and unwilling to wait for a hunger-free future.

There is a lot to be discouraged by these days, but the young people I met at the Gen Z Food and Hunger Summit give me hope. I am grateful for their energy, and I am grateful for their passion and our shared work to end hunger.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my Republican colleagues and members of this administration to pay attention to them. We live in the richest country in the history of the world, and we have 50 million Americans who are hungry and food insecure. It is unconscionable. It is shameful, and we can do something about it.

CONGRATULATING REVA FOSTER

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Reva Foster on her retirement from Willingboro Township, where she served as director of the senior citizen center, as well as executive director of the Department of Aging and Veterans Affairs, and community affairs.

After joining Willingboro Township in 1993, she became a fierce advocate for seniors and veterans in the region. Under her leadership, the town's senior services program grew into a highly respected, State-recognized resource that provided a welcoming community for generations of residents.

Her responsibility expanded to include the township's community affairs and Veterans affairs departments where she continued to champion programs that have improved the quality of life for Willingboro residents.

As a reflection of her achievements, in 2020, the senior citizen center was renamed the Reva Foster Senior Center, and in 2024 she was inducted into New Jersey Hall of Fame.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Reva and thank her for her career of tireless advocacy and service.

HONORING JEFFERSON HOLLAND

(Ms. ELFRETH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ELFRETH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of a friend, Jefferson Holland, poet laureate of Annapolis and a modern-day Chesapeake troubadour.

Anyone fortunate enough to know Jeff knows that he is a pillar of our community who has dedicated his life to capturing and sharing the essence of the Chesapeake Bay through song, story, and poetry.

Leading up to America's 250th anniversary, Jeff spearheaded Poets Afloat, a unique celebration featuring original poetry by locals, inspired by the rich history, characters, and spirit of Annapolis and Anne Arundel County.

Mr. Speaker, I will leave you with Jeff's own words that capture Annapolis' role in Nation's history—words I couldn't put to paper but words I hope this entire Chamber can take to heart: Let Annapolis show the world how democracy is done with justice, not with vengeance; with the truth, not outright lies; with good sense and consensus.

□ 1210

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8800, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2027; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8884, REMOVING BARRIERS TO WORK FOR DISABLED AMERICANS ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 113, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2027; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7008, STOP INSIDER TRADING ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6955, MAIN STREET CAPITAL ACCESS ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 9770, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2027; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1438 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1438

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8800) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2027 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in this section and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Armed Services now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 119–33 shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived.

SEC. 2. (a) No further amendment to H.R. 8800, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution, and pro forma amendments described in section 4 of this resolution.

(b) Each further amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment except as provided by section 4 of this resolution, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

(c) All points of order against further amendments printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules or against amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Armed Services or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of further amendments printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment except as provided by section 4 of this resolution, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

SEC. 4. During consideration of H.R. 8800 for amendment, the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services or their respective designees may offer up to 10 pro forma amendments each at any point for the purpose of debate.

SEC. 5. At the conclusion of consideration of H.R. 8800 for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SEC. 6. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 8884) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reauthorize demonstration authority for the disability insurance program. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 119–34 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 7. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 113) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2027 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2028 through 2036. The first reading of the concurrent resolution shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution are waived. General debate shall be confined to the concurrent resolution and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget or their respective designees. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 119–37 shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The concurrent resolution, as amended, shall be considered as read. After general debate the Committee shall rise and report the concurrent resolution, as amended, to the House. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and amendments thereto to adoption without intervening motion except amendments offered by the chair of the Committee on the Budget pursuant to section 305(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to achieve mathematical consistency. The concurrent resolution shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question of its adoption.

SEC. 8. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 7008) to amend chapter 131 of title 5 to require certain restrictions on stocks for Members of Congress and their spouses and dependents, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on House Administration now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 119–38, modified by the amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 9. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 6955) to make improvements to the Federal banking laws, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 119–35 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 10. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 9770) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2027, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 11. In the engrossment of H.R. 8800, the Clerk shall—

(a) add the text of S. 1383, as passed by the House, as new matter at the end of H.R. 8800;

(b) assign appropriate designations to provisions within the engrossment;

(c) conform cross-references and provisions for short titles within the engrossment; and

(d) be authorized to make technical corrections, to include corrections in spelling, punctuation, page and line numbering, section numbering, and insertion of appropriate headings within the engrossment.

□ 1220

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the underlying legislation.

Yesterday, the Committee on Rules met and produced the rule, H. Res. 1438, providing for the House's consideration of H. Con. Res. 113, H.R. 9770, H.R. 8800, H.R. 8884, H.R. 7008, and H.R. 6955.

This rule provides for consideration of H.R. 8800, the Fiscal Year 2027 National Defense Authorization Act, under a structured rule and makes in order 320 amendments.

The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services or their respective designees, and one motion to recommit.

Additionally, the rule provides that upon House passage of H.R. 8800, the Clerk shall add the text of S. 1383, the SAVE America Act, to the bill and transmit it to the Senate as one bill.

The bill further provides for consideration of H.R. 8884, the Removing Barriers to Work for Disabled Americans Act, under a closed rule.

The rule provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services or their respective designees and one motion to recommit.

The rule further provides for consideration of H. Con. Res. 113, establishing the congressional budget for fiscal year 2027, under a closed rule. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on the Budget or their respective designees.

Additionally, the rule provides for consideration of H.R. 7008, the Stop Insider Trading Act, under a closed rule.

The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on House Administration or their respective designees and one motion to recommit.

The rule further provides for consideration of H.R. 6955, the Main Street Capital Access Act, under a closed rule.

The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Financial Services or their respective designees and one motion to recommit.

Finally, the rule provides for consideration of H.R. 9770, the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2027, under a closed rule.

The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on House Administration or their respective designees and one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, the rule and its six underlying measures are a direct reflection of our Republican majority's expressed commitments on multiple fronts.

Contrary to the predictable and entirely incoherent hubbub that will reverberate from the other side of the Chamber during today's debate, Republicans remain at the helm, like we always have, and remain focused, as we always have.

It is okay to tune out those on the other side of the aisle while they are blathering on, Mr. Speaker. Their fevered, political rhetoric does not carry an iota of substance.

There is a great deal of business to attend to this week, Mr. Speaker. All of us understand that time indeed is of the essence here.

Let's talk for a moment about that business.

H. Con. Res. 113 begins the process to provide urgent, necessary resources for our Nation's firefighters, reinforce election integrity measures, and support the hardworking men and women of our agricultural community so that our Nation's food supply and food security remain as strong as they possibly can be.

H.R. 9770 upholds Congress' explicit Article I duties to fund the Federal Government so that its operational continuity does not lapse or is subjected to the same disgraceful political subterfuge that our colleagues across the aisle engaged in last year.

H.R. 8800, the keystone of Congress' mandate to provide for the common defense of the Nation, delivers for our Nation's servicemembers, allocates the resources necessary to maintain a strong posture of defense and deterrence, and confronts waste, fraud, and abuse head-on.

H.R. 8884 allows disabled Americans, who want to join the workforce to better their own lives, to do so without having to worry about whether their disability benefits will disappear abruptly.

H.R. 7008 prohibits Members of Congress, their spouses, or dependent children from purchasing publicly traded stocks, while also implementing the requirement—that the American people overwhelmingly support—of requiring a photo ID to vote in Federal elections.

It is entirely disingenuous for the other side to use fear-mongering tactics to scare people into believing that Republicans are trying to take away anyone's right to vote. That is downright false.

Finally, H.R. 6955 makes life more affordable for Americans, while also empowering Main Street, by ensuring that community lenders are no longer burdened by ill-advised mandates that make it harder for them to serve families, small businesses, and local economies.

That is the business at hand, Mr. Speaker.

We are not here to entertain the ever-so-tired ranting and raving from our colleagues across the aisle that the sky is falling, the world is ending, or any kind of absurd political musings they may want to spout off.

We are here to do the people's business, the business that makes America stronger, more secure, and more prosperous.

As we celebrate the 250th year of the greatest country in the world, Republicans are working hard to strengthen America and help it endure.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for yielding me the customary time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress is an absolute mess. The gentlewoman from North Carolina says that our rhetoric doesn't carry a bit of substance.

But let me begin by asking a question of the American people, a very simple question: Are you better off today than you were 1½ years ago?

It has been 18 months since Donald Trump returned to the White House. Republicans have controlled every lever of power in Washington for over 1½ years. They control the House. They control the Senate. They control the White House. They even control the Supreme Court.

□ 1230

That is the one simple question to me that matters more than anything else that we will debate today. In fact, it is the only thing that matters, really. Is it easier to fill up your gas tank? Are your rent bills more affordable? Are your groceries cheaper? Have your prescription medicine costs gone down? Does your paycheck go further?

In short, Mr. Speaker, has life gotten easier for anybody over these last 18 months, or has it gotten harder? I think most people, including most Republicans, if they are being honest with themselves, know the answer.

They don't need a politician or a fancy economics degree to say that things are not better. They are not better. In fact, they will tell you that things are worse—much, much worse.

They see it every time they tap their credit card at the gas station. They see it every time they check out at a grocery store. They see it every month when their rent is due, when their electric bill comes in, and when the pharmacist says that their kids' medicine is more expensive. They see it when their paycheck just doesn't go as far as it used to.

This is the Republican economy. These are their prices, and it is their policies that have failed America miserably.

Donald Trump and Republicans promised they would use their power to lower costs on day one. Well, it is year two, and costs are not lower, which by any definition would make that a broken promise.

Mr. Speaker, why are prices up? Why is life harder? Why are things worse off now? The reason is simple: It is because instead of working with Democrats to fight for everyday people, Republicans have made one decision after another to help the rich and the powerful and, basically, hurt everybody else.

I have example after example. Are things better off because of Trump's tariffs, Mr. Speaker? The tariffs the New York Federal Reserve says are almost exclusively paid by American consumers, American farmers, American manufacturers, and American companies, does that make anybody better off?

I don't think most people would say that tariffs have made their lives better. I would say that the tariffs have made their lives worse, more expensive, more difficult.

What about the war in Iran—a new, endless, illegal war, another one of Donald Trump's broken promises? Does anyone think that has made life better for the American people?

Maybe it has made life better for defense contractors. Maybe it has for the crazy neocon warmongers who get a kick out of another war, but not for everyday people.

We have spent probably well over $100 billion on this illegal and reckless war. That is $100 billion. That is not helping make sure that Americans don't go hungry. That is not lowering healthcare costs, lowering people's rents, or lowering gas prices. It is on this crazy war, a war of choice that the President had no plan for.

He doesn't know what the hell he is going to do next. This is nuts. In fact, we are now 5 months into a war that these guys said would only last a couple of weeks. They have declared victory like six times, yet the Strait of Hormuz is still closed. More American troops, sadly, were killed this weekend. Gas prices are back above $4 a gallon. Inflation continues to skyrocket.

Does anybody think that has made life better for most Americans? There has been 5 months of war in the Middle East. I can go right down the line.

Republicans promised better healthcare. Instead, they passed a law that takes hundreds of billions of dollars out of Medicaid and leaves millions more people uninsured. How the hell does that make anybody's life better?

Republicans promised lower taxes, except they chose another tax giveaway for those at the very top, and they pat themselves on the back for the pennies they gave to everyone else. Has that made life better for people?

After 18 months of higher costs, more inflation, new wars, costly tariffs, and stunning, stunning corruption, now they are bringing us a continuing resolution that kicks the can down the road.

They are bringing us a pathetic excuse of a stock trading ban that fails to address the much larger culture of corruption and self-dealing coming out of the White House, and they are bringing us a budget framework authorizing $73 billion for Trump's illegal Iran war, $12 billion as a Band-Aid to help farmers that their policies continue to hurt, and another $10 billion to rig the November elections.

That is nearly $100 billion in new spending with no offsets, meaning this bill could very well increase the debt by over $100 billion. Whatever happened to the old-fashioned Republicans who wanted to pay for things, who didn't want to increase the deficit or the debt? I guess that is a thing of the past.

Not one thing in this reconciliation bill, by the way—not a single damned thing—will be about affordability. Not one thing will lower prices. That is called being out of touch, Mr. Speaker.

There will be time to debate their crummy bills on the floor this week, but this hour is about priorities, and Republicans have their priorities all out of whack. Their agenda has only made things better for those at the top, for the Mar-a-Lago members and CEOs with private jets, the donor class and the corporate special interests. Things are better for them, but for the rest of America, their agenda has been a disaster.

The policies of this Republican Congress are a dumpster fire for everyday people, a total disaster. Their tariffs are crushing people. Their war is driving up costs. Their toxic environmental policies are filling our air with smoke and our food with parasites, and Americans are dying in the Middle East for their war.

Again, Mr. Speaker, when I go back home and I ask people if they are better off than they were 18 months ago, they don't even answer. They laugh because it is such a ridiculous question. It is so obvious that all of us are worse off because of this Republican majority and because of this administration, which cares only about not hurting the President's fragile feelings and delicate ego.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I will just note that our priorities are not out of whack. The number one role of the Federal Government is the defense of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. FULLER).

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule. This important legislation is required to allow Republicans in this House to advance important priorities for the American people, including funding legislation to keep our government operating.

Unfortunately, it has become clear, as the House has considered appropriations legislation on the floor and in Chairman COLE's committee, that Democrats are trying to hold our government hostage.

This legislation will make clear where Democrats stand. Will they vote against keeping the government working for the American people, or will they vote to keep us hostage?

Will they vote with me to fund important priorities, such as the programs that will allow communities in my district and many others to clean up and recover from years of PFAS contamination, or will they vote to hold hostage programs that will make Appalachia communities, like mine, healthier all to score political points?

I know where I stand. I know where leadership in this body stands. I promised my constituents that I would be a warrior for north Georgia, and I am proud to do that today.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am a little confused. The gentleman who just spoke maybe doesn't know this, but the government funding deadline isn't for months away, and he is scolding us as if it is now.

I am going to tell you what the crisis is right now. It is that people can't afford to live.

The gentlewoman from North Carolina said that our priority is about national security and national defense. I have news for her. National security means more than the number of bombs we have.

It also means healthcare for people. It means whether people can afford food, whether they can afford rent, whether they can afford to put gas in the tank of their car or pay their everyday bills, and whether they have a good job that allows them to support their family. Those are all sources of our national defense and our national security.

I will just say one other thing. I don't know how the hell our national defense and national security are served when the President takes us into an illegal, risky war in the Middle East, a war of choice, that he has no plan for.

□ 1240

Our troops are being put into harm's way, and this President has no plan about how to conduct this war or what the heck he is doing there. That is not national security.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that we defeat the previous question. If we do that, I will offer an amendment to the rule to make in order an amendment to H.R. 7008 consisting of the text of H.R. 6731, the Restore Trust in Government Act.

This bill is the Democratic proposal for a more comprehensive and robust stock trading ban than is found in the Republican plan. It is one which also includes the President of the United States and the Vice President.

There is a level of corruption that we have never ever seen in the White House. What is the response from our Republican colleagues? Silence. They are scared of the guy in the White House. They won't challenge this corruption, so he makes billions and billions of dollars while hardworking Americans struggle.

Mr. Speaker, in the first year of his term, President Trump cashed in to the tune of more than $2 billion—billion with a b.

In 2025 alone, the President completed over 21,000 stock trades. His investment accounts grew by over $850 million. He tweets out glowing endorsements of companies after he buys their stocks. Now, he is considering having people pay to get early access to his social media posts so they can cash in, too.

We need to ensure that people can trust their government to work for them and not enrich himself. This means banning stock ownership by Members and by this President.

That is what the Democratic proposal will do. Let the House decide and make this amendment in order. That is all we are asking, is to allow us to have this debate. You can vote however you want.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL) to discuss our proposal.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, let me be clear about what my colleagues are trying to do in their bill that they are advancing. They are trying to advance a fake stock trading ban. I want to be very clear: Their bill does not block insider trading, no matter what it is called.

It does not ban stock trading, which is the number one issue for over 80 percent of Americans who want Members of Congress to stop padding their own pockets instead of addressing their constituents' interests, things like ending the illegal war in Iran, bringing down gas prices, bringing down grocery prices, and investing in housing. None of that is going to be protected.

Their bill allows Members to still purchase private stocks, keep public stocks that they already own, and act on legislative matters that directly increase the value of their stocks. It allows Members to continue selling stocks that they know will decrease in value based on insider information they got while in Congress.

Their bill would do nothing to stop Congressman ROB BRESNAHAN, who just last year dumped $130,000 worth of stock in four Medicaid providers before he voted to slash Medicaid for constituents and people across the country.

It would do nothing to stop Congresswoman LISA MCCLAIN, whose husband bought at least $100,000 worth of stock in Elon Musk's AI company shortly before its model was adopted by the Defense Department.

A Common Cause report published at the end of 2025 said that Members of Congress made 13,324 trades, totaling a whopping $635 million in 2025. This is absurd. No wonder we are governing in a moment when public trust is at historical lows.

Only 2 in 10 Americans trust the government to do what is right for them, and they are constantly seeing their elected officials selling them out to the highest bidder. They see the people elected to represent them instead making decisions to increase their own personal wealth and pad their profits.

Who is to blame for thinking that there is no trust in Congress, in the government, when there is a President who is openly profiting from the American people? He generated at least $2.2 billion in income in his first full year in office. Now, he is selling Wall Street firms early access to Truth Social posts, where he brings out information that is ''market movers.'' This is literally the highway to making profit.

The Republican proposal is nothing but a sham to score cheap political points before they go home to their constituents. It tries to make you forget that there is a real solution that I helped co-lead called the Restore Trust in Government Act, which actually does ban stock trading. It does ban insider trading. It does root out corruption in government. It does prohibit Presidents, Vice Presidents, Members of Congress, and their dependent children, spouses, and trustees from owning and trading individual stocks.

If this Republican majority were to bring that bill to the floor, if we were allowed to force a vote on these bills, they would actually pass, and Republicans would have to admit that their bill does nothing.

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

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

Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are skirting very closely to having their words taken down when they call out individual Members.

Mr. Speaker, our colleagues sometimes ask who is to blame for the lack of trust of Members of Congress. It is Members of Congress and the press who call into question acts that are done by Members of Congress that are totally legal.

We already have laws in place against insider trading. There have been a couple of Members of Congress who have been prosecuted for that, and that is appropriate, but the Stop Insider Trading Act will prevent that.

I believe, and Republicans believe, that no lawmaker should profit off of insider information. I frankly don't know how people get the insider information, but the top line of the legislation we are bringing here, the Stop Insider Trading Act, led by Committee on House Administration Chairman BRYAN STEIL, will ensure that lawmakers cannot use their positions to profit off insider information, if there is insider information.

The Stop Insider Trading Act has a prohibition on stock purchasing. It bans Members, their spouses, and their dependent children from purchasing securities issued by publicly traded companies. It requires Members to file a public notice at least 7 days but no more than 14 days in advance for any intended stock sale with the Clerk of the House of Representatives or the Secretary of the Senate. Then, if a Member of Congress, spouse, or dependent child decides not to sell a covered investment, the Member must publicly withdraw the notice prior to its expiration.

There are penalties, Mr. Speaker, for violators. They will be assessed a fine equal to $2,000 or 10 percent of the value of the transaction, whichever is greater, and then any net gain realized from a transaction. This is designed to make sure that Members do not take advantage of any potential information or advantage that the Member has.

Mr. Speaker, we want to restore public trust in this institution. Members are doing their jobs diligently. They do not want to be under a cloud. News outlets and social media accounts have garnered significant attention for aggregating the stock trades of Members of Congress.

□ 1250

Under the STOCK Act of 2012, lawmakers are prohibited from using nonpublic information for their own financial benefit, but many Americans have become concerned that the STOCK Act is insufficient and stronger measures must be implemented.

The Stop Insider Trading Act will increase transparency and reinforce to the American people that Members are working for them, not themselves.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to respond to the gentlewoman. I am just a little confused. I thought I heard her say that we already have laws to deal with stock insider trading. If that is the case, then why are we doing a bill to ban stock insider trading?

I mean, the bottom line is we are doing it because it is a problem, and our objection is the fact that they are basically excluding somebody who is violating the law in our face right now, blatantly, who is in the White House, who is making countless millions, if not billions, of dollars on some really shady deals. Quite frankly, it makes Richard Nixon look like a Boy Scout.

I mean, the deal is the American people are sick of it. They want us to clean up Washington. That includes Congress, and that includes the executive branch.

I just also would like to kind of highlight kind of the absurdity of all the stuff. We have six different bills that we are talking about here today, but I want to read a tweet from a Republican, TOM MASSIE.

He says: "The House will pass a $12 billion bailout for farmers suffering from high fuel & fertilizer prices caused by the Iran war, expensive equipment & parts caused by tariffs, and lower sales prices for commodities due to trade disputes with China. But the GOP is fighting communism!"

The Republican leadership had a big press conference earlier today. It was all about communism, but I have to say to Mr. MASSIE, I don't think I have heard truer words spoken by a Republican Member of Congress. I really appreciate that, the truth, the accuracy of what the situation is.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. OLSZEWSKI).

Mr. OLSZEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule.

I agree, it is past time that we ban congressional insider trading. No one should benefit from public service, but wouldn't the easiest way to do that be to just completely ban stock trading entirely, not take the baby steps attached to this bill included in the rule?

Still, I was open to voting for the bill, to accept that incremental but wholly insufficient progress. What I am not open to, Mr. Speaker, is accepting modest progress on stock ethics, insufficient progress in exchange for significantly compromising American voting rights, and that is also exactly what this bill would do. It would add unnecessary and unrelated provisions that make it harder for Americans to vote.

Republicans can't even be bothered to provide the IDs they would have Americans be required to have in order to vote. In fact, that was in the bill, and they took it out. That is not reform, Mr. Speaker. That is a bait-and-switch.

It is one more ruse by this Republican majority to distract the public from their inability or their unwillingness, or both, to rein in costs and address corruption.

The American people deserve so much better. I urge a "no" vote.

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

Mr. Speaker, the voter ID provisions in this bill amend the Help America Vote Act to require States to obtain a photo ID from an individual to vote in person in a Federal election or to require a copy of the photo ID to be submitted with a ballot cast other than in person.

These requirements do not apply to an absent uniformed services voter or an individual provided the right to vote other than in person by the Voting Accessibility for the Elderly and Handicapped Act.

The bill permits voters to use several different forms of photo ID: a valid State-issued motor vehicle driver's license that includes a photo of the individual and an expiration date, a valid State-issued identification card that includes a photo of the individual and an expiration date issued by a State motor vehicle authority, a valid United States passport for the individual, a valid photo identification card for the individual issued by the Department of Defense or the Department of Veterans Affairs, or a valid identification document issued by a Tribal government that includes a photo of the individual and an expiration date.

While my friends across the aisle claim the bill will prevent individuals who cannot afford a photo ID from voting, this is nothing but false alarmism. The Supreme Court has held photo ID laws are constitutional only where the State provides a photo ID to those who do not have them. In other words, a photo ID requirement in the bill is not a barrier to voting for someone who cannot afford to pay the typical photo ID fee.

The data supports that Democrats are being disingenuous when they claim this bill would suppress voting. The nonpartisan National Bureau of Economic Research tracked 1.6 billion data points over an 8-year period. This massive amount of data confirms strict voter ID laws have no statistically measurable negative impact on voter participation.

This comprehensive, multiyear study found zero negative impact on overall registration or turnout, no drops in participation among minority or young voters, and an increase in Hispanic participation in some ID law States.

Photo ID as a form of verification is a part of American life. Americans must show an ID to participate in a wide range of everyday activities, including boarding a plane, entering government buildings, cashing their checks, buying a gun, and enjoying Olive Garden's Never Ending Pasta Bowl.

Politico just announced that more than 6,000 noncitizens were registered to vote in New Jersey and have been voting since 2023. This is clearly an issue which must be addressed.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, you know, one of the frustrating things about kind of where we are in terms of political debate in this country is that issues that really matter to regular people are being ignored or being shoved aside because, quite frankly, Republicans don't want to do anything about it.

They know that their agenda is unpopular. They know that people are struggling with the issue of affordability. They know that people are having a tough time paying their rent, filling up their gas tanks, affording healthcare costs—I can go on and on and on—buying food, and they don't want to talk about that. They know that the American people kind of are sick and tired of what they are doing here, and so they are trying to divert attention.

I just want to address something that happened this morning, and that is the Republican leadership in this House held this wackadoodle press conference. I have never quite seen anything like it, trying to divert attention away from issues of affordability and get people to look someplace else.

Basically, the Republican Party's new favorite talking point is calling Democrats Communists. I mean, oh, my God, Mr. Speaker, I mean, really? Really? Communists? Did we accidentally step into a time machine?

I get it. I get it. They don't want to talk about the real issues, the bread-and-butter issues. They don't want to talk about affordability. I guess my question is, is Joe McCarthy back from the dead? It sounds like that is who wrote all the garbage coming from Republicans about communism. These guys dust off the same, tired, old talking points every time they are backed into a corner.

Every time a new poll comes out saying that their economic agenda sucks, what they do is they change the subject. They try to divert attention. It is pathetic. But, fine, if they want to play that game, let's play that game.

Let's talk about the Republican Party, a party that worships one man above the Constitution in a cult of personality, a party that demonizes immigrants and says they poison the blood of our country, a party that calls the free press the enemy of the people and sics the Justice Department on journalists they don't like.

It is a party that says their political opponents are internal enemies and calls them ''the enemy within.'' It is a party that is okay with invading our allies, including other democracies, and it is a party that punishes their political opponents.

It is a party that has deployed troops on our own streets, that wants to use the American military on the American people. It is a party that believes any unhinged lie, fantasy, and conspiracy theory as long as it comes from one man.

□ 1300

It is a party that tries to lock up Members of Congress for exercising their free speech rights. It is a party that has tried to violently overthrow the results of a free and fair election in the United States of America.

It is a party that, in fact, pardoned everyone who invaded this building on January 6, 2021, and tried to throw out the votes of millions of Americans because the President couldn't accept a loss.

How dare that party lecture anyone. How dare they talk about communism when their own party has totally lost touch not just with the founding ideals of this country but lost touch with reality itself?

If we are going to start assigning political labels based on conduct, then let's call things by their proper names. The Republican Party has become the party of fascism, full stop. They have become a party of far-right fascists who are hell-bent on destroying our country and our way of life. Every single time they call us Communists, it is nothing more than a projection of their own radicalization. They don't want to talk about that, and they definitely don't want to talk about their higher grocery prices or skyrocketing gas prices or higher inflation or the cost of healthcare or their new endless illegal war that has now cost over $100 billion.

Instead, they scream and they yell because they have nothing else left to offer.

This would be funny, Mr. Speaker, if it weren't so pathetic and so unhinged.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats are patriots who love this country enough to fight for it. We are fighting to make it easier for people to afford groceries. We are fighting to try to make it easier for people to afford rent, prescription drugs, and healthcare. We will not be lectured by a fascist Republican Party that offers the American people nothing but lies, fear, endless culture wars, and tax breaks for billionaires.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I think after that, I will reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to return to the question I asked at the start of this debate: Are Americans better off than they were 18 months ago?

Think about the family sitting at the kitchen table tonight. The rent is due. The electric bill is higher, and groceries cost more. The gas tank is on empty. A prescription is waiting at the pharmacy. Somebody is trying to figure out which bill they can put off for 1 more week.

That family does not need a lecture about how great Donald Trump is. They know what life costs, and they know it costs more—much, much more—than it did 18 months ago.

Eighteen months is long enough to judge a majority by its choices. There is a lot packed into this rule, a budget resolution, a continuing resolution, a Defense bill, a disability bill, a banking bill, a bill on Congressional stock trading, and a bill to rig the elections. I could go on and on and on.

Republicans could not—could not—find a single provision for us to consider today about lowering the cost of housing, or lowering the cost of food, or lowering the cost of medicine or healthcare or electricity.

There is nothing—nothing in anything we are going to be considering does any of that or focuses on any of those issues. They have time to weaken bank oversight. They have time to combine a watered-down stock trading bill with new restrictions on voting. They have time to bring back bills that failed weeks ago. They have time to protect the President, bail out powerful special interests, and finance another endless war.

However, helping working people somehow never makes the cut. It never makes the cut.

Mr. Speaker, these bills are not just stacks of paper. They are statements on our values. They tell people who matter, who gets hurt, who gets helped, and who are expected to fend for themselves.

The answer from MAGA has been painfully clear, Mr. Speaker: The greedy get protected. The well-connected get rewarded, and everyone else gets told: Sorry, maybe next time.

Again, I ask: Are Americans better off?

The answer is ''no.''

Do the measures in this rule lower their costs, improve their healthcare, make them safer, or give them greater peace of mind?

The answer is absolutely ''no.'' Nothing does that.

We will hear talks about socialism and communism and all this other stuff to get people to not focus in on the fact that they are getting screwed over.

The American people deserve more than excuses. They deserve more than distractions. They deserve more than another blank check for the people on top from this failed Republican majority. They deserve a government that is on their side. They deserve a government that is on their side, and that is not what they are getting here.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''no'' vote on this rule.

We have to do better. We have to do better. The American people are hurting, and my friends on the other side of the aisle behave like everything is just fine and nobody is noticing.

Go and do in-person townhalls in your districts, I would say to all my colleagues who are listening, and you will get an earful. People have had it. They are fed up with the corruption in Washington. They are fed up with the policies that reward the well-off and well-connected. They are tired of getting screwed over.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we live in the greatest country in the world. We just celebrated the 250th anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence. We have a lot more to be talking about, about the founding of this country, and I hope people will pay close attention to that.

We do have a government that is on the side of the American people. We believe in capitalism. Our friends across the aisle constantly talk about how much people need to be paying more in taxes. We believe on the Republican side that the people have a right to what they have earned and not that the government should take their money and spend it the way the government wants to spend it.

Let me remind our colleagues that just 1 year ago H.R. 1 delivered the largest middle- and working-class tax cut in U.S. history. Low-income workers realized the largest percentage reduction in their tax liability.

Yes, we indeed care about the American people and the fruits of their labor. Nearly 40 percent of taxpayers have claimed one of President Donald Trump's signature cuts this year.

This tax season over 7.5 million filers claimed no tax on tips, with an average deduction of over $7,000. Over 29 million filers claimed no tax on overtime with an average deduction of over $3,100, and over 35 million seniors have claimed the enhanced deduction for seniors with an average deduction of over $7,500.

We do, indeed, care for the American people in allowing them to keep the fruits of their labor.

More than 5.5 million Trump Accounts have been opened with 1.4 million eligible for the $1,000 pilot program contribution. Nearly 40 million families have claimed the enhanced child tax credit, and over 127 million filers, or 90 percent of all tax filers, have claimed the permanently doubled standard deduction.

We do, indeed, care for American taxpayers.

I am not at all surprised by the recent rant from our colleague when one-half of the Democrats could not vote for a resolution against socialism.

Mr. Speaker, it is really no secret that this is a week of monumental importance in the people's House. The rule and six underlying measures carry with them a commitment to deliver upon the priorities of the President, the Nation, and the American people.

Some are quick to write off the progress that this Republican majority has made thus far, and they are dead wrong in doing so.

This week, Mr. Speaker, we will continue to build upon that progress in just the one issue I discussed, H.R. 1.

□ 1310

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the previous question and ''yes'' on the rule.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1438 OFFERED BY MR. McGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

Strike section 8 of the resolution, insert the following, and redesignate the subsequent sections accordingly:

SEC. 8. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 7008) to amend chapter 131 of title 5 to require certain restrictions on stocks for Members of Congress and their spouses and dependents, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on House Administration now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 119–38, modified by the amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration or their respective designees; (2) the further amendment specified in section 9 of this resolution, if offered by Representative Magaziner of Rhode Island or a designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 9. The amendment referred to in section 8 of this resolution is as follows:

Strike all after page 1, line 1, and insert the following:

SECTION 1. Short title.

This Act may be cited as the ''Restore Trust in Government Act''.

SEC. 2. Restrictions on trade and ownership of covered investments.

(a) Table of contents.—The table of contents for chapter 131 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

SUBCHAPTER IV. RESTRICTIONS ON TRADE AND OWNERSHIP OF COVERED INVESTMENTS

13151. Definitions.

13152. Trade and ownership of covered investments.

13153. Penalties.

(b) Restrictions.—Chapter 131 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end a new subchapter:

''SUBCHAPTER IV—RESTRICTIONS ON TRADE AND OWNERSHIP OF COVERED INVESTMENTS

''§ 13151. Definitions

''In this subchapter:

''(1) COMMODITY.—The term 'commodity'—

''(A) has the meaning given the term in section la of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 1a); and

''(B) does not include a precious metal (as defined in section 1027.100 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations).

''(2) COVERED INDIVIDUAL.—The term 'covered individual' means any of the following:

''(A) A Member of Congress, as defined in section 13101.

''(B) A dependent child (as defined in section 13101) or a spouse of a Member of Congress.

''(C) A trustee of a trust in which an individual described in subparagraph (A) or (B) has a beneficial interest in the principal or income of the trust as described in section 1403(b)(5) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

''(D) The President, or the spouse or a dependent child (as defined in section 13101) of the President.

''(E) The Vice President, or the spouse or a dependent child (as defined in section 13101) of the Vice President.

''(F) A Supreme Court Justice, or the spouse or a dependent child (as defined in section 13101) of the Supreme Court Justice.

''(3) COVERED INVESTMENT.—The term 'covered investment'—

''(A) means an investment in a security, a commodity, a future, or any comparable economic interest acquired through synthetic means, such as the use of a derivative, including an option, warrant, or other similar means; and

''(B) does not include—

''(i) a widely held investment fund described in section 13104(f)(8) that is diversified and publicly traded on a national or regional stock exchange;

''(ii) a United States Treasury bill, note, or bond;

''(iii) a State or municipal government bill, note, or bond;

''(iv) any compensation received by a spouse or a dependent child described in paragraph (2) from an employer of the spouse or dependent child;

''(v) an interest in a small business concern and, in the case of an investment in a family farm or ranch that qualifies as an interest in a small business concern, a future or commodity directly related to the farming activities and products of the farm or ranch;

''(vi) an interest in a limited liability company created for the sole purpose of purchasing or holding real estate that serves as the personal residences of the Member of Congress;

''(vii) any share of Settlement Common Stock issued under section 7(g)(1)(A) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1606(g)(1)(A)); or

''(viii) any share of Settlement Common Stock, as defined in section 3 of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1602).

''(4) DIVERSIFIED.—The term 'diversified', with respect to an investment fund, means such fund does not have a stated policy of concentrating its investments in any industry, business, single country other than the United States, or bonds of a single State within the United States except for the State in which the Member of Congress resides.

''(5) FUTURE.—The term 'future' means a financial contract obligating the buyer to purchase an asset or the seller to sell an asset, such as a physical commodity or a financial investment, at a predetermined future date and price.

''(6) SECURITY.—The term 'security' has the meaning given the term in section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)).

''(7) SMALL BUSINESS CONCERN.—The term 'small business concern' has the meaning given that term under section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632).

''(8) SUPERVISING ETHICS OFFICE.—The term 'supervising ethics office' has the meaning given the term in section 13101.

''§ 13152. Trade and ownership of covered investments

''(a) Conduct during federal service.—Except as described in subsection (b)(1)(B) and subsections (e) through (g), no covered individual may, directly or indirectly, own or trade a covered investment.

''(b) Compliance.—

''(1) REQUIREMENT.—To comply with subsection (a)—

''(A) a covered individual may not purchase a covered investment; and

''(B) a covered individual shall divest of any covered investment by the effective date established in paragraph (2) at fair market value.

''(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The effective date is established as follows:

''(A) 180 days for an individual who is a covered individual on the date of enactment of the Restore Trust in Government Act.

''(B) 90 days within the date on which an individual becomes a covered individual if such date occurs after the date of enactment of the Restore Trust in Government Act.

''(c) Certificates of divestiture.—

''(1) APPLICATION OF CERTIFICATE OF DIVESTITURE PROGRAM.—For purposes of section 1043 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986—

''(A) this section shall be treated as a Federal conflict of interest statute;

''(B) any covered individual described in section 13151(2)(A) shall be treated as an eligible person described in section 1043(b)(1)(A) of such Code; and

''(C) any spouse or dependent child described in section 13151(2)(B) shall be treated as an eligible person described in section 1043(b)(1)(B) of such Code.

''(2) ISSUANCE OF CERTIFICATE OF DIVESTITURE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Each supervising ethics office shall issue a certificate of divestiture to each covered individual required to divest under this subchapter upon submission of proof of compliance by such individual with the requirements to divest or any extensions granted by the supervising ethics office.

''(B) ELIGIBILITY.—Such certificate shall include an identification of each specific property eligible for the application of the certificate of divestiture program as determined by the supervising ethics office.

''(d) Income tax.—A loss from a transaction or holding involving a covered financial instrument that is conducted in violation of this section may not be deducted from the amount of income tax owed by the covered individual.

''(e) Occupational exception.—A spouse or dependent child of a covered individual as described in section 13151(2)(B) may trade any covered investment if such covered investment is not owned by a covered individual and if such trade is performed as a function of the primary occupation of the spouse or dependent child.

''(f) Trusts.—

''(1) QUALIFIED BLIND TRUST.—Any covered investment held in a qualified blind trust as defined in section 13104(f)(3) shall be divested in accordance with subsection (b)(1)(B) by the effective date established in subsection (b)(2).

''(2) FAMILY TRUST.—A supervising ethics office may grant an exemption for covered investments held in a family trust only if—

''A) no covered individual—

''(i) is a grantor of the family trust;

''(ii) contributed any covered investment to the family trust; or

''(iii) has any authority over a trustee of the family trust, including the authority to appoint, replace, or direct the actions of such a trustee; and

''(B) the grantor of the family trust is or was a family member of the covered individual.

''(3) REQUESTS.—A covered individual seeking an exemption under paragraph (2) shall submit to the applicable supervising ethics office a request for the exemption, in writing, certifying that the conditions described in that paragraph are met.

''(g) Assets acquired in special circumstances.—In the event that a covered individual acquires a covered investment after the date of enactment of the Restore Trust in Government Act other than by purchase (such as by marriage, inheritance, divorce settlement, or other circumstance), the covered individual shall have 90 days from the date on which such investment was acquired to divest such covered investment at fair market value.

''(h) Extension.—A supervising ethics office may grant a covered individual an extension of time to comply with a divestment deadline under this subchapter if a covered investment cannot be divested by such deadline due to low liquidity, vesting schedules, or contractual restrictions.

''(i) Interpretative guidance.—The supervising ethics office shall issue interpretive guidance on any relevant term not defined in this subchapter.

''§ 13153. Penalties

''(a) In general.—

''(1) PENALTIES.—Any covered individual who violates the restrictions on trading or ownership of covered investments in section 13152 shall, at the direction of the supervising ethics office—

''(A) pay a fee equal to ten percent of the value of the covered investment; and

''(B) disgorge the profits of any transaction that violates the provisions of this subchapter.

''(2) PAYMENT OF PENALTY TO TREASURY.—A penalty imposed under paragraph (1)(B) shall be payable into the Treasury of the United States.

''(b) Payment restrictions.—A Member of Congress may not pay any of the penalties under this section by using amounts from the following sources:

''(1) The Members' Representational Allowance.

''(2) The Senators' Official Personnel and Office Expense Account.

''(3) Any contribution (as defined in section 301(8) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30101(8))) accepted as a candidate, and any other donation received as support for activities of the individual as a holder of Federal office.

''(c) Publication.—Each supervising ethics office shall publish on a publicly available website a description of—

''(1) each fine assessed by the supervising ethics office pursuant to this section;

''(2) the reason why each such fine was assessed; and

''(3) the result of each assessment.''.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUSTOFF). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1331

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LOUDERMILK) at 1 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

The motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 1118;

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 1438; and

Adoption of House Resolution 1438, if ordered.

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

VALUE OVER COST ACT OF 2026

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1118) to amend title 41, United States Code, and title 10, United States Code, to provide best value through the multiple award schedule program, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BURLISON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 15-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 421, nays 1, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 252]

YEAS—421

Adams	Bera	Carson
Aderholt	Bergman	Carter (GA)
Aguilar	Beyer	Carter (LA)
Alford	Bice	Carter (TX)
Allen	Biggs (SC)	Casar
Amo	Bilirakis	Case
Amodei (NV)	Bishop	Casten
Ansari	Boebert	Castor (FL)
Arrington	Bonamici	Castro (TX)
Auchincloss	Bost	Chu
Babin	Boyle (PA)	Ciscomani
Bacon	Brecheen	Cisneros
Baird	Bresnahan	Clark (MA)
Balderson	Brown	Clarke (NY)
Balint	Brownley	Cleaver
Barr	Buchanan	Cline
Barragán	Budzinski	Cloud
Barrett	Burchett	Clyburn
Baumgartner	Burlison	Cohen
Bean (FL)	Bynum	Cole
Beatty	Calvert	Collins
Begich	Cammack	Comer
Bell	Carbajal	Conaway
Bentz	Carey	Correa