-owned port.

Vulcan Materials Company is proudly headquartered in my Alabama district, so I have been following this dispute closely since 2018.

The facts of the case are clear. The Government of Mexico used its military force to illegally occupy Vulcan's property, and, in 2022, President Obrador illegally shut down Vulcan's operations.

Mexico's justifications for the seizure are fabricated, and it is clear that the government wants to take Vulcan's port because it is the only deepwater port in the region.

Mr. Speaker, Vulcan has attempted to use all existing legal and diplomatic options to resolve this situation. Since 2018, they have used the USMCA arbitration policies and processes, and multiple U.S. Ambassadors to Mexico under the Biden and Trump administrations have attempted to find an amicable resolution.

I have met directly with President Obrador about this issue. While previous Ambassadors have been sympathetic to our concerns, President Obrador and now President Sheinbaum have overruled their own diplomats and staff.

It is time for Congress to act. I was told by the President that we had to have an act of Congress in order for the port to be returned. So, today, I say proudly: We are doing something. Congress is doing something.

This is just not about an Alabama company. It is about American property abroad.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Congress to vote in favor of this bill, and I support this legislation wholeheartedly.

□ 0940

Mr. EZELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER).

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 7084, the Defending American Property Abroad Act of 2026.

This legislation codifies the common-sense principle that foreign nations should not profit from properties stolen from Americans. This bill is needed because for years the Mexican Government has engaged in a deliberate campaign against an American company,

Vulcan Materials, headquartered in my district.

In 2022, Mexican authorities used military force to shut down Vulcan's lawful operations. Then, in 2024, they took the dramatic step of declaring Vulcan's private property a protected natural area. The move was not designed to conserve land but to justify taking it.

However, this is about more than one company. Mexico's actions sent a dangerous signal to every American business operating abroad that their investments, their assets, their rights could be stripped away at any moment by the corrupt Mexican Government.

When I and other members of the Alabama delegation, in a bipartisan manner, met with the Ambassador from Mexico, he described his government's actions as a civil dispute. I pointed out to the Ambassador that in America we don't send in our military to resolve civil disputes.

The port at the center of the dispute is not just any asset. As has been pointed out by other speakers, it is the only deepwater port on the Yucatan Peninsula, built by American investments and critical to supplying construction materials for infrastructure across the United States.

Mexico's actions undermine not only property rights but also our supply chains. The illegal action is more like an action by a cartel than it is a trustworthy government, and it raises serious questions about entering into any agreements with Mexico.

The Defending American Property Abroad Act ensures that foreign governments cannot seize American-owned infrastructure and then benefit from the infrastructure. It authorizes the United States to deny entry to vessels operating out of or that have visited ports unlawfully expropriated from American companies.

Mr. Speaker, this is about protecting American businesses and, fundamentally, the rule of law. If we fail to act here, then we invite more of this behavior not just from Mexico, but from any nation watching to see how the United States responds.

I thank Representative PFLUGER for his work on this important issue, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 7084.

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

Again, I just reiterate, the bill before us today does not resolve this dispute between the Mexican Government and an American company. There are tools available and that continue to be available to resolve that. It gives the Coast Guard more work on top of all the work our U.S. Coast Guard is already doing.

I had an amendment in the Rules Committee. They rejected an amendment that would have required the President to consider potential costs before exercising the authorities granted in this bill. That Rules Committee amendment was rejected.

Arbitration, treaties, trade agreements, these mechanisms exist to solve international disputes. These are appropriate venues for this dispute and not legislation. For those reasons, I will be voting "no."

In conclusion, I do want to note something. These 13 to 14 bills that came before this body earlier this week from the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee—those were on suspension. This one was not. But it needs to be said that the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee works extremely well. We see ourselves as an island of partnership in a sea of partisanship in the U.S. Congress.

Even though this bill may not fit that bill, the Committee works that way because of one person, and that one person is Representative SAM GRAVES.

This morning, it was announced that Sam will not be running for reelection.

I wanted to take this brief moment as part of my time in closing to just note that we are going to be losing a fierce advocate for infrastructure investment and for transportation safety with his announcement that he will not run again.

SAM and I have served together nearly 26 years. We came in together. In recent years, we have developed a partnership that overrode the partisanship in Congress. This body has dealt with the Federal Aviation Administration reauthorization, a Coast Guard reauthorization, a Water Resources Development Act reauthorization, and a lot of other things. We have passed a FEMA act that reforms FEMA. We have yet to get that to the floor. We certainly want to see that get to the floor.

Importantly, we are working right now on a bill to reauthorize the surface transportation authorization to fix roads, bridges, highways, transit, rail, and some other things. We are working on that right now. That work continues to progress, all because of the work of Representative SAM GRAVES.

Although the House is losing SAM, his home is regaining him back in Tarkio, Missouri, at some point at the end of this year. His family is getting him back. I have always said that SAM likes three things in life: his grandkids, vintage aircraft, and Congress, and in that order.

I thank SAM GRAVES for his friendship and his partnership and helping us to continue to do the work of this Committee to bring bills to the floor that we can debate in a manner that is respectful of the body that we all get to serve in.

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

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

In closing, passage of H.R. 7084 gives the President the authority to effectively address the illegal taking of a United States citizen-owned port, harbor, or marine terminal throughout the Western Hemisphere.

American companies are the source of more investments in the Western Hemisphere nations than investors from any other country.

Infrastructure projects in the Americas, especially port infrastructure projects, represent significant potential business opportunities for American companies.

Protecting overseas U.S. investments is an important policy objective. This bill creates an appropriate cost and consequence for stealing property from an American-owned business.

The Defending American Property Abroad Act of 2026 is consistent with other authorities Congress has given the President to act against the illegal taking of American businesses and investments.

Mr. Speaker, I am a former sheriff from Mississippi. Where I come from, when you take something that doesn't belong to you, that is stealing, and you have broken the law. If you break the law, there are consequences.

This bill ensures there are consequences for foreign countries that steal from our companies. Simply put, this legislation is common sense.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, today, the U.S. House of Representatives is acting in response to a situation in which a foreign government shut down an American company's operations, seized its property, and ignored the rule of law.

When an American business is targeted in this way, it is not just an attack on one company, it is an attack on American workers, American jobs, and American interests.

Vulcan Materials, an Alabama company, has lawfully operated for 35 years in Mexico. Yet the Mexican government illegally seized its assets. If this can happen to an Alabama company today, it can happen to any American business tomorrow.

That is why this legislation, H.R. 7084, the Defending American Property Abroad Act is so important. It allows the United States to take real action against foreign entities that seize American property.

This is about fairness and accountability. It is about ensuring that American companies and workers are not punished for following the rules while foreign governments face no consequences for breaking them. With this, we are ensuring protection for American companies that operate in the Western Hemisphere.

The protection of American property rights overseas is essential not only for economic growth but also for our national and economic security. When we stand up for our businesses, we stand up for the workers and communities who depend on them.

I am proud to support H.R. 7084 because it defends American property owners from wrongful seizure and sends a clear message: the United States will stand beside its companies, its workers, and its values.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEBER of Texas). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1131, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 247, nays 164, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 105]

YEAS—247

Aderholt	Flood	Massie
Alford	Fong	Mast
Allen	Foster	McBride
Amodei (NV)	Foxx	McClain
Arrington	Franklin, Scott	McClintock
Babin	Fry	McCormick
Bacon	Fulcher	McDowell
Baird	Garbarino	McGuire
Balderson	Gill (TX)	Messmer
Barr	Gillen	Meuser
Barrett	Gimenez	Miller (IL)
Baumgartner	Golden (ME)	Miller (WV)
Bean (FL)	Goldman (TX)	Miller-Meeks
Begich	Gonzalez, V.	Mills
Bentz	Gooden	Moolenaar
Bergman	Gosar	Moore (AL)
Bice	Gottheimer	Moore (NC)
Biggs (AZ)	Gray	Moore (UT)
Biggs (SC)	Griffith	Moore (WV)
Billrakis	Grothman	Moran
Bishop	Guest	Murphy
Boebert	Guthrie	Newhouse
Bost	Hageman	Norman
Brecheen	Hamadeh (AZ)	Nunn (IA)
Bresnahan	Hariopolos	Obernolte
Brownley	Harrigan	Ogles
Budzinski	Harris (MD)	Onder
Burchett	Harris (NC)	Owens
Burlison	Harshbarger	Palmer
Bynum	Higgins (LA)	Panetta
Calvert	Hill (AR)	Patronis
Carbajal	Hinson	Perez
Carey	Horsford	Perry
Carter (GA)	Houchin	Pfluger
Carter (LA)	Houlahan	Reschenthaler
Carter (TX)	Hudson	Riley (NY)
Ciscomani	Huizenga	Rogers (AL)
Cline	Hunt	Rogers (KY)
Cloud	Hurd (CO)	Rose
Clyburn	Issa	Rouzer
Clyde	Jack	Roy
Cole	Jackson (TX)	Ruiz
Collins	James	Rulli
Comer	Johnson (SD)	Rutherford
Correa	Jordan	Salazar
Costa	Joyce (OH)	Scalise
Crane	Joyce (PA)	Schmidt
Crank	Kaptur	Schneider
Crawford	Kelly (MS)	Schweikert
Cuellar	Kelly (PA)	Scott, Austin
Davidson	Kennedy (UT)	Self
Davis (NC)	Kiggans (VA)	Sessions
De La Cruz	Kiley (CA)	Sewell
DesJarlais	Kim	Shreve
Diaz-Balart	Knott	Simpson
Donalds	Kustoff	Smith (MO)
Downing	LaHood	Smith (NE)
Dunn (FL)	LaLota	Smith (NJ)
Edwards	Langworthy	Smucker
Elizy	Latta	Soto
Emmer	Lawler	Spartz
Estes	Lee (FL)	Stanton
Evans (CO)	Lee (NV)	Stauber
Ezell	Letlow	Stefanik
Fallon	Lofgren	Steil
Fedorchak	Loudermilk	Steube
Feenstra	Lucas	Strong
Figures	Luttrell	Stutzman
Fine	Lynch	Suozzi
Finstad	Mace	Taylor
Fischbach	Mackenzie	Tenney
Fitzgerald	Malliotakis	Thompson (CA)
Fitzpatrick	Maloy	Thompson (PA)
Fleischmann	Mann	Tiffany

Timmons
Turner (OH)
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Van Epps
Van Orden
Vasquez
Veasey

Vindman
Wagner
Walberg
Walkinshaw
Wasserman
Schultz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westerman

Whitesides
Wied
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NAYS—164

Adams
Aguilar
Amo
Ansari
Auchincloss
Balint
Barragan
Beatty
Bell
Bera
Beyer
Bonamici
Boyle (PA)
Brown
Carson
Casar
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Cleaver
Cohen
Conaway
Courtney
Craig
Crockett
Crow
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Dexter
Dingell
Doggett
Elfreth
Escobar
Espallat
Evans (PA)
Fields
Fletcher
Foushee
Frankel, Lois
Friedman
Frost
Garcia (CA)
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gomez

Goodlander
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Himes
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jacobs
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kamlager-Dove
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy (NY)
Khanna
Krishnamoorthi
Landsman
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latimer
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Levin
Liccardo
Magaziner
Mannion
Matsui
McBath
McClain Delaney
McClellan
McCollum
McDonald Rivet
McGarvey
McGovern
McIver
Meeeks
Menefee
Menendez
Meng
Min
Moore (WI)
Morable
Morrisson
Mrvan
Mullin
Nadler
Neal
Neguse
Norcross

Ocasio-Cortez
Olszewski
Omar
Pallone
Pappas
Pelosi
Peters
Pettersen
Pingree
Pocan
Pou
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Randall
Raskin
Rivas
Ross
Ryan
Salinas
Sánchez
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Scholten
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sherman
Simon
Smith (WA)
Sorensen
Stansbury
Stevens
Subramanyam
Swailwell
Sykes
Takano
Thanedar
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Tran
Underwood
Vargas
Velázquez
Waters
Watson Coleman
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—20

Buchanan
Cammack
Cherfilus-
McCormick
Clarke (NY)
Crenshaw
Garamendi

Goldman (NY)
Gonzales, Tony
Graves
Hern (OK)
Kean
Lieu
Luna

McCaull
Mfume
Miller (OH)
Moskowitz
Moulton
Nehls
Strickland

□ 1027

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. HORSFORD and SOTO changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for: Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I missed a series of votes today. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 105.

Stated against: Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote today due to an urgent commitment in my Congressional district. Had

I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 105.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, today, I missed a vote for personal reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 105.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 28 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2000

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) at 8 p.m.

HOOR OF MEETING ON TODAY

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9:30 p.m. today.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

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

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 208, nays 197, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 106]

YEAS—208

Aderholt	Carey	Fallon
Alford	Carter (GA)	Fedorchak
Allen	Carter (TX)	Feenstra
Amodei (NV)	Ciscomani	Fine
Arrington	Cline	Pinstad
Babin	Cloud	Fischbach
Bacon	Clyde	Fitzgerald
Baird	Cole	Fitzpatrick
Balderson	Collins	Fleischmann
Barr	Comer	Flood
Barrett	Crane	Fong
Baumgartner	Crank	Foxx
Bean (FL)	Crawford	Franklin, Scott
Begich	Crenshaw	Fry
Bentz	Davidson	Fulcher
Bice	De La Cruz	Garbarino
Biggs (AZ)	DesJarlais	Gill (TX)
Biggs (SC)	Diaz-Balart	Gimenez
Bilirakis	Donalds	Goldman (TX)
Boebert	Downing	Gooden
Bost	Dunn (FL)	Gosar
Brecheen	Edwards	Griffith
Bresnahan	Ellzey	Grothman
Buchanan	Emmer	Guest
Burchett	Estes	Guthrie
Burlison	Evans (CO)	Hageman
Calvert	Ezell	Hamadeh (AZ)

Haridopolos	Malliotakis	Salazar	Smith (WA)	Thompson (CA)	Veasey
Harrigan	Maloy	Scalise	Sorensen	Thompson (MS)	Velazquez
Harris (MD)	Mann	Schmidt	Soto	Titus	Vindman
Harris (NC)	Massie	Schweikert	Stansbury	Tlaib	Walkinshaw
Harshbarger	Mast	Scott, Austin	Stanton	Tokuda	Wasserman
Hern (OK)	McClain	Self	Stevens	Tonko	Schultz
Higgins (LA)	McClintock	Sessions	Strickland	Torres (CA)	Waters
Hill (AR)	McCormick	Shreve	Subramanyam	Torres (NY)	Watson Coleman
Hinson	McDowell	Simpson	Suozi	Trahan	Whitesides
Houchin	McGuire	Smith (NE)	Swalwell	Tran	Williams (GA)
Hudson	Messmer	Smith (NJ)	Sykes	Underwood	Wilson (FL)
Huizenga	Meuser	Smucker	Takano	Vargas	
Hunt	Miller (IL)	Spartz	Thanedar	Vasquez	
Hurd (CO)	Miller (OH)	Staubert			
Issa	Miller (WV)	Stefanik			
Jack	Miller-Meeks	Steil			
Jackson (TX)	Mills	Steube			
James	Moolenaar	Strong			
Johnson (LA)	Moore (AL)	Stutzman			
Johnson (SD)	Moore (NC)	Taylor			
Jordan	Moore (UT)	Tenney			
Joyce (OH)	Moore (WV)	Thompson (PA)			
Joyce (PA)	Moran	Tiffany			
Kelly (MS)	Murphy	Timmons			
Kelly (PA)	Nehls	Turner (OH)			
Kennedy (UT)	Newhouse	Valadao			
Kiggans (VA)	Nunn (IA)	Van Drew			
Kiley (CA)	Obernoite	Van Dуйne			
Kim	Ogles	Van Epps			
Knott	Onder	Van Orden			
Kustoff	Owens	Wagner			
LaHood	Palmer	Walberg			
LaLota	Patronis	Weber (TX)			
Langworthy	Perry	Webster (FL)			
Latta	Pfluger	Westerman			
Lawler	Reschenthaler	Wied			
Lee (FL)	Rogers (AL)	Williams (TX)			
Letlow	Rogers (KY)	Wilson (SC)			
Loudermilk	Rose	Womack			
Lucas	Rouzer	Yakym			
Luttrell	Roy	Zinke			
Mace	Rulli				
Mackenzie	Rutherford				

NAYS—197

Adams	Fields	McClain Delaney
Aguilar	Figures	McClellan
Amo	Fletcher	McCollum
Ansari	Foster	McDonald Rivet
Auchincloss	Foushee	McGarvey
Balint	Friedman	McGovern
Barragan	Frost	McIver
Beatty	Garcia (CA)	Meeke
Bell	Garcia (IL)	Menefee
Beyer	Garcia (TX)	Menendez
Bonamici	Gillen	Meng
Boyle (PA)	Golden (ME)	Mfume
Brown	Goldman (NY)	Min
Brownley	Gomez	Moore (WI)
Budzinski	Gonzalez, V.	Morelle
Bynum	Goodlander	Morrison
Carbajal	Gray	Mrvan
Carson	Green, Al (TX)	Mullin
Carter (LA)	Grijalva	Nadler
Casar	Harder (CA)	Neal
Case	Hayes	Neguse
Casten	Himes	Norcross
Castor (FL)	Horsford	Ocasio-Cortez
Castro (TX)	Houlahan	Olszewski
Cherfilus-	Hoyer	Pallone
McCormick	Hoyle (OR)	Panetta
Chu	Huffman	Pappas
Cisneros	Ivey	Pelosi
Clark (MA)	Jacobs	Perez
Cleaver	Jayapal	Pettersen
Clyburn	Jeffries	Pingree
Cohen	Johnson (GA)	Pocan
Conaway	Johnson (TX)	Pou
Correa	Kamlager-Dove	Pressley
Costa	Kaptur	Ramirez
Courtney	Kelly (IL)	Randall
Craig	Kennedy (NY)	Raskin
Crow	Khanna	Riley (NY)
Cuellar	Krishnamoorthi	Rivas
Davids (KS)	Landsman	Ross
Davis (IL)	Larsen (WA)	Ruiz
Davis (NC)	Larson (CT)	Ryan
Dean (PA)	Latimer	Salinas
DeLauro	Lee (PA)	Sanchez
DeBene	Leger Fernandez	Scanlon
Deluzio	Levin	Schakowsky
DeSaulnier	Liccardo	Schneider
Dexter	Lofgren	Scholten
Dingell	Lynch	Schrier
Doggett	Magaziner	Scott (VA)
Elfreth	Mannion	Scott, David
Escobar	Matsui	Sewell
Espallat	McBath	Sherman
Evans (PA)	McBride	Simon

NOT VOTING—27

Bera	Gonzales, Tony	McCaull
Bergman	Gottheimer	Moskowitz
Bishop	Graves	Moulton
Cammack	Jackson (IL)	Norman
Clarke (NY)	Kean	Omar
Crockett	Keating	Peters
DeGette	Lee (NV)	Quigley
Frankel, Lois	Lieu	Smith (MO)
Garamendi	Luna	Wittman

□ 2026

Ms. SCHOLTEN changed her vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mrs. HARSHBARGER and Mr. BOST changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to adjourn was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I missed a series of votes today. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 106.

Accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until today, March 27, 2026, at 9:30 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-3166. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Application of the Federal Securities Laws to Certain Types of Crypto Assets and Certain Transactions Involving Crypto Assets [Release Nos.: 33-11412; 34-105020; File No.: S7-2026-09] (RIN: 3235-AN56) received March 25, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC-3167. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Schedule of Fees for Consular Services-Fee for Administrative Processing of Request for Certificate of Loss of Nationality of the United States [Public Notice 12954] (RIN: 1400-AF61) received March 25, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-3168. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendments to HAVANA Act of 2021 Implementation Rules [Public Notice: 12969] (RIN: 1400-AG20) received March 25, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-3169. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 26-250, "Transfer of Jurisdiction of Portions of U.S. Reservations 343-C and 343-D, S.O. 23-03016, Approval Resolution of 2025", pursuant to Public Law 93-198,