

spend working across the aisle together to having successful pieces of legislation that actually get things done.

We both knew, the Senate knew, with Senator MORAN and Senator TESTER, that this piece of legislation that we are working on today needed to be moved by the last of this month or these services would fail. Rightfully so, in a bipartisan manner, we have and we will move this tonight, and it will move on to the President so those vital services are not removed or even say a flaw in them where a problem could happen. Remember, all I said about the words and the dots and the commas: They aren't just words; they affect people's lives. That is why we have got to get it right, and we are going to work to get it right.

Madam Speaker, I am ready to close, but I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I am pleased that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST), my friend and colleague, would like to feed cabbage to his hogs, but I want to feed America's veterans, America's military families, and America's servicemembers.

I ask all of my colleagues to join me in not only passing S. 2795, but we also need to fund the government, and we need to make sure that our military families, our veterans, and our servicemembers have enough to eat.

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

Mr. BOST. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for the spirited debate. Once again, that is the rhetoric I was talking about, to think that people on this side of the aisle don't want to take care of our veterans and feed our veterans, don't want to make sure that SNAP programs are passed and that those people in need are taken care of, that is the rhetoric we have got to stop.

In this particular bill, this bill actually does provide and make sure that we can carry on these three areas of service in the VA that are vitally important. We want to make sure that our colleagues on both sides of the aisle support this legislation. I will encourage mine. I just heard the ranking member support and encourage his Members to support this legislation as well.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 2795.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4365, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2024; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4367, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2024; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4665, DEPARTMENT OF STATE, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2024; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4368, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2024

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 723 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 723

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. 4365) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, 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 shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations 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.

SEC. 2. (a) No amendment to H.R. 4365 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 13 of this resolution.

(b) Each 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 13 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 amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules or against amendments en bloc described in section 6 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or her designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in part B 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 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment except as provided by section 13 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. 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. 4367) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, 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 shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations 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.

SEC. 5. (a) No amendment to H.R. 4367 shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, amendments en bloc described in section 6 of this resolution, and pro forma amendments described in section 13 of this resolution.

(b) Each amendment printed in part B 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 13 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 amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules or against amendments en bloc described in section 6 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 6. It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or her designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in part B 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 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment except as provided by section 13 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. 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 bill (H.R. 4665) making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, 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 shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendment printed in part C of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered

as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived.

SEC. 8. (a) No further amendment to H.R. 4665, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part D of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, amendments en bloc described in section 9 of this resolution, and pro forma amendments described in section 13 of this resolution.

(b) Each further amendment printed in part D 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 13 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 D of the report of the Committee on Rules or against amendments en bloc described in section 9 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 9. It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or her designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in part D 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 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment except as provided by section 13 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. 10. 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. 4368) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, 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 shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendment printed in part E of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived.

SEC. 11. (a) No further amendment to H.R. 4368 shall be in order except those printed in part F of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, amendments en bloc described in section 12 of this resolution, and pro forma amendments described in section 13 of this resolution.

(b) Each further amendment printed in part F 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 13 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 amendments printed in part F of the report of the Committee on Rules or against amendments en bloc described in section 12 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 12. It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or her designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in part F 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 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment except as provided by section 13 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. 13. During consideration of each bill—H.R. 4365, H.R. 4367, H.R. 4665, and H.R. 4368—for amendment, the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees may offer up to 10 pro forma amendments each at any point for the purpose of debate.

SEC. 14. At the conclusion of consideration of each bill—H.R. 4365, H.R. 4367, H.R. 4665, and H.R. 4368—for amendment the Committee shall rise and report such bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on such bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SEC. 15. The Clerk shall not transmit to the Senate a message that the House has passed H.R. 4367 until notified by the Speaker that H.R. 2, as passed by the House on May 11, 2023, has been enacted into law.

□ 1745

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, pursuant to section 426 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I make a point of order against consideration of the rule, House Resolution 723.

Section 426 of the Budget Act specifically states that the Rules Committee may not waive the point of order prescribed by section 425 of that same act.

The first section of House Resolution 723 states that all points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. Therefore, I make a point of order pursuant to section 426 that this rule may not be considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts makes a point of order that the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The gentleman has met the threshold burden under the rule and the gentleman from Massachusetts and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes of debate on the question of consideration. Following debate, the Chair will put the question of consideration as the statutory means of disposing of the point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

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

Madam Speaker, decades ago, Republicans came up with a rule that basically says that we cannot impose mandates on States and local governments that will cost them significant amounts of money. That rule is routinely waived, including in this rule.

Do you know what will cost States and local governments significant amounts of money? A government shutdown.

The Congressional Budget Office, CBO, estimated that the 5-week partial government shutdown in 2018–2019 reduced economic output by \$11 billion in the following two quarters, including \$3 billion that the U.S. economy never regained. Moody's Analytics estimated that the 2013 full government shutdown reduced GDP growth by \$20 billion. At the same time of the 2013 shutdown, consumer confidence fell, threatening the economic recovery following the Great Recession.

A shutdown this fall would jeopardize the improvements of consumer confidence as inflation has returned to more normal levels. A bipartisan congressional report found that the last three government shutdowns led to the equivalent of 56,940 years in lost productivity from Federal workers being furloughed. These lost work hours deprive the American people of important public services, delayed furloughed Federal employees from receiving backpay, and cost the government at least \$338 million in additional processing costs and late fees.

While Federal employees are guaranteed backpay during shutdowns, a prolonged shutdown could mean multiple missed paychecks and strained household budgets for these workers.

In 2013 and again in 2018, roughly 850,000 out of 2.1 million nonpostal Federal employees were furloughed. Additionally, at the beginning of the 2018–2019 partial shutdown, about 380,000 Federal employees were furloughed and another 420,000 reported to work but went unpaid.

Over 80 percent of Federal workers live and work outside of the D.C. area, meaning that local economies across the country would be harmed by Federal worker furloughs as families delay purchases or are forced to miss regular bill payments.

Let's consider more impacts of the Republican shutdown and how it will cost State and local governments. It would force servicemembers and law enforcement officers to work without pay. Under a Republican shutdown, all Active-Duty military personnel and many law enforcement officers would remain at work but receive no pay until appropriated funds are available.

It would endanger disaster response. A Republican shutdown would create an increased risk that FEMA's Disaster Relief Fund is depleted and would complicate new emergency response efforts

if additional catastrophic disasters occur. Funding for long-term recovery projects would also remain halted, worsening ongoing delays as FEMA awaits new appropriations.

It would undermine research on cancer and other diseases. A Republican shutdown would stall critical research on diseases like cancer and Alzheimer's disease because the National Institutes of Health would be forced to delay new clinical trials. New patients, many of whom are desperately waiting for a chance for a new treatment through a clinical trial, would be turned away.

It would eliminate Head Start slots for kids. Under a Republican shutdown, 10,000 children across the country would immediately lose access to Head Start as the Department of Health and Human Services wouldn't be able to award Head Start grants during a shutdown, with the impacts only growing worse over time.

It would risk significant delays for travelers. Air traffic controllers and TSA officers would have to work without pay, potentially leading to significant delays and longer wait times for travelers at airports across the country like there were during the previous shutdown.

It would undermine public health and environmental protections. Most EPA-led inspections at hazardous waste sites, as well as drinking water and chemical facilities, would stop. EPA would halt oversight and review of permits and plans to ensure safe water and clean air in communities. Additionally, efforts to address dangerous contaminants that are linked to severe health effects would be stopped. This would be a disaster.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1800

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the point of order in favor of consideration of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, the question before the House of Representatives is: Should the House now consider House Resolution 723, the rule that is before us, a rule that we are looking to advance this evening to advance four appropriations bills that, when combined with the appropriations bill we passed in July, would fund 73 percent of government.

Meanwhile, the United States Senate has passed no appropriations bills, and in fact, sent a continuing resolution to the floor just now, just this evening, having not done its job to pass appropriations bills.

The fact of the matter is the waiver we are talking about here in the rules is a prophylactic waiver that my colleagues used all the time when they were in the majority. They know full well that is what they are doing. This is dilatory. This is purposeful. I would

do it too if I didn't have all my folks back for the vote. That is what I would do. That is the reality of what we are talking about here.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle are talking about unfunded mandates. Let's talk about unfunded mandates.

Let's talk about all of the subsidies that are going out for electric vehicles to subsidize the elite in this country that make over \$200,000 and \$250,000 a year.

Let's talk about the subsidies, 90 percent of the corporate subsidies going to billion-dollar corporations.

Let's talk about the mandates in the form of vaccine mandates, mask mandates, and all of the mandates during COVID that shut down the largest economy that this world has ever known.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle complain about a shutdown. Yet, they are the masters of shutdown. They shut down and brought to a halt the great American economy resulting in exactly what you are experiencing right now: what the American people are feeling in terms of inflation, in terms of inability to afford homes, inability to afford gasoline, inability to afford power. Those are the mandates that the American people are concerned about. Those are the unfunded mandates that are killing their way of life right now at home.

That is the simple fact.

My colleagues are talking about the government and what it might cost if there is a government shutdown Saturday. Let's be very clear. If there is a shutdown on Saturday, it is because President Biden, CHUCK SCHUMER, and my Democratic colleagues would prefer to shut down the government of the United States than shut down the border of the United States and protect the American people.

That is the simple truth. That is how there would be a resulting shutdown on Saturday.

They lament what might be the impact on government, and that is because they have a government, the American people have a government that is on autopilot. We have a government that is so big and is funded with mandatory spending and is on autopilot such that you cannot constrain it.

The American people are asking why. The American people are asking what can you do about it.

I will give you the answer: My Democratic colleagues want more of the same. That is why our Democratic leadership in the United States Senate has put forward a continuing resolution on the floor of the Senate just now, in the last hour, that will perpetuate the status quo, will continue to fund government exactly as it was funded last December at the obscene levels of that \$1.7 trillion omnibus spending bill.

They are going to send that bill over here to the House and say to the American people they want status quo, busi-

ness as usual, and they are going to pile on additional supplemental funding. That is their response to what the American people are feeling and seeing.

I, if I were my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, would also want to have a dilatory vote because I would not have actual solutions for the American people.

What we are trying to put forward here, again, are four appropriations bills that fund 73 percent of the government when combined with MILCON-VA, which we passed in July. That is what my colleagues on the other side of the aisle do not want to go ahead and move to. They want to put forward a dilatory point of order because they don't have answers for the American people.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, the gentleman said the Democrats shut down the economy during the pandemic. I should remind him that Donald John Trump was the President of the United States and the Republicans controlled the House.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding.

Madam Speaker, let me announce breaking news.

I don't want to see the government shut down.

Democrats don't want to see the government shut down.

The American people don't want to see the government shut down.

I am standing with the American people and cities and hamlets and villages and counties and States.

What has failed to be enunciated, I say to my friend on the other side, is that we had a deal. We should have been finished with this.

The Speaker of the House and the President of the United States already agreed in the spring on what the numbers would be, what we were going to do for the government to keep operating. It has already been done.

We are here now because of the upheaval of MAGA Republicans talking about undermining a deal that was made on behalf of the good people of this Nation. We are facing an uphill battle.

We just came out of the Budget Committee where they are fighting to eliminate \$400 million in Medicare cuts and \$2 trillion in cuts to mandatory health spending.

The reason why we are on the floor now is because we believe in the people back home. They can't afford another unfunded mandate. Cities are now carrying over their fund balances with Federal dollars that Democrats were able to give to keep them alive. If we have these unfunded mandates, childcare goes out the window; Active-Duty military have problems with getting paid, our veterans don't get their

services; Social Security payments may be up in the air; the burden of having to pay money for unfunded mandates; the hanger-on amendments that are being put into these bills are just tragic.

Law enforcement may be impacted negatively. Those who are in need of getting violent criminals off the street may be put in jeopardy. People who are working-class Americans going to community colleges are in jeopardy of getting their resources.

Madam Speaker, let me just say this: No more unfunded mandates. Let's do the deal that we have and save the American people.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule governing debate on these four appropriation bills before us today: H.R. 4365—Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2024; H.R. 4367—Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2024; H.R. 4665—Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2024; and H.R. 4368—Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2024.

I oppose the Rule and the underlying legislation as it pertains to H.R. 4365, for the following reasons:

The bill, which should be earnestly attempting to best support the Department of Defense, is being used by Republicans to sneak partisan and damaging policies under our noses.

The underlying bill does not reflect the input of nearly half the Members of this body and is strongly opposed by the ranking members who sit on the very committee this bill originated from.

In order to further promote a culture war, the members who oversaw this bill are going to put many Americans at risk.

First, they are targeting the many brave servicewomen currently employed by the Department of Defense by directly going against the Secretary of Defense's promises for them to have access to reproductive healthcare regardless of their station.

Women currently make up 1 in 5 members of our military.

Denying them their previously promised ability to check their reproductive health is not only dangerous, but also grossly irresponsible. The loss of these rights also increases the risk for low retention amongst female servicemembers who need these benefits this bill would strip away.

Second, the bill targets the LGBTQ+ community, who are increasingly victimized by Republican agendas around the country.

Regardless of your beliefs, it is important to treat everyone with respect and equality, which this bill does not do.

This bill would prohibit hormone therapy or surgical treatment for gender affirming care, directly affecting those who experience gender dysphoria. Individuals who feel they do not belong in their own body is a serious issue and has led to 1 in 5 transgender and nonbinary young people attempting suicide in the past year.

Our priority as the legislative body of this country is to protect the wellbeing of ALL citizens, regardless of personal beliefs and ideologies.

The language in this legislation would further embolden those who wish to commit harm and violence against a minority group already facing so much hardship, both socially and legally.

This is unacceptable.

The lives and wellbeing of those who live across the country should not be put at risk simply to push a regressive agenda that does not promote the diversity of our nation but rather seeks to suppress it.

This brings me to my third point, which is the underhanded way Republicans sought to eliminate "Critical Race Theory?" or "CRT".

Let me be clear: Republicans have a warped understanding of what this term means, and they are using it as a means to remove any diversity in education.

Critical Race Theory is a collegiate field of study that examines the complex ways in which race fits into the structures of our society; it is not an attack on white people for their history, just as it does not victimize Black people based on ours.

Based on an incorrect definition, Republican leaders at all levels of government have worked to eliminate all diverse viewpoints providing a complete framework of the history of this country, and instead wash over the negative to present a false narrative.

At the same time, legislation aimed at elementary schools against a Critical Race Theory—which again, is only offered at the collegiate level—deprives diverse students of hearing their voice reflected accurately in the history of this multicultural nation.

Another issue with this Defense Appropriations bill is the cut of \$714 million to adapt military equipment to be more climate friendly.

Climate change is a crisis that requires global attention and efforts.

The refusal to even allow for updating our military alternative source of energy is regressive and promoted under a false message.

It was not Biden who indicated that he wanted an "all electric" fleet of tanks as is commonly stated, but rather the United States Army.

This part of the bill stands directly in the way of innovation as well as keeping us from doing our part in the world to strive towards a net zero future.

In 2020 alone, the United States military was responsible for 51 million tons of carbon dioxide released into the atmosphere; more than most countries.

But now, when the U.S. Army decides for themselves that they want to scale back on their emissions, certain members in Congress want to limit their choice.

One bright spot of this bill—though it is short-lived—is the Jackson Lee Amendment to H.R. 4365 that was made in order by the committee.

The Jackson Lee amendment H.R. 4365 seeks to allocate \$10 million to fund triple negative breast cancer research.

This issue is extremely important, especially for the brave men and women in the military, who are up to 20 to 40 percent more likely to develop breast cancer.

I must offer my appreciation to both the military and the Biden administration for making research into breast cancer a priority, but there is still work to be done.

This amendment would allow for more research so we can one day hopefully learn a way to reduce the number of military personnel affected by breast cancer.

Several initiatives I have designed in the past have aided active-duty servicemen and women along with veterans, such as enforcing accurate reporting of maternity mortality rates among the Armed Forces, addressing physical and mental health concerns, and securing authorization for Triple Negative Breast Cancer as well as Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder.

I am very proud of the work that I and Congress has done to address the health concerns of active duty and veteran servicemen and women, but there are still improvements to be made.

The men and women who are on the front lines or have already completed their valiant service to this country have many pressing issues and challenges they already must face; breast cancer should not be one of them.

While this amendment is important, the negatives of this defense appropriations bill vastly outweigh the positives.

As with all the additional appropriation bills on the floor today, the Administration likewise strongly opposes the passage of this bill for a myriad of reasons—including the following:

Border Management Funding: It is disappointing this bill does not include funding for a new Southwest Border Contingency Fund. This fund would enable DHS to respond more effectively to changing conditions on the Southwest border and fulfill its critical and complementary missions of securing the border, performing efficient and effective screening and processing, and meeting the Nation's humanitarian obligations.

Shelter and Services Program: It also shameful that this bill seeks to eliminate the Shelter and Services Program, a priority grant program for DHS that provides temporary food, shelter, and other services to state and local entities and non-governmental organizations that provide support to migrants who are released from DHS custody. This grant program is a key mechanism for Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to relieve overcrowding in short-term holding facilities.

United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) Funding: This bill further fails to provide appropriations for USCIS application processing and grant programs. Without this funding, USCIS would be unable to improve its operations and the application processing backlog would continue to grow in FY 2024.

Targeting Violence and Terrorism Prevention (TVFP) Grants: It is absolutely abhorrent that this bill eliminates the TVTP grant program. TVTP provides funding to nonprofits and to State, local, tribal, and territorial governments to develop multidisciplinary targeted violence and terrorism prevention capabilities in local communities, to pilot innovative prevention approaches, and to identify prevention best practices that can be replicated in communities across the Nation.

Immigration Enforcement Prohibitions and Requirements: I also stand with the Administration in strongly opposing section 220 of the bill, which would prohibit U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) from using appropriated funds to carry out the Administration's immigration enforcement priorities, as well as the requirement in the bill for ICE to fill 41,500 detention beds and enroll all non-detained migrants in Alternatives to Detention. These requirements are unrealistic, pose implementation challenges, and would dilute the Department's focus on protecting America from security threats.

Restrictions on Alternatives to Detention (ATD): This bill wrongfully eliminates funding for the Young Adult Case Management Program, as well as for Operation Horizon, and grant funds for a case management pilot program. These restrictions would simultaneously strain limited resources and remove valuable flexibilities in managing low-risk populations.

Limiting Interior Transportation: Prohibiting the transport of noncitizens to interior locations risks overcrowding at border processing sites and other DHS facilities, threatening to exacerbate life and safety concerns of those in custody.

Restrictions on Access to Healthcare: Section 222 of the bill is also particularly harmful, which would make it more difficult to access lawful reproductive healthcare. I stand in strong opposition to this section, which targets LGBTQI+ individuals who are in ICE detention.

Prohibiting the Implementation of the Asylum Processing Rule: This bill further prohibits the use of funds to implement the Administration's Asylum Processing Rule—which serves as a key part of the Administration's efforts to streamline the immigration system, allowing USCIS Asylum Officers to hear and decide certain asylum claims in the first instance.

Prohibiting the Implementation of the Legal Pathways Rule: I further oppose the bill's prohibition on using funds to implement the Administration's Circumvention of Lawful Pathways Rule. The Rule encourages migrants to use lawful, safe, and orderly processes for entering the United States; imposes conditions on asylum eligibility for those who fail to do so or fail to seek protection in a country through which they transit; and supports the swift return of migrants who do not have valid protection claims. The bill would undermine DHS's continued ability to safely, effectively, and humanely enforce and administer U.S. immigration law.

Restricting the Use of the CBP One Application: I also strongly oppose the bill's restrictions on using the CBP One application. A key part of the Administration's efforts to foster fair and orderly conditions at the border, the CBP One application allows border officials to screen migrants seeking asylum along the Southwest border, and issue them a document to appear in court upon their arrival.

Border Wall: Lastly, I oppose the homeland security appropriation bill for its rescission and reappropriation of \$2.1 billion in border wall funding. Building a border wall is not a serious policy solution nor is it a responsible use of Federal funds.

While I am grateful the Rules Committee made my Jackson Lee Amendment No. 16/No. 43 in order, I strongly oppose this rule and the underlying bill.

I will, however, briefly recap why my amendment is important for this particular measure should we be able to move forward with a feasible appropriations bill that can accommodate this amendment.

The Jackson Lee Amendment increases funds by \$1,000,000 and decreases funding by \$1,000,000 for the Global Health Programs account to highlight and support the fight against the practice of Female Genital Mutilation.

I have been a dedicated champion against this practice for a long while, working closely with former Congressman Joe Crowley of New York to introduce legislation targeted at sup-

porting the elimination of this ludicrous practice of mutilating young women.

Female genital mutilation/cutting (FGM/C) comprises all procedures that involve partial or total removal of the external female genitalia, or other injury to the female genital organs for non-medical reasons.

This practice is rooted in gender inequality and is often linked to other elements of gender-based violence and discrimination, such as child marriage and recognized internationally as a violation of the human rights of women and girls.

Unfortunately, this means an estimated 200 million girls and women alive today have been victims of FGM/C, with girls 14 and younger representing 44 million of those who have been cut.

For example, consider that around the world, at least five girls are mutilated/cut every hour and more than 3 million girls are estimated to be at risk of FGM/C, annually.

The impacts of FGM/C on the physical health of women and girls can include bleeding, infection, obstetric fistula, complications during childbirth and death.

Other significant barriers to combatting the practice of FGM/C include the high concentration in specific regions associated with several cultural traditions, that is not tied to any one religion.

According to UNICEF, FGM/C is reported to occur in all parts of the world, but is most prevalent in parts of Africa, the Middle East, and Asia.

Due to the commonality of this practice many migrants to the U.S. bring the practice of FGM/C with them, increasing the importance of combatting FGM/C abroad.

Jackson Lee Amendment No. 16/No. 43 prioritizes funding for foreign assistance to combat Female Genital Mutilation/Cutting (FGM/C), an internationally recognized violation of the human rights of girls and women comes to an end.

Lastly, as it pertains to the bill to determine appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, the Food and Drug Administration, and related agencies for the 2024 fiscal year, I strongly oppose this rule and the underlying legislation.

While I am again grateful the Rules committee made in order my Jackson Lee Amendment, listed as No. 18 in the Harris (MD)—En Bloc, this bill seeks to return America's agriculture back to 2006 funding levels—with an allocation of \$17.1 billion, nearly \$8 billion below last year's enacted bill.

The Jackson Lee Amendment increases funding that provides grant research financial support for "1890s Land Grant Universities," which are 28 Historically Black Colleges and Universities. This amendment also proposes decreasing funding for the Office of the Chief Information Officer.

The Association of Public and Land-grant Universities' (APLU) Council of 1890s includes all Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) that are land-grant universities.

Under the Morrill Act of 1890, at least 19 universities have been designated with land-grant status. The Historically Black Colleges and Universities—Excellence in Research HBCU-EIR program was established in response to direction provided in the Senate Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee Report (Senate Report 115-139). That initiative was

built on prior and continuing efforts by the National Science Foundation (NSF) to strengthen research capacity at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs).

The Jackson Lee Amendment would provide sufficient funding and guidance to enable the NSF to be successful with the HBCU Excellence in Research program.

This amendment would further provide opportunities for both public and private HBCUs, particularly for those who have not been successful in competing with larger NSF Research & Related Activities.

Increasing Funding for the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) agency that provides grant research would help to stimulate sustainable improvement in research and development capacities of HBCUs.

By increasing funding for relevant agencies that provide appropriate financial support for these historically underserved institutions, we can ensure that federal funds are redirected toward more critical funding needs of the American people.

However, the proposed underlying bill as is would mean a pull back on investment, slashing the number of loans awarded to financially distressed farmers.

H.R. 4368 rescinds \$500 million from the Renewable Energy for America Program (REAP), which helps farmers facing high input costs.

Many provisions in this bill seek to limit access to viable programs and put many out of reach of energy efficient projects that help American farmers to lower their energy bills and live decent lives.

For everyday rural Americans, the implementation of this bill would have a substantially negative impact on their daily livelihood. These communities rely on crucial infrastructure, from water and wastewater systems to high-speed internet.

However, these infrastructure projects require huge upfront costs that smaller tax bases of rural communities cannot bear alone.

H.R. 4368 would cut federal grants to community facilities by a whopping 90 percent, obstructing the progress in bringing affordable health care to underserved and rural communities, and it will cut rural water and waste disposal loans by 30 percent and rural waste disposal grants by 36 percent.

All these senseless cuts to funding amount to 325 crucial projects for rural water and wastewater systems that simply will not have the funding to be implemented.

This bill also seeks to eliminate funding for the Distressed Communities program, which means hundreds of small local governments will not be able to renovate their systems to meet EPA standards for getting arsenic and lead out of their drinking water systems.

The cumulative and direct impact of these policies on the American people will be devastating. Thousands of American families could lose access to reliable sources of water, not knowing if they could turn on the spigot and get clean, safe water to drink or complete a myriad of other essential daily tasks.

H.R. 4368 further limits funding for Rural Electric Cooperatives that help close the gaps in our power grid across the country. Over 900 rural electric cooperatives serve 42 million people across 48 states—including 92 percent of persistent poverty counties—those who can least afford to build and maintain this crucial infrastructure. These Rural Electric Cooperatives play vital roles in ensuring that rural communities have access to affordable energy.

Additionally, H.R. 438 will contribute to food insecurity in our country. The bill calls for new work requirements for SNAP recipients, which exacerbates the cycle of poverty—particularly in rural communities.

We cannot deny the fact that SNAP recipients who are able to work, do work. However, even with a full-time job, many Americans, especially those in our rural communities, struggle to earn enough to escape poverty.

This is not an issue of pulling oneself up by the bootstraps, but of limited job opportunities, cut-back work hours, and other extenuating factors.

America cannot thrive if Americans are hungry, and this bill will take food out of the mouths of over 6 million Americans who will lose SNAP benefits due to the increased work requirements.

If this bill passes, it will rescind \$500 million dollars in WIC funding, underfunding the account for 2024 directly affecting nearly 5 million hungry women and children.

H.R. 4368 will reduce levels for WIC fruit and vegetable vouchers by \$1.2 billion—hurting both families and farmers.

As a result, 4.6 million of our people would lose out on produce and our farmers would lose an expected \$1.2 million dollars in revenue.

Not only that, the nearly 30 percent cut to single family direct housing loans—from \$1.25 billion in FY 2023 to \$900 million in FY 2024—will make it harder for rural Americans to afford to buy a house.

This means that over 2800 rural families will not be able to get financing to put a roof over their heads; our farmers, producers, and rural communities deserve a more reliable partner in our Congress.

While it is without question that the USDA has a long and storied history of discrimination, Congress, however, has always been a steadfast partner and cornerstone of this country's agricultural industry. This appropriations bill, H.R. 4368, however, seeks to undermine enduring efforts of this Congress to ensure equal opportunity and access for every American.

These appropriations should be a reliable means by which we help Americans from all walks of life; unfortunately, the Republican proposed bill before us today does not meet the moment.

Too much is at stake—from the food we eat, to the medicine and medical devices on which we rely, and the fiber and materials that help clothe and build our country, and our national security. Americans deserve better.

America cannot permit a child, a family, or a small business that has their potential to be limited, and opportunities curtailed simply because they are located in a Rural Free Delivery (RFD) zip code.

This appropriations bill presented to us today takes food out of the mouths of hungry people, creates barriers for women who need access to medication, raises energy costs for rural Americans, and makes it harder for small farmers and poultry producers to meet their basic needs.

We can do better. We are better than this. The American people deserve better.

I cannot support this bill as it stands, and I urge all my colleagues to vote against this cruel proposal.

For all these reasons, I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose the rule and the underlying legislation for all four appropriation bills.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, as I said, this is a dilatory tactic by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. I wouldn't want to speak about what is going on either.

I wouldn't want to speak about the story this afternoon of Hunter Biden receiving a \$250,000 wire originating in Beijing with the beneficiary address listed as Joe Biden's home. I wouldn't want to talk about that.

I wouldn't want to talk about what we have been learning in the Committee on the Judiciary. I wouldn't want to be learning about what is going on or talking about what we have heard from the whistleblowers or from Devon Archer. I wouldn't want to talk about that at all. I would want to sweep that aside.

I wouldn't want to talk about the Department of Justice that targeted Scott Smith and put him on the domestic terrorism list.

I wouldn't want to talk about a Department of Justice that targeted Mark Houck and have used the FACE Act to go after pro-life Americans.

I wouldn't want to talk about anything that this administration is doing. I would want to delay.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSON), my good friend.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for all of his hard work here.

I just heard one of our colleagues over here suggest that somehow Republicans are in favor of a government shutdown. No one desires a government shutdown.

What we desire and what we are working towards is changing how Washington works. That is the commitment that we made to the American people. That is why they gave us the majority.

How do we do that? We have to change the decades of reckless spending and corruption. We have to change the weaponization of the Federal agencies that are designed to protect and serve the American people instead of being used against them.

We have to change the opening of the borders that is destroying our communities contributing to the rising crime wave.

We have to change the way that the Biden administration is administering the economy.

We have to change the radical shift, the forced transition that they are trying to push us into, this radical green energy transition. It is nonsense.

The American people have had enough. They see the Democrat policies destroying our economy, destroying our security, destroying opportunity for their children and grandchildren.

We are taking a stand here. We are operating in good faith. We are negotiating together for the best outcome for the people, and we do not desire a shutdown.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's comments,

but I should remind him that the Republicans set an amendment deadline on appropriations bills after the shutdown deadline, so don't tell me you are interested somehow in avoiding a shutdown.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BOYLE), the ranking member on the Budget Committee, to speak more about that.

Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, the previous speaker just said that no Republican Member wants a shutdown. I have the quotes right here, which I will submit for the RECORD when I am done.

One House Republican said: "... let's shut it down."

Another Republican colleague said: "We should not fear a government shutdown . . . Most of the American people won't even miss it. . . ."

The leader of the Republican Party, the former President, said: "Unless you get everything, shut it down."

Make no mistake about it, we are here because certain Members on the other side of the aisle want a shutdown. They even said they want a shutdown.

Why should we be surprised about that?

Ever since I was in high school 30 years ago, we have had five government shutdowns; all five took place under House Republican leadership. When Democrats were in charge of the House, zero government shutdowns during that same time period.

Now, in terms of the one Republican Member who said that the American people won't miss it if there is a government shutdown, actually here is what would happen.

More than 7 million Americans would lose access to their benefits: women, infants, and children; 2½ million Active-Duty and Reserve personnel serving in our Nation's Armed Forces would go without the pay they deserve; 2.3 million Federal workers could be furloughed or forced to work without pay; millions of Americans who are going to our airports and going through TSA lines suddenly finding themselves with unending delay—by the way, 1.6 million Americans who fly through our airports every single day will be impacted; 660,000 college students who rely on Federal work study.

I was one of those students at one point who relied on that program, so make no mistake about it, there are real consequences to shutdowns.

My colleague from Massachusetts cited the data before. It cost us \$11 billion the last shutdown. This one would do the same.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. HAGEMAN). The gentleman from Massachusetts has 1 minute remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, again, my colleagues don't want to focus on the

Keating	Neguse	Sewell
Kelly (IL)	Nickel	Sherman
Khanna	Norcross	Sherrill
Kildee	Ocasio-Cortez	Slotkin
Kilmer	Omar	Smith (WA)
Kim (NJ)	Pallone	Sorensen
Krishnamoorthi	Panetta	Soto
Kuster	Pappas	Spanberger
Landsman	Pascall	Stanton
Larsen (WA)	Payne	Stevens
Larson (CT)	Pelosi	Strickland
Lee (CA)	Perez	Swalwell
Lee (NV)	Peters	Sykes
Lee (PA)	Pettersen	Takano
Leger Fernandez	Phillips	Thanedar
Levin	Pingree	Thompson (CA)
Lieu	Pocan	Thompson (MS)
Magaziner	Porter	Titus
Manning	Pressley	Tlaib
Matsui	Quigley	Tokuda
McBath	Ramirez	Tonko
McClellan	Raskin	Torres (CA)
McGarvey	Ross	Torres (NY)
McGovern	Ruiz	Trahan
Meeks	Ruppersberger	Trone
Menendez	Ryan	Underwood
Meng	Salinas	Vargas
Mfume	Sánchez	Vasquez
Moore (WI)	Sarbanes	Veasey
Morelle	Scanlon	Velázquez
Moskowitz	Schakowsky	Wasserman
Moulton	Schiff	Schultz
Mrvan	Schneider	Waters
Mullin	Scholten	Watson Coleman
Nadler	Schrer	Wexton
Napolitano	Scott (VA)	Wild
Neal	Scott, David	Williams (GA)

NOT VOTING—26

Allen	Crow	Lynch
Baird	Dean (PA)	McCullum
Bera	DesJarlais	Nunn (IA)
Burlison	Goldman (NY)	Peltola
Bush	Huffman	Rogers (AL)
Carson	LaMalfa	Stansbury
Carter (TX)	Lofgren	Van Drew
Clyburn	Lucas	Wilson (FL)
Crenshaw	Luna	

□ 1837

Ms. CHU and Mr. COHEN changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. HUDSON changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the question of consideration was decided in the affirmative.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. ALLEN. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 404.

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “YEA” on rollcall No. 404.

Stated against:

Mr. BERA. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 404.

□ 1845

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. MALLIOTAKIS). The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ROY. Madam 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

Mr. ROY. Madam 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. Madam Speaker, on Saturday, the Rules Committee reported a rule for four appropriations measures and made in order 440 total amendments.

We bring to the floor H.R. 4365, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act; 180 amendments were made in order.

This bill, combined with the amendments that were made in order, takes significant steps to invest in resources that will help deter China, will cut the bureaucracy, will support military families and servicemembers, and will restore the Department of Defense’s focus to warfighting rather than social engineering.

We bring to the floor H.R. 4665, the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2024.

This bill would defund international bodies like the World Health Organization, eliminate woke offices at the State Department, defund John Kerry, and it stands up for Israel while funding our State Department and foreign operations.

H.R. 4368, the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2024, was also a part of the rule.

This bill makes significant strides to reduce spending to pre-COVID levels, prevents members of the Communist Party of China from buying United States farmland, defunds the FDA’s rule allowing abortion drugs by mail, and makes strides in ending wokeness at the United States Department of Agriculture.

Madam Speaker, importantly, these three bills, combined with the next one that I am going to talk about, reflect our commitment to reduce spending and an agreement to reduce spending further than the FRA, which was passed earlier this year, to a target of \$1.526 trillion of discretionary spending.

That is our goal. That is our objective. It is something the American people are clamoring for from their leaders in Washington—to actually address the debt crisis fueling inflation and undermining the sovereignty of our Nation.

This is why we are here. This is the job we are supposed to do. I have offered to my colleagues that I wish this were July. We passed MILCON-VA in July. The Senate has passed nothing.

Last year, under Democrat control, six bills were packaged together in the summer and passed, and then a massive omnibus bill was passed in December.

I had an exchange with one of my Democratic colleagues a minute ago about this not being regular order, but this actually is regular order.

It is late in the process, I acknowledge. We are trying to move four bills

that would total, when combined with MILCON-VA, upwards of almost three-quarters of the discretionary funding for our government.

Hopefully, we can reach some resolution as to how to move forward funding the government appropriately. We obviously have disagreements on what funding the government appropriately means, which stands here at the center of the debate, stands here at the center of the impasse, which brings me to H.R. 4367, the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act.

It is a good bill, has strong provisions, strong language in it to try to encourage the Department of Homeland Security and Secretary Mayorkas to do their jobs.

In our view, it is not sufficient because the Secretary, backed by the President of the United States, has utterly refused to do his job.

This should concern all of us. Every Member of this body, Democrat or Republican, Texas or New York, Florida or California, ought to be concerned with what is happening to our country, what is happening in Eagle Pass, Texas.

Madam Speaker, 11,000 human beings, 11,000 the night before last, 304,000 apprehensions in August—this is incomprehensible. The human toll is staggering; the deaths from fentanyl poisoning, the things that we have talked about ad nauseam on this floor.

As I was alluding to earlier, it is not compassionate to have open borders as currently exist under this administration and under the leadership of Secretary Mayorkas.

Last Thursday, Texas authorities recovered the bodies of two migrants, including a 3-year-old boy, trying to cross the Rio Grande.

Madam Speaker, 2 weeks ago, a 10-year-old migrant drowned while trying to cross the Rio Grande, and 853 migrants died last year.

This is every day in Texas. I get a phone call or a text from a rancher every day in Texas. They find a body on their ranch. How is that remotely acceptable?

That is at the center of this debate. There are countless issues we disagree on, countless issues we need to address, and the appropriations process can, in fact, through the power of the purse, address many of those issues. These bills do that.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle say, well, these bills are dead on arrival. Well, that is how this process works. We put forward bills, and if there is disagreement, if the Senate disagrees, then we conference. I hope we can get to that stage.

I, again, will posit I wish this were July or August or 3 weeks ago, but we sit here with four bills that will fund almost 75 percent of the government when added to MILCON-VA.

Let’s do our job. Let’s work to move the DHS bill. Let’s work together to figure out how to deal with the border.

To be very clear, we must address the border. That is a nonnegotiable truth;

that we must address the border. We can sit around a table and debate how, but we must address it.

There has been too much death, too much destruction, too much damage to States and to human beings across this country, and the Federal Government has an obligation to do its job, and that is what we are endeavoring to do.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, forgive me, but what the hell is going on around here? We just heard the gentleman from Texas scream talking points that sound like they were written in Mar-a-Lago.

This is crazy. I can't believe I have to say this, but the Federal Government of the United States is shutting down on Saturday because a handful of MAGA Republicans didn't get everything they wanted. I have to tell you, that is a bad thing. It is a bad thing for our country.

Some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are acting like a shutdown is no big deal. Stop it. Stop it. This is not a mock Congress. This isn't the Model U.N.

We are talking about real people's lives here. Shutdowns cost taxpayer money. Shutdowns hurt the economy. Shutdowns mean people don't get paid. Shutdowns are bad. Yet, Republicans are on the verge of shutting down the government.

We have a Democratic President. We have a Democratic Senate. All we need is this Republican House of Representatives to get their act together, but they can't.

Their bumbling, incompetent leadership can't even do the basic job of standing up to their extreme Members so we can keep the lights on.

It might have made sense for them to pass these appropriation bills and send them to the Senate to iron out our differences if it were still June or July. It is September.

They have spent months fighting with themselves, and now we are 4 days from our deadline. Have they ever looked at a calendar? Have they ever heard of the concept of scheduling? Have they ever heard of clock management?

You don't start a months-long process 4 days before the deadline, but here we are, considering the most extreme, partisan, unhinged MAGA messaging bills this majority could come up with.

My colleague from Texas talks about the border, the border, the border. It is an important issue, but these bills cut funding for the border. He cares so much about securing the border that he is willing to—wait for it—defund the border.

Madam Speaker, they are not even sending their Homeland Security appropriations bill to the Senate. What

brilliant legislative mind came up with this bright idea?

Let me explain what this rule does. The House is refusing to send this bill to the Senate until the Republicans' extreme immigration bill is signed into law, which is never going to happen.

What will happen because of all their nonsense is that the people who actually work to secure the border will not get paid. This is nuts.

These bills are chock full of MAGA culture wars. Their agriculture bill takes money away from food assistance for pregnant mothers and newborns. I could spend all day talking about how awful these bills are.

The bottom line is we have 4 days, and I am asking my Republican colleagues: Do not shut this government down because you are all fighting with yourselves. Do your job and keep the government open. That shouldn't be too much to ask.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

First of all, with all due respect to the gentleman from Massachusetts, the bill we put forward does not cut funding. It increases spending over last year.

We can debate the merits of that and debate how much we need to restrain spending, but it is simply not true. Let's at least speak about the facts before us and the legislation in front of us.

I heard my colleague talking about getting our act together. I would say to my colleague from Massachusetts: How about the Senate and the President get their act together? How about they actually do their jobs and secure the border of United States?

The gentleman from Massachusetts just blithely swept it aside. Oh, it is an important issue. Tell that to the people in Texas. In August, 304,000 encounters, the fifth month in fiscal year 2023 over 200,000, 2.2 million in fiscal year 2023 encounters.

Since the President took office, there have been nearly 6 million illegal migrants encountered along the southwest border, more than the populations of Houston and Dallas combined.

We have had 2 million released in the United States, thousands of migrants traveling through the Darien Gap, trains chock-full of people, children getting sold into the sex trafficking trade on a daily basis.

We know it because it is in Federal orders from judges. These are not made-up facts. They are right before us, and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle don't care, and the Senate leadership, the Democrats leading the Senate and the President don't care, and the Secretary of Homeland Security doesn't care.

My answer to the question about why we are saying that H.R. 2 must be signed into law before the funding bill gets passed is because the law must change, and the Secretary must be

forced to do his job because he is refusing to do it.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

Mr. NORMAN. Madam Speaker, it is interesting here, my colleagues on the other side saying, shutdown, shutdown, shutdown; that is all you hear.

What about the shutdown that occurred for the COVID virus for over a year and a half? What about the shutdown that kept children out of school for over a year and a half?

It is outrageous that here we are on this floor trying to pass legislation to cut spending to put money back in the pockets of the taxpayers.

Folks, we are in an economic crisis. We are in a national security crisis. The fact is my colleagues are continually against a shutdown, which is never good, but in this case, we are fighting for the American people.

As Representative ROY mentioned with Homeland Security, go to the border. Go to the border and see what is happening there. See the rape trees. See the people coming across this border that now number in excess of the 5.2 million from my State of South Carolina.

Think about the medical crisis. We don't know what they are coming with. Think about the hundreds of programs that they are automatically going to be enrolled in.

Think about the Social Security numbers and the driver's licenses that are given to illegals that occurred in New York City. Think about the flights paid for by taxpayers' money to go all over this country illegally.

It is un-American, it is an invasion, and my good friends on the other side of the aisle will pay a price as they are being booed in different parts of the country because of leaving this border open, leaving this country unsecure. We have never faced this kind of crisis that we face right now just on that issue alone.

On the spending issue, I would like for those listening today to realize it boils back to our \$32 trillion, \$20,000 per second it is costing the taxpayers.

They don't want to cut anything. They want to go on with a bloated Federal Government and continue spending as we have done before. We are saying no.

□ 1900

I am proud of my colleagues. We will sit up here and fight if it takes all night long. It is a sad day that we are arguing over things that should be common sense. It is un-American what they are trying to do.

Now, the four appropriations bills, the Homeland Security bill, tying H.R. 2 to it, is exactly the right thing. My good friends on the other side of the aisle talk about reduced funding. They are not enforcing anything.

Mayorkas is not enforcing anything. Why pay him? All this does is say: Unless you enforce the border and include

it, we are not paying Mayorkas a dime for homeland security.

Look at the Department of Defense. Look at the cuts, yet the increases overall which we have given our Department of Defense. The FDA, we have made some legitimate cuts on the FDA on some things that should have been.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, the gentleman from South Carolina says we keep on talking about government shutdown, government shutdown. The reason we do is because we listened to you.

On September 19 in the PBS Hour interview, you were asked: How likely is a shutdown right now?

Your response was: It is 100 percent. We have heard that from other Members.

The gentleman keeps on talking about the border. We believe the border is a serious issue. The border is not open. Maybe people think it is open because you guys keep on saying it is open. You are signaling to people that it is open. It is not open, and we don't believe it should be open. We don't view this issue as a political talking point. We want to get results.

My friends on the other side of the aisle voted against a fiscal year 2023 government funding package that President Biden signed into law that provided Border Patrol with \$7.153 billion, a 17 percent increase from the year before.

The funding package provided \$65 million for 300 new Border Patrol agents, \$60 million for 125 new personnel at every point of entry, and \$230 million for technology, like the autonomous surveillance towers. Does any of that sound like open borders?

Here is the kicker. House Republicans voted "no."

By the way, Mr. NORMAN, this bill does nothing about Mr. Mayorkas' salary, but it does cut salaries for people who are working at the border, Border Patrol agents.

The gentleman from Texas said that he wants the Senate to get their act together.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a press release from the chair of the Appropriations Committee, U.S. Senator PATTY MURRAY, who just announced that Democrats and Republicans have come to a bipartisan agreement on a continuing resolution.

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

There was no objection.

[From the U.S. Senate Committee on Appropriations, Sept. 26, 2023]

MURRAY RELEASES BIPARTISAN CONTINUING RESOLUTION

WASHINGTON, DC.—Today, U.S. Senator Patty Murray (D-WA), Chair of the Senate Appropriations Committee, released a bipartisan Continuing Resolution to extend government funding through November 17, prevent a government shutdown at the end of the month, and allow work on full-year appropriations bills to continue.

"A shutdown would be nothing short of a catastrophe for American families, our national security, and our economy. It is critical that we avoid one, and that's exactly what this bipartisan legislation will do," said Chair Murray. "While we continue work on annual appropriations bills to address our country's full needs in the year ahead, this legislation prevents a shutdown, keeps our government funded, and provides critical dollars to support communities struck by disaster and support Ukraine at a pivotal moment in its defensive efforts against Putin's brutal, unprovoked war of aggression. This bill ensures wildland firefighters will not see a pay cut, and it prevents critical laws from lapsing to ensure the FAA and community health centers can continue operating. We have much more to do, but we should pass this legislation immediately—there is no time to waste."

The bipartisan Continuing Resolution:

1. Extends government funding through November 17.
2. Extends funding to help communities struck by disaster and continues support for Ukraine at a pivotal moment.
3. Prevents critical health statutes from lapsing to ensure funding for community health centers and teaching health centers does not expire.
4. Extends the Federal Aviation Administration's (FAA) authorities through the end of the calendar year.
5. Ensures federal wildland firefighters will not see a pay cut.
6. Ensures the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) will continue to be able to serve the nearly 7 million women and children who rely on it.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, they are talking to each other. You can't even get an agreement amongst Republicans—how pathetic.

Madam Speaker, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their comments to the Chair and not to each other.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, the American people deserve to know why we are in this position. They need to know that less than 5 percent of the 435 Members of this body have put us in this position.

The gentleman from Texas indicated how they did that. They have held the rest of us hostage unless the bill that they want is passed. They are taking hostage the American people. They are taking hostage Federal employees. They have taken hostage the Congress of the United States.

What ought to happen is the over 300 of us—147 Republicans and 165 Democrats vote to compromise. I would call all of your attention to a 1998 speech in October by Newt Gingrich, he called it the "Perfectionist Caucus" speech.

He made a deal with Clinton because Clinton was the President. As Newt Gingrich pointed out, we had a lot of Democrats in the House, a lot of Democrats in the Senate, and a lot of Republicans in the Senate, who he said, by the way, don't always agree with us.

The American people expect us to make it work. How do we make it work?

We make compromises.

The 5 percent that shut down the Congress for a week did it because they didn't like the compromise, and they stomped their feet and they sent us home, which of course cost money because none of us took a salary cut. Nothing got done that week.

Yeah, maybe it should be back in July, but it was shut down again just last week when they sent us home because less than 5 percent—in this case, a little more than 1 percent, of the Congress—1 percent of this body had a tantrum.

They wouldn't vote for national security. They wouldn't vote for a rule that put a defense appropriation bill on the floor. Their bill, not our bill.

Madam Speaker, the American public needs to know why their House is in the chaos of which the gentleman from Texas talked about is occurring at the border.

We are going to be here for the next 4 or 5 days, maybe even longer, pretending that somehow we are compromising, and we are moving forward. That is not the case. We have had a small group take the House hostage, the American peoples' House hostage.

We can talk about the numbers and disagree on the numbers.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I only have 30 seconds left to say some pretty substantive things, and I won't have the time to do it.

Madam Speaker, Mr. and Mrs. America ought to know that when I was the majority leader we didn't shut down the government. When I was the majority leader on this side of the House, we passed every bill we wanted to pass because we are not a divided party, as the party that is now in the majority has so clearly demonstrated on a regular basis how divided they are.

The Speaker made a deal. Keep the deal. Stop taking hostage the American people and their government.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, the only people being held hostage are the American people by Democrat leadership in the Senate and in the White House; holding them hostage to a wide open border, endangering them every single day, including the 110,000 some-odd migrants that have been sent to and gone to New York City, and that are endangering our people on the streets.

The American people are, in fact, being held hostage because this Democratic leadership refuses to do their job to secure the border.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), my friend and colleague.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I thank the members of the Rules Committee who put in so many hours over the past several days to prepare what is an unprecedented rule, in my experience. It is important for moving us forward.

To the members of the Rules Committee who put in the long hours this weekend, I certainly want to thank the members of that committee and the staff for working so hard. We are going to get this underlying legislation to the floor. It is important.

You are hearing a lot about the border this evening for a reason. A lot of us have studied the problems at the border for several years, but I will just tell you, it has never been this bad, and people see that. We are constantly asked at home: Why can't you do something about that?

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mrs. LEE).

Ms. LEE of Nevada. Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge my Republican colleagues to end this MAGA meltdown and come together to avert a government shutdown and the chaos it will bring our country.

They are still fighting amongst themselves. We don't even have a draft of anything that they are proposing in terms of avoiding a shutdown.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Mrs. LEE).

Ms. LEE of Nevada. Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge my Republican colleagues to end this MAGA meltdown and come together to avert a government shutdown and the chaos it will bring our country.

I just returned from my hometown of Las Vegas—the entertainment capital of the world—and spent the weekend talking to my constituents who are fed up with the political theater here in Washington.

They can't understand how extreme Members of this body won't stop until they force this country into a government shutdown.

Maybe those Members should have spent the weekend talking to the thousands of TSA agents who are going to be forced to work without pay; or the 53,000 women and children in Nevada whose vital nutrition assistance will be put in jeopardy; or maybe the 200,000 Nevada veterans whose VA claims processing and wait times will grow; or the tens of thousands of Nevadans whose Medicare and Social Security inquiries will be put on hold.

Most importantly, maybe they should have listened to the thousands of hospitality workers and small businesses who make Las Vegas the magical place that it is, and whose livelihoods will be put at risk by a shutdown.

Have no doubt, without funding to keep the 50 million visitors moving through Harry Reid International Airport each year, our city, our hard-working families, and our local economy will suffer the consequences of these extremists' political games, and the rest of the country will, too.

The U.S. Travel Association estimates that a government shutdown will cost the U.S. travel economy as much as \$140 million every single day. Let's be clear: we all know how this story ends. It ends by working across the aisle, that is what will get us out of this mess.

House Democrats are ready to fund the government to avert a shutdown. The question right now is: Can Republican leadership stand up to the most extreme minority wing of their party and end this nonsense?

Madam Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the rule.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, the American people are fed up, my constituents are fed up, the people we represent are fed up, and they are fed up with the very deal that the gentleman from Massachusetts just described that came out of the Senate.

Madam Speaker, that is 45 days of continued spending at the existing levels and continuing the status quo with an additional \$6 billion for Ukraine, and nothing to deal with the border. Nothing. Zero changes at the border.

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

□ 1915

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, we were promised that this year would be different, that we would run all 12 spending bills individually and actually find some savings for the American people. Yet, this is another year where the taxpayers' hard-earned dollars are just squandered.

Congress has passed all required spending bills only four times in about the 50 years since we have been under the current system. The last time Congress actually passed all the bills was in 1996, when the U.S. national debt was a staggering \$5.2 trillion.

Just last week the debt hit \$33 trillion. This is a cycle of perpetual failure, and, yes, our citizens are sick of it. The American people have lost faith in our ability to handle the country's fiscal issues.

Madam Speaker, the other side talks about how efficiently they moved through things. Yeah, they moved through things. In 1996, we were \$5 trillion in debt. Now we are \$33 trillion in debt. They have efficiently spent us into bankruptcy because there is no amount of money, Madam Speaker, there is zero amount of money that they won't spend. They will spend as much as the American people make and then so much more.

The cost of living is tied to the spending, Madam Speaker. Our citizens—my bosses and their bosses—can't afford their groceries, gasoline, or electricity because this town continues to spend like there is no tomorrow.

Madam Speaker, we should pass this rule so we can pass the 12 bills and so we can reject the nongermane Senate bill that hooks the FAA with Ukraine spending. Maybe both of those are important, Madam Speaker, but tell me why I have got to vote to keep airplanes flying in the United States and also vote to spend money in a war 8,000 miles away. The American people are sick of that failure theater, Madam Speaker.

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

Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Pennsylvania complaining about the mismanagement of this House of Representatives. It is reinforcing our message. He can complain all he wants, but he can't blame Speaker PELOSI, Joe Biden, or anybody but his own leadership. I hate to tell him, but his party is in charge.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BOYLE), the distinguished ranking member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, a wise coach once said: You are your record.

Well, let's look at the record. Over the last 30 years, five government shutdowns, all five took place under House

What we are doing here today is critical. We are fulfilling our obligation to our constituents and the American people. We are going to fund the government in a responsible and fiscally sound manner, as opposed to this business of usual stuff that has been going on for several years where Congress is expected to rubberstamp what comes over from the Senate or rubberstamp what is asked for by the President.

Our duty extends far beyond what is happening just today. The next generation and the next generation after that, our future, the country's future depends on us standing strong at this moment and ensuring that the funds of the American taxpayer are wisely spent.

This administration's track record has failed on so many levels—failed my constituents, failed your constituents, Madam Speaker, the people of Texas, and the migrants who have lost their lives on this dangerous journey to cross our border.

Madam Speaker, this administration is not only complicit, but bears the sole responsibility for this humanitarian crisis that is unfolding before our very eyes.

The Biden administration's failure to enforce our laws, their shameful handcuffing of our courageous Border Patrol agents from effectively safeguarding our borders has allowed the southern border to fall from anarchy into a calamity.

Madam Speaker, our work here today signifies our crucial mission to rectify past errors and steer our Nation back on the path of fiscal responsibility. People need to know that we recognize our solemn duty to correct course and restore fiscal sanity, not only for our sake but for the sake of those who will come after.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, breaking news, news flash, the Senate just voted on cloture on the motion to proceed on the CR, 77–19. They are working in an overwhelmingly bipartisan fashion to get this thing done so we don't shut the government down.

What are my Republican friends doing?

Republican leadership. When Democrats were in charge of the House, those 30 years, zero government shutdowns. Heck, some on the other side like shutdowns so much, the last one was under a Republican House, a Republican Senate, and a Republican President.

Now, some on the other side have said publicly that there would be essentially no consequences to a government shutdown. One Member even said people won't even miss it.

Here is what happened during the last Republican shutdown: \$11 billion lost to this economy, billions of taxpayer money wasted, 140,000 fewer jobs as a result of that shutdown.

You look at those that took place even before 2018, and you see similar results. This is all, by the way, from the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office. There are real costs to a government shutdown.

Here we are just 4 days, 4 hours, and some minutes away from the shutdown. It pains me to say this, but we see the Senate doing its job. They actually just voted on a bipartisan basis, by a 4-1 margin, to make sure we don't have a government shutdown.

What is the leadership doing here in the House? Debating bills that, frankly, will have no impact whatsoever on whether or not we shut down at midnight Saturday.

Let's stand up to this extreme MAGA shutdown. Let's say "no" to the shutdown. Let's pass the bipartisan continuing resolution tonight and make sure we don't disrupt the lives of the American people.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ), my friend and colleague.

Mr. GAETZ. Madam Speaker, the gentleman is right, you are your record, and our record in this country right now is \$33 trillion in debt, facing \$2 trillion annual deficits. We are in so much debt, we are driving up deficits so fast, we are devaluing American money so rapidly that in America today, you can't even bribe Democratic Senators with cash alone. You need to bring gold bars to get the job done just so that the bribes hold value.

My friends, I am extremely in favor of this rule because this rule moves us onto single-subject spending bills, and this is the only way to liberate this House and this country from the scourge of governing by continuing resolution and omnibus legislation.

It is an insult to our governing authority to have the Senate lash Ukraine funding to the reauthorization of the FAA, and, by the way, every other thing in government. The American people know that in our State legislatures throughout this land there is a maturity and a seriousness to set a top line, balanced budget number and then appropriate to each of the agencies in government independently. The fact that we don't do that is not a bug of the system. It is a feature of the system.

The one thing I agree with my Democratic colleagues on is for the last 8 months, this House has been poorly led. We own that, and we have to do something about it. My Democratic colleagues will have an opportunity to do something about that, too, and we will see if they bail out our failed Speaker.

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

Madam Speaker, there is a pattern here that I have seen develop over the years. When Republicans are in charge, the debt doesn't matter. When Democrats are in charge, all of a sudden, the debt is the central issue. It is funny, when Donald Trump, who I don't know how many indictments he has against him at this particular point, how many dozens of years in jail he faces if he is convicted, but when he was President, he added \$8 trillion to the debt, and there was silence from the other side of the aisle. That was only in 4 years, by the way. It is a little bit ironic to hear some of this back and forth here.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I just got off the telephone with one of my chief law enforcement officers in Houston, Texas, in Harris County, who just simply begged us not to shut down the government.

As everyone knows, I was on the floor just an hour or so ago saying, breaking news, I am against a government shutdown. We will fight against the government shutdown. My good friend on the other side of the aisle is complaining that the Senate did their work with such an amazing, overwhelming majority.

Let me tell you how we can solve that before I get into discussion of why we are standing here today. Put the Senate bill on the floor. That is the rules that are the operational underpinnings of the House and Senate. They send it over, and we put it on the floor. If you don't like it, you change it and send it back. That way, you are engaged in stopping the shutdown.

However, if we sit here tonight and do nothing, the government shutdown, in particular, is going to impact the gross domestic product from 2 to 6 percentage points or \$2- to \$6 billion in lost output. That is people without jobs, resulting in the creation of 120,000 fewer private-sector jobs.

In addition, things like Medicare and Medicaid are going to be in jeopardy. Our economic security will be in jeopardy. Education and training will be in jeopardy, infrastructure dollars; and, particularly, my seniors and others in need of Social Security checks are just going to be out in the cold.

Combining, however, the bills that my friends want us to move on, they attack women's reproductive rights, they attack the LGBTQ+ community, who are continuously victimized for medical care that they need. They talk

about Homeland Security, and it is completely untenable that they exclude funding for a new southwest border contingency fund that would enable DHS to respond more effectively to changing conditions on the southwest border. They cut out shelter and services programs. It is shameful to eliminate those programs that provide temporary food and shelter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SALAZAR). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, in addition—can you believe it?—they slash or eliminate the number of loans awarded to financially distressed farmers under the agriculture bill; and then targeting violence and terrorism prevention grants, they take that out.

What are we talking about here? Let's deal with the CR from the Senate. You don't like it, add something to it, and send it back. Today is September 26. We will be able to say to the American people, we are adults, and we can stop the shutdown.

Let's go to work. These bills have to go back to the table again. I want to make sure we don't have a shutdown, and we can do it with the Senate CR right now.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, how much time is remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 10½ minutes remaining.

The gentleman from Massachusetts has 13½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON), my good friend.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Madam Speaker, our debt, our deficit, and our spending are indefensible. Three years ago, our national debt was \$23 trillion, a staggering sum by any measure. Since then, it has grown by 50 percent to \$33 trillion.

We have heard allegations tonight from one side of the Chamber that everybody deserves blame for that crisis, so let me be very clear. During that time, I voted against \$13 trillion in spending. Nevertheless, we find ourselves at a tipping point.

In the last 10 years, we have spent \$3 trillion just on interest on the debt. In the next 10 years, we won't spend \$3 trillion on interest, we will spend \$10 trillion. For that money, our country gets nothing. No sailor, no soldier, no safety net. We get nothing.

Making matters worse, in 7 years, Medicare is insolvent and in 10 years, Social Security is insolvent.

We must get our fiscal house in order.

Now, the appropriations bills before us move us in that direction. They do so through real, robust, and significant cuts, billions of dollars in cuts.

Are the bills perfect? No.

Do I support every single cut in every single bill? No.

Can we balance the budget through nondefense discretionary cuts alone? No.

To be honest, these bills will not solve all that ails us, but they are a critically important step toward stopping this runaway train. Business as usual, Madam Speaker, is unacceptable. A “yes” vote acknowledges that and moves us in the right direction.

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

Business as usual for my Republican friends is more tax cuts for corporations and millionaires and billionaires, slashing programs that help the most vulnerable in our country, and subsidies to Big Oil companies and more and more money to big defense contractors.

Let me just explain to some of my colleagues, especially the moderate Republicans, if there are any of them left:

The ag appropriations bill, before the manager’s amendment, which, by the way, imposed even deeper cuts in some of these programs, slashes WIC by \$800 million. It reduces the value for WIC fruit and vegetable vouchers by \$1.2 billion, hurting both families and farmers.

It guts the Rural Energy for America Program by \$500 million.

It guts rural electric investments in clean energy and energy efficiency from the Inflation Reduction Act by \$1 billion.

It eliminates a lifeline that has already helped more than 20,000 distressed farmers who have received assistance from the Inflation Reduction Act.

It blocks FDA from acting on important tobacco issues, banning menthol cigarettes and flavored cigars, and limiting the nicotine in cigarettes.

It blocks the Biden executive orders on diversity, equality, inclusion, and accessibility.

It reverses the 2023 FDA decision to allow mifepristone to be dispensed in certified pharmacies with a prescription instead of only hospitals, clinics, and medical offices.

This bill, made worse by a manager’s amendment, guts food programs, nutrition programs to our kids, to pregnant mothers and newborns.

What are they thinking? What sense does that make? How does anybody on that side of the aisle vote for a bill that does that? To my moderate friends, if they are still around, how do they do that? This is unacceptable. By the way, read the fine print in these appropriations bills, look at the programs they cut.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. LOIS FRANKEL).

□ 1930

Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule, which is for a bad bill that takes food out of the mouths of children, hurts our farmers, guts climate

change actions, and is another step toward the Republicans’ dark and extreme goal to ban abortion nationwide. More specifically, it nullifies the FDA’s decision to make the abortion pill, mifepristone, more accessible.

The medication abortion pill has been used effectively and safely for 20 years. FDA made an evidence-based decision to allow patients to fill this medication as they would fill any other prescription, by going to a drugstore or to their doctor or getting it through the mail.

The FDA decision removed a barrier for women in underserved communities in need of care. Reversing this decision harms the most vulnerable populations—women in maternity care deserts, women without reliable access to transportation or childcare, and women who can’t take time off from work to visit a doctor.

Madam Speaker, I say this with emphasis: All women deserve the freedom to decide whether or when to start or grow a family without interference from politicians.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to listen to the science, listen to the FDA, and reject this rule for these and so many reasons.

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

Madam Speaker, one of the previous speakers from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle talked about victims, and I would note the extent to which we have countless victims, as we have talked about before, from the scourge of fentanyl poisonings across this country.

Two weeks ago, 1-year-old Nicholas Feliz Dominici died from fentanyl exposure from a kilo of fentanyl at an at-home daycare in the Bronx, New York, that, reportedly, a new arrival from the Dominican Republic was renting out.

More than 25,000 pounds of fentanyl have been seized in FY23. I spent time in August sitting on panels with moms and dads who lost their children to fentanyl poisonings—six children in the school district in which I reside. It is commonplace in Texas. It is becoming, unfortunately, more commonplace around the country.

How about the woman who was stabbed 28 times by an illegal immigrant with a criminal record in Pennsylvania, or the 10-year-old boy who was on a schoolbus on the first day of school killed by an illegal immigrant who ran into the bus? How about the father in Florida who opened his home to a supposedly unaccompanied alien child, who was 19 years old, and he stabbed and killed the father of this family who opened his home?

This is happening every day to the American people, and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle do not care. They watch Secretary Mayorkas completely ignore his duty to secure the border of the United States, leaving us entirely exposed to cartels and to the flood of fentanyl pouring into our com-

munities. Border Patrol is overwhelmed, trying to manage numbers at the border, which is completely avoidable if the Secretary and the President would actually follow the law.

Republicans have responded with a bill that would force the Secretary to follow the law and that would improve the laws of the United States to secure the border of the United States, as we are constitutionally required to do. We have made that a condition precedent for giving more money to the Secretary of Homeland Security as he ignores his job and endangers the American people. We will continue to do that.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, for the gentleman to say that people on our side of the aisle don’t care about the fentanyl problem in this country, that we don’t care that our constituents are dying, that people are dying in this country, that is offensive.

One of the reasons why people watching this debate despise Congress at this moment is because of the characterizations that are made by the gentleman.

I will tell you this: We believe we should fund our Border Patrol agents. We believe we should do more to confront these issues. We don’t use these matters as a political football or political talking point. To come down here and say that somehow we don’t care, that is offensive.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an article from CBS News titled: “Government shutdown could jeopardize U.S. credit rating, Moody’s warns.”

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

There was no objection.

[From CBS News, September 25, 2023]

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN COULD JEOPARDIZE U.S. CREDIT RATING, MOODY’S WARNS
(By Aimee Picchi)

The U.S.’ credit worthiness is one of its most prized fiscal assets, with global investors relying on the guarantee that the nation can make good on its debts. But now, a leading credit agency is warning that a possible federal government shutdown this week could tarnish the country’s goldplated rating.

Time is running out for House Speaker Kevin McCarthy to find a compromise to keep government agencies running and to avoid a shutdown on October 1, the first day of the new fiscal year. If McCarthy and other Republicans are unable to find a solution, funding would expire on September 30 and many agencies would be forced to halt some of their operations. Hundreds of thousands of federal workers also wouldn’t draw a paycheck until the crisis is resolved.

With Congress divided between a Democratic-controlled Senate and Republican-led House—and with some far-right conservatives looking to use the shutdown as leverage to force government spending cuts—many are bracing for a stoppage that could last weeks. While the actual economic impact of a shutdown is likely to be reversed once the government reopens, the damage

could be longer-lasting for other reasons, Moody's Investors Service said Monday in a report.

"A shutdown would be credit negative" for the U.S. debt, while a shutdown "would underscore the weakness of U.S. institutional and governance strength relative to other Aaa-rated sovereigns that we have highlighted in recent years," Moody's analysts wrote.

The credit rating firm added, "In particular, it would demonstrate the significant constraints that intensifying political polarization put on fiscal policymaking at a time of declining fiscal strength, driven by widening fiscal deficits and deteriorating debt affordability."

Moody's didn't change its Aaa rating on U.S. debt, but cautioned that the nation's "lack of an institutional focus on medium-term fiscal planning . . . is fundamentally different from what is seen in most other Aaa-rated peers, for instance historically in Germany (Aaa stable) and Canada (Aaa stable)."

NO LONGER AAA

The warning comes roughly two months after Fitch Ratings, another major credit ratings agency, downgraded U.S. credit from the highest rating, citing the nation's rising debt and eroding political stability. In that case, the firm lowered the nation's rating to AA+, from its previous AAA level.

Fitch cited the country's "repeated debt-limit political standoffs and last-minute resolutions" as weakening investors' faith in U.S. fiscal management.

Like Fitch, Moody's also cited the nation's ballooning debt as a pressing issue, partly because it requires higher costs to service the debt, resulting in less fiscal flexibility. Meanwhile, political infighting could create "extremely difficult" conditions for creating a plan to reverse widening fiscal deficits by either increasing federal revenue or cutting entitlement spending, it warned.

"In the absence of significant fiscal policy measures, we expect debt affordability to deteriorate at a much faster pace, with federal interest payments relative to revenue and GDP rising to around 27 percent and 4.6 percent, respectively, by 2033, from 9.7 percent and 1.9 percent in 2022, driven by materially higher interest rates and relatively weak revenue," Moody's said.

COSTS OF A GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

Despite such concerns, the economic effects of a government shutdown itself is likely to be short, with the impact most heavily felt in industries and geographical areas with a high concentration of federal workers, such as Washington, D.C., Moody's noted.

"Some defense contractors and municipal issuers, including mass transit systems, and certain municipal housing sector bonds that rely on annual federal appropriations could be affected," Moody's, led by analyst William Foster, said in the report. "Mass transit authorities, already grappling with lower post-ridership and the looming expiration of pandemic relief funds, may face further challenges due to potential delays in federal grants."

Even so, a shutdown would occur just as millions of American workers are set to face another economic challenge with the resumption of student debt repayments in October.

Furloughed government workers "will not receive pay until the shutdown ends," noted High Frequency Economics in a research report. "They are likely to step back from spending, at least temporarily."

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, months after Fitch Ratings downgraded the U.S. credit rating, a

Moody's analyst wrote that a shutdown "would underscore the weakness of U.S. institutional and governance strength relative to other AAA-rated sovereigns that we have highlighted in recent years."

Extreme MAGA Republicans are embarrassing our country internationally and exacerbating economic hardship at home when they openly brag about how they would welcome a government shutdown.

Madam Speaker, this is the theater of the absurd. The gentleman comes down here and talks about the border. Once again, his bill defunds border security. Does he propose to secure the border through volunteerism?

I am so sick of listening to the Republicans rant and rave about spending. Joe Biden has added \$1.8 trillion to the national debt. That is a fact. Donald Trump, the last Republican President, added \$8.2 trillion. Trump added as much in 4 years as his predecessor did in 8 years, and Republicans added \$2 trillion to the debt with their tax cuts for the rich.

Now, the so-called pro-life party has the nerve to try to cut WIC, the women, infants, and children program, which helps provide food to new moms and very young children.

Now, let me explain this to the gentleman from Texas and to my Republican colleagues: Cutting funding for WIC means more malnourished babies. Malnourished babies end up needing expensive healthcare. Who pays the bill? It is Medicaid that pays. It is taxpayers who pay. In fact, according to USDA, every dollar spent on WIC means \$3 in taxpayer savings.

Madam Speaker, what kind of twisted values would make someone think it is a good idea to cut taxes on billionaires but a bad idea to fund WIC, a program that saves money, a program that helps women, infants, and children?

All of these appropriations bills that are being brought to the floor at this last minute are so extreme that Republicans in the Senate won't even support them. These bills shouldn't go over to the Senate. They should go to a shredder.

Republicans want to gut programs that help seniors, gut programs that help students, gut programs that help working people. Instead of trying to do anything that helps anyone, they are obsessed with banning Pride flags from flying at our embassies. What is wrong with them?

This is absurd. What is happening here is not governing.

Just so everyone is clear: All of this should have been done months and months ago, and doing it now, 4 days before a shutdown and having no plan to avoid a shutdown, is incompetence, pure and simple.

I just saw a tweet from a reporter about conference calls that are going on amongst Republican Members, where Republicans are warning each other about getting their list of prior-

ities straight, trying to figure out how you get to a deal, if you can get to a deal. They are saying we need some organization. You are just having those conference calls now.

Let me just say that it is clear that my Republican friends have no idea at all what they are doing. It is clear they have no plan to get us out of this mess. My Republican friends need to move out of the way and let serious people on both sides of the aisle do what we have to do to clean up the GOP's mess and keep government funded.

The Senate right now has come to a bipartisan compromise. That is a good thing. They are trying to avoid a shutdown that my friends on the other side of the aisle in this Chamber don't seem to think is a big deal. They will know it is a big deal when they shut the government down and their constituents start calling and complaining about not getting paid, about the services that are being cut. They will hear loud and clear from their constituents—Democrats, Independents, and Republicans.

Now is time for the adults in the room to figure this out. The Senate has given us a way forward. We should take it.

When my friends say that they need more time to figure all this out, what have they been doing? For months, what have they been doing?

We have had enough of this nonsense. We have had enough talk about shutdowns. We need to work together in a bipartisan way, work in the way that our constituents expect us to work to get things done, not to shut things down, not to tear things apart, not to blow things up.

At the end of the day, we have our policy differences. When I look at these appropriations bills, I can say honestly to my friends that we don't share the same values. I don't understand how you can gut food and nutrition programs. I don't even understand how you can cut border security. I don't get the thinking behind all of that, but that is your problem to work out.

In the meantime, let's come together and do the right thing. Let's keep this government open.

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

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

Madam Speaker, I have absolutely no idea what the gentleman from Massachusetts was just talking about. We have four bills before us here in the House of Representatives, four bills that, when combined with the MILCON-VA bill that we passed in July, would fund upward of 75 percent of our discretionary spending of government. That is what is on the floor of the House.

The fact is, the four bills we have before us represent this body doing its job. The gentleman says the Senate is going to be the adults who save us. This is a Senate that has passed not one appropriations bill. This is a Senate that today dropped on the floor of

the Senate a bill that no one had seen 45 minutes prior to the vote, a bill which would continue to spend at the levels adopted last December that are yielding \$2 trillion a year in deficit spending.

If that represents the adults, I think I want to hang out with the kids because that is not the job that we are supposed to do—\$2 trillion a year of deficit spending when we are \$33 trillion in debt, continuing to fund an administration completely at war with the well-being of the American people and a Department of Justice weaponized against the people like Mark Houck, a father who wakes up with a raid at his home for defending his son, for exercising his free speech rights, completely not pursued by local authorities, taken to Federal court, and summarily dismissed within an hour by a jury. That is your FBI and Department of Justice at work.

This is the same Department of Justice that wants to label Scott Smith a domestic terrorist. That is your Department of Justice at work.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle would say the Senate being adults and writing another check to that Department of Justice is a good use of your money.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle would say it is a good idea to continue to rack up \$2 trillion in deficit spending, to borrow more money, to increase inflation, to devalue the dollar, to spend money we don't have to fund a Department of Homeland Security that refuses to secure the homeland.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to do this while thousands of Americans die from fentanyl poisonings, while cartels are empowered, while China is empowered, while China is selling the printing presses and the fentanyl pills to the cartels, while thousands pour into Eagle Pass, while 11,000 people just the day before yesterday poured across into Eagle Pass, while people are in railroad cars, while children are dying, while children get sold into the sex trafficking trade, where migrants are being held for ransom so their little girl doesn't get raped in a stash house in Fort Worth, Texas. All of that, I suppose, is from the adults we have in the Senate. They want to continue to fund a lawless administration, exposing our people to danger and exposing migrants to danger, all in the false name of compassion.

□ 1945

Well, if that is what adults look like, count me out. I am going to stand up for the American people who sent me here to stand up for them.

Madam Speaker, we are going to pass these four bills. We are going to work hard to do the work for the American people while the Senate can preen and posture with yet another swamp game by putting forward another continuing resolution of the status quo rather

than trying to change this place, rather than trying to stand up for the people who sent us here to do something different: to reduce spending, to secure the border, to fund our troops at a higher level than we have ever funded them; a \$28 billion increase for the Department of Defense while we undo the social engineering experiment and refocus the military on its mission to defend the United States.

I am proud of these four bills. I am proud to stand up here and advance them forward but let me be very clear: We are going to secure the border of the United States.

It will be up to Democrats to make a choice. Will they shut down this open border or will they shut down the government of the United States.

Mr. ROY. Madam 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.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Adoption of the resolution, if ordered;

Motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 5110; and

Agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 215, nays 209, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 405]		
YEAS—215		
Aderholt	Cloud	Fulcher
Alford	Clyde	Gaetz
Allen	Cole	Gallagher
Amodei	Collins	Garbarino
Armstrong	Comer	Garcia, Mike
Arrington	Crane	Gimenez
Babin	Crawford	Gonzales, Tony
Bacon	Crenshaw	Good (VA)
Baird	Curtis	Gooden (TX)
Balderson	D'Esposito	Gosar
Banks	Davidson	Granger
Barr	De La Cruz	Graves (LA)
Bean (FL)	DesJarlais	Graves (MO)
Bentz	Diaz-Balart	Green (TN)
Bergman	Donalds	Greene (GA)
Bice	Duarte	Griffith
Biggs	Duncan	Grothman
Bilirakis	Dunn (FL)	Guest
Bishop (NC)	Edwards	Guthrie
Boebert	Ellzey	Hageman
Bost	Emmer	Harris
Brecheen	Estes	Harshbarger
Buchanan	Ezell	Hern
Buck	Fallon	Higgins (LA)
Bucshon	Feenstra	Hill
Burchett	Ferguson	Hinson
Burgess	Finstad	Houchin
Burlison	Fischbach	Hudson
Calvert	Fitzgerald	Huizenaga
Cammack	Fitzpatrick	Hunt
Carey	Fleischmann	Issa
Carl	Flood	Jackson (TX)
Carter (GA)	Foxx	James
Chavez-DeRemer	Franklin, C.	Johnson (LA)
Ciscomani	Scott	Johnson (OH)
Cline	Fry	Johnson (SD)
Jordan		
Miller (WV)		
Joyce (OH)		
Miller-Meeks		
Joyce (PA)		
Mills		
Kean (NJ)		
Molinaro		
Kelly (MS)		
Moolenaar		
Kelly (PA)		
Mooney		
Kiggans (VA)		
Moore (AL)		
Kiley		
Moore (UT)		
Kim (CA)		
Moran		
Kustoff		
Murphy		
LaHood		
Nehls		
Lamborn		
Newhouse		
Langworthy		
Norman		
Latta		
Nunn (IA)		
LaTurner		
Obernolte		
Lawler		
Lee (FL)		
Ogles		
Lesko		
Palmer		
Letlow		
Pence		
Loudermilk		
Perry		
Luetkemeyer		
Pfluger		
Luttrell		
Posey		
Mace		
Reschenthaler		
Malliotakis		
Mann		
Massie		
Rogers (KY)		
Mast		
Rose		
McCarthy		
Rosendale		
McCaul		
Rouzer		
McClain		
Roy		
McClintock		
Rutherford		
McCormick		
Salazar		
McHenry		
Santos		
Meuser		
Scalise		
Miller (IL)		
Schweikert		
Miller (OH)		
Scott, Austin		
NAYS—209		
Adams		
Foushee		
Aguilar		
Frankel, Lois		
Allred		
Frost		
Auchincloss		
Gallego		
Balint		
Garamendi		
Barragán		
García (IL)		
Beatty		
García (TX)		
Bera		
Garcia, Robert		
Beyer		
Golden (ME)		
Bishop (GA)		
Goldman (NY)		
Blumenauer		
Gomez		
Blunt Rochester		
Gonzalez,		
Bonamici		
Vicente		
Bowman		
Gottheimer		
Boyle (PA)		
Green, Al (TX)		
Brown		
Grijalva		
Brownley		
Harder (CA)		
Hayes		
Bludworth		
Hernandez		
Higgins (NY)		
Caraveo		
Himes		
Cárdenas		
Horsford		
Carson		
Houlihan		
Carter (LA)		
Hoyer		
Carterwright		
Hoyle (OR)		
Casar		
Case		
Ivey		
Jacobs		
Chu		
Jeffries		
Beyer		
Clark (MA)		
Clark (NY)		
Courtney		
Cleaver		
Clyburn		
Cohen		
Connolly		
Cruz		
Cummings, Tony		
D'Esposito		
D'Onofrio		
Dingell		
Dobkin		
Dow		
Drew		
Duncan		
Fitzgerald		
Fitzpatrick		
Fleischmann		
Flood		
Franklin, C.		
Fry		
García (TX)		
García (IL)		
García (PA)		
García (FL)		
García (NM)		
García (CA)		
García (NY)		
García (VA)		
García (OH)		
García (GA)		
García (IL)		
García (PA)		
García (FL)		
García (NM)		
García (CA)		
García (NY)		
García (VA)		
García (OH)		
García (GA)		
García (IL)		
García (PA)		
García (FL)		
García (NM)		
García (CA)		
García (NY)		
García (VA)		
García (OH)		
García (GA)		
García (IL)		
García (PA)		
García (FL)		
García (NM)		
García (CA)		
García (NY)		
García (VA)		
García (OH)		
García (GA)		
García (IL)		
García (PA)		
García (FL)		
García (NM)		
García (CA)		
García (NY)		
García (VA)		
García (OH)		
García (GA)		
García (IL)		
García (PA)		
García (FL)		
García (NM)		
García (CA)		
García (NY)		
García (VA)		
García (OH)		
García (GA)		
García (IL)		
García (PA)		
García (FL)		
García (NM)		
García (CA)		
García (NY)		
García (VA)		
García (OH)		
García (GA)		
García (IL)		
García (PA)		
García (FL)		
García (NM)		
García (CA)		
García (NY)		

Stevens	Tokuda	Velázquez	McClintock	Posey	Steube	Waters	Wexton	Williams (GA)
Strickland	Tonko	Wasserman	McCormick	Reschenthaler	Strong	Watson Coleman	Wild	Wilson (FL)
Swalwell	Torres (CA)	Schultz	McHenry	Rodgers (WA)	Tenney			
Sykes	Torres (NY)	Waters	Meuser	Rogers (AL)	Thompson (PA)			
Takano	Trahan	Watson Coleman	Miller (IL)	Rogers (KY)	Tiffany			
Thanedar	Trone	Wexton	Miller (OH)	Rose	Timmons			
Thompson (CA)	Underwood	Wild	Miller (WV)	Rosendale	Turner			
Thompson (MS)	Vargas	Williams (GA)	Miller-Meeks	Rouzer	Valadao			
Titus	Vasquez	Wilson (FL)	Mills	Roy	Van Drew			
Tlaib	Veasey		Molinaro	Rutherford	Van Duyne			
			Moolenaar	Salazar	Van Orden			
			Mooney	Santos	Wagner			
			Moore (AL)	Scalise	Walberg			
Bush	LaLota	Luna	Moore (UT)	Schweikert	Waltz			
Carter (TX)	LaMalfa	Peñtola	Moran	Scott, Austin	Weber (TX)			
Costa	Lucas	Smith (MO)	Murphy	Self	Webster (FL)			

NOT VOTING—9

Bush	LaLota	Luna	Moore (AL)	Scalise	Walberg			
Carter (TX)	LaMalfa	Peñtola	Moore (UT)	Schweikert	Waltz			
Costa	Lucas	Smith (MO)	Moran	Scott, Austin	Weber (TX)			

□ 2006

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

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 405.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 216, noes 212, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 406]

AYES—216

Aderholt	Davidson	Hern	Cartwright	Garcia, Robert	Nickel			
Alford	DesJarlais	Higgins (LA)	Castor (FL)	Golden (ME)	Norcross			
Allen	Diaz-Balart	Hill	Castro (TX)	Goldman (NY)	Ocasio-Cortez			
Amodei	Donalds	Hinson	Cherifilus-	Gomez	Omar			
Armstrong	Duarte	Houchin	McCormick	Gonzalez,	Pallone			
Arrington	Duncan	Hudson	Kapthur	Vicente	Panetta			
Babin	Dunn (FL)	Huizinga	Keating	Beatty	Pappas			
Bacon	Edwards	Hunt	Hoover	Green, Al (TX)	Pascrall			
Baird	Ellzey	Issa	Hoyle (OR)	Greene (GA)	Payne			
Balderson	Emmer	Jackson (TX)	Huffman	Grijalva	Pelosi			
Banks	Estes	James	Ivey	Blumenauer	Perez			
Barr	Ezell	Johnson (LA)	Jackson (NY)	Harder (CA)	Peters			
Bean (FL)	Fallon	Johnson (OH)	Jackson Lee	Hayes	Petterson			
Bentz	Feenstra	Johnson (SD)	Jackson (SD)	Higgins (NY)	Phillips			
Bergman	Ferguson	Jordan	Jackson (IL)	Himes	Pingree			
Bice	Finstad	Joyce (OH)	Jackson (NC)	Horsford	Pocan			
Biggs	Fischbach	Joyce (PA)	Castor (TX)	Houlihan	Porter			
Bilirakis	Fitzgerald	Kean (NJ)	Castro (FL)	Hoyer	Pressley			
Bishop (NC)	Fitzpatrick	Kelly (MS)	Cherifilus-	Hoyle (OR)	Quigley			
Boebert	Fleischmann	Kelly (PA)	McCormick	Huffman	Ramirez			
Bost	Flood	Kiggans (VA)	Kapthur	Ivey	Raskin			
Brecheen	Foxx	Kiley	Keating	Jackson (IL)	Ross			
Buchanan	Franklin, C.	Kim (CA)	Hoover	Jackson (NC)	Ruiz			
Buck	Scott	Davids (KS)	Hoyle (OR)	Jackson Lee	Ruppertsberger			
Bucshon	Fry	Kustoff	Huffman	Jackson (SD)	Ryan			
Burchett	Fulcher	LaHood	Ivey	Jayapal	Salinas			
Burgess	Gaetz	LaLota	Jackson (IL)	Jeffries	Sánchez			
Burlison	Gallagher	LaMalfa	Jackson (NC)	Johnson (GA)	Sarbanes			
Calvert	Garbarino	Lamborn	Jackson (SD)	Kammlager-Dove	Scanlon			
Cammack	Garcia, Mike	Langworthy	Jordan	Kapthur	Scakowsky			
Carey	Gimenez	LaTurner	Connolly	Keating	Schiff			
Carl	Gonzales, Tony	Lawler	Correa	Hoover	Scalise			
Carter (GA)	Good (VA)	Dingell	Castor (FL)	Hoyle (OR)	Scanlon			
Chavez-DeRemer	Gooden (TX)	Lee (FL)	Cherifilus-	Huffman	Schakowsky			
Ciscomani	Gosar	Lesko	McCormick	Ivey	Schiff			
Cline	Granger	Letlow	Kapthur	Jackson (IL)	Shelby			
Cloud	Graves (LA)	Loudermilk	Keating	Jackson (NC)	Shelby			
Clyde	Graves (MO)	Luetkemeyer	Hoover	Jordan	Shelby			
Cole	Green (TN)	Luttrell	McCormick	Johnson (GA)	Shelby			
Collins	Griffith	Mace	Kapthur	Hoover	Shelby			
Comer	Grothman	Malliotakis	Keating	Hoover	Shelby			
Crane	Guest	Mann	Hoover	Hoover	Shelby			
Crawford	Guthrie	Frankel, Lois	Hoover	Hoover	Shelby			
Crenshaw	Hageman	Frost	Hoover	Hoover	Shelby			
Curtis	Harris	Mast	Hoover	Hoover	Shelby			
D'Esposito	Harshbarger	Garcia (IL)	Hoover	Hoover	Shelby			
		Garcia (TX)	Hoover	Hoover	Shelby			

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

NOT VOTING—5

Carter (TX)	Lucas	De La Cruz	Luna
-------------	-------	------------	------

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2012

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROTECTING HUNTING HERITAGE AND EDUCATION ACT

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. 5110) to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to clarify that the prohibition on the use of Federal education funds for certain weapons does not apply to the use of such weapons for training in archery, hunting, or other shooting sports, 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 Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 424, nays 1, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 407]

YEAS—424

Adams	Budzinski	Crawford
Aderholt	Burchett	Crenshaw
Allen	Burgess	Crockett
Allred	Calvert	Cuellar
Amodei	Cammack	Curtis
Armstrong	Caraveo	D'Esposito
Babin	Carson	Carbajal
Balderson	Carter (GA)	Davidson (KS)
Banks	Carter (LA)	Cardenas
Barr	DeLauro	Davidson
Bentz	Cartwright	DelBene
Bergman	Casar	Deluzio
Bice	Case	DeSaulnier
Biggs	Barragán	DesJarlais
Bilirakis	Casten	Diaz-Balart
Bishop (NC)	Bean (FL)	Castor (FL)
Boebert	Beck	Castro (TX)
Bost	Bentz	Dingell
Brecheen	Bezerra	DeGette
Buchanan	Bishop (NC)	DeGraffenreid
Buck	Blumenauer	DeLauro
Bucshon	Boehner	Cartwright
Burchett	Bonamici	DelBene
Burgess	Bonamici	Donalds
Burlison	Bonamici	Emmer
Calvert	Bonamici	Fitzpatrick
Cammack	Bonamici	Fitzpatrick
Carey	Bonamici	Fitzpatrick
Carl	Bonamici	Fitzpatrick
Carter (GA)	Bonamici	Fitzpatrick
Chavez-DeRemer	Bonamici	Fitzpatrick
Ciscomani	Bonamici	Fitzpatrick
Cline	Bonamici	Fitzpatrick
Cloud	Bonamici	Fitzpatrick
Clyde	Bonamici	Fitzpatrick
Cole	Bonamici	Fitzpatrick
Collins	Bonamici	Fitzpatrick
Comer	Bonamici	Fitzpatrick
Crane	Bonamici	Fitzpatrick
Crawford	Bonamici	Fitzpatrick
Crenshaw	Bonamici	Fitzpatrick
Curtis	Bonamici	Fitzpatrick
D'Esposito	Bonamici	Fitzpatrick