

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7888, REFORMING INTELLIGENCE AND SECURING AMERICA ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 529, EXTENDING LIMITS OF U.S. CUSTOMS WATERS ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 1112, DENOUNCING THE BIDEN ADMINISTRATION'S IMMIGRATION POLICIES; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 1117, OPPOSING EFFORTS TO PLACE ONE-SIDED PRESSURE ON ISRAEL WITH RESPECT TO GAZA

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1125 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1125

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. 7888) to reform the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978. 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 shall not exceed two hours equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees and the chair and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered 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, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 529) to extend the customs waters of the United States from 12 nautical miles to 24 nautical miles from the baselines of the United States, consistent with Presidential Proclamation 7219. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment

thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 1112) denouncing the Biden administration's immigration policies. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees.

SEC. 4. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 1117) opposing efforts to place one-sided pressure on Israel with respect to Gaza. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs or their respective designees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. VAN DREW). The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, today, the Rules Committee reported out a rule for four pieces of legislation: H.R. 7888, Reforming Intelligence and Securing America Act. This legislation reauthorizes title VII, section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act for 5 years from the date of enactment.

This bill is far from perfect, but we are going to have a lot of debate on that bill in just a moment in the rule and in 2 hours later. I will come back to that in a moment.

There are three other pieces of legislation. First, H.R. 529, Extending Limits of U.S. Customs Waters Act. This bipartisan legislation enhances Customs and Border Protections' air and marine operations mission by extending Custom's law enforcement authority from 12 to 24 nautical miles of the United States coast. This will help CBP combat unlawful activity in coastal waters at a time when we have significant problems with respect to our borders.

H. Res. 1112, denouncing the Biden administration's immigration policies. This resolution denounces President Biden's open-border policies. It calls on the administration to immediately put in place policies that will end the crisis at our southern border. This is an important message. It is an important statement, but I hope this Congress will speak with one voice against an administration that refuses to enforce the law. This resolution is one statement along those lines.

H. Res. 1117, opposing efforts to place one-sided pressure on Israel with respect to Gaza. This resolution affirms that Israel, our greatest ally in the Middle East, has the right to defend itself against Hamas and makes clear that the House of Representatives opposes efforts to place one-sided pressures on Israel to implement an immediate cease-fire.

This resolution is necessary because regrettably, embarrassingly, this administration took a seat, sat down, abstained, abstained in the face of the horrors that we saw unfold on October 7 to our friend, Israel; by sitting down when the United Nations Security Council called for a cease-fire, and pushing on Israel to walk away from its efforts to combat what Hamas has been doing to the people of Israel.

We should speak with clarity as the Congress of the United States that we stand in solidarity with the people of Israel, and this resolution is one way in which we can do that.

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY) for the customary 30 minutes. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, we just returned from 2 marvelous weeks in our beautiful districts. I was invited to visit a food bank to highlight food insecurity and the need to provide families with nutritious and available meals. I talked with Tribal leaders and law enforcement about how we must work together to solve the many issues facing Native American communities from the missing and murdered indigenous women crisis to the need for greater economic development to the need for protection of sacred sites from desecration. We gathered healthcare providers from across New Mexico for a Congressional Hispanic Caucus on the road event to talk about Latino access to rural healthcare.

That event was standing room only because our constituents want us to address healthcare access and continue Democrats' work to bring down the cost of prescription drugs and healthcare costs, the work we began last year with the Inflation Reduction Act.

These are really important things. Our constituents want us to work on

really important things that make a difference in their lives every day.

So what are we doing today? Three of these bills don't really address anything. We have more resolutions that just express things but don't have any solutions. We are spending another valuable week on nonbinding resolutions and bills that Republicans have already failed to pass.

This is the third time we will vote on a resolution complaining about an immigration system that has been broken for years, and it is Congress' fault that we have not fixed it.

Republicans want to just talk about blame, but do they offer any solutions? That is not how governing works. It is not about coming down here and passing press releases on the floor of the House. If you want to engage in a problem and offer solutions, you engage in bipartisan negotiations to pass a law that fixes the problem. Instead, Republicans do the opposite. They block bipartisan immigration deals and complain that nothing is happening.

Well, something is happening. Republicans are making the problem worse. Six months ago, the President sent Congress a supplemental border security request. That request would have bolstered border security and slowed the flow of refugees by addressing the root cause of migration.

For 6 months, Republicans, who control this House, have refused to take up the President's supplemental border security funding request.

In the Senate, a bipartisan group led by a Republican Senator and Democrats worked for 4 months. They worked hard on a bipartisan border security deal. Before we could even discuss the merits of it in this House to say what we liked or didn't like, Trump told them to kill the bill.

Following Trump's orders, as always, House Republican leadership declared it dead on arrival in the House. Why? They want to preserve immigration as a political weapon, not something that Americans are asking us to fix.

Americans would like to see comprehensive immigration reform. How about if we do something like taking up the bipartisan Dream and Promise Act or the bipartisan Farm Work Modernization Act, which passed with bipartisan support out of this Congress because we need more agrarian workers to help pick the food we need to place on our tables.

What is especially shameful is that instead of offering solutions, Republicans are creating a dangerous environment in America. Rhetoric from the twice impeached and four times-indicted former President Trump that suggest immigrants are poisoning the blood of America is dangerous and disgraceful.

Trump's language echoes, almost verbatim, the propaganda and hate used by Hitler and other Nazi leaders. America is not Nazi Germany. We will push back against such a scary road to tyranny and bigotry.

□ 1230

Trump forgets but America remembers that immigrants are vitally important to the economic vibrancy and future of our Nation. While securing the border is an important policy objective, there is no reason to demonize our parents, grandparents, coworkers, friends, and neighbors in the process.

This rule also makes in order H. Res. 1117, yet another nonbinding resolution, a press release. It has been just 1 week since seven World Central Kitchen volunteers were killed in Gaza, killed while trying to bring food to starving Gazans, who are on the brink of famine. More than 200 aid workers have been killed in Gaza over the last 6 months.

Over 13,000 children and 9,000 women have died in the war. So far, 27 kids have died of malnutrition. Do you know how horrible it is to die of starvation? Twenty-seven children. Famine is imminent for 1.1 million Gazans.

There are still over 130 Israeli hostages who, without a cease-fire, cannot go home to their grieving families, their worried families. Tens of thousands of Israelis are marching in the streets to bring the hostages home.

This resolution that we are hearing today fails to acknowledge the sad reality I have just discussed. It also fails to support President Biden's efforts to bring lasting peace to this region, which should be our goal. President Biden is right: A cease-fire is needed to bring over 130 Israeli hostages home and to prevent the deaths of innocent Gazans. Too many people have died already.

President Biden's calls to Netanyahu for a cease-fire, to bring the hostages home, and to reverse the humanitarian crisis should be welcomed by everyone with a caring heart. If you care for the hostages and their worried families, a cease-fire is needed. If you care for the women and children who are dying and starving, a cease-fire is needed. If you care for a future where peace can come to this region, a cease-fire is needed.

Next, the House will consider H.R. 7888, the Reforming Intelligence and Securing America Act. The bill reauthorizes FISA for 5 years and implements minor changes to the program. The Republicans have waited until the last minute to bring this reauthorization to the floor.

I will say, they tried once before back in February. We had a hearing in the Rules Committee on Valentine's Day. It was great. We saw amazing bipartisan agreement from the Judiciary Committee, but we never did get to hear from the Intelligence Committee.

Instead, Republicans waited until the last minute. It expires in 9 days. That is not a way to govern. This is an important bill that needs conversation and debate. Members need to hear from the two committees with jurisdiction over FISA to determine how they will vote and the important balance between protecting constitutional rights of citizens and protecting our national security.

Next, this rule makes in order H.R. 529, the Extending Limits of U.S. Customs Waters Act. While this bill is a bipartisan bill, which I will point out received unanimous support in committee and will probably receive almost near-unanimous support on this floor, this is the kind of bill that usually doesn't go through Rules. It is the type of bill that would normally pass under suspension.

Why wasn't it put under suspension? Is it because House Republicans needed something that could finally pass the Rules Committee, come to the floor, and maybe make it into law? The last bill to pass the Rules Committee and become law was almost a year ago. It is almost a year ago since we did the people's business on this floor where we actually got a bill, sent it out of Rules, sent it to the Senate, and it made it onto the President's desk.

Republicans have presided over the most ineffective sessions of Congress in history. Despite the pressing challenges facing our Nation, they have repeatedly chosen to prioritize silly censures, sham impeachments, and doing nothing messaging bills.

That is no way to run the House. That is no way to run the people's House and address the people's business.

Meanwhile, Democrats have kept our focus on delivering for the American people and implementing the incredible laws we passed last Congress when Democrats controlled this House, which was, by the way, the most successful and most productive in recent memory. We have carried the vote to make sure the U.S. didn't default on its debt last year. Democrats carried bills to fund the government, keep it running, and protect against draconian spending cuts.

Democrats always stand ready to work across the aisle to tackle important issues. This includes coming together to work on a bipartisan solution, a comprehensive solution to fix the border, to secure the border, to lower costs. We hope that our colleagues will work with us.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward presumptive nominees for the Office of President of the United States.

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

Mr. Speaker, the reason that we have a resolution on the floor to stand and say that we believe that the Biden administration is failing to carry out its duty to secure the border of the United States is because it is true. The American people need to know and see that, and see us speaking with one voice.

The reason that we have a resolution on the floor saying we should stand with Israel is because the administration walked away from Israel, abandoned them in a vote in the Security Council vote by abstaining.

That is the truth. That is why these resolutions matter. That is why they are here on the floor.

We are going to have a lot of debate here about the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. On this, I think there is a lot of bipartisan agreement. There are a lot of bipartisan concerns about the size and scope of government. I think it is important to remember James Madison wrote to Thomas Jefferson on May 13, 1798: "Perhaps it is a universal truth that the loss of liberty at home is to be charged . . . against danger real or pretended from abroad."

The Founders knew what they were doing. The Founders intentionally built into the United States Constitution protections for us, protections for the people.

Unfortunately, the legislation before us doesn't do what is necessary to answer the question, to secure the people's rights. There are amendments that are in order that might get the legislation there.

Remember, section 702 allows the NSA to surveil non-U.S. individuals and organizations abroad if a significant purpose is to acquire foreign intelligence information, which it defines as information related to the conduct of U.S. foreign affairs.

Remember, there are some 230,000 targets that the government has, the blob, the intelligence community, that they are targeting over there, overseas, targeting externally. However, here is the problem: They are collecting information here in the United States on those individuals. We don't know who they are.

I asked the Judiciary Committee chairman and staff: Do you all know who they are? Have you gone into a SCIF and seen who they are targeting? The answer is no, we don't know who they are targeting.

Then, information is collected in communication to those individuals, which necessarily brings American citizens into the mix. The question is, what do we do about it? Remember this: The Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board, in a report released last year, stated: "Ordinary Americans may be in contact with section 702 targets for business or personal reasons even if the Americans have no connection to, or reason to suspect, any wrongdoing by their foreign contacts." That is an important issue. That is at the heart of the debate.

What we have right now before us is a rule to bring forward reauthorization of legislation passed so that we can go try to protect our country, supposedly looking outward, but it has ensnared American citizens in their information. That is why we are here. The question is whether we are going to have the ability to amend it to ensure that American citizens can be protected.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE).

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, today, we are voting on a resolution that will

bring forward reauthorization of a program that has been abused for decades, the FISA 702 surveillance program.

Before we vote on that program, though, this resolution that we are voting on now prescribes that we will bring forward an amendment to require warrants. If you want to spy on Americans, if you want to use this database as a back door to look at the private information of Americans, you would need a warrant if this amendment passes.

Now, there are some people who say, oh, getting a warrant is too hard. It will slow us down. You will put America in danger.

Listen, I have been in the SCIF, the classified area where they are supposed to tell us the problems with requiring a warrant, and they never have told us a single example of where getting a warrant would be a problem to national security.

In fact, we have a provision in the warrant amendment that says in exigent circumstances you can skip that step. You will hear today that everything is fine, that we don't need the warrant amendment, that we have 53 reforms in this package.

Here is the problem with those reforms: We rely on the same people who abused the system to enforce those reforms, and they still don't go to the constitutional level that is required in this country.

Who doesn't trust those 53 reforms? Congress—the authors of this bill—doesn't trust those 53 reforms. Do you know how I know? Because they put in two exemptions for themselves in this bill. That is right: If the FBI is going to use 702 FISA to spy on Congressmen, they have to tell Congress. They even have to get permission from the Congressmen they are spying on if they say it is for the Congressmen's own good. Why do we have a provision in there that exempts Congressmen but not all of America?

Americans deserve the protections that are enshrined in the Constitution. Nothing less should pass this House.

This is an enormous database. They will tell you that we are just looking at intelligence that was gathered on foreigners. The problem is, they are collecting this intelligence in the United States, using service providers in the United States, using internet connections in the United States. They collect a lot of stuff here.

Do you think the NSA employee who did a FISA search on a Tinder date was looking for information about Hamas? No.

There is all kinds of information in there, and that is why it is being abused and why we need the warrant provision. I urge folks to vote for this rule so that they can vote for the warrant provision amendment. If that amendment doesn't pass, they shouldn't vote to reauthorize FISA.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr.

MCGOVERN), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Rules and a mentor.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, this place is so broken, it is pathetic.

It is interesting to listen to the gentleman from Texas, who is now managing this rule and who regularly lectures us on the importance of regular order and making sure that we have a more open process.

The rule that he is bringing before the membership today contains four measures. Three of these measures are being brought to us under completely closed rules. No amendments are made in order. Three of the bills weren't even considered by committees of jurisdiction—no hearings and no markup—yet here we are. What a wonderful process to celebrate.

I mean, this place is not functioning. We don't even know whether this rule that we are spending time debating today will even pass because there is such disarray on the Republican side. It is a pathetic way for this Congress to be run.

Mr. Speaker, I could be here all day talking about the dysfunction on the other side, but I rise today to applaud two public servants who I think have made this institution a better place.

First is our senior professional staff member and director of Member services, Eric Delaney, who will have his last day with us this Friday.

Eric is a Philly native and alum of Binghamton University, New York. He has spent over 18 years working for the American people here on Capitol Hill.

Like many staffers, Eric's journey began when he became a legislative assistant working for Representative Ted Strickland and the people of Ohio. He spent 8 years as a senior adviser for Member services under Xavier Becerra, the Caucus vice chair and then chair. He then served as legislative director for Representative ANTHONY BROWN before joining the Rules Committee in 2018.

Eric has an impressive resume, but let me also say he is also just a great guy and an integral part of our team. His dedication to public service, skill as a coalition builder, fast problem-solving, and quiet leadership have left a mark on all of us, and we will miss him at the Rules Committee.

We are sad to see him go but excited to see what he will accomplish in his new role at the Department of Energy. On behalf of all of us, I thank him for his hard work and unwavering commitment to this institution.

□ 1245

Mr. Speaker, I also want to congratulate my dear friend, TOM COLE, who has officially been selected by the Republican Conference as the next chair of the Appropriations Committee.

It is no surprise to me given his skill as a legislator, his dedication as a public servant, and his decency as a person. I cannot think of any other person I would rather have chairing the Rules

Committee except me, but that is going to take change in the majority, and that is up to the American people, not us.

TOM has consistently demonstrated a tremendous respect for this institution, and he has always conducted himself in a way that demonstrates it, and it is not just in public when the cameras are rolling, but he does it in private, too. He is a man of integrity, a man of his word, and he works hard to do the right thing even after the gavel comes down and the cameras shut off.

To be honest, I wish there were more TOM COLES in Congress because he knows the secret of legislating, which is you don't have to agree on everything to agree on something.

The American people send us up here to work out our differences on their behalf, to do what is right for our country. It is a skill I have seen TOM COLE deploy time and time again to bring people together to try to find common ground.

Although Chairman COLE and I don't always see eye to eye, I think what we have done is show the American people that it is possible to disagree without being disagreeable. I think that is worthwhile. I think it matters, especially in this time of polarization and partisan anger.

On a more personal note—and I said this last night in the Rules Committee, and I hope I don't get in trouble for this—I value TOM COLE's friendship and respect his guidance and the example he sets around here. He conducts himself in a thoughtful, decent, and dignified manner.

I am thankful for the staff that he has surrounded himself with. I think they reflect positively on him, and they are a credit to this institution. I hope he doesn't take them all away from the Rules Committee when he goes to Appropriations.

I look forward to continuing to work with him in his new capacity, and I think all of us can learn a lot from Chairman COLE, and we should all join in a bipartisan way in honoring his service to this institution and to this country.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for his words. I think they are very inspiring as to the wonderful leadership that we have had with Chairman COLE, and also, we are going to miss Eric.

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

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his kind words for our colleague, Mr. COLE. Those of us on the committee will miss working with the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE). Obviously, as the gentleman from Massachusetts pointed out, he is not going very far. He will be down the hall in the Appropriations Committee. I guess we won't get ahead of things. It has not been formalized yet, but it seems like that is the direction it is going. It has been an

honor to work on the Committee with TOM COLE.

Again, without getting ahead of things, I think there are able folks on the Rules Committee, and Dr. BURGESS from Texas very likely might move into that role, and I will look forward to working with him in the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. HAGEMAN).

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in favor of this resolution, which sets up the House of Representatives to consider much-needed reform and limitations to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act.

With the pending expiration of 702 of FISA, Congress is tasked with reforming an authority intended for foreign intelligence collection, but which has turned into warrantless surveillance of the American people.

The targeting of Americans is well documented. Reporting from the Office of the Director for National Intelligence found that in 2021 the FBI conducted over 3,394,000 U.S. person searches without a warrant. In 2022, the FBI was still conducting hundreds of warrantless searches each day.

These queries target Members of Congress, State elected officials, judges, campaign donors, protestors, and more.

In May of this last year, The Washington Post reported that in 2020 and early 2021, the FBI conducted over 278,000 searches of the 702 database that violated Justice Department rules and often lacked national security connections.

Even the FISA court found that “. . . the FBI's querying of section 702 information have proven to be persistent and widespread.”

Warrantless surveillance of the American people by the Federal Government in violation of the Fourth Amendment is well documented and well known.

If such an alarming reality does not merit serious reform and paring back of authorities, then my question is: What does?

As a member of the Judiciary Committee, I was proud to be involved in the development of the Protect Liberty and End Warrantless Surveillance Act through which we first advanced these important reforms.

The FISA working group was the next installment of this important process, and the Reforming Intelligence and Securing America Act is a good start, but there is more work which must be done.

The underlying rule makes in order three critically important amendments—one prohibiting warrantless searches of Americans in the 702 database, one ending the overly intrusive abouts collection, and one enhancing reporting requirements and injecting Congress into the FISA court process.

These amendments are crucial to placing limitations and imposing transparency.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule and support these three amendments.

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

I appreciate that the rule makes in order several amendments for the Reforming Intelligence and Securing America Act. These are amendments that we heard about that both the members of the Judiciary and Intelligence Committees have proposed, but we also heard last night in the Rules Committee that there are many important amendments the Committee blocked and that the full House won't get to consider.

The process on this could indeed have been better.

What I wonder now is do we even have the votes to pass this rule? We need to be able to get to a point where we are taking up on the floor of the House rules that are going to get the votes.

As we know, they have already defeated six of their own rules. These are important matters, and I think it is important that we get to do the work.

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. D'ESPOSITO). The gentlewoman has 13¼ minutes remaining.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I would point out that on this issue one of the concerns that we have is ensuring an adequate and fair hearing on the issue of the warrant amendment.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE) raised the issue as did the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. HAGEMAN), the importance of warrant protections for American citizens.

It cannot be overstated the extent to which, at our founding and throughout our history, it has been critical to place that constitutional barrier between the authority of government being used in the name of defense and in the name of security in a way that tramples on the rights and the security of the American people.

That is what is at issue.

That is the conundrum we face.

For all of us that wish to protect our country, we know first and foremost we must protect our civil liberties or there is no country to protect.

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

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Let me tell you what bothers me.

So we know that there is a severe problem with the apparatus of the Federal police state abusing FISA, both section 702 and title I, to use those authorities to surveil and search Americans' private data.

I want nothing more than to put every Member of this body on the record. Do you support the warrant

protections granted under the Fourth Amendment to your constituency? I want everyone on the record on that.

In order to get there, we put at risk this bigger, broader problem because the other amendments made in order will expand that authority before we know we can even curb the authority.

So you are creating another bucket for which you are exposing American citizens—innocent American citizens, 19,000 donors to a political campaign. Don't tell me that all those 19,000 people were in contact with Hamas. They weren't.

The system was abused. That is why we need the warrant requirement. That is why we need the Fourth Amendment is Not for Sale Act, but we are not even going to be able to consider that.

What I am telling you is we have a conundrum, as my friend from Texas has said, of the Speaker saying we are going to brief you on what NSA, CIA, FBI says, but we are not going to bring in anybody to counter what they say. And we are going to do it in a SCIF so you can't tell the American people.

Well, what I want is: I want accountability. I want accountability to myself and everybody else in this body. That is why I am leaning towards voting for this.

On the other hand, the real question is: Are we going to go ahead and expand the authorities of the Federal police state just because we want a vote?

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, as we can see, there is strong consideration on some of the issues with regard to FISA, but we have also seen that we are so close to its expiration, and I really wonder whether the rule will pass.

I haven't heard them talk about whether they think this rule will pass. As I noted, six rules have been killed on the Republican side. There was also a tweet that was recently issued by the presumptive Presidential nominee in all caps. It says—and I am quoting this; I am not making any observations. It says in all caps—and I can't yell that loud—but it says: "Kill FISA, it was illegally used against me, and many others. They spied on my campaign."

I wonder whether this House will continue to move forward on the business that must be done or whether tweets will indeed lead to what action we are taking here today. Hopefully, we will take action that leads us to move forward.

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

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 15½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me time.

I am here to remind myself and everybody that we each took an oath to

uphold and defend the Constitution, and within the Constitution and the Bill of Rights is the Fourth Amendment.

I will read a portion of that for all of you: "The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures shall not be violated. . . ."

It doesn't say: Well, if we have got an important matter, we can violate it; if it is too difficult, if it takes too long, Mr. Speaker, we can violate it. It doesn't say that. It says it "shall not be violated."

Now, we are here to debate the rule today on this, and I will tell you I have concerns about the rule because we worked to make sure that amendments would be in order so that we could vote for them on the floor.

I have concerns about the rule. Assuming this rule passes and this bill comes to the floor, Mr. Speaker, the FBI and the intelligence agencies—just the last time there was a report out—spied on Americans illegally 278,000 times. It sure is long past time that we do something about it. It is sure long past time.

I will tell you, the fact that they are quibbling and fighting about having a warrant requirement, that they are fighting over protecting the data that they are purchasing, not just on me, Mr. Speaker, not just on you, the people in the gallery, the people that are watching on TV. Every single American, these intelligence agencies, without a warrant, are collecting your information for which they each took an oath to uphold and defend the Constitution which says they can't do it.

Mr. Speaker, this reauthorization is not reformed. It is not currently reformed. It might be reformed depending upon the amendments available, but we already know that the one that protects your data from being bought by the FBI is not going to be allowed.

Somebody has to stand up for the Constitution and the rights of the American people, and if I can't do anything else here in this House of Representatives, you can count on me for standing up for that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members that the rules do not allow references to persons in the gallery.

□ 1300

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I, too, like many more, take sacred the oath that we have taken to preserve the Constitution. I hope that as elections come up and as we think about how we make sure that we preserve our democracy, that those words continue to ring throughout all of my colleagues' memories of what has happened on the floor of this House.

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

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. SPARTZ).

Mrs. SPARTZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to assure you I have significant concerns about why it does not address some material potential violations of Fourth Amendment rights of Americans. It really has to do a lot with upstream collection, and I will explain what it is.

Upstream collection is where the government and the State can go in the backbone and collect data about all Americans, whatever they want, and then they have to go through minimization procedures. Supposedly, this minimization procedure is supposed to limit the data that they incidentally collect about Americans.

Well, the challenge is no one ever audits and checks what they are doing.

Mr. Speaker, if you remember what happened in 2016, where pretty much these minimization procedures didn't allow to collect about information. It means that if you have the name of some potential terrorist in the body of your email, they can collect your data but NSA still did it. They collected the data.

Mr. Speaker, what happened? We don't know what happened; but we also know in 2022 that a new technique was authorized where, according to the review of the oversight board, if used in a widespread way and not minimized, it can be extraordinarily intrusive.

This is a very new sensitive technique, but no one ever checked this. We know these agencies, how they felt so many times collecting data on Americans. We are turning into a police state. This is a material flaw with this bill, and I want to raise significant concerns that it has to be addressed or we are just putting lipstick on a pig.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER).

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I am standing here in favor of this rule. This is an important rule that allows to come to this House floor the reauthorization of FISA and 56 significant reforms to this bill to curb what have been just devastating abuses by the intelligence community and by the FBI.

These reforms are essential to make certain that we can protect our most important national security tool, at the same time protecting American citizens and their civil liberties.

I am in favor of this rule. I ask all my fellow Members to support the rule, and I specifically thank CHIP ROY for his support for the rule as it came out of the Rules Committee. I appreciate him standing here today as we try to bring this rule to passage.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I would point out that the concerns that we are looking at here, I think boil down to questions that people assert when they say, "lawfully collected information."

Therefore, you don't need a warrant to search the 702 data for United States citizens' information.

I think that is really at the crux of the debate going on. The rule that we have before us, which takes a product to respond to and make reforms and changes in response to some of the concerns raised, but then takes the critical and core component of warrant requirement and puts it off as an amendment subject to debate when there has been now some public pressure put on opposing the amendment.

That is the conundrum that you are seeing unfold, for the American people to understand why there is some hesitation here to proceed, when we are proceeding with reforms that don't get to the engine of the reform, reforms that might make some improvements but those improvements are in the periphery. They ignore the core problem, that fundamental issue as to whether or not you must have a warrant to look at the information of American citizens. That is it. That is at the core of it.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking about things that are significant. Just the tip of the iceberg: Searches by the intel community and the FBI included 141 Black Lives Matter protesters; two Members of Congress; journalists; political commentators; victims who contacted the FBI, people who came to the FBI offices to perform repairs; individuals on online dating services.

Now we have in this bill a carve-out for Members of Congress. We get a heads-up: Hey guys, you have been queried.

Why do we get something that 330 million Americans don't get?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN), my good friend.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I support the rule, but like the gentleman, I will not support the legislation unless we get this warrant amendment requirement in the legislation itself.

Query is a fancy name for search, and the intelligence community will tell us right now there are 200,000 queries, 200,000 searches that take place every year on U.S. persons, on American citizens—200,000 a year. Those things are done on American citizens without a warrant, and this is the FBI that my friend and member of the Committee on Rules just talked about, who has abused the system.

Mr. Speaker, 278,000 times. It is not Mr. ROY, not Mr. JORDAN, that is giving you that number. That is the number from The Washington Post, 278,000 times.

The Inspector General at the Justice Department determined that FBI did not follow the previous rules when they searched this database on U.S. persons. Now, we are supposed to believe, Oh, we have new rules, stricter rules, better rules—and I am all for those—now they are going to follow the new rules. They didn't follow the old ones but now they are going to follow the new.

Why don't we go to the tried-and-true method. If you have the executive branch wanting to look at American citizens' information, they have to go to a separate and equal branch of the government, the judicial branch, and get a probable cause warrant.

It has worked pretty darn well for 200-plus years in the greatest country ever, but somehow, we can't do it here?

Our warrant requirement has three exceptions and the first exception is if it is an emergency situation you don't have to go to a judge and get a warrant. You do the search, you find out, and you protect America.

There are two other exceptions in there, as well.

Here is the fundamental question: If there are 200,000 searches done on U.S. persons a year, how many of them aren't covered by the exceptions?

Guess what? Nobody seems to be able to give us an answer. That is the question we need to know because if it is a big number, we should all be scared. If it is a small number, what is the big deal?

No one will answer that question. That is what we need to know.

Mr. Speaker, the best way to safeguard the liberty of the people we get the privilege of representing is to do what has been done in this country forever: Go get a warrant.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is really important that the American people know that we are debating a rule today, and that rule has the FISA bill, which we have heard much, but it also has other bills.

Mr. Speaker, half the bills, half the legislation that are on the floor today do nothing. They do absolutely nothing. In fact, it is not surprising that Republicans, my colleagues, worry about the do-nothing Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I request ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an article from NBC NEWS titled: "It is embarrassing": Republicans worry they have no achievements to run on in 2024."

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

There was no objection.

[From NBC News]

'IT'S EMBARRASSING': REPUBLICANS WORRY THEY HAVE NO ACHIEVEMENTS TO RUN ON IN 2024

(By Sahil Kapur)

"They can't pass an agenda" Democrats intend to highlight the majority's thin record this fall.

"I think people are paying attention to that," Rep. Pete Aguilar, D-Calif., the chair of the House Democratic Caucus, said in an interview. "This is clearly a Republican conference where the only thing that brings them together are impeachments and censures. That's what they're about because they can't pass an agenda. They can't do anything substantively to help the American people. And so we plan on making that an issue throughout the year."

Rep. Mario Diaz-Balart, R-Fla., a senior appropriator, said there's still time for Re-

publicans to bag some victories. "If we can do the tax bill, and if we can do the appropriation bills . . . if we can do something to actually strengthen the border . . . then I think that would be a highly, highly, highly successful Congress," he said.

Rep. Brian Fitzpatrick, R-Pa., who represents one of 17 GOP districts that Biden won in 2020, praised the tax bill and said he wants to fund Ukraine and Israel, help Taiwan and secure the border.

"I hope there's enough adults in the room that are willing to focus on progress rather than purity," Fitzpatrick said.

GOP senators concur. "It would be really nice if they could hang their hat on some accomplishment," said Sen. Kevin Cramer, R-N.D., who previously served three terms in the House.

Cramer said the record of accomplishments since Republicans took the House majority has so far been "damn thin." He warned that if conservatives scuttle an immigration deal, it could hurt swing-district GOP members who would benefit from achievements as they fight for political survival in competitive districts.

"It would be ironic if the thing that prevented them from being able to hang their hat on a good immigration or border security policy would be the election because it could be the only thing that might save some of them," Cramer said. "The whole 'burden of governing' thing that I was hopeful would weigh heavily enough on them to get serious hasn't worked so far."

"We keep doing the same stupid stuff"

House Rules Committee Chair Tom Cole, R-Okla., said divided government always complicates lawmaking but argued that since the GOP took the House, "the big accomplishments here are what we stopped, not what we got done."

"Certainly so far we've avoided shutting down the government; that's no small achievement," he said. "I actually think that House races are going to be shaped more by the presidential race than they are by anything that happens here. The country is very evenly divided. I don't think very many people are going to vote for one guy for president and a person of a different party for their local congressman or congresswoman."

That's not good enough for some Republicans.

The frustration over the lack of achievements boiled over for Rep. Chip Roy, R-Texas, around Thanksgiving when he went to the floor to deliver a fiery speech that gained national attention.

"I want my Republican colleagues to give me one thing—one!—that I can go campaign on and say we did. One!" Roy yelled. "Anybody sitting in the complex, you want to come down to the floor and come explain to me one material, meaningful, significant thing the Republican majority has done besides, 'Well, I guess it's not as bad as the Democrats.'"

Rep. Richard Hudson, R-N.C., the GOP campaign chief, said members conveyed their dissatisfaction to Roy about his comments that the party doesn't deserve the majority.

"I don't think it's helpful," Hudson said. "I bet some Democrats will take his words and make some ads out of them."

But he added that he doesn't think Roy's outburst will impact any races by fall. He said Republicans "have legislative accomplishments coming out of the House," citing conservative measures to bolster fossil fuel energy production and a "parents' bill of rights," even though they've gone nowhere in the Democratic-led Senate.

"I think we've got a record to run on," Hudson said.

Roy told NBC News he stands by his critique “because nothing’s been delivered yet—no final product.” And the message from his colleagues didn’t seem to impress him. On Thursday, as Congress passed a third stopgap funding bill in five months, Roy went back to the floor to question the value of the Republican majority.

“By the way, it does not matter who’s sitting in the speaker’s seat or who’s got the majority,” he said before the C-SPAN cameras on the House floor. “We keep doing the same stupid stuff.”

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I would say that some of the quotes—and I am saying quotes—say: “I hope there is enough adults in the room that are willing to focus on progress rather than purity.”

Mr. Speaker, that means when you don’t have bipartisan legislation to work on some of the issues my constituents have talked about, the resolutions that nobody on the other side wants to talk about, because they do nothing.

I would also point to another quote: “I want my Republican colleagues to give me one thing—one—that I can go campaign on and say we did. One.” Roy yelled. “Anybody sitting in the complex, if you want to come down to the floor and come explain to me one material, meaningful, significant thing the Republican majority has done besides: Well, I guess it is not as bad as Democrats.”

I think that is a really important thing that Americans need to know.

Mr. Speaker, when we were in charge of this House, we looked on making sure that we brought down the cost of prescription drugs. We made sure that we addressed the needs of the American people.

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

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 6¾ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from New Mexico has 9¾ minutes.

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, which I hope we will, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 12, a bill that would protect access to reproductive and abortion healthcare for the millions of Americans who need it.

Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker, the far-right and MAGA Republicans will stop at nothing short of a full abortion ban. As of this month, over a dozen States have restricted access to that critical healthcare with some extreme States eliminating access entirely.

Just yesterday, an Arizona Supreme Court upheld a 160-year-old law, making it a felony to perform or induce an abortion at almost any time. This is inhumane.

Mr. Speaker, do you think Republicans will stop at 15 States, 20 States? On the contrary, they won’t stop until every single woman in this country is

deprived of her right to make her own healthcare decisions in conversation with her faith, her family, and her doctors without government interference.

Mr. Speaker, that is why House Democrats are fighting to protect women, protect doctors, and protect patients who simply want access to needed care.

H.R. 12, the Women’s Health Protection Act, will prevent States from trampling on Americans’ constitutional rights and keep fundamental healthcare services available across the country.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, to discuss our proposal, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. SCHRIER).

Ms. SCHRIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague, Representative LEGER FERNANDEZ, for her commitment to ensuring women’s access to abortion care, no matter where they are in this country. This is because extreme Republicans are doubling down on their out-of-touch—and I will repeat—extreme attacks on women as they march toward a national abortion ban.

Make no mistake. By overturning *Roe v. Wade*, the Supreme Court deprived millions of women the freedom to make one of the most personal and important decisions of their lives.

As a physician, in fact, a pediatrician, I understand that reproductive healthcare, including abortion, is part of women’s healthcare.

There is simply no place for politics in the exam room. This is a personal decision between a woman and her doctor. It is not a government decision, and government should not be meddling in healthcare. This is a slippery slope, as we are already seeing.

When there is a claim by my colleagues, by my Republican colleagues, that life begins at conception, the moment a sperm touches an egg, boy, that is a slippery slope.

We have already seen what that has done to IVF care. Parents who desperately want children are unable to have families now in Alabama because of this ruling. This is interfering with even more aspects of women’s healthcare.

Next is contraception. Again, make no mistake. As one of two pro-choice woman doctors in Congress, you can count on me to do everything I can to protect women’s access to safe abortion.

Mr. Speaker, this is why the Women’s Healthcare Protection Act, which will keep government out of this most personal and important medical decision, is so critical to pass.

□ 1315

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time for closing.

I want to give everyone at home a behind-the-scenes look at what we just did here today. Republicans needed filler this week because they have no real agenda to work on. Of the four bills, three of them are do-nothing bills that attack the President, a customs bill that has broad support and didn’t need a rule, and a FISA reauthorization which we don’t even know will pass.

I think Americans want to know what we are not doing here. They want to know that we are not taking up the important legislation that Americans are worried about, like security assistance for Ukraine, which the Senate voted overwhelmingly to pass. The crucial aid to Ukraine would be critical to fight for democracy, but we are not even taking it up.

We are not taking up the need to pass a farm bill. Everywhere I go in my district, my rural area, I am asked: What is happening with the farm bill?

We are not taking it up. We are not taking up legislation to protect a woman’s access to healthcare, so that if she has a miscarriage she is welcomed with assistance from her doctors and not handcuffs.

We have pointed out that the last bill to pass the Rules Committee and become law was almost a year ago, because Republicans in this Congress have been trying but failing over and over to govern. Democrats, in contrast, are willing to work across the aisle on bipartisan issues, to attack the important issues our constituents know we need to get done. We cannot continue to have the kind of infighting that stops legislative action for us to get the work done we need to get done.

Mr. Speaker, because of all the important issues that were raised and we need to take up, for women and people who love the women, who want to make sure they have the healthcare they deserve, vote “no” on the previous question. Let’s take up the Women’s Health Protection Act. Let’s move on things that in every State, election after election, we know we need to get done.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the previous question and the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to summarize what we have in front of us, particularly with respect to the foreign intelligence surveillance issue. That is where we have, I think, the most debate.

The fact of the matter is, for the average American watching this, they are going to be confused as to what exactly we are doing because it is a complex issue.

I started this rule debate by quoting James Madison, who in 1798, I will repeat, wrote to Thomas Jefferson and said: “Perhaps it is a universal truth

that the loss of liberty at home is to be charged to provisions against danger real or pretended from abroad.”

I think that is the question that is before us right now. It is the balance that a nation struggles with, if you are a republic like ours, a republic built on the back of liberty and our constitutional protections, that is trying to balance the need to stop evil abroad from attacking our people with protecting civil liberties at home.

What we have, for the average American to understand, is a big pot of collected information that is, in the words of the intel community, directed outward. That large pot of information is directed toward some 230,000 people, individuals and entities abroad. As I said earlier, we don't know who they are. We are not briefed on who they are. When we try to go into that kind of level of briefing, it is often cloaked in the intel world. They just say this is dangerous and important stuff. The Judiciary Committee chairman, for example, doesn't know who is on that list of 230,000 people.

From that list of 230,000, who we don't know, and which can expand or shrink at the whim of the intel community, we then take that information and communications with any of those individuals, if you are an American citizen, you can get swept up and viewed by the intel community. That is where the abuses took place.

I have heard some of my colleagues saying: You are asking for a secondary warrant when we say that the warrant amendment here is critically important. That misses the point that you have got an intelligence-driven apparatus to collect information abroad that then will sweep in communications by Americans citizens, or U.S. persons, into that database. Those communications can now be seen and can be viewed.

As I noted, the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board report released last year said: “Ordinary Americans may be in contact with section 702 targets for business or personal reasons even if the Americans have no connection to, or reason to suspect, any wrongdoing by their foreign contacts.”

That is the problem. That is why the Judiciary Committee, which is the committee with primary jurisdiction, put in place additional protections in the form of a required warrant if you are going to look at the information of those American citizens. That was the wisdom of the very broad, bipartisan 35-2 vote in the Judiciary Committee. That was removed.

The bill now put on the floor, the bill before us, now we are forced to proceed to a bill by virtue of a rule whereby we are not sure whether the issue at play, the warrant requirement, will be supported.

Now, that might be fine. You say we have an open process, but it wasn't really an open process. It was a structured rule. There were provisions that

were sort of cooked up to achieve the result. That is what we are looking at.

In truth, there are amendments that have been part of the rule that are intel amendments which will expand FISA, which will expand the reach, and by all accounts, more likely than not, will pass.

Then there are the provisions that some support that would constrain the power, for example, the warrant requirement or the “abouts” language which would limit the use of the more generic “abouts,” so you have to target the specific individuals. Then there is the enhanced reporting, which happens to be my amendment. Those provisions are meant to constrain government.

The conundrum that you see, that you are going to see play out on the floor is: Do you support the rule to proceed, to move forward, under the hope that the warrant amendment will be passed? Because the sword of Damocles that is hanging over our heads is that this will expire and thus there will be pressure to pass a simple reauthorization for 5 years. That is the truth.

We will see what transpires. It is my considered judgment that we ought to try, as a body, to stand behind a warrant requirement to make sure we protect the American people.

The material previously referred to by Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ is as follows:
AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1125 OFFERED BY
MS. LEGER FERNANDEZ OF NEW MEXICO

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 5. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 12) to protect a person's ability to determine whether to continue or end a pregnancy, and to protect a health care provider's ability to provide abortion services. 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 Energy and Commerce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 6. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 12.

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

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

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. 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 for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1330

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. D'ESPOSITO) at 1 o'clock and 30 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:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 1125;

Adoption of House Resolution 1125, if ordered; and

Motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 3250.

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.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7888, REFORMING INTELLIGENCE AND SECURING AMERICA ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 529, EXTENDING LIMITS OF U.S. CUSTOMS WATERS ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 1112, DENOUNCING THE BIDEN ADMINISTRATION'S IMMIGRATION POLICIES; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 1117, OPPOSING EFFORTS TO PLACE ONE-SIDED PRESSURE ON ISRAEL WITH RESPECT TO GAZA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 1125) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7888) to reform the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 529) to extend the customs waters of the United States from 12 nautical miles to 24 nautical miles from the baselines of the United States, consistent with Presidential Proclamation 7219; providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 1112) denouncing the Biden administration's immigration policies; and providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 1117) opposing efforts to place one-sided pressure on Israel with respect to Gaza, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 210, nays 209, not voting 12, as follows: