



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 169

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 2023

No. 157—Part II

House of Representatives

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2024

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 723 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4367.

Will the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE) kindly take the chair.

□ 1832

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further 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, with Mr. GUTHRIE (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole House rose earlier today, amendment No. 11 printed in part B of House Report 118-216 offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. CORREA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in part B of House Report 118-216.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 13, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$496,260,000) (increased by \$496,260,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 723, the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I say to you, if you want to reduce fentanyl on our streets, I ask you to vote for this amendment.

This amendment No. 13 simply allows CBP to hire additional CBP officers at our ports of entry in addition to new CBP Border Patrol agents. Our ports of entry today are the economic engine of our country. They are vital gateways for our international commerce, travel, and they collect more than \$112 billion in duties and taxes every year, but our ports of entry are understaffed.

CBP has told us they need 4,000 more agents at our ports of entry. As you know, about 90 percent of fentanyl seizures and other narcotics actually happen at our ports of entry. That is with only 2 percent of the vehicles crossing being inspected. That is with only 17 percent of cargo coming across those ports of entries being inspected. If you want to stop and if you want to seize more fentanyl, you need to hire more agents at our ports of entry. It is very simple.

Today, this bill that I am amending calls for 2,000 more border agents, but only 150 new officers at our ports of entry. Let me repeat: This bill only calls for 150 new agents at our ports of entry, and my amendment simply says: Give the CBP, our folks at the border, the ability and the flexibility to determine who they hire—ports of entry, or between ports of entry. Those experts that are there protecting our borders day in and day out should make that decision.

Again, Mr. Chair, 90 percent of the fentanyl seized coming into this country is seized at our ports of entry. Ninety percent? Says who? Ninety percent, says those officers at our ports of entry.

They need our help. Let's give them the flexibility. Let's give them the tools to make sure they keep our country safe from fentanyl while continuing to increase economic commerce and trade at our borders.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to support amendment No. 13, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chair, the amendment offered by the gentleman from California is well-meaning, but ultimately misguided. We are averaging nearly 10,000 encounters at the southern border on a daily basis, near record levels. My bill addresses the challenge by funding an additional 1,800 Border Patrol agents to relieve the burden on our overworked agents along the southwest border.

Taking funds dedicated to the Border Patrol agents and instead using them to hire additional customs officers dilutes our efforts to secure the border between the ports of entry. Additional officers may be needed to help with legitimate trade and travel that crosses the border, but we have to address the immediate crisis caused by this administration's disastrous border security policies.

If you turn on the television, you can see the flood of migrants heading north on trains, crossing the border in an uncontrolled fashion. It must stop, which is why we desperately need additional men and women in green uniforms to help us gain operational control of the border. I reluctantly urge my colleagues to vote no on this amendment. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Chair, and I say to my colleague on the other side of the aisle, who is absolutely correct, we need those forces at our border. I am just pointing out that we know most of the drugs, narcotics, fentanyl, come across the ports of entry. Why not give those ports additional personnel to stop the fentanyl that we know is killing our citizens, our young people in our streets.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

Give them the opportunity to also hire. Give the Border Patrol and those agents at our ports of entry the ability to stop these poisons from coming into our country. One death is one death too many from an overdose from fentanyl. Let's stop fentanyl and other narcotics from coming into the country.

Again, sir, 90 percent of the fentanyl and narcotics are actually apprehended at our ports of entry. That is not my statistic. That is not his statistic. That is Homeland Security data. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Chair, again, I think all of us recognize the challenges we have at our border.

What I am merely doing is presenting this amendment, amendment No. 13, in response to what I have seen at our ports of entry, which is: They need more personnel, and they need it today. Let's help them at the border keep our country safe. Let's give them the personnel and the resources they need.

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

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MR. GROTHMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 19 printed in part B of House Report 118-216.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 14, line 20, after the first dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000) (increased by \$1,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 723, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I have been down on the border several times, and every time we are down there, we learn a little bit more.

My amendment would highlight the need for alternative methods of man-

agement for border wall infrastructure during flood season. The border wall faces a challenge when the waters rise during flood season. These floods can jeopardize the structural integrity of the wall, compromising its effectiveness and putting our border at risk.

During a recent hearing I held in Sierra Vista, Arizona, I was surprised to discover the way in which we deal with this issue. We deal with it just by opening up the gates along the wall. You heard that right. Border Patrol agents are required to open vast sections of the wall, allowing migrants to flow into the country unimpeded. This comes at a time when we are facing an unprecedented crisis.

Last month, U.S. officials encountered 230,000 migrants crossing the border; 180,000 of those migrants crossed the border between ports of entry, areas that are supposed to be protected by the wall. However, during flood season, these migrants simply walked through because we open up the gates.

To address this critical concern, we need to explore alternative methods and technologies that can protect the border wall.

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

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUELLAR. Again, I understand where the gentleman is coming from, but, if we look at it, even the prior administration also understood that the way to address this issue is to put those gates there because of the flooding.

Congress has been looking at this issue with CBP for the last 15 years, and, while it is not perfect, I do understand the prior two administrations have come to the same conclusion, and that is: Deal with the monsoons, the flooding, and they put those doors to make sure that things are not washed off.

Keep in mind that we are spending about \$36 million a mile for every fence that we put up. That is \$36 million a mile. With about \$3 to \$5 million, we can get the best technology that can include drones, that could include sensors, that can include so much of the technology to address that.

Again, if you spent \$36 million a mile for a fence, all you need is a \$100 ladder that would take care of the problem that you have. Again, I will show that, even in Texas, Mr. Chairman, people are concerned about the flooding over there, and that is why the fence is put a quarter mile or a half a mile away, so all the landowners that are over here, they lose their property because you are putting the fence on this side, so the renters, the property, the private right is gone because of the fence.

All you have is the river over here. People just walk over here to the fence and claim asylum. We have to have repercussions at the border. Whoever is supposed to stay, stay. Whoever is sup-

posed to be deported should be deported.

Again, we cannot play defense on the 1-yard line, called the U.S. border. We need to extend the perimeter out there. Again, I feel, Mr. Chairman, that the wall might be damaged because of the water or the flooding, but, again, the past administration—the Trump administration, the Biden administration, and the Bush administration—all came up with the same conclusion when they got asked to look at this issue, and they said: You have to put doors or gates so the rain or the floods don't wash away the fence.

Mr. Chair, I understand where my colleague is coming from, but I will ask the floor to vote "no."

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

□ 1845

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chair, I just reiterate, being at the border and talking to the members of the Border Patrol who are on the border every day, they feel the current situation is untenable and is allowing more people to cross the border than they should.

As far as the idea of simply climbing over a fence, I have yet to meet anybody on the border, be it Border Patrol agent, be it American law enforcement, be it people who have land on the border, who do not feel the wall is a good thing.

They all realize it is a wall system. It takes more than just a wall. They prefer if we describe it as a wall system, but they all feel we need additional barriers at the border to prevent this over 200,000 people a month streaming in here.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MS.

WASSERMAN SCHULTZ

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 23 printed in part B of House Report 118-216.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 213.
Strike section 214.
Strike section 220.
Strike section 221.
Strike section 224.
Strike section 404.
Strike section 405.
Strike section 544.
Strike section 549.
Strike section 550.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 723, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chair, my amendment gives my Republican colleagues a chance to reconsider some of the cruel and reckless partisan riders tacked onto this atrocity of a Homeland Security bill.

Republicans are really done, obviously, pretending that they just want people to immigrate here legally. This bill puts their bitter disdain for all immigrants on clear display because when President Biden set up legal pathways to reduce pressure at the border, the radical right objected. They took aim at Dreamers and refugees with legal status. By taking away their right to work, they threaten to harm our economy, jack up inflation, and condemn these communities to poverty in the process. That is not securing the homeland. It is inflicting vicious harm.

Instead of registering immigrants and offering the chance to work and pay taxes, this bill would leave immigrants to languish in private prisons that fail to meet bare minimum standards for convicts, all at taxpayer expense.

This Republican bill blocks inspections of detention facilities so our constituents can't see the horrific treatment and squalid conditions that migrants are forced to endure.

Even that malevolence doesn't satisfy my Republican colleagues. Listen carefully here. This bill goes further to mandate that every last one of these prisons is filled to the brim, packed full of people who have not been convicted of a crime, have not faced a judge, and have not seen a lawyer.

Finally, this bill blocks legally admitted migrants from being reunited with their families, separating children, even toddlers, from their families. Yet, MAGA Republicans will still preach to all of us about family values.

I know the people they are marginalizing in this bill, people who come from Venezuela, Cuba, and Haiti. They are my neighbors, my friends, my children's classmates. They are like family in my community.

None of us are happy with our immigration system. Why not work toward a bipartisan plan that balances legal pathways with unbiased enforcement?

The secret is out: Republicans don't want a solution. They want more chaos and more heartbreak. They want more desperate people trying their luck against the Rio Grande or the Florida Straits instead of safely applying online from home and coming through a port of entry. The pain is the point for these extremists.

Mr. Chair, I wish my amendment could make sense of this bill, but these provisions barely scratch the surface. All I can hope is that my colleagues will show a shred of courage and common sense, even if it means facing jeers from the radical rightwing fringe, their base who is holding this majority hostage.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to join me in countering this effort to deepen the despair of families who have had enough of it for one lifetime.

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

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chair, this amendment seeks to strike several provisions that are crucial to ending the open border crisis that this administration has created.

While I have heard it just portrayed as somehow being cruel and being done by names that are called MAGA or other things, if I am not mistaken, it was just this morning on the news that I happened to see the mayor, I believe a Democrat, from New York saying they can't take any more; the Governor of New York, a Democrat, saying they can't take any more; the Governor of Massachusetts declaring a state of emergency; the Democratic mayor of Chicago, same issue.

I guess it is our problem, and we are attempting to fix it. The Biden administration continues to subvert the law and implement policies that are detrimental to our border security, our national security, and our overall sovereignty.

This bill includes several provisions to mitigate the misguided and ineffective policies of the Biden administration that have been exploited by transnational criminal organizations, human smugglers, and cartels.

For example, the bill prohibits funds to implement the administration's prosecutorial discretion guidance, which encourages DHS attorneys to administratively close nonpriority cases, allowing aliens to continue living in this country without having any legal basis to do so.

Additionally, this bill includes a provision prohibiting asylum officers from making determinations about an alien's credible fear claims instead of actual immigration judges.

These are only two of the main provisions in the bill that seek to reverse the damage done in the past 2½ years and halt the migration crisis in its tracks.

To strike these provisions would be to tell our constituents that Congress approves of this administration's catastrophe at the border. Nothing could be further from the truth.

While they may not admit it, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle know that what is happening at the border right now is nothing short of a catastrophe.

Mayors and Governors throughout this country alike are speaking out on the impact of the illegal migration crisis on communities across the Nation and are calling on this administration to acknowledge and resolve the problem at the border. This amendment would only make the disaster worse.

Mr. Chair, I urge defeat of the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chair, I will give a couple of examples

of the type of torture that the language in this bill supports and endorses.

One provision, section 404, prohibits funds for asylum officers to adjudicate fear claims, which is the point of our asylum program.

Republicans include the perfect provision to demonstrate that they value disrupting due process for migrants more than they value speeding up results for their constituents. They want to block asylum officers, who receive extensive training and face enough difficulties as it is, from assessing whether refugees have a reasonable claim to asylum.

While Republicans continue to engage in massive hyperbole, leaving people with the impression that people are storming the border, this bill actually prevents a lawful, orderly asylum process from occurring because the Republicans defund it in this bill.

Another section eliminates the inspections of detention facilities. All I have heard since the MAGA majority gaveled in this Congress is oversight, oversight, oversight. Yet, when it comes to our detention facilities where vulnerable women and families are held indefinitely without a trial or legal counsel, Republicans want no oversight at all.

These inspections are critical. These inspectors ought to get combat pay for what they walk into. At one facility in my home State, Mr. Chair, an investigation found severe violations, including sexual voyeurism by guards, denial of menstrual products as punishment, refusal of lifesaving medication and healthcare, beatings, and extended solitary confinement.

Yet, Republicans in this Homeland Security bill actually eliminate funding for inspections of detention facilities and allow this torture to continue. It is outrageous.

Mr. Chair, I will use the balance of my time to underscore my fierce opposition to these toxic anti-immigrant provisions.

I will always stand up to counter-attacks on legal pathways for migrants. I will also condemn cruelty against the vulnerable, even when it is justified by deterrence. I will never stay silent when opportunists try to blind the American people to the trauma we are inflicting on a generation of refugees.

The extreme MAGA Republicans ignored dozens of commonsense requests from bipartisan Members regarding detention conditions, preserving asylum access, and ensuring that Congress upholds its oversight responsibility.

Mr. Chair, I hope my colleagues will join me in mitigating the most harmful components of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I urge a "no" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. BURCHETT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 24 printed in part B of House Report 118-216.

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 32, line 1, insert “or across State lines” after “United States”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 723, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BURCHETT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Chair, the key to this amendment is just four words: “or across State lines.”

One of my cosponsors, Mr. DONALDS—I guess it is like football practice this morning—is absent.

This amendment prohibits Federal funds from being used to transport illegal immigrants over the age of 18 across State lines except for the purpose of removing the individuals from the country.

As it currently stands, the bill prohibits funds from being used to transport illegal immigrants into the interior of this country but fails to recognize there are already folks here illegally.

This amendment will cut wasteful and unnecessary spending of taxpayer dollars. It will get the Biden administration out of the human trafficking business. It will focus Homeland Security operations on removing the people who enter our country illegally.

Mr. Chair, our border States have been overwhelmed by the Biden administration’s pro-illegal immigration agenda since he first came to office. This amendment would help our border agents do what they are supposed to do, and that is protect our border and deport illegal immigrants.

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

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chair, I oppose this amendment.

I trust the work of Border Patrol agents. I trust the work of OFO, which are the men and women in blue at ports of entry. I trust the Air and Marine agents. I trust the work of ICE agents. I trust the work of HSI, Homeland Security agents. I trust the work that they do.

What we are looking at, what wants to be changed, is section 221 that says that none—this is what the law is right now—none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this act may be made available to transport aliens unlawfully present, paroled, or inadmissible to the United States into the interior of the United States for purposes other than the enforcement of immigration law.

It is already here. Again, I don’t think we ought to be legislating on the House floor. I think we need to get input from the agents that I mentioned that I support: Border Patrol, OFO, Air and Marine, ICE, HSI. I think we need to ask for it, but the law is already there. It says: cannot go into the interior of the U.S. itself.

Mr. Chair, I stand in opposition, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Chair, we are leaving out a key element of this. I, too, trust our Border Patrol agents. They are underpaid and overworked. I do not trust this White House. This has four words added to it: “or across State lines.” That is what is currently happening. It needs to stop, Mr. Chair. That is the bottom line.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BURCHETT).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee will be postponed.

□ 1900

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MS. ESCOBAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 25 printed in part B of House Report 118-216.

Ms. ESCOBAR. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 224.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 723, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. ESCOBAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. ESCOBAR. Mr. Chair, my amendment strikes section 224 of the bill, which mandates that ICE prioritize detention before considering any other options, such as alternatives to detention.

This mandate is absurd, and for a party claiming to champion fiscal responsibility, it makes no sense to mandate detention, which is the most expensive option available.

We know from previous alternatives to detention, like the case management program run by DHS in 2016, that providing case management services for migrant families costs the Department roughly \$39 per day. Compare that to the cost of detaining those same families, which is roughly \$300 per day.

The mandate makes no sense, even on the most practical level. The United States simply does not have the capacity to detain every single asylum seeker who arrives at our Nation’s front door, nor should it.

Furthermore, section 244 of the bill hamstrings DHS’ operational flexibility to effectively manage their resources depending on the Department’s needs at a given time. This could cause a ripple effect of management issues for several agencies within DHS, including ICE and CBP, which would further exacerbate the challenges we see in border communities like mine.

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

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chair, the amendment before you seeks to strike a provision in the bill that requires the prioritization of detention and appropriate GPS monitoring technology for aliens going through immigration proceedings.

As we continue to see record levels of migrant encounters under this administration, and our nondetained docket continues to grow exponentially, we must use every available tool to compel the Department to enforce the law.

Striking the provision will give the Biden administration a free pass to continue releasing migrants into the country, a total disregard of the law. We cannot allow the administration to continue the status quo that has ravaged our communities.

Mr. Chair, I urge defeat of the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ESCOBAR. Mr. Chair, if my colleagues were truly being honest with each other, they would admit the proposed Homeland Security appropriations bill is unworkable and truly will not solve the challenges that we face.

For this reason, at the appropriate time, I will offer a motion to recommit this bill back to committee.

Mr. Chair, this bill pulls money from critical DHS functions and improvements, including investing in our ports of entry, the CBP One app, and even endangers public safety by defunding CBP’s recently updated vehicle pursuit policy.

In short, this bill is filled with unworkable, empty promises Republicans feed their base instead of putting forth real solutions.

I have tremendous respect for my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, and I would implore him to work with

us on a bipartisan solution that is truly workable.

I was born and raised in El Paso, Texas, on the U.S.-Mexico border. I live there today. I raised my two children there in that beautiful community.

No one wants safety, security, and order more than those of us who live there and have invested our lives in those communities. We know that relying on borders, as my colleague, Representative CUELLAR, has pointed out, is not the answer.

They don't deter or manage, and they don't make migrants go away. All it does is feed cartels so that they can find other routes for migrants. We share a commitment to wanting to end that.

We can find a solution and a bipartisan pathway. My colleague, MARIA SALAZAR, and I have come together to find compromise, to seek true solutions that uphold our values and actually solve the problems at hand, and I invite my Republican colleagues to join us.

There is no doubt that this is a very broken system that puts significant pressure and strain on communities like mine, on NGOs, on local governments, on our Federal personnel, and, of course, the incredible inhumanity that migrants endure in order to seek an opportunity to live and work in our country.

This broken system is a consequence of Congress' inaction. It has been 37 years since Congress has reformed and passed a comprehensive immigration law. There is no better time than the present to do that together, in a bipartisan way.

Depending on unworkable solutions, expecting that Mexico will accept every migrant, believing we can jail every human being that comes to our border is unrealistic, and it is not a true solution.

If the House rules permitted, I would have offered a motion to recommit with an important amendment to this bill.

My amendment would cut the billions of dollars being allocated to the outdated and expensive border wall and reallocate it to the programs and services necessary to address a deadly and urgent matter—the fentanyl smuggling detection and interdiction that is needed at our ports of entry.

The most effective way to ensure that fentanyl smugglers are caught and held accountable is to send resources where fentanyl is entering the country—our ports of entry.

Over 90 percent of fentanyl is seized at these land ports and interior checkpoints, and it is overwhelmingly smuggled by U.S. citizens crossing the border legally.

Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD the text of my amendment.

Ms. Escobar moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4367 to the Committee on Appropriations with the following amendment:

Page 13, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$310,274,000)".

Page 14, line 20, after the first dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$658,400,000)".

Page 14, line 20, after the second dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$317,000,000)".

Page 14, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$975,400,000)".

Page 15, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$258,750,000)".

Page 16, line 21, after the first dollar amount, insert "(increase by \$15,000,000)".

Page 16, line 21, after the second dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$15,000,000)".

Page 18, line 16, after the first dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$9,676,000)".

Page 19, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$50,000,000)".

Page 27, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$658,400,000)".

Page 27, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,052,000,000)".

Page 27, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$317,000,000)".

Page 27, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$76,600,000)".

Page 56, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$14,700,000)".

Ms. ESCOBAR. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I certainly appreciate my distinguished colleague and am always there to work together in a bipartisan fashion to try to fashion something.

She is right. It is long overdue for Congress to address this situation, but unfortunately, this is about appropriations and not authorizations.

Therefore, Mr. Chair, I urge a "no" vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. ESCOBAR).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. ESCOBAR. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MR. TONY GONZALES OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 26 printed in part B of House Report 118-216.

Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 33, line 8, insert "at all detention facilities" after "full capacity".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 723, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TONY GONZALES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas. Mr. Chair, I represent a district that is over 42 percent of the southern border, places that, sadly, nobody knew very well a few years ago and now everybody knows, places like Eagle Pass, Del Rio, and El Paso.

Right now in my communities, we are completely overwhelmed. In El Paso alone, there are over 11,000 people who are here illegally in the community. That has saturated the situation.

In Eagle Pass, we have come to beyond the breaking point where over 2,000 people are coming illegally. In that community, we are beyond a point of return, and we need help. We need assistance.

Every instinct in my body is to leave this place and go home and help the people in my district. It feels as if a Category 5 hurricane has hit the southern border. This is the absolute worst I have seen it, and there is no bottom to it. There is no end in sight.

My amendment is simple. My amendment asks to end catch and release essentially in a humane and orderly way. If there is space, if there is capacity, instead of DHS releasing migrants into a community that is already saturated, this amendment asks that they look for other places where they have capacity.

It is humane and orderly, and most importantly, it would end the catch-and-release policies that have turned my communities upside down.

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

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chair, I rise respectfully in opposition against this amendment, but I will say this: My good friend and I share the border. We will continue working.

I do believe in detention beds. I do believe there is a place for them. I do believe that we should best utilize the detention beds for the high-risk detainees, and I believe also that we should give ICE flexibility.

I will commit to my good friend from Texas (Mr. TONY GONZALES) and to my other good friend from Ohio (Mr. JOYCE) that I will work with them when we get in conference committee because this is not the final bill. I will work with them on this particular language.

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

Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I urge this body to please grant the people in my district, the people in Eagle Pass, the people in El Paso some relief. We are beyond a breaking point, and we are completely overwhelmed.

I am here to urge this body to do something today, not a week, not a month, not a year, not 10 years from now—today. Ending catch and release is exactly what our communities need to get some relief.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TONY GONZALES).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment Nos. 27 and 28 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MR. CLYDE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 29 printed in part B of House Report 118-216.

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 41, line 9, strike the first dollar amount and insert “\$1,778,222,250”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 723, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CLYDE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to cut the funding levels for the Department of Homeland Security’s Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, also known as CISA, by 25 percent, which equals about a \$592.7 million reduction.

On CISA’s website, the agency’s mission reads: “We lead the national effort to understand, manage, and reduce risk to our cyber and physical infrastructure.” Great mission statement.

Unfortunately, CISA has dangerously and nefariously migrated far from its mission, kind of like one of the illegal aliens coming across our southern border.

Last year, CISA was involved in the infamous Disinformation Governance Board established under the Biden administration’s Department of Homeland Security to regulate and police Americans’ speech.

While this dystopian Disinformation Governance Board was rightfully disbanded a few months later after enormous public outcry, many will be shocked to learn that CISA has not stopped monitoring Americans’ free speech.

According to a draft copy of DHS’ “Quadrennial Homeland Security Review,” CISA drafted plans to target “inaccurate information” on a wide range of topics, including “the origins of the COVID-19 pandemic, the efficacy of the COVID-19 vaccine, racial justice, U.S. withdrawal from Afghanistan, and the nature of U.S. support to Ukraine.”

Moreover, Twitter’s business records suggest that CISA migrated its true mission to protect the Nation’s critical cyber and physical infrastructure into controlling what Americans can say and what speech is accessible online.

This is wrong, dangerous, and a massive violation of our constitutional rights. Americans’ First Amendment freedoms shall not be regulated or controlled by a rogue government agency either directly or indirectly through Big Tech. This government by proxy censorship has no place in our constitutional Republic.

For some background, CISA was first created with overwhelming bipartisan

support prior to my service here in the House. Under the Trump administration, CISA focused on countering foreign cyber influence. Unfortunately, since the current administration took office, CISA has aggressively shifted beyond the original mandate of countering foreign threats.

In January 2021, CISA officials renamed the Countering Foreign Influence Task Force, one of the key bodies countering foreign disinformation founded during the Trump administration. They renamed it to the mis-, dis-, and malinformation team, or MDM team, meaning they took the word “foreign” out of the title. This shift in name represents a shift in CISA’s mission from foreign to domestic to censor American citizens.

□ 1915

Earlier this year, information was reported that showed members of CISA had privately characterized those who raised concerns over government censorship of free speech. CISA had labeled these individuals bad actors.

CISA needs to return to its original mission of strengthening and protecting our national cybersecurity and infrastructure, not censoring free speech and infringing America’s First Amendment liberties.

As CISA’s budget has drastically increased by 44 percent over the last 3 fiscal years, this agency has dangerously expanded its mission to police free speech and to silence the American people.

There is a clear connection here. Given an extraordinary boost in funding, CISA has weaponized tax dollars to censor Americans and target speech they find disagreeable. It is time to end this injustice in order to protect the American people’s unalienable First Amendment rights.

Therefore, I offer this amendment to reduce CISA’s funding closer to its fiscal year 2019-2020 funding level. This agency must be refocused on its true mission and not get expanded funding to continue undermining our constitutional rights.

There is nothing like a budget cut to get an agency’s attention.

Mr. Chair, I urge all Members to support my amendment in an effort to stop CISA’s Orwellian practices and defend our cherished First Amendment freedoms.

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

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I claim time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chair, we set out to make precise and calculated cuts in this bill due to CISA’s rapid growth over the last few years. The top line serves effectively as a strategic pause and significant budget growth. It is \$19 million above the fiscal 2023 enacted level, but \$130 million below the President’s requests.

This provides CISA the opportunity to mature its operations commensu-

rate with its historic budget growth. This amendment would cut CISA’s operation and support budget by 25 percent on top of what we have already done.

We had a debate on a cut of this magnitude during full committee consideration, and I said then, as I do again now, passing this amendment would make our homeland less secure. This mis-, dis-, and mal-information language is strong, and I want to commend the gentleman from Georgia for his valuable edits to those provisions during markup, which we made sure we addressed in a more holistic way.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Chairman, the only thing that agencies in this town respect is funding.

Indeed, reduced funding is the only way that we will bring them back to their core mission. This agency has had a 44 percent increase in funding, and yet, they have taken that money, and what they have done to our First Amendment civil liberties, to our rights, is they have spied upon us.

In the cybersecurity world, they have taken our information and they have misused it. I think CISA needs a haircut, and I think this haircut will get their attention.

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

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chair, it is with the utmost respect I speak to my colleague. We have had lengthy debates about this in full committee. I understand and appreciate the desire that he has to defund or at least severely reduce the budget of this agency.

However, we are at a time in America where it serves as a clearinghouse for those rogue nations and bad actors that prey upon Americans on a daily basis. This is something that is not only important for everybody who works in the cyber communities and cyber systems, but also for the schools, hospitals, water and sewage facilities, the gas pipeline, and all those things throughout our country that don’t have a safety net. They have to rely on CISA for their information in the hope and support because unfortunately the companies that provide the software do nothing when they are hacked by these outside influences and actors.

All this agency could do and hope to do is promote that clearinghouse, if you will, that platform for which we can all come to an understanding. Bad actors exist and we must prevent it.

I understand and appreciate and will work closely with my colleague to make sure the things he talks about as far as the attacks on First Amendment rights never occur in any agency of the United States.

Mr. Chair, at this time I must urge a “no” vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CLYDE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MS. TENNEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 38 printed in part B of House Report 118-216.

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay Secretary Alejandro Nicholas Mayorkas a salary that exceeds \$1.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 723, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. TENNEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment to reduce Department of Homeland Security Secretary Mayorkas' salary to \$1.

Since President Biden has taken office, we have witnessed an unprecedented invasion on our southern border, causing 6 million migrants to flood across our border, and including the northern border.

The district that I represent in upstate and central New York contains most of the New York border region. Secretary Mayorkas has ended numerous successful border policies by the Trump administration, including the remain in Mexico policy, building the border wall, and ending the catch-and-release policy. As a result, all of our communities have been transformed into border communities, including New York.

Near my district in Erie County, two migrants were charged, one for rape and one with a sexual assault. In nearby Rensselaer County, a migrant has been charged with murder.

These migrants were not vetted, in spite of the false claims of Governor Kathy Hochul, who claimed they were vetted. Over 100 individuals on the terror watch list have successfully crossed the southern border, putting all of our communities at risk, including those in New York.

Secretary Mayorkas is willfully derelict in his duties or is completely incompetent. Either way, he should no longer be paid hundreds of thousands of dollars a year for failing to perform the basic obligations required under our Constitution to protect American citizens and to provide effective border security and control of our border.

I was honored to co-lead this amendment with my friend from Texas and

my colleague, Representative CHIP ROY. I urge my colleagues to join us in support of this amendment and to finally hold Secretary Mayorkas accountable. I am hoping Mr. ROY will join me and speak on behalf of this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I would say that just this past month we hit a record for migrant crossings in American history of over 304,000. Despite repeated pleas and actions by me and my colleagues on this side of the aisle, Mayorkas refuses to change course and actually secure our border.

Secretary Mayorkas has completely failed to do his job and has completely doubled down on his failed policies. While Congress ultimately needs to impeach and remove Secretary Mayorkas, defunding his salary is a great first start.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chair, I claim time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Any Secretary of Homeland Security plays a very critical role in national security. Secretary Mayorkas has served our country as U.S. Attorney, director of USCIS, Deputy Secretary of Homeland Security and now Secretary.

I know that we hear a lot from the other side of the aisle where they say that the Secretary has not achieved operational control of the border. Operational control of the border was first defined in the Secure Fence Act of 2006, and neither the Border Patrol chief nor the Secretary has yet declared operational control since then.

If you look at it, two Republican Presidents, Bush and Trump, neither of them obtained operational control. Two Democrats, Obama and Biden, also have not obtained operational control.

I know how important the Constitution is to my colleagues, and I would ask you to say that by targeting salaries it is simply unconstitutional, as pointed out in the *United States v. Lovett*, a Supreme Court case from 1946.

If we are going to uphold the Constitution, the Court has said that targeting salaries is not the right way. We all want to secure the border, but targeting somebody's salary does not get us to the end that we want to get to.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "no," and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Chairman, the Holman rule still exists, and we are exercising our right under the Holman rule.

Mr. Chair, may I inquire much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman has 2½ minutes remaining.

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY).

Mr. ROY. Mr. Chairman, I have great respect for my colleague on the other side of the aisle from Texas. On this matter we disagree.

The Secretary of Homeland Security has entirely abdicated his responsibility to follow the laws of the United States. He has done so purposely, he has done so with complete disregard to his constitutional obligation to run the Department of Homeland Security, which by definition means he is supposed to secure the homeland—having released some 2 million people into the United States.

He has come before the House Judiciary Committee, and literally said, yes, we have operational control of the border, while staring directly at a statute defining operational control of the border under the Secure Fence Act. He later went back to the committee and said, no, no, no, that is not the definition I was talking about. He knew full well what he was doing.

He is trying to pull the wool over the eyes of the American people that he is somehow following the laws. That he is somehow following asylum laws and parole laws when he is using parole—which is supposed on a case-by-case basis—to literally dump hundreds of thousands of people into the United States.

Americans are dying. Kids are dying from fentanyl poisoning. The very migrants that my colleagues say this is supposed to be helpful for are dying in the Rio Grande or dying on south Texas ranches or getting sold into the sex trafficking trade, or dying, or getting abused in stash houses.

This is a blatant disregard of his duty. He should be removed from office. We sure as hell shouldn't be funding his salary. The Holman rule exists for us to exercise our Article I authority over an abusive Article II executive.

It is time for Congress to reassert its authority, to reclaim control, to use the power of the purse to stop the abusive authority by this Secretary to endanger the American people, to endanger migrants, and to undermine our Homeland Security.

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Chair, may I inquire much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman has 30 seconds remaining.

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Chairman, let me just be clear to everyone out there. The Democrats in New York are against this policy put in place by Joe Biden and Secretary Mayorkas. Even Mayor Adams of New York City has blamed Joe Biden. Our current Governor Kathy Hochul has done a 180 and now she blames Joe Biden. Even former Governor Cuomo is now blaming Joe Biden for this migrant crisis in New York.

Mr. Chair, 82 percent of New Yorkers, in a recent poll, blame Joe Biden and Secretary Mayorkas for this migrant crisis in New York, which is having devastating consequences on our security, and is harming our taxpayers.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to join Congressman ROY and I in reducing Secretary Mayorkas' salary to \$1. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. TENNEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1930

AMENDMENT NO. 39 OFFERED BY MR. BIGGS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 39 printed in part B of House Report 118-216.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay the salary and expenses of the position of the Director of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, occupied by Jen Easterly.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 723, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in support of my amendment, which prohibits the use of funds to pay the salary and expenses of CISA Director Jen Easterly.

It is no secret at this point that this administration is waging war on conservative voices, and Jen Easterly has been at the tip of the Biden administration's spear to censor American speech.

In the recent case decision of *Missouri v. Biden*, Judge Doughty specifically pointed out Ms. Easterly's targeting of conservative speech for censorship. In fact, Ms. Easterly's censorship efforts were so explicit and pervasive that Judge Doughty believed that the plaintiffs in the case are likely to succeed in their claims against Ms. Easterly and the other Biden administration officials.

This was affirmed recently by the Fifth Circuit. On September 6, 2023, they wrote, "CISA, however, did flag content. Beyond holding regular industry meetings with the platforms, CISA officials engaged in 'switchboarding' operations, meaning they acted as an intermediary for a third-party group by forwarding flagged content from them to the platforms."

For her part, Ms. Easterly has both worked with and in some cases coerced social media platforms to take down and suppress posts that don't fit into the administration's idea of what the truth is. We know this because Ms. Easterly herself has said that conservative opinions that question the administration are not truth but are instead alternative facts and are dangerous to national security, implying

that terms like truth are for her and the administration to define. She and other members of the administration have ordered the removal of posts about Hunter Biden's laptop, the COVID lab-leak theory, the ineffectiveness of masks and the vaccine, questions about the security of the 2020 election and future elections, and the state of the economy. Most of that has been proven objectively to be true, but she suppressed it as well as suppressing a variety of other posts, which happened to be inconvenient for the Biden administration.

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

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I understand and join in the outrage shared by my colleagues over the CISA mis-, dis-, and malinformation scandal.

No administration and no government should ever be in the business of labeling or attempting to convince social media companies that First Amendment-protected speech is or is not disinformation.

The government is not the arbiter of the truth, a position that even the ACLU agrees with. That is why we worked diligently to address government censorship concerns in this bill, and I stand by our language.

However, this amendment is not targeted at the policies of the Biden administration that we disagree with. It is targeted at a person who wasn't in office when CISA engaged in mis-, dis-, and malinformation activities. While we might not agree with her policies, the CISA Director has a history of dutiful service to this country, including a long career in the military.

Director Easterly is a West Point graduate, two-time recipient of the Bronze Star, retiring from the Army after more than 20 years in intelligence and cyber operations.

While I empathize with the sponsor on the sentiment behind this amendment, I cannot support it, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

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

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chair, not only has Ms. Easterly already suppressed many conservative voices, she has stated that she is preparing to do the same thing again for the 2024 election; not somebody else in the administration, not somebody else in CISA, Ms. Easterly has said this. This continuous and purposeful censorship of conservative voices must stop.

Just as we saw in the last amendment with Secretary Mayorkas, using the Holman rule helps us do our job and do our duty.

In July, Federal Judge Doughty of the Western District of Louisiana gave a memo decision in the case of the State of Missouri v. Joseph R. Biden, Jr. As part of his conclusions, Judge Doughty stated multiple times that it

was likely the plaintiffs in this case will prevail on their ultimate case of censorship and suppression of conservative voices by the Biden administration.

The primary means of censorship by the defendants in the case was by colluding with and in some cases ordering social media companies to ban conservative individuals on their platforms and to take down posts which dared to question the Biden administration on a number of important issues.

Among the defendants listed by Terry Doughty as having directed this purposeful policy of censorship are CISA Director Jen Easterly. I urge my colleagues to join me in this important endeavor of holding someone accountable. I don't know what more we need to do, but certainly we should hold Ms. Easterly accountable.

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

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR), the ranking member.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chairman, I join the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOYCE), my chairman, in strong opposition to this amendment.

CISA Director Easterly leads an organization of over 3,000 dedicated public servants who play a critical role in our national security.

First, Director Easterly is the operational lead for Federal cybersecurity charged with protecting and defending the Federal civilian executive branch networks, the dot-gov we all rely on.

Second, CISA serves as the national coordinator for critical infrastructure security and resilience, working with partners across government and industry to make sure that we protect and defend our Nation's critical infrastructure from bad actors.

Again, when you target somebody by name and you want to reduce their salary, it is unconstitutional. Targeting salaries is unconstitutional, as pointed out by *United States v. Lovett*, a Supreme Court case from 1946.

I join the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOYCE), my good friend, in asking my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the two-on-one here. No, that is fine. I am just kidding you guys.

Here is the deal. Not only is this critical that you hold people accountable, but this person, this Director lied in response to a question from Representative CLOUD on this particular issue, on these issues that we were talking about in testimony in the approps oversight hearing earlier this year.

It is my opinion that if we fail to hold this person accountable, then we are going to see like things happen in the future. When you provide a specific deterrent, you also provide a general deterrent, and that is the way a justice system works. That is the way you hold people accountable.

Mr. Chair, in closing, I appreciate my colleagues who don't want to see this

done. It is not unconstitutional to do this. This is a good way to hold people accountable. That is one of the jobs of the United States Congress, to hold people accountable.

What did the Founders give us? They gave us the purse strings. In this instance, it seems to me that this individual should have her salary eliminated.

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

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chair, in closing, I disagree. I understand and appreciate the concerns of my colleague and certainly feel that, again, they have been addressed in what we could do within the confines of an appropriations bill. I urge a “no” vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 40 OFFERED BY MR. BIGGS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 40 printed in part B of House Report 118-216.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay the salary and expenses of the position of Director for the Election Security Initiative of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, occupied by Geoffrey Hale.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 723, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chairman, this may seem like Groundhog Day, but I am going anew. I rise to speak in support of my amendment which prohibits the use of funds to pay the salary and expenses of CISA Director of Election Security Initiative Geoffrey Hale.

As outlined in Judge Doughty’s memo decision in the Missouri v. Biden case, as Director Hale worked with social media companies to censor conservatives who speak out against the Biden administration, he was singled out by the judge.

Under the guise of protecting national security and election integrity, Mr. Hale and his team purposely suppressed social media posts that went against the Biden administration’s

view of what they considered the truth to be.

CISA seems to believe itself to be the ultimate arbiter of truth, ordering social media companies to suppress and ban posts and users that dare to question their side of the story, that dare to speak up for what they believe. Listen to what I am saying, please.

That is what was going on in the agency that was supposed to protect cybersecurity and our elections.

The blatant censorship by Mr. Hale and others of constitutionally protected speech has got to end. It is the weaponization of government against the American people. It is up to us to stand up against that.

I urge my colleagues to join me in passing this amendment. At some point we are going to have to recognize that we need to hold people accountable.

Now, I appreciate my colleagues who oppose this, but I will just tell you something. I don’t think we can say we can’t do this in the appropriations bill. We have already done something else in the appropriations bill. We just passed by voice vote a defunding of the Secretary of Homeland Security. Why cannot we hold these people accountable? I think we can.

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

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I empathize with wanting to hold this administration accountable for its many failed border and immigration policies. I also join in the outrage shared by my colleagues over the CISA mis-, dis-, and malinformation scandal.

Labelling Americans’ First Amendment-protected speech as mis-, dis-, or malinformation is not a role for any government agency, whether there is a Democrat or Republican in the White House. However, this amendment targets a career civil servant who was not in charge of creating the policy on which we disagree.

We worked diligently in our bill to address the security failures and censorship concerns associated with this administration. I stand by our language.

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

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR), the ranking member.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOYCE), my good friend, for yielding. Again, I stand in opposition to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS) on this amendment.

What we are looking at here is CISA Director of Election Security plays a critical role in our national security. Director Hale has served his role in many administrations as a career civil servant under Republican and Democratic administrations.

Again, I say that targeting salaries is unconstitutional, as pointed out in United States v. Lovett, a Supreme Court case from 1946. I join my chairman, Mr. JOYCE, in urging our colleagues to vote “no.”

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I again appreciate my colleagues and their position. I fundamentally disagree. You have a heavy burden when you are going to enjoin people. When this case came before the court, the CISA Director of Election Security Initiative, Geoffrey Hale, was one of the defendants that was found to be one of the officials of this administration that was engaged in a clear and focused policy of using the Department of Homeland Security to stop conservatives from questioning the Biden administration on social media, even if it meant censoring constitutionally protected speech.

I guess we have a fundamental difference here. I appreciate and understand what my colleagues who oppose this measure are saying, but I am just not certain what we are going to do then. How are we going to stand up to an administration where every institution of this administration has been weaponized: FBI, DOJ, Department of Education, the border security leadership.

□ 1945

We have CISA and the people who are running CISA leading areas that are systematically suppressing speech and censoring speech.

This isn’t me saying it. It is a court of law saying it after evidentiary hearings. It is through admissions, through discovery of these individuals. That is why these individuals lost in court, but there is no other way to hold them accountable.

Holding an administration accountable is one thing, but holding an individual accountable for systematically participating in violations of our First Amendment rights, this is the way we do it. This is the way we should do it.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to join me, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I don’t want to make any arguments other than to say that I urge a “no” vote on this, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MR. BIGGS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 41 printed in part B of House Report 118-216.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay the salary and expenses of the position of the Under Secretary of the Office of Strategy, Policy, and Plans at the Department of Homeland Security, occupied by Robert Silvers.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 723, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chair, I rise to speak in support of my amendment, which prohibits the use of funds to pay the salary and expenses of the DHS Under Secretary for the Office of Strategy, Policy, and Plans, Robert Silvers.

Much of my argument is the same. In a court hearing, they are found to have violated the free speech rights of Americans systematically. They are going to lose in court, and we have an opportunity to hold them accountable.

I feel the need to try to throw maybe a slider instead of a fastball. I am reminded of George Mason, who said many years ago something to the effect that because individuals can be punished and rewarded in Heaven but nations can't, nations need to be held accountable on Earth. I am now making an appeal that we hold individuals where we can accountable on Earth.

What we have are people who systematically defied the rights of American citizens for no other reason than they didn't like what was being said about the administration. They politicized their position, and we are going to hold them accountable. I thought it was \$17 million or something like that that was going to come off their overall budget. Maybe I am off on that—\$19 million? I was pretty close.

Let me give you another example. Somebody said recently that they will take responsibility for that, for a problem that this administration was doing. That begs the question: How did you take responsibility for it? You can't just say, "I take responsibility. I take the full blame." No. What did you do? What did you do to take blame? Were you fired? Were you reprimanded? What happened?

If you don't hold people accountable, they will persist. There is a theory of punishment in criminal law—and I practiced criminal law—and it was, why do you have punishment and sentencing at all? You have punishment and sentencing for public safety. That is one reason.

You also have two kinds of deterrents. You have a general deterrent and a specific deterrent. If you have a specific deterrent, you are trying to teach that individual that that conduct

is not acceptable and cannot happen again, so you punish them in whatever way you can that is appropriate. A general deterrent is when the entire society—in this instance, it is the Federal bureaucracy that says, if we do that, we are subject to specific deterrents—in other words, maybe even the elimination of our position, elimination of our salary, whatever it may be.

If we don't hold people accountable, this action will persist because there will be no specific or general deterrents.

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

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment of my friend from Arizona.

The DHS Under Secretary for the Office of Strategy, Policy, and Plans plays a critical role in our national security. The Senate confirmed this position to do certain things. At his confirmation, Mr. Silvers said that the Department must secure the borders. It must be relentless in disrupting the human and drug trafficking organizations that inflict such devastation. It must administer our immigration system securely and humanely and must also facilitate the lawful flows of trade and travel that power this economy.

Again, we might have some differences on how we secure the border. We did have an opportunity the last 2 years in the Homeland appropriations that we added \$2.4 billion, a 15 percent increase, to Homeland the last couple of years. I remind my colleagues that except for two members of the Republican Party that are still serving, everybody else voted no on securing the borders—hiring more Border Patrol, hiring more ICE agents, hiring more RFO, Air and Marine, technology. Except for two Members that are still serving on the Republican side, everybody voted no.

If we want to secure the border, let's look at how we do that. Again, I say this just because we might have differences on how we do it, but to target an individual, I would assume it would violate the Bill of Attainder Clause of the Constitution. In fact, targeting an individual by name is unconstitutional, as pointed out in *United States v. Lovett*, a Supreme Court case in 1946.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this unconstitutional amendment. If we want to have a debate on border policy, we certainly can do that.

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

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chair, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chair, I appreciate my colleague talking about the border. I wasn't going to bring up the border

because that is not what my main beef is with this amendment. My beef was about the censorship of U.S. citizens, but if you want to talk border, let's talk border.

I have to clear up one fact that I hear so often from my colleagues across the aisle. When they say something like 90 percent of all the fentanyl that is coming across the border is seized at ports of entry, that is a total sham statement. Ninety percent of interdictions take place at ports of entry, not 90 percent of the drugs coming across.

Why do you stop 90-plus percent at the ports of entry? Because that is where the X-ray machines are, where the dogs are, where the personnel is.

You have all the equipment, but do you know where you don't have equipment? How about the 62-linear miles of the Tohono O'odham Nation Reservation in southern Arizona, which is one of the busiest drug and human trafficking corridors in the world?

This Under Secretary has not secured the border. That is two strikes.

I want to get back to the CISA argument because we have an individual who systematically is okay with censoring United States citizens who are exercising First Amendment rights, but if we want to talk border, I will be here till hell freezes over to talk about why we need to make changes in the Homeland Security folks on the border.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 42 OFFERED BY MR. BIGGS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 42 printed in part B of House Report 118-216.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay the salary and expenses of the position of the Assistant Secretary for Counter Terrorism and Threat Prevention at the Department of Homeland Security, occupied by Samantha Vinograd.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 723, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chair, I rise to speak in support of my amendment, which

prohibits the use of funds to pay the salary and expenses of the DHS Assistant Secretary for Counterterrorism and Threat Prevention, Samantha Vinograd.

When she was senior adviser for national security, Ms. Vinograd took her role of surveilling and stopping terrorist threats against our Nation and turned it on the American people.

As outlined by Judge Doughty in his memo ruling in the *Missouri v. Biden* case, Ms. Vinograd and her colleagues purposefully and systematically targeted American conservatives who dared to exercise their right of freedom of speech.

This is on issues that later proved to be accurate objectively, ranging from COVID-19 origins, lab leak theory, the Hunter Biden laptop. The DHS explicitly sought to suppress statements and posts that made the Biden administration look bad.

Turning the counterterrorism role of the DHS on the American people and engaging in explicit government censorship of constitutionally protected speech constitutes a major breach of trust.

Despite this—or, more likely, because of it—Ms. Vinograd was promoted. She wasn't held accountable.

The court names her as a responsible defendant for this activity. She wasn't held responsible. She was promoted to Assistant Secretary for Counterterrorism and Threat Prevention.

In her new position, Ms. Vinograd is no doubt even more of a threat to conservatives who wish to exercise their constitutional right of freedom of speech.

Unelected bureaucrats like Ms. Vinograd cannot be allowed to continue to censor Americans and to decide for themselves what is worthy of being called the truth.

Mr. Chair, I urge the passage of my amendment.

Now, I want to add something different this time, as well. Elected officials have an accountability measure built in. Leave out impeachment or anything else, our voters elect us. They look at us with scrutiny. We stand before them. We tell them what we intend to do. They look at our record to see how successful we were in doing what we said we would do. You do not have the same ability with a bureaucrat.

The reason that we know about these things, as we began to see these things, is you had an attorney general and several attorneys general come together and file a lawsuit, and a court, in looking at the discovery and taking evidence, said the plaintiffs here, the attorneys general, the States, are going to probably win this. Why? Because people like this bureaucrat, Ms. Vinograd, abused her authority and violated the constitutional rights of American citizens. Seems to me that someone like that should not be in the pay of the American Government.

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

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment. Respectfully, to my colleague, again, if we are concerned about the security of the country, national security, border security, again, I will remind that the last couple of years, we have added over \$2.4 billion to the Homeland Security bill, and there were only two of my Republican colleagues that are still in Congress that voted for the increase.

If we are concerned about security and the work that we are doing—terrorism, counterterrorism, and threat—we all should have voted for the appropriation bill.

□ 2000

Mr. Chair, let me bring up some figures again. We know as of July 2023, just a couple months ago, 92.9 percent of the fentanyl, 93 percent of the heroin, 94.1 percent of the meth were seized at the ports of entry and interior checkpoints.

If you look at the U.S. Sentencing Commission, 86 to 87 percent of the people that were caught with drugs were U.S. citizens. I want to go after anybody that brings drugs in but, again, we, as Members of Congress, have the constitutional duty to provide oversight over the budget. The way we provide oversight is not by targeting somebody by name and going after their salary.

Again, this will violate the Bill of Attainder Clause in the U.S. Constitution, and it would also be in violation of the Supreme Court case of 1946 that we have mentioned before.

If we want to provide oversight, there is a way of doing it and it is not targeting somebody without their due process and basically firing that individual.

Again, if we want to go ahead and debate how much money we put in, we can do that, but not by targeting somebody against the Constitution.

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

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chair, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I would rebut a couple of things. When you quote statistics saying 94 percent of all drugs coming into the country are stopped at interior checkpoints or ports of entry, that is an inaccurate statement. It is 94 percent of drugs that are interdicted, that we catch, that is where you catch them.

Why do you catch them there? I mean, this is not rocket science. You catch them there because you have personnel there. You have drug-sniffing dogs. You have X-ray machines that are looking at trucks. You have personnel there.

But I will tell you what you don't have. Come with me to San Miguel Gate.

I have been all over southern Texas. I have been all over southern Arizona and Southern California. Come with me to San Miguel Gate. There is nothing near the San Miguel Gate. The nearest town south of the border is Caborca; that is 2 hours away.

You know what happens? You have more got-aways, known and unknown, through that sector than anywhere else in the country.

Good grief. They don't want to be caught because they are the ones that are bringing in drugs and human trafficking. That is just kind of a fallacious argument.

The next thing is when you say, only two people voted to increase Homeland Security funding, it was because it was an omnibus bill. You had every Christmas tree ornament in the world on that puppy, just enough to drive every Republican off but two.

Yeah, if we had done 12 bills like so many of us advocate, you might have seen a different thing. You might have seen a kind of a joinder of stuff. This does not violate the Bill of Attainder provision of the Constitution. It doesn't violate a court decision. What this is is adherence to the Holman Rule?

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 43 OFFERED BY MR. BIGGS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 43 printed in part B of House Report 118-216.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay the salary and expenses of the position of the Director of the Departmental GAO-OIG Liaison Office for the Department of Homeland Security, occupied by Jim Crumpacker.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 723, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chairman, at the risk of sounding like a broken record, I rise in support of my amendment, which prohibits the use of funds to pay the salary and expenses of DHS Director of the Departmental GAO-OIG liaison office Jim Crumpacker.

Director Crumpacker leads DHS's Department of OIG liaison office, an office tasked with maintaining mutually beneficial and productive relations with GAO and the OIG. That is what Mr. Crumpacker stated in testimony before the Senate several years ago.

Unfortunately, under the Biden administration, that mutually beneficial and productive relationship has broken down completely.

DHS continues to obstruct oversight by its own inspector general in violation of the agency's obligations under the Inspector General Act.

Last year, then-Ranking Member COMER and Oversight Committee Republicans opened an investigation into reports that the Department of Homeland Security was obstructing efforts by their inspector general to conduct oversight over DHS programs and policies consistent with its obligations under the Inspector General Act.

At the time the letter was sent, committee Republicans had uncovered a memo circulated to Customs and Border Protection employees, which essentially encouraged CBP employees to resist OIG's request for access to CBP systems.

Think of that. You have a memo going out to CBP employees saying, Don't cooperate with the OIG. The memo falsely claimed that OIG's access to information was not unlimited, contrary to the statute, incorrectly relying on a statute that limited public disclosure of information.

To be clear, the Inspector General Act contains no such limitation.

DHS/OIG has a statutory mandate to have timely access to all records, reports, audits, reviews, documents, papers, recommendations, or other materials from DHS components, with only a narrow national security exemption that requires Congressional notification. Unfortunately, DHS continues to slow-walk and stonewall oversight efforts.

In June, Inspector General Cuffari came to committee and testified under oath that:

Since the fall of 2021, DHS/OIG has consistently reported DHS delays and denials of DHS/OIG's request for information.

These are requests for information allowed under statute, and a response is mandated. These are requests for information that our more than 700 career professionals need in order to do their jobs in the OIG offices and which DHS is required to provide to DHS/OIG consistent with the statute.

I remain hopeful that DHS will improve its responsiveness to our requests for information so that DHS/OIG can continue to provide Congress and the public robust and timely oversight with the words that Inspector General Cuffari said.

I appreciate his optimism, but after nearly 3 years, Congress may need to start twisting some arms.

This is the place, this is the individual who has put his thumb on the

scale to prevent that information from going to the inspector general, information that we need, and we need the results of that OIG report.

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

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chair, again, this amendment violates the Bill of Attainder Clause of the U.S. Constitution. This amendment, again, by targeting someone by name is unconstitutional as pointed out by U.S. v. Lovett, a Supreme Court case from 1946.

Again, I would go back. If we are so interested in border security and national security, we had a chance to add \$2.4 billion to CBP's budget authority, an increase of 15 percent. It doesn't matter what the vehicle was. The bottom line is some people who voted, except for two of my Republican colleagues, voted against pay raises for Border Patrol, the mental health services that we provided, college help also, clothing allowance, technology, canines, everything that is so important to border security, except for two of my colleagues who are still in Congress.

Again, you can say that I didn't like the vehicle and this pay raise for Border Patrol and the other help that we provided. The bottom line is some folks voted against border security, and now we are trying to come back to try to change the narrative.

Again, I would say that it violates the Bill of Attainder Clause of the U.S. Constitution and the Lovett case of 1946. If we want to provide oversight, there are ways, and I will be happy to sit down with my colleague from Arizona and go over that.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to vote "no," and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chair, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chair, let's litigate the border some more, and let's talk about how these things get funded.

If that is the new deal that you throw an omnibus bill because you don't bother to do your 12 bills and you are going to say, Oh, you voted against something, then we should start talking about all of the bad programs and policies that you all voted for in that omnibus bill that has left us with \$2 trillion in deficit this year. That is what you did. You added \$2 trillion to the national debt.

Mr. Chair, the bottom line is they have an individual here, Mr. Crumpacker, who has basically said we are not going to provide information to the DHS-OIG.

What are we going to do about it? We are going to say, Oh, that is just too bad. That is too bad.

Mr. Chair, we have a massive border problem. I don't even think my col-

league across the aisle would disagree with that.

Last Friday in the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts said there was no border crisis. I thought that was intriguing. You got 11,000 people rolling through the Tucson sector. Those are the encounters. They don't get those kinds of groups in Tucson because they are getting the runners. But you know what, the whole border is in disarray, and that is between the ports of entry.

That is your ports of entry that you are so pleased with. You have the CBP One app bringing people in by the tens of thousands. I think we need to hold Mr. Crumpacker responsible.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 44 OFFERED BY MR. BIGGS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 44 printed in part B of House Report 118-216.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay the salary and expenses of the position of the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, occupied by Alejandro Mayorkas.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 723, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in support of my amendment, which prohibits the use of funds to pay the salary and expenses of DHS Secretary Alejandro Mayorkas.

I want to speak about Secretary Mayorkas. I want to speak about what has happened at the border. By the time we are standing here today, you have millions and millions of people who have come through illegally into our country, and what they have done is they have surrendered.

In the meantime, you have at least 2.5 million people who have not surrendered and who have escaped into the country.

I have asked Secretary Mayorkas, I brought him to a Border Security Caucus. I said: Secretary, do you know what the Secure Fence Act of 2006 says?

Can you tell me, do we have operational control of the border?

He says: Oh, yeah, we have operational control of the border.

Okay. Then how come you have set a record every month?

At that point, he had set a record every month, from February 2021; every month a new record. In fact, last month we had another new record: 304,000 encounters.

We brought him into the Committee on the Judiciary. He is under oath at that point.

Do you know what the definition of operational control of the border is?

□ 2015

Oh, yeah.

Do we have it?

Yeah, we have it.

Then, Mr. Secretary, why in the world are we seeing literally tens of thousands of people, 8 to 9,000 most days, some days 10, 12, 13,000 people? That is a violation of that act.

He says, Look, we have control.

The last time we had him in, what, just a month, month-and-a-half ago: Mr. Secretary, hey, do you have operational control?

And he says, Yeah.

We bring out the poster with the statute again and said, Hey, take a look at the statute.

He says, Oh, no, no. We don't have operational control with that. We have defined our own operational control.

That is the kind of person that needs to be held accountable.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), our distinguished majority leader, who we are so happy to see with us on the floor tonight.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from Arizona for leading and for his leadership on the border, on this amendment, on this issue.

I rise in strong support of the amendment. As I see my friend from Ohio, Mr. JOYCE, I rise in strong support of his legislation. Frankly, Mr. Chairman, all of us here in the House and Senate, as we talk about the necessary funding of government, should be talking about what we need to do to secure America's border, and it should start with the Secretary of Homeland Security, who has been derelict in his job, and this is the most important job that he has.

Not only has he gone before committees and said, Yes, the border is secure, as Mr. BIGGS talked about, he said there is operational control. Do you know who has operational control of the border? The drug cartels have operational control of the border.

It has become a multibillion-dollar industry for the drug cartels to bring people across our border—not just from South America, Central America—from all over the world, over 140 countries, millions of people. He can't even tell you what the real number is. Is it 5 million? Is it 8 million?

This Department of Homeland Security won't even tell you what that

number is of how many millions of people have come into our country illegally since he took this job, since Joe Biden became President of the United States and systematically destroyed the things that were working to secure America's border.

More people than live in my home State of Louisiana have entered our country illegally since Joe Biden became President of the United States. They can't even tell you where they are going. We see mayors all around the country, livid—Republican mayors, Democrat mayors. It doesn't matter what your party affiliation is. It is wrecking cities.

Read comments from the mayor of New York City himself, Mayor Adams. The cost of migrants will destroy New York City. You have people, leaders—Republican, Democrat—all across America pleading with President Biden to address this problem, and he refuses. He doesn't want to solve this problem.

Secretary Mayorkas doesn't want to do his job and solve this problem. The tools are there. The ability is there. They dismantled the things that were working day one, and so what we have done as House Republicans is brought legislation, not just today in Mr. JOYCE's bill, but we brought H.R. 2, the border security package that we passed months ago, to take necessary steps to secure America's border.

It has been sitting over in the Senate. They don't want to take action on this. The United States Senate has sat back and done not a single thing to secure the border. They want to pass a CR over here that continues the open border policy, meaning millions more people coming across our border illegally to communities all across America.

I have gone to our border. I have embedded with our Border Patrol agents. You don't need to re-invent the wheel to know how to fix this problem. Our Border Patrol agents will tell you what needs to happen to fix this problem. They have told the President. He doesn't want to take those steps.

This House took those steps, but more of those steps need to be funded, and that is what Mr. JOYCE did in his bill that the Committee on Appropriations put together, to actually fund more Border Patrol agents, to give them more technology, to build the wall. Yes, walls work. Technology works.

Border Patrol agents want to do their job because they don't want the drug cartels having operational control like Secretary Mayorkas has allowed them to have. If he is going to be derelict in his duty, we are not going to be derelict in ours, and so why don't we work until we get this right, not only here in the House, which we have done and we are going to continue to do, but until the Senate finally realizes it is a problem worth taking up for America, until the President of the United States finally realizes this is a problem worth taking up for the American peo-

ple, who are sick and tired of an open southern border.

It is not just because it is open. It is because of the problems that are coming with it every single day. We are losing 150 young people who are dying every single day in America from the drug overdoses that are coming in from the open southern border.

Imagine if an airplane fell out of the sky every single day in America. How long would it take for us to stop everything we are doing and fix that? It wouldn't be a week that would go by that we would allow that to happen as a country, and, yet, it has been going on for over a year and a half, over 2 years, every community.

Talk to coroners in any community in America and ask them how many fentanyl deaths they are seeing of young people. I had a high school group here not long ago, and I said, How many of you know someone who died of a fentanyl overdose? Every single hand went up.

These are our young people in America that they are poisoning with drugs made in China, infiltrated through our southern border because the drug cartels have been allowed to have operational control of our border by a Secretary who says it is under control. If that is under control, I don't know what he would consider out of control.

We are fed up with this problem. America is fed up with this problem. Look at what they are saying all around the country. The whole mainstream media is covering this issue. It is not like this issue is under radar anymore. Six months ago, it was. This issue wasn't being covered for a long time.

I have to give credit to a lot of my colleagues who represent border communities, because they are on the front lines. They started getting vocal, because they started seeing it before anybody else did. They started raising alarms, and they said, This is a crisis.

Then others started going down to the border. We have taken over 150 delegations down to the border, Members of Congress, again, embedding with Border Patrol agents, talking about the problem, listening to our Border Patrol agents, who are telling us what needs to happen. That is how we built the legislation we passed. That is how we built the legislation we are working on passing here on this floor right now.

Look at what they are saying all around the country. Everybody is seeing this except the President of the United States and the United States Senate. We are not going to be quiet about this. We are going to continue fighting until we get this problem fixed. America demands it. America deserves it. We need to secure our border.

That is what this bill does. It is a package of bills. It has been months in the works. It is time for the President to pay attention to this crisis and join with us as we talk about funding the government. You fund the government

to address the problems that this country is facing, and this open southern border is at the top of that list.

Let's get this done.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chair, first of all, let me just say, as a point of privilege, it is so good to see my good friend from Louisiana. Again, I am with him all the way. I appreciate it.

We disagree on this amendment. We might agree on defunding other things, but not this particular one.

I will say, again, in the last 2 years, we added \$2.4 billion to the CBP operation moneys. From there, we added moneys for more Border Patrol agents, more CBP officers, new intel specialists, trade enforcement staff, and other personnel. We added additional technology at the ports of entry. We added initiatives that support CBP workforce, such as suicide prevention, wellness efforts, uniform allowances, tuition allowance, to make sure that we support our men and women in green, in blue, and Homeland Security in general.

Again, I will say that, if we support them, except for two Members that are still on my Republican side, all voted against supporting Border Patrol in all this. If we are so interested, why did we vote on \$2.4 billion of moneys for Border Patrol?

Again, this is something that I would ask you to look at. Again, what we should be focusing right now is: How do we keep our government open? Folks said, If you pass H.R. 2, and we are going to go ahead and get the job done. It is right in the Senate. If this bill passes the floor, it is going to be in the Senate.

What we ought to be focusing on is: How do we keep the government open? Again, I would remind my colleagues that, if you look at the last five shutdowns, the House Republicans controlled the House. On November 13, 1995, the Republicans controlled the House; December 15, 1995, it was the Republicans who controlled the House; September 30, 2013, the Republicans controlled the House; January 19, 2018, the Republicans controlled the House; December 21, 2018, again, the Republicans controlled. We had shutdowns, and, again, if we are not careful, the Republican-controlled House will have another shutdown at 12:01 this coming Sunday.

Again, we want to work with you. We want to sit down. You know my position. I have always said that I don't like open borders, and we have to make sure that we secure the border. Again, people talk about crime. I can pick any city. I will say New Orleans. If I pick New Orleans, you will see that crime is lower per 100,000 than in my hometown of Laredo. Rape, murder, assaults, those crimes are lower. Our border is safe.

Now, that is on the crime part. If you want to talk about migration, I agree we need to do more on that, but cutting somebody's salary doesn't get us to what we need. We need to make sure that we stop playing defense on the one-yard line, called the U.S. border.

What we need to do is to do what happened in 2015 and 2019. President Barack Obama sat down with the Mexicans and said, Hey, you have to stop people from coming to the border, and guess what? The numbers went down.

In 2019, President Trump did the same thing, and asked the Mexicans, Hey, stop the people from coming in. Guess what? The numbers came down.

We need to make sure that we put authorities—and I emphasize—authorities for Homeland, where they can do more outside the U.S. border, because otherwise, we are not going to see the same thing we saw in 2015 and 2019.

We keep playing defense on the one-yard line. I want to secure the border, but, again, if you want to stop drugs, I will say it again, most of the drugs will be coming in—again, the latest numbers from July of 2023, 92.9 percent of the fentanyl, 93 percent of the heroin, 94.1 of the meth were seized at the ports of entry and interior checkpoints.

Again, I will say that, if you look at the U.S. Sentencing Commission, 86 to 87 percent of the people that were caught with drugs were U.S. citizens. I don't care who brings in drugs. I want to make sure that they are put in jail.

Again, I will say this: I know that a lot of you believe in the border wall, but if you look, this is fencing all here, and this is where the heat map shows. Why? Because the border fence is a quarter mile to a mile away from the river where the international border is.

Keep in mind—I agree with you—89 to 90 percent of the people asking for asylum don't get granted asylum officers. What we ought to be doing is sending judges and asylum officers down here to make sure that we do our job over here.

If we need to deport somebody, I will be the first one to say, Deport that individual, but, again, putting a wall, \$36 million a mile, when you can get \$3 to \$5 million for the drones.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MOLINARO). Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

□ 2030

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chair, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chair, let's talk about which side wants to get something done on the border. I keep hearing about the magnificent omni bill. How many Democrats voted for H.R. 2 in this House? Not one. Don't tell me that you care about the border. You didn't vote to secure the border with H.R. 2.

When you say Americans are importing the drugs, first of all, you got it wrong again. I don't think you are listening. Ninety-two percent of the drugs they catch, that is what they catch. It is what they interdict. That is what they stop. That is who they arrest. That takes place at the ports of entry. That ain't where 92 percent of the drugs are coming through.

They are coming through the places wide open where there is no fencing in Arizona. We don't have the river. We have four-strand barbed-wire fence in places. They are coming through there. It is considered the number one drug trafficking corridor in the world.

Don't be telling me that we are stopping 92 percent of the drugs because we are not. Don't show me a heat map of where people are coming through in Texas. That is xenophobic. You need to spread out. Don't be so parochial.

Let's go to Arizona. I will take you to Cocopah. We will stand right there. Literally hundreds of people walk on through. They are not coming from the Northern Triangle states. They are coming from Mauritania. They are coming from Mali and Togo. They are coming from all over the world.

Don't say that you guys care about the border because you are not doing a damn thing to stop it.

What is happening on the border is a crisis. It is the largest mass migration in the history of this entire world. It is time you join us and bring it under control because it is bringing crime.

Laredo is great. Good.

Do you know what they are releasing in Cochise County now? Secretary Mayorkas is calling them freedom runs. We are just going to release people into the community and call them freedom runs.

Mr. Chair, it is time to do something, and I urge my colleagues to vote for my amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 45 OFFERED BY MR. BIGGS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 45 printed in part B of House Report 118-216.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the rule entitled "Public Charge Ground of Inadmissibility" published by the Department of Homeland Security in the Federal Register on September 9, 2022 (87 Fed. Reg. 55472).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 723, the gentleman

from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chair, I rise to speak in support of my amendment, which prohibits the use of funds in furtherance of the public charge ground of inadmissibility rule.

Section 212 of the Immigration and Nationality Act states that any alien who is likely at any time to become a public charge is inadmissible for entry or a readjustment of status. Any alien at any time who might become a public charge is inadmissible for entry or even for readjustment of status. Think about that.

Someone is a public charge if they are likely to become primarily dependent on the government for subsistence, as demonstrated by either receipt of public cash assistance for income maintenance or institutionalization for long-term care at government expense.

The primary factor that the DHS is supposed to look at when determining if someone is or will likely be a public charge is the likelihood that the person will be reliant on government benefits and services, such as Medicaid and SNAP.

This past December, the DHS greatly reduced the number of public benefits considered when determining whether an immigrant is or will be a public charge and thus inadmissible for entry or permanent residency.

The Trump administration rightly included programs such as SNAP, housing vouchers, and Medicaid in its determinations on whether an individual would be a public charge. However, President Biden and Secretary Mayorkas have decided that not only should we take in thousands of illegal aliens every day but that they should receive the same benefits that thousands of struggling Americans rely on and that those same Americans should pay for it.

The American ideals of self-sufficiency and personal responsibility have always been the spirit of our immigration law. It is in this spirit that Congress decided that immigrants who are likely to become a public charge are ineligible for admittance or permanent residency. However, under this new rule, individuals who are reliant on a number of government benefits can be considered self-sufficient when applying for renewal or adjustment of status.

The DHS' new rule is not only costly to the American taxpayer but also directly incentivizes hundreds of thousands of illegal aliens to cross the southern border and come into our country.

It seems to me that Secretary Mayorkas is not only negligent and reckless with securing the border, but he is also negligent and reckless with the American taxpayers' hard-earned money.

That is why I am calling to stop any funding for the DHS' new public charge

rule until they secure our border and start acting in the best interests of the American people.

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

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chair, since 1999, the policy has been, under the Clinton administration, under the Bush administration, and the Obama administration, that immigration officials still consider whether a noncitizen will become dependent on cash benefits. I agree. That has been the policy since 1999, and I think we ought to stick with that policy where a noncitizen should not be dependent on cash benefits. Follow the law, and that is what we want to do under the current policy.

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

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chair, I urge the passage of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 46 OFFERED BY MR. BIGGS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 46 printed in part B of House Report 118-216.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement a COVID-19 vaccine and mask mandate for travelers passing through the Transportation Security Administration checkpoints.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 723, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chair, I rise to speak in support of my amendment.

My amendment prohibits the use of funds to implement a TSA vaccine or mask mandate. For years, the Biden administration subjected millions of Americans to draconian vaccine and mask mandates, even when the science showed these mandates did very little.

I remember at one point having literally meta studies and individual studies showing the inefficacy of masks, but we were nonetheless compelled to wear masks.

Now, we are beginning to hear the same people and institutions suggesting again that we need to start looking at public vaccine and mask mandates due to small rises in COVID. This must be coming up on an election year or something.

Specifically, there is talk about TSA mandating people who wish to fly to

wear a mask or be vaccinated. These types of mandates are just another form of overreach by this power-grabbing administration, and the American people are not going to put up with it for a second time.

Americans make calculated decisions about their health risks every day. You just saw the great STEVE SCALISE come down, with a judgment of his own health risk, so he could participate on the floor in something that is meaningful to him. We all make those types of decisions about our health risks every day.

The last thing they need is for unelected bureaucrats to tell them once again when they can and cannot fly, especially since we now know the actual efficacy, or I should say ineffectiveness, of the vaccine and masks.

These calls to renew vaccine and mask mandates are coming from the same people such as Anthony Fauci, who relished controlling the day-to-day lives of Americans and profited off it.

Americans have had enough. This is why we must ensure that neither President Biden, Anthony Fauci, or any other bureaucrat can force Americans to get a vaccine or wear a mask just to exercise their right to travel.

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

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chair, these policies, in my opinion, should be debated in a different bill. DHS' role here is guided by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the CDC. The DHS doesn't come up with policies. They don't develop their independent policies on these issues. Rather, they implement policies that originate with the CDC.

We can get into a debate about wearing masks or having vaccines, but, again, I think we need to concentrate this on another bill and not on Homeland.

Mr. Chair, I oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chair, I think this does belong in this bill. TSA is in this bill, and this is an important policy. I urge the passage of my amendment to stop any funds from being used to implement a TSA vaccine or mask mandate.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 47 OFFERED BY MRS. BOEBERT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 47 printed in part B of House Report 118-216.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. The salary of Ur M. Jaddou, Director of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, shall be reduced to \$1.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 723, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. BOEBERT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer my amendment that utilizes the Holman rule to reduce the salary of Ur Jaddou, director of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, to \$1.

Ms. Jaddou is a radical leftist. Before joining the Biden administration, she worked for an open borders group called DHS Watch. While at DHS Watch, Jaddou called for stopping Border Patrol funding and referred to CBP as President Trump's "personal militia."

Ms. Jaddou has also previously called for the mass release of illegal immigrants. Someone like this should not be in a position of influence at the Department of Homeland Security. She has no regard for the rule of law.

Ms. Jaddou proposed and finalized the rule Procedures for Credible Fear Screening and Consideration of Asylum, Withholding of Removal, and CAT Protection Claims by Asylum Officers, which removed ICE attorneys and the adversarial process from the credible fear asylum application process. The rule violates the jurisdiction of Department of Justice immigration judges as stated by section 103 of the Immigration and Nationality Act and the Homeland Security Act.

Ms. Jaddou also heavily prioritizes USCIS resources to adjudicate and issue employment authorization documents for millions of illegal aliens, parolees, and ever-expanding populations of temporary protected status instead of adjudicating lawful nonimmigrant and immigrant applications. These misguided amnesty pursuits have rapidly increased the USCIS' pending backlog to over 9 million cases.

□ 2045

Mrs. BOEBERT. Jaddou previously pushed other amnesty policies in her role as USCIS during the Obama administration.

Specifically, she aggressively tried to expand parole in place in order to bypass Congress and implement mass amnesty.

Jaddou has also defended the unconstitutional Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program, falsely claiming this is a permissible exercise of discretion by the Secretary of Homeland Security.

As an attorney, she should know only Congress has the authority to authorize this type of program. With that, Obama and DHS should have never unilaterally created this amnesty program.

Jaddou in her current role is literally enabling and supporting the Biden border crisis. In August alone, there were 232,972 illegal immigrants encountered at the southern border.

Customs and Border Patrol has seized 25,500 pounds of fentanyl so far in fiscal year 2023. Of course, that is only what has been seized, not what we know is coming into our country illegally and killing Americans, at least 300 a day.

Biden's bureaucrats like Jaddou are literally allowing deadly fentanyl to easily flow into our communities and kill our children.

My amendment is supported by the National Immigration Center for Enforcement, NumbersUSA, and the American Accountability Foundation.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and hold Ms. Jaddou accountable for her blatant disrespect for the law of our Nation.

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

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chair, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chair, we support border security. We also support the U.S. Citizen Immigration Service where they have asylum officers.

One of the things we ought to be doing is adding more money to support the asylum officers so they can be at the border, and they can make a decision whether somebody stays or has a credible fear.

We know the numbers; 89, 90 percent of the people who ask for asylum will be denied because the law is very specific on what asylum is.

It has to be persecution by the state based on religion or based on political beliefs. If you are coming in because you want a job, or you are coming in for a better life, or you are coming in because of a drought or you are hungry or because your country is falling apart, it is not allowed under the law.

What we ought to do is make sure that Homeland has the money to support border security. Again, I remind my friends that the last 2 years, we added \$2.4 billion to the CBP budget authority, a 15 percent increase. Except for two Members from the Republican side, everybody voted "no" on it.

Again, we want to support border security. If you want to look at fentanyl, the fentanyl will come in through two ports in Mexico, the legal precursors.

Then they come up here, and we have to make sure that we add money for technology to make sure that we stop the drugs coming in.

Again, I am for border security, and I want to work with you to get to border security. Congressman Holman in 1976, the Holman Rule—keep in mind that the Bill of Attainder Clause says no punishment without a trial.

I believe this is in violation of Lovett in The Supreme Court in 1946; it says this type of action is unconstitutional.

Again, if we want to have a debate, let's go ahead and have a debate, but to

target somebody's salary is unconstitutional.

I agree. We need to do more to secure the border, and I certainly want to work with my colleagues from Colorado, Ohio, and wherever you might be from. I certainly want to work with you.

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

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Chair, I do appreciate my colleague on the other side of the aisle and his efforts to promote border security.

He and I have had conversations about the border. I realize that he represents a district on the border, and I appreciate his sincere concern for what is taking place.

Unfortunately, we do have an invasion. My colleague mentioned that much of the fentanyl that is coming into our country is being found at the ports of entry.

We know that it is being found at the ports of entry, but unfortunately, our Border Patrol agents are overrun, they are overworked, and there is just too large of a surge for them to handle everything that is happening at the border.

Certainly, we want more funding to secure the border, but we don't want more funding for our Border Patrol agents to simply be process agents and bring people into our country in these mass amounts that we are seeing.

I do appreciate my colleague and his efforts to work with us to secure the southern border, and I look forward to future conversations, as well.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. BOEBERT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 48 OFFERED BY MRS. BOEBERT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 48 printed in part B of House Report 118-216.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. The salary of Kenneth L. Wainstein, Secretary of Homeland Security for Intelligence and Analysis, shall be reduced to \$1.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 723, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. BOEBERT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer my amendment that utilizes the Holman Rule to reduce the salary of Under Secretary of Homeland Security for Intelligence and Analysis, Kenneth Wainstein.

In 2020, Mr. Wainstein claimed that President Donald Trump's leadership

was a threat to the rule of law and endorsed Joe Biden for President of the United States.

I will tell you what is a threat to the rule of law: blatantly violating Federal immigration law and intentionally facilitating a complete and total invasion at our southern border.

I will tell you what is a threat to the rule of law: refusing to cooperate with State and local law enforcement officials as required under Section 287(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

I will tell you, Mr. Chair, what is a threat to the rule of law: pursuing a radical open border agenda, purposefully and willfully circumventing every safeguard, check, and balance required by law, allowing terrorists and deadly drugs like fentanyl to freely flow into our great country.

This administration has presided over the largest influx of illegal immigrants in American history. Since they took power, there have been over 6 million illegal crossings of our southern border. That's right—6 million.

Under this administration's watch, illicit fentanyl has killed more than 100,000 American citizens. Furthermore, 151 people whose names appear on the terrorist watch list were stopped.

I applaud our brave men and women who serve as our Customs and Border Patrol agents who were able to detain these 151 people who are on the terrorist watch list.

They were trying to cross our southern border, an all-time record of known terrorists on the watch list crossing into our country, beating the previous record also held by the Biden administration in fiscal year 2022. This is more than the encounters in all fiscal years 2017, 2018, 2019, and 2020 combined.

In August, we discovered that a smuggler with ties to ISIS was helping migrants enter the United States from Mexico. This madness needs to end.

This has all occurred on the Under Secretary of Homeland Security for Intelligence and Analysis, Mr. Wainstein's, watch.

The American people deserve to have a Department of Homeland Security committed to securing the homeland, not sitting idly by as terrorists flock across our wide open southern border.

My amendment is supported by the National Immigration Center for Enforcement, NumbersUSA, and the American Accountability Foundation.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and hold Mr. Wainstein accountable for not doing his job and for his role in facilitating the worst border crisis in our Nation's history.

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

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chair, I claim time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chair, the last 2 years we had an opportunity to add \$2.4 billion to the CBP budget authority. That is a 15 percent increase.

Except for two Members, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle voted "no". Money for Border Patrol, money for intelligence, money for securing the border, and they voted "no" on it. We had an opportunity to vote "yes", and it was voted against.

Again, I would say that if we have differences, how do we address this, by cutting somebody's salary, which is unconstitutional?

In *United States v. Lovett*, the Supreme Court says you can't do this. It is due process without a trial, punishment without a trial, which is the Bill of Attainder Clause again.

I want to secure the border, but I want to make sure that we put funding on this. We are about to have a shutdown this Saturday.

Again, we have been asking our Republican friends to sit down, and I am ready to sit down and work it out. If we don't do this, we are going to be affecting so many people.

It is going to affect 43,000 U.S. Coast Guard employees, including 38,000 Active-Duty Coast Guard military personnel.

It is going to affect 59,000 CBP personnel, including Border Patrol agents, Customs and Border Protection officers, 16,800 ICE personnel, including HSI agents, 58,000 TSA personnel, 19,300 FEMA employees, and 6,300 Secret Service personnel. We are not focusing on what we ought to focus on, and that is making sure that we don't have a shutdown.

Again, Members, I would remind you that the last five shutdowns, you were in charge, and again, five—we are going to make it number six.

We want to sit down and work with you, but again, as the minority Members, we want to sit down and be at the table.

I ask that we oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BOEBERT. May I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman has 2 minutes remaining.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Chair, I would agree with my colleague on the other side of the aisle. We do want to sit down and have a conversation.

We realize we are in divided government right now, and that is the process that we are currently working on. We are trying to avoid doing things as normal as they have been done since the mid-1990s here in Washington, D.C.

We do not want to govern and fund the entire government with a straight up and down vote "yes" or "no."

We don't want continuing resolutions or omnibus bills. We want to go through the funding of the Federal Government bill by bill, sit down, and work with our colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

This will be bipartisan. This will be bicameral. We do not have the majority in the Senate. We will have to come together in conference and hash out our differences and work with one another.

I do agree with my colleague that we are going to have to work together in a bipartisan, bicameral way to fund the Federal Government.

I understand that there are a lot of scary numbers of people who would be impacted by a shutdown, but that is why this week we are here, passing four appropriations bills to fund the Federal Government, to avoid a full government shutdown.

There may be a partial shutdown for a short amount of time, but I believe that we can come together and alleviate that and come to a resolution soon.

We can do our jobs. We are passing the Department of Defense bill. We have that on the floor. We are also bringing up the Department of Homeland Security bill, the State and foreign ops, and the ag bill. We can fund these parts of the Federal Government.

Mr. Chair, again, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. BOEBERT).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 49 OFFERED BY MRS. BOEBERT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 49 printed in part B of House Report 118-216.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. The salary of Claire Trickler-McNulty, Assistant Director of the Immigration and Customs Enforcement Office of Immigration Program Evaluation, shall be reduced to \$1.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 723, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. BOEBERT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer my amendment that utilizes the Holman Rule to reduce the salary of the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Assistant Director, Office of Immigration Program Evaluation, Claire Trickler-McNulty, to \$1.

Ms. McNulty needs to be held accountable for her blatant disregard of our Nation's national security. Ms. McNulty is an advocate for open borders and is implementing policies that encourage illegal entry.

Ms. McNulty admitted publicly that she stayed at the Department of Homeland Security during the Trump administration to sabotage border enforcement.

Ms. McNulty worked for an organization known as KIND where she provided legal services for illegal aliens to fight deportation and stay in the country even though they broke our laws and entered America illegally.

□ 2100

Now this open borders advocate is supposed to help protect America's cross-border crime and illegal immigration that threaten national security when she clearly has no interest in following the law and doing either of these things.

The appointment of Ms. McNulty is a prime example of the Biden-Harris administration's ignorance to the importance of securing the border. Not only is she an open borders fanatic, but she was behind an \$80 million no-bid contract that the DHS Inspector General criticized as improper.

The Biden administration has essentially closed ICE down. They do nothing about people entering the country illegally, that has been shown repeatedly. Just look at the 151 terrorists on the terror watch list that have entered America on Biden and McNulty's watch.

During Ms. McNulty's tenure at ICE, instead of protecting our borders and enforcing our laws, ICE now is acting more like a social service agency for illegals.

ICE is even partnering with groups that campaign for ICE to be abolished, that give aid to illegal aliens, and that award contracts that strictly prohibit tackling the whereabouts of illegal aliens.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and hold Ms. McNulty accountable for doing her job, or not, and for her role in facilitating the worst border crisis in our Nation's history.

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

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chair, I claim time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition. This particular individual has served in senior roles throughout DHS, including as a career official under Republican and Democratic administrations.

As a career official, she led the initial implementation of the Prison Rape Elimination Act standards for ICE during the Trump administration—and she was not fired under the Trump administration. During the Trump administration she also led the development of a 2019 National Detention Standards, which is interesting because my colleagues included it as a provision in this bill that would require those standards to be applied to all detention facilities.

If we have a problem with policy, let's debate policy. I can tell you we ought to be focusing on making sure that we keep the government open. We can pass these four bills, but I can tell you there is no Senate conference over there. They are not going to take these bills up in the next couple of days.

Instead of focusing on what we ought to do, that is, preventing the sixth Republican-led shutdown since 1995, we ought to be working together instead of doing this.

This amendment violates the Bill of Attainder Clause of the U.S. Constitution. As the U.S. Supreme Court has said in *United States v. Lovett*, 1946, it is unconstitutional to target an individual.

Mr. Chair, I ask Members to vote "no," and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Chair, I would remind Members that Ms. McNulty only stayed in the Trump administration, as she was quoted, to sabotage border security efforts. That is not genuine. That is un-American. It is not dutiful.

There are many things that we are doing right now to avoid a shutdown. I certainly do not want a government shutdown. That is why my colleagues do not want a government shutdown. That is why we are debating these four bills and why we are debating the amendments to these four bills.

I agree with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and maybe many on my own side, that we should have done this sooner. We should not have waited until the deadline, but here we are, and we are all in Washington, D.C., working diligently to ensure that the debate is heard on these bills and we have an opportunity to fund these very important aspects of the Federal Government.

Mr. Chair, I urge adoption of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. BOEBERT).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 50 OFFERED BY MRS. BOEBERT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 50 printed in part B of House Report 118-216.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. The salary of Shoba Sivaprasad Wadhia, Officer for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, shall be reduced to \$1.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 723, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. BOEBERT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer my amendment that utilizes the Holman rule to reduce the salary for the Officer for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, Shoba Sivaprasad Wadhia to \$1.

DHS's Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties is staffed with people that literally want to abolish the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, an agency whose mission is to protect America from the cross-border crime and illegal immigration that threaten national security.

The woman that leads DHS's Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties once said that illegal immigrant felons, convicted of murder and rape, shouldn't be eligible for deportation solely because of their crimes.

Let me repeat that. Wadhia believes that illegal immigrant felons convicted of murder and rape should not be deported. She has also advocated for purging the term illegal immigrant and tried to humanize illegal immigration in order to allow mass illegal immigration.

Throughout her career, this open border bureaucrat has aggressively pursued pro-amnesty policies and even defended illegal immigrants in court who should have been deported.

In her current role, she is literally enabling and supporting the Biden border crisis. Since Joe Biden took office, more than 6 million illegal aliens have entered America. In August alone, there were 232,972 illegal aliens encountered at the southern border, and that does not include the got-aways who were not encountered by our brave Custom and Border Patrol agents.

Customs and Border Patrol have seized 25,500 pounds of fentanyl so far in fiscal year 2023, a deadly drug that is literally killing our children.

Mr. Chair, 25,500 pounds is only what was seized at the border, not what is still flowing freely into our country. Biden's bureaucrats are literally allowing deadly fentanyl to easily flow into our communities.

She has also been a major part of the Federal Government's obsession with diversity, equity, and inclusion, consistently forcing woke policies down the throats of public servants. These woke Federal policies shouldn't be embedded in our Nation's border and national security policies. These misguided agency initiatives need to come to an end.

My amendment is supported by the National Immigration Center for Enforcement, NumbersUSA, and the American Accountability Foundation. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and hold Shoba Wadhia accountable for her going rogue in an administration that has ignored the rule

of law and has facilitated the worst border crisis in our Nation's history.

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

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUELLAR. This bill on Homeland Security passed June 21, 2023. We are in September and we are just taking the bill right now. This bill, Homeland Security, got passed out of appropriations on June 21, 2023, and here we are late at night trying to pass a bill where there is no Senate conference. They are not even considering this bill, and we are not addressing the issue before us.

The issue before us is that the last government shutdowns were under Republican House majorities. In fact, the longest shutdown in history was a Republican House and Senate with Trump in the White House in 2018. Again, on November 13, 1995, December 15, 1995, September 30, 2013, June 19, 2018, and December 21, 2018, Republican-controlled Houses had a shutdown, five of them that we are looking at, and I think we are going to have the sixth one. Again, this bill passed on June 21 of 2023, and here we are in the middle of the night trying to decide.

Instead of focusing on what we ought to do to make sure we don't have a government shutdown, we are focusing on a bill that might pass over to the Senate, but there is no conference committee. What are we going to do at 12:01?

Again, if we have a problem or a difference—I should say, a difference in policy—I am ready to sit down. I don't want to see open borders. I want to make sure we support Border Patrol. I don't just go visit the border; I live there. I go with Border Patrol to church, I see them at the stores, our kids go to school together. I want to make sure that we support our men and women in green.

This amendment is unconstitutional. When you target salaries, the Supreme Court has already said in *United States v. Lovett* in 1946, it said, the Bill of Attainder Clause to the Constitution says that you cannot provide punishment without due process.

If we have a difference, let's debate it. You know what? We should have been doing this on June 22, the day after we passed it. Here we are in the middle of the night, 9:10 p.m. Eastern time, and we are talking about passing a bill that the Senate is not even considering right now.

Mr. Chair, I want to sit down with my good friend from Colorado and the chairman, Mr. JOYCE, but this is not the time to be talking about taking people's salaries away.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time, and I ask Members to vote "no."

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Chair, legislating is beautiful. It is great to actually be down here debating the real

issues that Americans are faced with day in and day out.

I do agree with my colleague on the other side of the aisle that we should have been debating this bill on June 22, but here we are. It is our responsibility to pass these appropriations bills, 12 individual appropriations bills in total, to the Senate.

What the Senate does is up to them and their Chamber. This is our House and it is our responsibility to do our part of our jobs. That is exactly what we are doing tonight.

I, too, would like to see our border secured. And I look forward to my colleague on the other side of the aisle joining us to support H.R. 2 to secure the border. I can tell he is very, very enthusiastic about actually accomplishing something rather than just throwing money at a problem and creating more processing agents.

I can see the sincerity and hear the sincerity in his voice that he wants a secure Nation and secure borders, especially since he represents a district on the southern border and encounters our brave Border Patrol agents each and every day.

My colleague has brought up several times tonight that you cannot have punishment without a trial. Well, this Holman rule is part of our House rules. We are a self-governing, majority rule body. The Holman rule is here in place to hold unelected bureaucrats accountable.

If my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have any sort of qualm with punishment without trial, I would encourage them to visit our January 6 prisoners in the D.C. jail.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. BOEBERT).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado will be postponed.

□ 2115

AMENDMENT NO. 51 OFFERED BY MR. CASTRO OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 51 printed in part B of House Report 118-216.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the Texas border and immigration enforcement program known as "Operation Lone Star".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 723, the gentleman

from Texas (Mr. CASTRO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas for 5 minutes.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Chair, I yield myself 2½ minutes.

My amendment would prohibit Federal Homeland Security funding from being diverted for Operation Lone Star, ensuring that Federal Homeland Security appropriations are spent on Federal operations like Border Patrol.

Operation Lone Star, unfortunately, has been defined by corruption, incompetence, and cruelty. Two years ago, the Governor of my State of Texas launched Operation Lone Star, a destructive \$4.5 billion political stunt that has led to a Federal civil rights investigation, the tragic deaths of 8 National Guard servicemembers, and a formal diplomatic complaint from our Nation's and Texas' largest trading partner.

Under the guise of border security, Governor Greg Abbott has embarked on an unprecedented campaign of government overreach—seizing private property, destroying livelihoods, and turning American border cities and towns into war zones where helicopters buzz overhead and armed troopers pull over American citizens for looking too much like immigrants.

At the beginning of the summer, Governor Abbott installed invisible razor wire in the middle of the Rio Grande and built a 1,000-foot string of floating deathtraps that are separated by serrated blades and secured to the riverbed with a net that is designed to catch and drown the families who reach it.

During the August recess, I went down to Eagle Pass, Texas, to see the impact of Operation Lone Star for myself. Standing on the banks of the river, I could see scraps of clothing and shoes stuck in the razor wire mesh that Governor Abbott's troops have installed on the border.

The wire isn't tall enough or strong enough to stop anyone who is desperate enough to cross, but it is sharp enough to leave them bloodied and broken.

When families finally make it to U.S. soil, Operation Lone Star troopers have been arresting the fathers and sons on trumped-up trespassing charges and locking them up for months at a time, some without the ability to reach their families, while bussing their wives and children to cities that are thousands of miles away and also to other States, including New York, Colorado, California, and Illinois.

Mr. Chair, Americans want border security. They also want an efficient and orderly immigration process. Operation Lone Star interferes with that. It hurts the Federal Government's effort, and it damages Border Patrol's efforts.

When Democrats were in the majority, we voted for billions of dollars in funding for Customs and Border Protection and Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and we fought to rebuild a functioning immigration system

from what had been left behind by the Trump administration.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Chair, I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. Chair, Operation Lone Star isn't border security. It is just plain out brutality. There is a difference between treating people like human beings and treating them like animals.

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

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chair, Texans have every right to defend and secure their borders, particularly during a time when the White House has abandoned attempts to secure the border and enforce our immigration laws.

Due to the Biden administration's failed policy, States along the border, including Texas, are seeing their resources being severely depleted. They are overrun. Therefore, Governor Abbott did what most responsible, reasonable public servants would do and launched Operation Lone Star. The goal of Operation Lone Star is to stop cartels and criminals from smuggling deadly drugs, weapons, and people into Texas.

As of last week, the multiagency effort resulted in 457,500 apprehensions and more than 34,400 criminal arrests, with more than 31,300 felonies reported. In the fight against fentanyl, Texas law enforcement has seized over 429 million lethal doses of fentanyl.

Due to the rapid and dangerous migrant street releases in Texas, the Governor has recently had to deploy additional buses to Eagle Pass and El Paso to assist those border communities overwhelmed by the influx of migrants. This is a constantly compounding issue that gets forgotten in the beltway because it is out of sight and out of mind.

This administration is putting politics over people, and it has completely abandoned these areas along our southwest border. If this was happening in my backyard, I would want my State to step up, too. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASAR), my good friend.

Mr. CASAR. Mr. Chair, we must stop the dangerous, expensive, corrupt, and ineffective political stunts at the border and instead chart a new path for a safe, orderly, and humane immigration system. Abbott's Operation Lone Star must end, and I urge passage of the amendment of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO), my good friend, to ensure Federal funding does not go to this failed program.

Every day, Texas Governor Greg Abbott violates the rights of asylum seekers and violates the rights of our border communities all to score political

points against President Biden. We have seen these inhumane policies in action that have taken the lives of children at the border, and we have lost National Guardsmen to death.

This is not only inhumane, but Operation Lone Star is not effective. Governor Abbott is lighting \$25 million on fire every week to cause suffering instead of creating solutions.

Why do my colleagues across the aisle not want solutions? Because they have no interest in a functioning immigration system. They thrive off of keeping the immigration system broken so they can continue to stoke anti-immigrant fears for their own politics.

Operation Lone Star, furthermore, is also unconstitutional. In *Arizona v. United States*, the Supreme Court ruled the Federal Government, not people like Governor Abbott, have supremacy over the immigration system. Abbott's unconstitutional, abusive, wasteful, and inhumane Operation Lone Star is a disgrace to our State and to our Nation.

I want to be clear: Not one cent of Federal money should go toward caging families, cutting innocent people with razor wire, or drowning children, period.

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. PFLUGER), my friend.

Mr. PFLUGER. Mr. Chair, what an opportunity to have Texans debating Texans. I hope that every Texan from the RGV all the way to Amarillo and from El Paso all the way to Beaumont is listening to this debate because the line is clear.

Chaos and lawlessness or law and order. Which is it going to be?

I do agree with my colleague who just said that the Constitution clearly says this is a Federal issue. I think this is the first thing that we have agreed on. The Constitution does say that. Article IV, Section 4. Joe Biden has abdicated his responsibility.

I have got the numbers from the Del Rio sector right here. Just in Del Rio during FY 23, 347,572 encounters, 144,900 known got-aways, 2,155 criminal arrests, and the gall to say that the Governor of Texas doesn't have the right to protect us when the Federal Government has completely abdicated?

I was in Eagle Pass this week. I wish that my colleagues would have been there. I wish they would have met the young lady from Venezuela who was brutally attacked by the cartels, separated from her husband, kicked in the face multiple times, 30 stitches in her head because of the failed policies.

Texas is the only government that is doing anything about this, and yet they have the gall to say that we don't have the right to defend ourselves when a Venezuelan flag is placed onto the shore of Texas property? In any other time period in history, that would be a declaration of war.

Talk to the troopers. Talk to the State troopers who are down there and

see the things that they are going through: The resuscitation of a 4-year-old last week and the week before.

I have had multiple Border Patrol agents tell me that the reason we have 2.3 million people who have entered this country illegally this year is because we have no consequences. There were 2.2 million last year. Every year since Joe Biden has been President, this chaos has gotten worse and worse. Enough is enough.

I am so glad that we are sitting here having a Texas versus Texas debate because I hope that Texans are looking at this for what it is. The reason that this is an issue is because the President of the United States, Secretary Mayorkas, and others throughout the administration on day one in January of 2021 reversed every single policy that worked. No more MPP, no more border wall, and to hear the falsehoods that are coming out of my colleagues about not funding Border Patrol agents? Take a look at H.R. 2. Take a look at what that does to fund more agents, to put more technology into place.

It is time for a shutdown of the southern border, and that is what we are calling on the President to do. This amendment should have said that we are going to reimburse the State of Texas for \$5 billion this year and \$5 billion last year.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Chair, cruelty and incompetence, these are what define Operation Lone Star. Unfortunately, the era that we are in in American politics for those across the aisle is marked by fearmongering because they have no solutions to the real issues that confront Americans—education, healthcare, jobs. They can't even get a budget together, so they try to scare everybody. They try to use these brown-skinned immigrants to scare everybody. That is what this is about. They are either going to send this money to Border Patrol or they are going to send it to Greg Abbott so he can go on FOX News and be celebrated.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 52 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 53 OFFERED BY MS. GREENE OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 53 printed in part B of House Report 118-216.

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to require an employee of the Department of Homeland Security to wear a face mask.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 723, the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. GREENE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Georgia.

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Chair, my amendment will prohibit the Department of Homeland Security from implementing any mask mandate for the employees of the Department.

This is an extremely important amendment. Our current appropriation bills completely stop the mandates for vaccines but do not stop the mandates for any future mask mandates.

We need to recognize as a country what Americans have already recognized, COVID is over. This is something that we even passed a resolution on, and the President himself signed it, declaring COVID is over.

We all know something to be very, very true: Masks don't work. They did not stop the spread of COVID. They were really a violation of people's rights. Even Dr. Anthony Fauci himself said that masks do not prevent the spread of COVID, and he said so in a personal email to one of his friends, advising her not to wear a mask when she flew on an airplane.

However, the Biden administration forced our TSA agents, forced everyone to be masked every single time they flew and every single time TSA agents showed up to work.

This administration insisted that illegal aliens posed no threat to spreading COVID, yet treated Border Patrol agents as if they were the COVID superspreaders. We saw many migrants come up illegally invading our country with no masks on, a constant, steady stream of thousands and thousands of people coming into our country from countries all over the world, bringing all kinds of diseases, but yet Homeland decided that it was Border Patrol agents and ICE agents who had to be masked, not the people coming into our country illegally, bringing all kinds of diseases with them. They weren't worried about COVID. It was about control.

Border Patrol agents and all DHS employees were required to wear masks when fulfilling a number of official duties at a time when there was almost no enforcement of these same mask requirements for these same illegal aliens coming across the border.

In light of Democrats' attempts to manufacture the resurgence of COVID, my amendment will protect employees of the Department of Homeland Security against all tyrannical mask mandates.

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

□ 2130

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment because I think this is a policy that should be debated in a different context in a different bill.

DHS' role here is guided by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the CDC. DHS does not develop independent policies on these issues but rather implements policies that originate within the CDC.

Again, we can have this debate, but I think we are in the wrong jurisdiction of the bill. This is the Department of Homeland Security bill, not the Labor-HHS bill. If we are talking about things that are important, I would respectfully ask that we look at the date that this Homeland bill was on—June 21, 2023.

We should have taken this bill on June 22, 2023, but here we are, at 9:30 on September 27, looking at trying to pass one of four bills to a Senate that has not taken H.R. 2. Certainly, they are not in conference ready to take up any of our bills.

What we ought to be focusing on is the shutdown. That is what we ought to be focusing on. Again, I will remind my friend that the last five government shutdowns were under a Republican House majority. We are, again, under a House Republican majority, whether it was on November 13, 1995, a Republican-controlled House, 5 days of a shutdown; December 15, 1995, a Republican-controlled House, 21 days of a shutdown; September 30, 2003, a Republican-controlled House, 16 days of a shutdown; January 19, 2018, 2 days; and, of course, December 21, 2018, a Republican-controlled House, 34 days.

Again, we are under a Republican-controlled House. On Sunday, 12:01, I hope we are not talking about a shutdown because, Members, we could pass this bill. Over there, there is no Senate waiting for this. They are working on a continuing resolution. If we have a shutdown, it is border security that is going to be hurt because, in October, starting next week, we are supposed to hire 150 new Border Patrol agents.

All of that will stop. Any vetting, any hiring, anything that we are supposed to do will be shut down. Members should have done this on June 22, 2023, but here we are, at 9:33 p.m. Eastern time, where we are debating a bill and an amendment that has nothing to do with this. It is the wrong jurisdiction.

I say, respectfully, that we ought to be focusing on trying to keep the government open.

Mr. Chair, I respectfully ask Members to vote "no" on this, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Chair, this is laughable. This is absolutely pathetic. All the whining and complaining about shutdowns coming from Democrats, who forced shutdowns on

Americans by shutting down their businesses, shutting down their freedom of speech, shutting down their churches, shutting down their playgrounds, shutting down beaches, shutting down every human right that Americans possessed, shutting down their freedoms. Listen to Democrats whining and complaining about working late at night.

Americans wanted to work late. They wanted to work all the time, but Democrats forced shutdowns. Do you know how many small businesses closed? We don't know the actual number, but it is a casualty to the American Dream. Businesses were forced to shut down, and they went out of business.

Children are behind in schooling because their schools shut down, and they were forced to stay home doing virtual schooling. We have kids all over America who can't read, can't do math, and this is all happening under the Biden administration that wants to use all of our hard-earned taxpayer resources to pay for migrant children in our taxpayer-funded schools.

Yes, it is important to have an amendment in the Department of Homeland Security appropriation bills forcing there to be no mask mandates because we know the truth: Democrats will do everything they can to bring COVID back, scare Americans, and convince them that a piece of paper strapped on their ears with rubber bands is going to protect them from the man-made COVID-19 virus that came from the Wuhan lab.

This is outrageous. I can't listen to the pathetic whining. It really is pathetic.

We remember last Congress. Last Congress, Democrats had us in here late at night practically every night. I can remember many times sitting on the House floor waiting for them to get all of their things together and voting past midnight.

This is what hard work looks like. We don't want to hear government employees getting a taxpayer-funded paycheck whining about a shutdown when this comes from the very party that shut down America, and we haven't recovered yet.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. GREENE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 54 OFFERED BY MS. GREENE OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 54 printed in part B of House Report 118-216.

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used for the Uniting for Ukraine program.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 723, the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. GREENE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Georgia.

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Chair, my amendment will prohibit funding for the Uniting for Ukraine program.

This is a streamlined, categorical parole process that allows an unlimited number of illegal aliens into our country from Ukraine.

There have been over 9 million illegal aliens who have invaded our country since Joe Biden took office. It is unprecedented.

Just last month, over 300,000 illegals invaded our country, the most ever recorded in a single month. Over this past weekend, Border Patrol reported there were over 11,000 illegal alien encounters in just a 24-hour period.

I deeply sympathize with the innocent people in Ukraine, especially since our government is forcing a proxy war there by funding and fueling the war instead of pushing peace in this country.

However, America is facing our own war at our southern border, and we cannot stand to address every global crisis when our own house is not in order, not safe.

We cannot afford to violate our own immigration laws on behalf of a global crisis, especially a global crisis that the United States Government is fueling and funding. The United States is fueling the war in Ukraine by sending tanks, ammunition, F-16s, and over \$113 billion taxpayer dollars and counting, especially when the debate in Washington and the argument is about more money for Ukraine.

The Uniting for Ukraine process grants mass categorical parole to these individuals, which is a complete violation of our own immigration laws. Parole is to be granted on a case-by-case basis, as required by the law. Although many claim the specific process is granting parole on a case-by-case basis, based on a proven track record, this administration doesn't even know what case by case means. They just know mass migration into the United States.

Joe Biden and Secretary Mayorkas continue to abuse our immigration laws and create categorical parole for illegal aliens into our country. Secretary Mayorkas has already granted temporary legal status to 75,000 Ukrainians under the temporary protected status designation, which includes benefits such as work permits, Social Security numbers, and driver's licenses.

This Uniting for Ukraine process has no numerical cap, which means an unlimited number of illegal aliens from Ukraine can come and displace American workers. Our country needs to put American citizens first for once.

We need to win the war at the southern border that the Mexican cartels are waging on our country before granting

parole to an unlimited number of individuals and allowing them to remain here for an indefinite amount of time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to an amendment that prohibits funding for the Uniting for Ukraine program.

In life, we have to make a decision: Either we are for good or for evil. Either we are for democracy or for dictatorships. This Uniting for Ukraine program allows Ukrainians who are displaced by the Russian invasion of Ukraine to apply to come to the U.S. through humanitarian parole.

This amendment seeks to stop a program and block thousands of Ukrainians from entering the country. Here, again, is an attempt to cut any support for Ukraine as they fight to defend the country from an illegal Russian invasion.

Putin is attempting to rewrite the map of Europe through the use of force. He is doing so in violation of international law and is deliberately killing civilians, destroying the economic livelihood of Ukraine, and taking kids from Ukraine, stealing the kids, taking them to Russia.

War crimes are being committed on a mass scale, and the United States and the democratic nations of the world must continue to strongly oppose him.

Again, I remind Members that this bill passed on June 21, 2023. Here we are, at 9:40 p.m., and we are going to be here till about 2 or 3 o'clock in the morning. I don't mind working. My parents were migrant workers who worked hard, so we can work and stay here till whatever time, but the point I am trying to make is that instead of looking at this bill on June 22, 2023, here we are a few days before the shutdown and, again, I remind everyone that the last five shutdowns have been by Republican-controlled Houses.

This Sunday, at 12:01, we will probably see the sixth Republican-controlled shutdown. Again, I want to work with the majority. I want to work with my good friend, who is always in a good mood, Mr. JOYCE. I want to work with him on this, but you can't say: We are in the majority. You are in the minority. You are not going to have a say.

Some of us don't just go visit the border. We actually live there. I work with the Border Patrol. I want to support them.

I want to remind Members that we had an opportunity to put \$2.4 billion, which we did add, to support Border Patrol and control the border. Guess what? All except for two Republicans that are still in the House of Representatives voted against border security.

Again, we have a choice. It is either good or evil. It is either a dictatorship or a democracy. I stand for good, and I stand for democracy, and I ask Members to vote against this amendment.

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

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Chair, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Georgia has 1 1/4 minutes remaining.

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I will remind the House and the American people watching at home that Democrats aren't worried about shutdowns. They love shutdowns. They shut down America for almost 2 years.

People are still suffering from the Democratic, communist shutdowns. I don't know why they keep complaining about it because they are the party that forced it on the American people while they are complaining about it for themselves. That is so pathetic.

Everyone here gets a taxpayer-funded paycheck, so don't whine about shutdowns when you shut down America on the very people who pay your salary.

Let's talk about allowing an unlimited number of Ukrainians into the country on the American taxpayer dime. This war is not supported by American taxpayers, not Americans. Over 55 percent of Americans do not want to fund it anymore.

We want to talk about funding Border Patrol agents. Let's talk about funding Border Patrol so they can secure our border, not be the welcoming committee to the entire world for the United States of America.

Mr. Chair, I ask the House to pass my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2145

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. GREENE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 55 OFFERED BY MS. GREENE OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 55 printed in part B of House Report 118-216.

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. The salary of Alejandro Nicholas Mayorkas, Secretary of Homeland Security, shall be reduced to \$1.00.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 723, the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. GREENE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Georgia.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chair, haven't we done this amendment two or three times already?

I mean, we know that the majority doesn't want to pay the salary. We already passed—

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will suspend.

The amendment has been made in order under the rule.

The gentlewoman from Georgia is recognized.

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Chair, my amendment uses the Holman rule, which is different from other amendments that have been introduced. This uses the Holman rule to reduce the salary of Secretary Alejandro Mayorkas to \$1, and \$1 is too much money.

Secretary Alejandro Mayorkas has aided and abetted the complete invasion of our country by deliberately flooding our Nation with drugs, terrorists, and illegals from over 160 countries from around the world.

The mission of the Department of Homeland Security States right here: "With honor and integrity, we will safeguard the American people, our homeland, and our values."

Being that Secretary Mayorkas has direction, authority, and control over the entire Department, he has failed in his duties to safeguard the American people and our homeland, and he deserves to be fired and impeached.

His job is to protect our homeland and strengthen the national security of our country. Yet, his policies, directives, and statements have created a national security crisis, and has tragically resulted in the deaths of thousands of Americans each year.

Since assuming office, he has allowed approximately 7.5 million illegal encounters at our border; over 250 people on the terrorist watch list to be caught crossing our border, and those are the ones we know of, approximately 1.6 million known got-aways to evade U.S. authorities. Imagine how many we don't even know about.

Just this fiscal year alone, Border Patrol arrested over 32,000 illegals with criminal convictions and over 167 MS-13 gang members.

Remember, there are 1.6 million that got away.

Are these terrorists? Are these gang members?

I am sure they are. How many of them have criminal records?

Secretary Mayorkas has allowed fentanyl, the number one killer of Americans between the ages of 18 and 45, to overwhelmingly flood into our country and kill around 300 Americans every single day. This fiscal year alone Border Patrol has seized approximately 24 pounds of fentanyl attempting to be smuggled into the United States. That is enough fentanyl to kill every single American 15 times over, but the fentanyl keeps coming because 300 Americans are dying every single day.

His open border policies have allowed unaccompanied children to be ex-

ploited, and now over 85,000 of them are unaccounted for. Where are these children?

Tens of thousands of other children have been forced into slave labor, and that is according to The New York Times.

He has provided copious amounts of baby formula to illegal aliens at one of the largest processing centers in the country, while American mothers and infants were intensely suffering from severe shortages and couldn't find baby formula on the grocery store shelves.

He flooded hospital maternity units with illegal aliens, so much so that American mothers were turned away and forced to delay inductions. That was in Yuma, Arizona.

He canceled border wall construction contracts established under President Trump that would have secured our Nation's border and was securing our Nation's border, but now the materials lay rusting on the ground.

He has repeatedly pulled border agents from actually securing our border and has moved them to processing roles, welcoming committees, leaving huge gaps for the Mexican cartels and drug smugglers to exploit and gain control of our border, and they are controlling our border.

He has violated the law by directing DHS to mass-parole illegal aliens into the U.S. when Federal law specifically prohibits this. He has encouraged asylum fraud, abused the credible fear standard, and exercised mass catch-and-release policies.

He has turned every single State into a border State. Veterans are even being kicked out of their hotel rooms to make room for illegals.

He has even caused approximately a 1,700-percent increase in just one sector of the northern border. He has not only enabled child exploitation, sex and drug trafficking, and fentanyl overdoses, but he has also done everything in his power to put Americans last.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman's time has expired.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chair, I guess the question I have is, we have done this amendment three times.

Lower it down to \$1. Lower it down to \$1. Lower it down to \$1. I guess his salary would now be \$3 dollars since we have done this three times.

Nevertheless, I would remind Members again that the last two fiscal years we added \$2.4 billion to CBP authority. That is a 15-percent increase. Money that would have been used to hire more Border Patrol agents, more CBP officers, intel specialists, threat enforcement officers, and other personnel, adding technology at the ports of entry where 90 or 94 percent of the drugs come in.

Again, initiatives to support the morale of the CBP workforce, like suicide prevention, wellness efforts, uniform allowances, and tuition.

Guess what? Every single Republican, except two that are still serving, voted no to pay the Border Patrol and give them the money so they can do the work. They voted no.

Again, here we are, at 9:50. What are we doing? Taking a bill that passed on June 21, 2023. We are not talking about the continuing resolution—because again, on Sunday at 12:01, we are going to have the sixth Republican shutdown since 1995.

Again, I thank all the staff, both on the Republicans' and Democrats' side, for working late; Capitol Police are working late. We can stay here as long as you want to, and maybe increase it to \$4 instead of \$3 on the pay for the Secretary.

Mr. Chair, I would say this: We are going to have a shutdown because we can pass this bill, or we can say we are going to strip out the H2B visa and get some Members who are going to vote "no." Whatever you want to do, but there is no Senate waiting to handle this bill.

Mr. Chair, I say to my colleagues again, we can stay as long as we want to. I can stay, and some of us will be here at 2:00, 3:00 in the morning, but again, we ought to be working on a CR because we are going to have the sixth Republican shutdown. Five in a row; you can make it six if you don't work with us.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment respectfully, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. GREENE).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment Nos. 56 through 59 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 60 OFFERED BY MS. HAGEMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 60 printed in part B of House Report 118-216.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Secretary of Homeland Security to travel to outside of the United States.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 723, the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. HAGEMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wyoming.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of my amendment, No. 60, which would prohibit the Secretary of Homeland Security from traveling outside of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, under Mr. Mayorkas, the Department of Homeland Security is a disaster by every single metric, and he has utterly failed at protecting our country, securing our borders, adhering to the rule of law, and protecting the constitutional rights of the citizens of this country.

The southern border is in chaos. We are being invaded by military-aged men from hostile countries from around the world and our cities are being overwhelmed by a mass of humanity and level of migration most likely not seen in world history.

At the same time, the Committee on the Judiciary continues to expose Mayorkas' role in creating, implementing, and enforcing the censorship industrial complex. The list of failures goes on and on and on and on.

Despite Mr. Mayorkas' direct and intentional involvement in the destruction of the borders, boundaries, security, and integrity of the United States of America, he has had the audacity to travel overseas to praise—yes, praise—the importance of the borders in other countries and the benefits of having an orderly transfer of people and goods across the same.

Yes, while ignoring the invasion on our southern and northern borders, an invasion that he has facilitated, Mr. Mayorkas actually traveled to a border between Poland and Ukraine to praise “the use of U.S. technology that has been deployed to ensure the safe transfer of people and goods between Poland and Ukraine.”

That is right, even while our border has become a raging inferno, Mr. Mayorkas traveled to view another nation's border crossing, to view and judge their operations while also meeting and speaking with their border enforcement officers. If only he had the same such care for what is happening right here in the United States of America.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of amendment No. 60, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chair, I claim time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment, with all due respect, but I would remind folks that we can't play defense on the one-yard line and call it the U.S. border. We have to make sure we move the perimeter. The Secretary has to look at threats inside and outside the United States.

Mr. Chair, I ask the gentlewoman to look at 2015.

What happened in 2015? The numbers went down under President Obama. Why? Because we were able to go, visit, talk to other countries so they can stop the migrants before they came to the U.S. The numbers went down.

In 2019, under President Trump, the same thing happened. Again, we were able to work with those countries, traveled over there, talked to them to

make sure that they are able to stop folks before they come over here. The numbers went down.

Again, we need to do the same thing, because it is not only the Secretary, but if you have a shutdown—and again, I remind Members at 10:00 at night, we should have been doing this debate back on June 22, a day after the appropriations of Homeland Security passed.

But here we are, addressing something when we know there is no Senate waiting for this bill. There is no Senate ready that has handled H.R. 2. So again, the best thing to do to avoid the sixth Republican shutdown since 1995 is to sit down with Democrats, do it in a bipartisan way, and address this particular issue.

Mr. Chair, a shutdown would not be helpful for anybody. I ask my colleagues to please look at this amendment, and I urge them to reject it.

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

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Chair, with all due respect, I do not believe Mr. Mayorkas was traveling to other countries to learn how best we can secure our border.

In fact, I don't think there is any evidence whatsoever that he has ever traveled to another country and asked them to stop sending their poor to our country to invade our country.

The fact is that Mayorkas and his boss, Joe Biden, are the largest human traffickers and drug smugglers in U.S. history. We receive absolutely no benefit whatever from Mr. Mayorkas traveling to other countries to observe their functioning borders while ours is burned to the ground.

□ 2200

There is no basis, rationale, or benefit for Secretary Mayorkas to travel outside of the United States to enjoy the fruits of an ordered society. He has failed to do his job and should not be rewarded for such failure by traveling the world at the taxpayers' expense. He needs to leave the visitation and discussions with foreign nations to the State Department. He needs to secure our border and reform his corrupt Department.

My amendment would prohibit Mr. Mayorkas from traveling outside of the United States while acting as the Secretary of the DHS.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. HAGEMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 61 OFFERED BY MS. HAGEMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 61 printed in part B of House Report 118-216.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement the Climate Literacy Strategy.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 61, the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. HAGEMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wyoming.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of my amendment No. 61 to H.R. 4367, which would prevent the DHS from implementing its “climate literacy strategy.”

Mr. Chair, it seems that there is nothing that Mr. Mayorkas and his Department won't do to distract from carrying out their central mission of defending the U.S. homeland, a mission at which they have failed miserably.

The climate literacy strategy states its objective is “. . . to develop a climate literate DHS workforce, ensuring all employees across the Department have a sufficient and up-to-date understanding of climate change and its relevance to the DHS mission.”

That is flatout hogwash.

The DHS states it will develop and administer this climate literate workforce through its program for climate change professionals, which DHS calls the “CCP” for short. No, I am not making that up.

It will also have a Department-wide website for sharing climate change information, have climate change trainings, and develop a community of practice to champion and share climate discussions.

I will use the word again: This is hogwash.

There are no resources to build a wall, no resources to apprehend illegal aliens, which have numbered over 10 times the population of the State of Wyoming since Joe Biden took office, no resources to stop terrorists from crossing our borders, but, of course, under Mr. Mayorkas' so-called leadership, there are vast sums of money available for promoting climate hysteria to ensure access to the newest climate propaganda and developments.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of amendment No. 61.

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

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment. It ensures that all employees across the Department have a sufficient up-to-date understanding for climate change.

If we keep in mind, one of the agencies under DHS is FEMA. What does FEMA deal with? Climate, hurricanes. All this strategy does is it blocks the

Department from studying or even understanding one of the most pressing issues.

Again, just understand, we can't put our heads in the sand and say there is nothing happening on that, yet in times of crisis during a natural disaster we expect the Department to deliver on its mission and make decisions during evolving circumstances.

All it does is understand the evolving environment. That is all.

I will vote "no" and encourage my colleagues to do the same.

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

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Chair, again, with all due respect, it is not the DHS' responsibility to deal with climate. In fact, the DHS has absolutely no capacity to do that whatsoever.

What the DHS' responsibility is is to protect the homeland from the invasion that we are seeing on the southern and northern borders.

My constituents are sick and tired of this. Not a cent of money should go to distracting the DHS employees from their jobs of defending this country.

I urge all of my colleagues to support my amendment, strip every last penny from this bone-headed initiative, and force the DHS to actually do its job.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. HAGEMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 62 OFFERED BY MS. HAGEMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 62 printed in part B of House Report 118-216.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the Department of Homeland Security's Environmental Justice Strategy.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 723, the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. HAGEMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wyoming.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of my amendment No. 62, which would prevent the DHS from carrying out its environmental justice strategy, whatever that nonsensical word salad means in today's parlance.

Similar to the climate indoctrination boondoggle I addressed when addressing my prior amendment, this is yet another angle being taken by Secretary Mayorkas and the DHS to worship at the altar of the so-called climate change instead of actually focusing their attention and resources on the gross incompetence that this administration calls border security.

While this administration continues to use newspeak to extol the virtues of this so-called environmental justice agenda, the reality is that Joe Biden, Mayorkas, and others in this administration are responsible for vast amounts of energy poverty around the world.

What this administration is not pursuing is environmental justice. It instead, has an affirmative goal of universal government-imposed wretchedness. This is what happens when you staff an entire administration with people who have never held a job in the private sector—a collapse of your supply chain, your energy resources, and ultimately, your prosperity.

Environmental justice isn't any such thing. It is an Alice in Wonderland level of gaslighting that is destroying our ability to produce energy, grow food, and provide affordable housing.

Congress' power is in the purse, and we must exercise that power by ensuring that there are no funds going to anything that doesn't secure our border. For my colleagues across the aisle, 11,000 illegal border crossings a day does not count for border security.

I urge my colleagues to support amendment No. 62, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment, and I encourage my colleagues to vote "no."

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

Ms. HAGEMAN. Again, Mr. Chair, I think that I have made my point with these three amendments. The purpose of the DHS and Mr. Mayorkas is to secure our border and protect the homeland. He has failed. There is no other thing that our DHS should be doing except specifically that.

For that reason I urge that my colleagues support amendments 60, 61, and 62, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. HAGEMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 63 OFFERED BY MR. HUIZENGA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 63 printed in part B of House Report 118-216.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be made available to administer, implement, or enforce the "Funding the Asylum Program With Employer Petition Fees" section of the proposed rule entitled "U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services Fee Schedule and Changes to Certain Other Immigration Benefit Request Requirements" (88 Fed. Reg. 402).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 723, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment to protect farmers, the agricultural business, and small businesses throughout west Michigan, and, frankly, across America from a costly new fee.

Along with a host of additional fee increases for H-2A and H-2B visas, the Biden administration has proposed a brand-new \$600 per-petition fee, Mr. Chair, on employers seeking visas for temporary workers.

This impacts a wide range of guest worker categories, such as H-2A and H-2B. H-2As, of course, are used for temporary agricultural work, and H-2Bs are usually used in the tourism industry. Frankly, I know my friend from Texas has been very involved in the H-2B and H-2A space. We have had this discussion before.

Furthermore, the administration—not me, not Republicans—but the Biden administration itself is dubbing this increase the "asylum program fee." This \$600 fee will be coming directly out of the pockets of farmers and small businesses and funneled to the asylum process backlog caused by this administration's failed border policies.

In April of this year, six Republicans and six Democrats from Michigan—nearly our entire delegation—joined together to oppose this increase in a bipartisan letter to Secretary Mayorkas requesting that he reconsider reimplimenting this fee and other significant fee increases that we view as harmful.

Making ends meet in the face of soaring prices and record inflation is hard enough. The Federal Government should not be inventing additional costs that raise prices for consumers and make it harder for family farms and small businesses to keep their doors open.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this commonsense amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment. Again, this amendment would strike a section within a proposed rule. Proposed rules have no force of law.

If enacted, the administration would just simply rename the section and continue to execute the fee rules as currently as they are trying to do that.

Let's keep in mind USCIS is a fee-funded agency. Except for a small portion, they don't get appropriations. They work on fees. We have to find the right balance on the fees and where we add those fees.

Again, I understand what you're trying to do, but I think this amendment

will strike a proposed rule, and I don't think this is the right way to address this. I do understand what you are saying, but based on that, I would ask that we vote "no," and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

I would say this as the ranking member, if Chairman JOYCE would want to sit down with me, I would be happy to sit down and have this conversation.

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

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chair, I wish the gentleman hadn't necessarily yielded back his time because I would have loved to have a little bit of a colloquy on this.

I fully understand the USCIS is a fee-based institution. It takes in those fees.

In addition to the \$600 per petition fee, they also had proposed a tripling of a fee for the named employee. If you are putting in—and the gentleman knows this issue very well. If you have a particular person that you are requesting to come into the country, this administration tripled that fee. If you have an unnamed person for an H-2A or an H-2B, they doubled that fee increase.

I had an amendment that was going to attempt to address those two issues, as well. The Rules Committee ruled that nongermane. We can have that discussion outside of that, but they did rule this particular proposal and this amendment as germane, as relevant to this discussion.

While we have seen a fee already that is in place be increased, we are not able to do that, but this is a brand-new fee that the administration, again, has labeled the "asylum program fee."

We all know that there are serious issues at the southern border, and it is something the gentleman has talked about pretty extensively. I just don't see how penalizing small businesses and people who are using the system legally and increasing their costs which are going to be passed along to the general public, how that makes sense in this case.

I talked to a farmer back in southwest Michigan who regularly employs about 100 seasonal temporary workers. It doesn't take a math genius to figure out 100 H-2A visas with a \$600 fee, that is \$60,000 in additional fees that this farmer is going to have to put up front before they have done the harvest, before they have actually reaped any of the benefit of the work.

That is why I believe this is so crucially important to U.S. agriculture.

□ 2215

While I understand the gentleman may oppose this particular amendment as it is sitting, I hope he wouldn't oppose the spirit of this. I would love to work with him on this because I do believe we need to address this issue.

Mr. Chair, I again urge all of my colleagues to vote for this amendment. I believe it is a commonsense amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 64 OFFERED BY MR. NEHLS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 64 printed in part B of House Report 118-216.

Mr. NEHLS. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties of the Department of Homeland Security.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 723, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEHLS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. NEHLS. Mr. Chair, my amendment would prohibit funds for the Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties at the Department of Homeland Security.

Under Joe Biden, the Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties at the Department of Homeland Security, also known as CRCL, has become a corrupt, woke, and anti-ICE component of DHS.

The CRCL is responsible for advancing equity at the DHS. As part of this principle, DHS created its first-ever equity task force in 2021. One of the task force's so-called accomplishments was reversing the public charge. I call it public disaster.

President Donald J. Trump rightfully defined "public charge" as an immigrant who receives one or more designated public benefits for more than 12 months within a 36-month period. He rightfully included food stamps, housing vouchers, and Medicaid as benefits that would disqualify an immigrant from receiving a green card.

Trump's rule protected the American taxpayer and put Americans first. Joe Biden and his woke CRCL continue to put Americans last.

Under Joe Biden, through the CRCL, his administration has made it easier for illegal aliens to receive Federal benefits at the expense of hard-earned tax dollars.

The CRCL said President Trump's rule "had a chilling effect on immigrants of color and individuals with disabilities with respect to their willingness to seek any form of assistance from the Federal Government." This decision, folks, had nothing to do with skin color or disabilities.

It is clear that DHS's Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties is catering to these immigrants in an attempt to get their votes. To me, it is criminal.

Perhaps even more troubling, bureaucrats at the CRCL have deep ties to the abolish ICE movement, which seeks to

stop deportation of illegal aliens. In fact, CRCL chief Shoba Wadhia has led the charge with pro-open border and anti-enforcement activities for years. She even advocated to take away funds from ICE and CBP.

Prior to joining CRCL, she also suggested that even the most violent illegal alien felons should not be deported. Let me say that again. The chief of CRCL at DHS doesn't believe that violent illegal aliens, felons, should be deported. Tell me how that makes sense.

Let me be clear. Someone who immigrates illegally is an illegal alien. Ms. Wadhia advocates against using the term "illegal immigrant" and suggests using the term "noncitizens" or "migrants" instead.

Ms. Wadhia has no business leading this office.

Other CRCL policy advisers have also directly supported the abolish ICE movement or worked with other organizations that have. These people are not concerned with defending our homeland.

I remind my colleagues on the left that DHS has a vital mission to ensure a safe, secure, and prosperous homeland. It is abundantly clear that the DHS Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties is doing the exact opposite. We must defund this woke, corrupt, anti-ICE office within the DHS.

Mr. Chair, I urge all of my colleagues to support my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment, with all due respect to my colleague, the former sheriff, as my brother is a former sheriff on the border.

I ask that if we have differences in opinion, instead of just eliminating this office of civil rights, I would remind our colleagues that this Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties covers the 260,000 personnel who work for DHS. That is, it covers the 43,000 U.S. Coast Guard employees and the 59,000 CBP personnel. That includes Border Patrol and OFO, who are the men and women in blue. It covers 16,800 ICE personnel, including HSI agents and immigration enforcement officers; 58,000 TSA personnel; 19,300 FEMA employees; and 6,300 Secret Service personnel. All of those employees are under Homeland.

Again, I do understand we might have some differences, and I will be the first one to say let's sit down and have a bipartisan conversation to address those concerns. To eliminate the office, I would say that would not be the right policy.

Again, I remind folks, at 10:23, that we passed the Homeland appropriations on June 21. We should have been doing this at 10:23 on June 22 instead of doing this tonight.

I don't think there is a conference committee on the Senate side. We

ought to be focusing on how to keep the government open.

With all due respect to my good friend from Texas, the former sheriff, we might have some differences, but I will be the first one to sit down with him and figure out how we can address these issues.

Mr. Chair, for those reasons, I ask my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NEHLS. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEHLS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. NEHLS. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 65 OFFERED BY MR. NEHLS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 65 printed in part B of House Report 118-216.

Mr. NEHLS. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk as the designee of Mr. NORMAN.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 1. The salary of Jonathan Davidson, Chief of Staff of the Department of Homeland Security, shall be reduced to \$1.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 723, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEHLS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. NEHLS. Mr. Chair, my amendment reduces the salary of Jonathan Davidson, the chief of staff of the Department of Homeland Security, to \$1.

His salary last year was \$158,500. With his new role, it will be at least \$180,000. \$180,000 for this guy, and he does nothing.

In a short stint in his role, he has completely failed in upholding his mission, a complete dereliction of duty under his leadership at DHS with the invasion that is currently happening at our southern border.

Just in his first month on the job, there were over 232,000 enforcement encounters at the southwest border. This is a 36.5 percent increase in traffic.

Mr. Chair, 101,000 single individuals, with the majority of these persons being military-age males, were encountered at our border just in the month of August. This isn't effective leadership, and we need to hold DHS officials accountable. This guy needs to be unemployed.

We have written DHS 15 times this Congress to conduct oversight over the board. Again, we request documents

and information to understand the Biden administration's plans, if any. We never get anything.

My point is this: This guy's salary needs to be reduced to \$1 because that is all he is worth.

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

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Again, getting information from Homeland can be frustrating. I have been frustrated, also. I agree that they should be providing information.

Sometimes we disagree with the policy on how to secure the border. Sometimes I disagree with my Republican friends. Sometimes I disagree with my Democratic friends. Again, it is a difference in policy that we can work out.

To go after a specific person by name is against the Constitution, the Bill of Attainder Clause, where you should have due process before this step is taken. Targeting salaries is unconstitutional, as pointed out by the United States v. Lovett, a Supreme Court case from 1946.

There is another way to address this. I will be happy to sit down with my good friend from Texas to address this.

Mr. Chair, at this time, I respectfully oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NEHLS. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEHLS).

The amendment was agreed to.

VACATING DEMAND FOR RECORDED VOTE ON
AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURCHETT

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 24 be vacated to the end that the amendment be withdrawn.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 24 offered by the gentleman from Tennessee is vacated and the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 118-216 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 13 by Mr. CORREA of California.

Amendment No. 23 by Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ of Florida.

Amendment No. 25 by Ms. ESCOBAR of Texas.

Amendment No. 29 by Mr. CLYDE of Georgia.

Amendment No. 39 by Mr. BIGGS of Arizona.

Amendment No. 40 by Mr. BIGGS of Arizona.

Amendment No. 41 by Mr. BIGGS of Arizona.

Amendment No. 42 by Mr. BIGGS of Arizona.

Amendment No. 43 by Mr. BIGGS of Arizona.

Amendment No. 48 by Mrs. BOEBERT of Colorado.

Amendment No. 49 by Mrs. BOEBERT of Colorado.

Amendment No. 50 by Mrs. BOEBERT of Colorado.

Amendment No. 51 by Mr. CASTRO of Texas.

Amendment No. 64 by Mr. NEHLS of Texas.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. CORREA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 13, printed in part B of House Report 118-216 offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 206, noes 223, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 442]

AYES—206

Adams	Crow	Huffman
Aguilar	Cuellar	Ivey
Allred	Davids (KS)	Jackson (IL)
Auchincloss	Davis (IL)	Jackson (NC)
Bacon	Davis (NC)	Jackson Lee
Balint	Dean (PA)	Jayapal
Barragán	DeGette	Jeffries
Beatty	DeLauro	Johnson (GA)
Bera	DelBene	Kamlager-Dove
Beyer	Deluzio	Kaptur
Bishop (GA)	DeSaulnier	Keating
Blumenauer	Dingell	Kelly (IL)
Blunt Rochester	Doggett	Khanna
Bonamici	Escobar	Kildee
Boyle (PA)	Eshoo	Kilmer
Brown	Espaillat	Kim (NJ)
Brownley	Evans	Krishnamoorthi
Budzinski	Fletcher	Kuster
Caraveo	Foster	Landsman
Carbajal	Foushee	Larsen (WA)
Cárdenas	Frankel, Lois	Larson (CT)
Carson	Frost	Lee (CA)
Carter (LA)	Fulcher	Lee (NV)
Cartwright	Gallego	Leger Fernandez
Casar	Garamendi	Levin
Case	García (IL)	Lieu
Casten	García (TX)	Lofgren
Castor (FL)	Garcia, Robert	Lynch
Castro (TX)	Golden (ME)	Mace
Cheriflusi- McCormick	Goldman (NY)	Magaziner
Chu	Gonzalez	Manning
Clark (MA)	Vicente	Matsui
Clarke (NY)	Gottheimer	McBath
Cleaver	Green, Al (TX)	McClellan
Clyburn	Grijalva	McCullom
Cohen	Harder (CA)	McGarvey
Connolly	Hayes	McGovern
Correa	Higgins (NY)	Meeks
Costa	Himes	Menendez
Courtney	Horsford	Meng
Craig	Houlahan	Mfume
Crockett	Hoyer	Morelle
	Hoyle (OR)	Moskowitz

NOES—320

Adams Franklin, C. McCormick Thompson (MS) Thompson (PA) Underwood Valadao Waters Reschenthaler Smucker Weber (TX)
 Aderholt Scott McGarvey Titus Van Duyne Watson Coleman Rodgers (WA) Spartz Webster (FL)
 Aguilar Frost McGovern Tlaib Van Orden Wenstrup Rogers (AL) Stauber Wenstrup
 Alford Gallagher McHenry Tokuda Vargas Wexton Rose Stefanik Westerman
 Allred Gallego Meeks Tonko Vasquez Williams (GA) Williams (NY) Strong Williams (TX)
 Armstrong Garamendi Menendez Torres (CA) Veasey Williams (NY) Santos Tenney Wilson (SC)
 Auchincloss Garbarino Meng Torres (NY) Velázquez Wilson (FL) Scalise Tiffany Yakym
 Bacon García (IL) Meuser Trahan Wagner Womack Self Timmons Zinke
 Baird García (TX) Mfume Trone Wasserman Turner Schultz Sessions Van Drew
 Balint Garcia, Mike Miller (OH) Miller-Meeks
 Banks Garcia, Robert Miller-Meeks
 Barragán Giménez Molinaro Barr Luna Radewagen Adams Garamendi Miller-Meeks
 Beatty Golden (ME) Moore (WI) Bush Lynch Sablan Aguilar Garbarino Molinaro
 Bentz Goldman (NY) Moran Carter (TX) Peitola Pence Gonzales, Tony Garcia (IL) Moore (WI)
 Bera Gomez Morelle Gonzales, Tony Garcia (TX) Moran
 Beyer Gonzalez, Moskowitz Moulton
 Bice Vicente Moulton
 Bilirakis González-Colón Mrvan
 Bishop (GA) Gottheimer Mullin
 Blumenauer Granger Murphy
 Blunt Rochester Graves (LA) Nadler
 Bonamici Graves (MO) Napolitano
 Bowman Green, Al (TX) Neal
 Boyle (PA) Grijalva Neguse
 Brown Guest Newhouse
 Brownley Guthrie Nickel
 Bucshon Harder (CA) Norcross
 Budzinski Hayes Norton
 Calvert Higgins (NY) Nunn (IA)
 Caraveo Hill Obernolte
 Carbajal Himes Ocasio-Cortez
 Cárdenas Hinson Omar
 Carl Horsford Pallone
 Carson Houchin Panetta
 Carter (LA) Houlahan Pappas
 Cartwright Hoyer Pascrell
 Casar Hoyle (OR) Payne
 Case Hudson Perez
 Casten Huffman Peters
 Castor (FL) Ivey Pettersen
 Castro (TX) Jackson (IL) Pettersen
 Chavez-DeRemer Jackson (NC) Phillips
 Cherfilus- Jackson Lee Plaskett
 McCormick Jacobs Pocan
 Chu James Porter
 Ciscomani Jayapal Pressley
 Clark (MA) Jeffries Quigley
 Clarke (NY) Johnson (GA) Ramirez
 Cleaver Johnson (OH) Raskin
 Clyburn Johnson (SD) Rogers (AL)
 Cohen Joyce (OH) Rogers (KY)
 Cole Kamlager-Dove Ross
 Connolly Kaptur Rouzer
 Correa Kean (NJ) Ruiz
 Costa Keating Ruppersberger
 Courtney Kelly (IL) Rutherford
 Craig Kelly (MS) Ryan
 Crawford Kelly (PA) Salazar
 Crenshaw Khanna Salinas
 Crockett Kiggans (VA) Sánchez
 Crow Kildee Sarbanes
 Cuellar Kiley Scalise
 D'Esposito Kilmer Scanlon
 Davids (KS) Kim (CA) Schakowsky
 Davis (IL) Kim (NJ) Schiff
 Davis (NC) Krishnamoorthi Schneider
 De La Cruz Kuster Scholten
 Dean (PA) Kustoff Schrier
 DeGette LaHood Schweikert
 DeLauro LaLota Scott (VA)
 DelBene Landsman Scott, Austin
 Deluzio Larsen (WA) Scott, David
 DeSaulnier Larson (CT) Sewell
 Diaz-Balart LaTurner Sherman
 Dingell Lawler Sherrill
 Doggett Lee (CA) Simpson
 Duarte Lee (FL) Slotkin
 Dunn (FL) Lee (NV) Smith (NE)
 Ellzey Lee (PA) Smith (NJ)
 Escobar Leger Fernandez Smith (WA)
 Eshoo Letlow Sorensen
 Espaillat Levin Soto
 Estes Lieu Spanberger Carter (GA)
 Evans Lofgren Stansbury Cline Griffith
 Ezell Lucas Stanton Cloud Grothman
 Feenstra Luetkemeyer Stauber Clyde Guest
 Finstad Luttrell Steel Collins
 Fischbach Mace Stefanik Comer Hageman
 Fitzgerald Magaziner Steil Crane Harris
 Fleischmann Malliotakis Stevens Crawford Harshbarger
 Fleischmann Manning Strickland Crenshaw Hern
 Fletcher Mast Strong Curtis Higgins (LA)
 Flood Matsui Swalwell Davidson Hill
 Foster McBath Sykes De La Cruz Houchin
 Foushee McCaul Takano DesJarlais Hudson
 Foxx McClellan Thaenadar Donalds Huizinga
 Frankel, Lois McCollum Thompson (CA)

Thompson (CA) Torres (NY) Velázquez
 Titus Torres (NY) Wild
 Tlaib Vargas
 Tokuda Vásquez
 Tonko Williams (GA)
 Meeks Torres (CA) Williams (NY)
 Meng Torres (NY) Wilson (FL)
 Garcia (IL) Trahan Wagner
 Mfume Trone Wasserman
 Balint Garcia, Mike Turner Schultz
 Banks Garcia, Robert Miller-Meeks
 Barr Luna Radewagen
 Bush Lynch Sablan
 Carter (TX) Peitola Pence
 Gonzales, Tony
 NOT VOTING—10
 ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
 The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2306

So the amendment was rejected.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 39 OFFERED BY MR. BIGGS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 39, printed in part B of House Report 118-216 offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 147, noes 282, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 446]

AYES—147

Adams Garamendi Miller-Meeks
 Aguilar Garbarino Molinaro
 Allred Garcia (IL) Moore (WI)
 Amodei Garcia (TX) Moran
 Auchincloss Garcia, Robert Morelle
 Bacon Golden (ME) Moskowitz
 Baird Goldman (NY) Moulton
 Balint Gomez Moylan
 Banks González, Mrvan
 Barragán Vicente Mullin
 Beatty González-Colón Nadler
 Bentz Gottheimer Napolitano
 Bera Granger Neal
 Beyer Green, Al (TX) Neguse
 Bice Grijalva Newhouse
 Bishop (GA) Harder (CA) Nickel
 Blumenauer Hayes Norcross
 Blunt Rochester Higgins (NY) Norton
 Bonamici Himes Nunn (IA)
 Bowman Hinson Obernolte
 Boyle (PA) Horsford Ocasio-Cortez
 Brown Houlahan Omar
 Brownley Hoyer Pallone
 Bucshon Hoyle (OR) Panetta
 Budzinski Huffman Pappas
 Calvert Ivey Pascrell
 Caraveo Jackson (IL) Payne
 Carbajal Jackson (NC) Pelosi
 Cárdenas Jackson Lee Perez
 Carson Jacobs Peters
 Carter (LA) James Pettersen
 Cartwright Jayapal Phillips
 Casar Jeffries Pingree
 Case Johnson (GA) Plaskett
 Casten Joyce (OH) Pocan
 Castor (FL) Kamlager-Dove Porter
 Castro (TX) Kaptur Pressley
 Chavez-DeRemer Kean (NJ) Quigley
 Cherfilus- Keating Ramirez
 McCormick Kelly (IL) Raskin
 Chu Kelly (PA) Rogers (KY)
 Ciscomani Khanna Ross
 Clark (MA) Kiggans (VA) Ruiz
 Clarke (NY) Kildee Rutherford
 Cleaver Kiley Ruppersberger
 Cuellar Kilmer Ryan
 D'Esposito Scanlon Schakowsky
 Davids (KS) LaHood Schiavone
 Davis (IL) LaTurner Schrier
 Davis (NC) LaLota Scott (VA)
 De La Cruz Landsman Schiavone
 DeSaulnier Luetkemeyer Scott, Austin
 Diaz-Balart Luttrell Scott, David
 Dingell Malliotakis Schneiders
 Fischbach LaMalfa Scholten
 Finstad Fallon D'Esposito
 Fornet Larrson (WA) Latta
 Fornet Larson (CT) Larson (CT)
 Fornet Leger Fernandez Schrier
 Fornet Letlow Simpson
 Fornet Levin Slotkin
 Fornet Lofgren Smith (NE)
 Fornet Loudermilk Smith (NJ)
 Fornet Lucas Sorensen
 Fornet Madsen Soto
 Fornet Mace Spanberger
 Fornet Stansbury Stansbury
 Fornet Stanton
 Fornet Steel
 Fornet Stevens
 Fornet Strickland
 Fornet Sykes
 Fornet Takano
 Fornet Thanedar
 Fornet Thompson (CA)
 Fornet Thompson (MS)
 Fornet Thompson (PA)
 Fornet Titus
 Fornet Tlaib

Tokuda	Vargas	Watson Coleman	Reschenthaler	Smith (NJ)	Walberg	Torres (NY)	Vargas	Waters
Tonko	Vasquez	Wexton	Rodgers (WA)	Smucker	Waltz	Trahan	Vasquez	Watson Coleman
Torres (CA)	Veasey	Wild	Rogers (AL)	Spartz	Weber (TX)	Trone	Veasey	Wexton
Torres (NY)	Velázquez	Williams (GA)	Rose	Staber	Webster (FL)	Turner	Velázquez	Wild
Trahan	Wagner	Wilson (FL)	Rosendale	Stefanik	Wenstrup	Underwood	Wagner	Williams (GA)
Trone	Walberg	Wittman	Roy	Steil	Westerman	Valadao	Wasserman	Wilson (FL)
Turner	Waltz	Womack	Santos	Steube	Williams (NY)	Van Orden	Schultz	Womack
Underwood	Wasserman	Scalise	Strong	Williams (TX)				
Valadao	Schultz	Schweikert	Tenney	Wilson (SC)				
Van Orden	Waters	Self	Tiffany	Wittman				
		Sessions	Timmons	Yakym				
		Smith (MO)	Van Drew	Zinke				
		Smith (NE)	Van Duyne					

NOT VOTING—9

Bush	Luna	Radewagen
Carter (TX)	Peltola	Sablan
Gonzales, Tony	Pence	Steube

NOES—270

NOT VOTING—8

Bush	Luna	Radewagen
Carter (TX)	Peltola	Sablan
Gonzales, Tony	Pence	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2309

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 40 OFFERED BY MR. BIGGS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 40, printed in part B of House Report 118-216 offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 160, noes 270, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 447]

AYES—160

Aderholt	Ellzey	Johnson (OH)	Keating	Ross	Aderholt	Emmer	Johnson (SD)
Alford	Emmer	Johnson (SD)	Chu	Rouzer	Alford	Estes	Jordan
Allen	Estes	Jordan	Ciscomani	Ruiz	Allen	Ezell	Joyce (PA)
Armstrong	Ezell	Joyce (PA)	Clark (MA)	Ruppersberger	Armstrong	Fallon	Kelly (MS)
Arrington	Fallon	Kelly (MS)	Clarke (NY)	Rutherford	Arrington	Feenstra	LaHood
Babin	Feenstra	LaMalfa	Cleaver	Kildee	Babin	Ferguson	LaMalfa
Balderson	Ferguson	Lamborn	Cohen	Kiley	Balderson	Finstad	Lamborn
Barr	Finstad	Langworthy	Cole	Kim (CA)	Banks	Fischbach	Langworthy
Bean (FL)	Fischbach	Latta	Connolly	Kim (NJ)	Bean (FL)	Fitzgerald	Latta
Bergman	Fitzgerald	LaTurner	Castro (TX)	Kammlager-Dove	Bentz	Fleischmann	LaTurner
Biggs	Franklin, C.	Lesko	D'Esposito	Kaptur	Bergman	Franklin, C.	Lesko
Bilirakis	Scott	Loudermilk	Crockett	Kean (NJ)	Bice	Scott	Loudermilk
Bishop (NC)	Fry	Luetkemeyer	Crow	McCormick	Biggs	Fry	Luetkemeyer
Boebert	Fulcher	Luttrell	Davids (KS)	Keating	Bilirakis	Fulcher	Luttrell
Bost	Gaetz	Malliotakis	Davidson	Chu	Allen	Ezell	Joyce (PA)
Brecheen	Garcia, Mike	Mann	Davis (IL)	Kelly (IL)	Armstrong	Fallon	Kelly (MS)
Buchanan	Gimenez	Massie	Davis (NC)	Kelly (PA)	Rutherford	Feenstra	LaHood
Buck	Good (VA)	Mast	Dean (PA)	Khanna	Ryan	Babin	Ferguson
Burchett	Gooden (TX)	McCaul	DeGette	Kilmel	Arrington	Finstad	Ferguson
Burgess	Gosar	McClain	DeLauro	Kim (CA)	Balderson	Banks	Finstad
Burlison	Graves (LA)	McClintock	DelBene	Kim (NJ)	Banks	Fischbach	Fischbach
Cammack	Graves (MO)	McCormick	Deluzio	Kammlager-Dove	Sánchez	Bean (FL)	Fischbach
Carey	Green (TN)	McHenry	DeSaulnier	Larsen (WA)	Barbanes	Fitzgerald	Fischbach
Carl	Greene (GA)	Meuser	Diaz-Balart	Larson (CT)	Scanlon	Bentz	Fleischmann
Carter (GA)	Griffith	Miller (IL)	Dingell	Leger Fernandez	Ramirez	Bergman	LaTurner
Cline	Grothman	Miller (WV)	Doggett	Leiter	Raskin	Franklin, C.	Lesko
Cloud	Guest	Mills	Lynch	Letlow	Rogers (KY)	Scott	Franklin, C.
Clyde	Guthrie	Moolenaar	Edwards	Smith (WA)	Ross	Biggs	Franklin, C.
Collins	Hageman	Mooney	Mace	Schiff	Aderholt	Ezell	Franklin, C.
Comer	Harris	Moore (AL)	Magaziner	Schneider	Estes	Allen	Feenstra
Crane	Harshbarger	Moore (UT)	Manning	Scholten	Ezell	Armstrong	Fallon
Crawford	Hern	Moylan	McAuliffe	Salazar	Ryan	Rutherford	Feenstra
Crenshaw	Higgins (LA)	Murphy	McClellan	Salinas	Rutherford	Balderson	Finstad
Curtis	Hill	Nehls	Fitzpatrick	Spanberger	Ryan	Babin	Balderson
Davidson	Houchin	Norman	Fleischmann	Spanberger	Arrington	Balderson	Banks
De La Cruz	Hudson	Ogles	Flood	Spanberger	Balderson	Banks	Fischbach
DesJarlais	Huizenga	Owens	Foster	Spanberger	Balderson	Banks	Fischbach
Donalds	Hunt	Palmer	Foushee	Spanberger	Balderson	Banks	Fischbach
Duarte	Issa	Perry	Frankel, Lois	Spanberger	Balderson	Banks	Fischbach
Duncan	Jackson (TX)	Pfluger	Frost	Spanberger	Balderson	Banks	Fischbach
Dunn (FL)	Johnson (LA)	Posey	Gallagher	Spanberger	Balderson	Banks	Fischbach

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2312

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MR. BIGGS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 41, printed in part B of House Report 118-216 offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 168, noes 261, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 448]

AYES—168

Aderholt	Emmer	Johnson (SD)
Alford	Estes	Jordan
Allen	Ezell	Joyce (PA)
Armstrong	Fallon	Kelly (MS)
Arrington	Feenstra	LaHood
Babin	Ferguson	LaMalfa
Balderson	Finstad	Lamborn
Barr	Balderson	Fischbach
Bean (FL)	Banks	Langworthy
Bergman	Fitzgerald	Latta
Biggs	Bentz	Fleischmann
Bilirakis	Bergman	LaTurner
Bishop (NC)	Franklin, C.	Lesko
Boebert	Boeber	McCormick
Bost	Bost	Massie
Brecheen	Brecheen	Good (VA)
Buchanan	Buchanan	Mast
Buck	Buck	McCaull
Burchett	Burchett	McClain
Burgess	Burgess	Granger
Burlison	Burlison	McClintock
Cammack	Cammack	Graves (LA)
Carey	Carey	McHenry
Carl	Carl	Meuser
Carter (GA)	Carter (GA)	Miller (IL)
Cline	Griffith	Miller (WV)
Cloud	Cline	Mills
Clyde	Clyde	Moolenaar
Collins	Collins	Moore (AL)
Comer	Comer	Moore (UT)
Crane	Crane	Murphy
Crawford	Crawford	Neils
Crenshaw	Crenshaw	Norman
Curtis	Curtis	Ogles
Davidson	Davidson	Owens
De La Cruz	De La Cruz	Palmer
DesJarlais	DesJarlais	Perry
Donalds	Donalds	Pfluger
Duarte	Duarte	Posey
Duncan	Duncan	Rodgers (WA)
Dunn (FL)	Dunn (FL)	Rogers (AL)

Rose	Spartz	Waltz	Veasey	Waters	Wilson (FL)	Smith (MO)	Strong	Weber (TX)
Rosendale	Stauber	Weber (TX)	Velázquez	Watson Coleman	Womack	Smith (NE)	Tenney	Wenstrup
Rouzer	Stefanik	Webster (FL)	Wagner	Wexton		Smith (NJ)	Tiffany	Westerman
Roy	Steil	Wenstrup	Wasserman	Wild		Smucker	Timmons	Williams (NY)
Rutherford	Steube	Westerman	Schultz	Williams (GA)		Spartz	Van Drew	Williams (TX)
Santos	Strong	Williams (NY)		NOT VOTING—9		Stauber	Van Duyne	Wilson (SC)
Scalise	Tenney	Williams (TX)				Van Orden	Van Orden	Wittman
Schweikert	Tiffany	Wilson (SC)				Walberg	Yakym	Zinke
Self	Timmons	Wittman						
Sessions	Van Drew	Yakym	Gonzales, Tony	Peltola	Sablan			
Smith (MO)	Van Duyne	Zinke						
Smith (NE)	Van Orden							
Smucker	Walberg							

NOES—261

Adams	Garcia (TX)	Mrvan						
Aguilar	Garcia, Robert	Mullin						
Allred	Golden (ME)	Nadler						
Amodei	Goldman (NY)	Napolitano						
Auchincloss	Gomez	Neal						
Bacon	Gonzalez,	Neguse						
Baird	Vicente	Newhouse						
Balint	González-Colón	Norcross						
Barr	Gottheimer	Norton						
Barragán	Green, Al (TX)	Nunn (IA)						
Beatty	Grijalva	Obernolte						
Bera	Harder (CA)	Ocasio-Cortez						
Beyer	Hayes	Omar						
Bishop (GA)	Higgins (NY)	Pallone						
Blumenauer	Himes	Panetta						
Blunt Rochester	Hinson	Pappas						
Bonamici	Horsford	Pascrall						
Bowman	Houlahan	Payne						
Boyle (PA)	Hoyer	Pelosi						
Brown	Hoyle (OR)	Perez						
Brownley	Huffman	Peters						
Bucshon	Ivey	Petterson						
Budzinski	Jackson (IL)	Phillips						
Calvert	Jackson (NC)	Pingree						
Caraveo	Jackson Lee	Plaskett						
Carbaljal	Jacobs	Pocan						
Cárdenas	James	Porter						
Carson	Jayapal	Pressley						
Carter (LA)	Jeffries	Quigley						
Cartwright	Johnson (GA)	Ramirez						
Casar	Joyce (OH)	Raskin						
Case	Kamlager-Dove	Rogers (KY)						
Casten	Kaptur	Ross						
Castor (FL)	Kean (NJ)	Ruiz						
Castro (TX)	Keating	Ruppersberger						
Chavez-DeRemer	Kelly (IL)	Ryan						
Cherfilus-	Kelly (PA)	Salazar						
McCormick	Khanna	Salinas						
Chu	Kiggans (VA)	Sánchez						
Ciscomani	Kildee	Sarbanes						
Clark (MA)	Kiley	Scanlon						
Clarke (NY)	Kilmer	Schakowsky						
Cleaver	Kim (CA)	Schiff						
Clyburn	Kim (NJ)	Schneider						
Cohen	Krishnamoorthi	Scholten						
Cole	Kuster	Schrader						
Connolly	Kustoff	Scott (VA)						
Correa	LaLota	Scott, Austin						
Costa	Landsman	Scott, David						
Courtney	Larsen (WA)	Sewell						
Craig	Larson (CT)	Sherman						
Crockett	Lawler	Sherrill						
Crow	Lee (CA)	Simpson						
Cuellar	Lee (FL)	Slotkin						
D'Esposito	Lee (NV)	Smith (NJ)						
Davids (KS)	Lee (PA)	Smith (WA)						
Davis (IL)	Leger Fernandez	Sorensen						
Davis (NC)	Letlow	Soto						
Dean (PA)	Levin	Spanberger						
DeGette	Lieu	Stansbury						
DeLauro	Lofgren	Stanton						
DelBene	Lucas	Steel						
Deluzio	Lynch	Stevens						
DeSaulnier	Magaziner	Strickland						
Diaz-Balart	Manning	Swalwell						
Dingell	Matsui	Sykes						
Doggett	McBath	Takano						
Edwards	McClellan	Thanedar						
Escobar	McCullum	Thompson (CA)						
Eshoo	McGarvey	Thompson (MS)						
Espallat	McGovern	Thompson (PA)						
Evans	Meeks	Titus						
Fitzpatrick	Menendez	Tlaib						
Fletcher	Meng	Tokuda						
Flood	Mfume	Tonko						
Foster	Miller (OH)	Torres (CA)						
Foushee	Miller-Meeks	Torres (NY)						
Foxx	Molinaro	Trahan						
Frankel, Lois	Moore (WI)	Trone						
Frost	Moran	Turner						
Gallego	Morelle	Underwood						
Garamendi	Moskowitz	Valadao						
Garbarino	Moulton	Vargas						
Garcia (IL)	Moylan	Vasquez						

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2315

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 42 OFFERED BY MR. BIGGS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 42, printed in part B of House Report 118-216 offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 164, noes 265, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 449]

AYES—164

Aderholt	Feenstra	Langworthy						
Alford	Ferguson	Latta	Clyburn	Krishnamoorthi				
Allen	Finstad	LaTurner	Cohen	Kuster				
Armstrong	Fischbach	Lesko	Cole	Kustoff				
Arrington	Fitzgerald	Loudermilk	Connolly	LaLota				
Babin	Franklin, C.	Luetkemeyer	Correa	Landsman				
Balderson	Scott	Luttrell	Costa	Larsen (WA)				
Banks	Fry	Mace	Courtney	Larson (CT)				
Barr	Fulcher	Malliotakis	Craig	Sherrill				
Bean (FL)	Gaetz	Mann	Crockett	Simpson				
Bentz	Gallagher	Massie	Crow	Slotkin				
Bergman	Garcia, Mike	Mast	Cuellar	Smith (WA)				
Bice	Gimenez	McCaul	D'Esposito	Sorensen				
Biggs	Good (VA)	McClain	Davids (KS)	Lorenz				
Bishop (NC)	Gooden (TX)	McClintock	Davis (IL)	Spanberger				
Boebert	Gosar	McCormick	Davis (NC)	Stansbury				
Bost	Granger	McHenry	Dean (PA)	Stanton				
Brecheen	Graves (LA)	Meuser	DeGette	Steel				
Buchanan	Graves (MO)	Miller (IL)	DeLauro	Stevens				
Buck	Green (TN)	Miller (WV)	DelBene	Strickland				
Burgess	Greene (GA)	Mills	Deluzio	Swalwell				
Cloud	Griffith	Moolenaar	DeSaulnier	Sykes				
Grothman	Hern	Mooney	Diaz-Balart	Takano				
Horn	Ogles	Escobar	Matsui	Thanedar				
Higgins (LA)	Issa	Owens	McBath	Thompson (CA)				
Hill	Palmer	Perry	Doggett	Thompson (MS)				
Houchin	Perry	Posey	McDowell	Thompson (PA)				
Hudson	Pluger	Reschenthaler	McClellan	Titus				
Huizenga	Posey	Rodgers (WA)	Fitzpatrick	Tlaib				
Jackson (LA)	Rosendale	Rogers (AL)	Fleischmann	Fleischmann				
Johnson (SD)	Rouzer	Rose	Fletcher	Frances				
Johnson (OH)	Frankel, Lois	Rutherford	Molinaro	Miller (OH)				
Johnson (PA)	Fox	Stewart	Moore (WI)	Miller (NY)				
Donalds	Frankel, Lois	Wadsworth	Frost	Trahan				
Donaldson	Fox	Wadsworth	Yost	Westerman				
Estes	Gallego	Wadsworth	Yost	Williams (WI)				
LaHood	Garbarino	Wadsworth	Yost	Wagner				
LaMalfa	Garamendi	Wadsworth	Yost	Wasserman				
Self	Garbarino	Wadsworth	Yost	Wasserman				
Sessions	Garcia (IL)	Wadsworth	Yost	Wasserman				
Fallon	Garcia (TX)	Wadsworth	Yost	Wasserman				
Lamborn	Garcia (TX)	Wadsworth	Yost	Wasserman				

Watson Coleman	Wild	Wilson (FL)	Strong	Walberg	Wilson (SC)
Wexton	Williams (GA)	Womack	Tenney	Waltz	Wittman
NOT VOTING—9					
Bush	Luna	Radewagen	Tiffany	Weber (TX)	Yakym
Carter (TX)	Peltola	Sablan	Timmons	Westerman	Zinke
Gonzales, Tony	Pence	Webster (FL)	Van Drew	Williams (NY)	Williams (TX)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2318

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 43 OFFERED BY MR. BIGGS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 43, printed in part B of House Report 118-216 offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 162, noes 264, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 450]

AYES—162

Aderholt	Fischbach	Luetkemeyer	Clark (MA)	Kuster	Kim (NJ)	Scott (VA)	Aderholt	Franklin, C.	Mast
Alford	Fitzgerald	Luttrell	Clarke (NY)	Kustoff	Scott, Austin	Scott, David	Alford	Scott	McCaul
Allen	Fleischmann	Mace	Cleaver	LaLota	Sewell	Fry	Allen	Fry	McClain
Armstrong	Franklin, C.	Malliotakis	Clyburn	Landsman	Sherman	Armstrong	Fulcher	Fulcher	McClintock
Arrington	Scott	Mann	Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Sherrell	Arrington	Gaetz	Gaetz	Mccormick
Babin	Fry	Massie	Cole	Simpson	Balderson	Balderson	Gimenez	Gimenez	McHenry
Balderson	Fulcher	Mast	Connolly	Slotkin	Barr	Barr	Good (VA)	Good (VA)	Meuser
Banks	Gaetz	McCauley	Correa	Smith (WA)	Bean (FL)	Bean (FL)	Gooden (TX)	Gooden (TX)	Miller (IL)
Barr	Gallagher	McClain	Costa	Sorenson	Bentz	Bentz	Gosar	Gosar	Miller (WV)
Bean (FL)	Garcia, Mike	McClintock	Courtney	Soto	Bergman	Bergman	Granger	Granger	Moolenaar
Bergman	Gimenez	McCormick	Crockett	Spanberger	Bice	Bice	Graves (LA)	Graves (LA)	Mooney
Bice	Good (VA)	McHenry	Lee (PA)	Stansbury	Biggs	Biggs	Graves (MO)	Graves (MO)	Moore (AL)
Biggs	Gooden (TX)	Meuser	Leger Fernandez	Stanton	Bishop (NC)	Bishop (NC)	Green (TN)	Green (TN)	Murphy
Bilirakis	Gosar	Miller (IL)	Lee (CA)	Slotkin	Boebert	Boebert	Greene (GA)	Greene (GA)	Nehls
Bishop (NC)	Granger	Miller (WV)	Lee (FL)	Smith (WA)	Bentz	Bentz	Bost	Bost	Norman
Boebert	Graves (LA)	Mills	Lieu	Sorenson	Grothman	Grothman	Brecheen	Brecheen	Ogles
Bost	Graves (MO)	Moolenaar	Lofgren	Strickland	Buchanan	Buchanan	Guest	Guest	Palmer
Brecheen	Green (TN)	Mooney	Davis (IL)	Swallow	Buck	Buck	Guthrie	Guthrie	Perry
Buck	Greene (GA)	Moore (AL)	Davis (NC)	Takano	Hageman	Hageman	Hern	Hern	Pfluger
Burchett	Griffith	Murphy	Dean (PA)	Sykes	Burgess	Burgess	Reschenthaler	Reschenthaler	Posey
Burgess	Grothman	DeGette	Lynch	Burgess	Burchett	Burchett	Greene (LA)	Greene (LA)	Rodgers (WA)
Burlison	Guest	DeGrazie	Magaziner	Thanedar	Burlison	Burlison	Carmack	Carmack	Rodgers (WA)
Cammack	Guthrie	Ogles	DeGrazie	Thompson (CA)	Boehner	Boehner	Higgins (LA)	Higgins (LA)	Rogers (AL)
Carey	Hageman	Owens	DeSaulnier	Thompson (MS)	Greene (GA)	Greene (GA)	Carey	Carey	Rogers (AL)
Carl	Harris	Palmer	McClellan	Thompson (PA)	Bost	Bost	Hill	Hill	Rogers (AL)
Carter (GA)	Harshbarger	Perry	DesJarlais	Titus	Grothman	Grothman	Hughes	Hughes	Rose
Cline	Hern	Diaz-Balart	McCullum	Tlaib	Buchanan	Buchanan	Carl	Carl	Rosendale
Cloud	Higgins (LA)	Evans	McGarvey	Cloud	Buck	Buck	Houchin	Houchin	Rouzer
Clyde	Hill	Reschenthaler	Tokuda	Hunt	Hageman	Hageman	Carter (GA)	Carter (GA)	Rutherford
Collins	Houchin	Rodgers (WA)	Doggett	Thompson (CA)	Burgess	Burgess	Hudson	Hudson	Self
Comer	Hudson	Rogers (AL)	Meeks	Thompson (MS)	Thompson (PA)	Thompson (PA)	Huizinga	Huizinga	Sessions
Crane	Huizinga	Rose	Menendez	Thompson (PA)	Titus	Titus	Johnson (OH)	Johnson (OH)	Sessions
Crawford	Hunt	Rosendale	Torres (CA)	Titus	Carter (GA)	Carter (GA)	Johnson (LA)	Johnson (LA)	Scalise
Crenshaw	Issa	Rouzer	Torres (NY)	Cline	Hudson	Hudson	Johnson (SD)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
Curtis	Jackson (TX)	Rutherford	Turner	Cloud	Huizinga	Huizinga	Johnson (OH)	Johnson (OH)	Rouzer
Davidson	Johnson (LA)	Santos	Tokuda	Hunt	Hunt	Hunt	Self	Self	Rutherford
De La Cruz	Johnson (OH)	Scalise	Underwood	De La Cruz	De La Cruz	De La Cruz	Johnson (LA)	Johnson (LA)	Scalise
Donalds	Johnson (SD)	Schweikert	Valadao	DesJarlais	DesJarlais	DesJarlais	Johnson (OH)	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
Duarte	Jordan	Self	Diaz-Balart	Diaz-Balart	Diaz-Balart	Diaz-Balart	Johnson (SD)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
Duncan	Joyce (PA)	Sessions	Moore (UT)	Moore (WI)	Donalds	Donalds	Johnson (OH)	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
Dunn (FL)	Kelly (MS)	Frankel, Lois	Frost	Moore (WI)	LaHood	LaHood	Johnson (SD)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
Ellzey	LaHood	Smith (MO)	Gallego	Moore (WI)	Spartz	Spartz	Johnson (OH)	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
Emmer	LaMalfa	Smith (NE)	Garamendi	Mrvan	LaMalfa	LaMalfa	Self	Self	Scalise
Estes	LaMalfa	Smith (NJ)	Mullin	Schultz	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (OH)	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
Ezell	Lamborn	Smucker	Watson	Watson	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (SD)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
Fallon	Langworthy	Spartz	Garbarino	Watson	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (OH)	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
Feenstra	Latta	Stauber	Nadler	Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (SD)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
Ferguson	LaTurner	Stefanik	Garcia (TX)	Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (OH)	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
Finstad	Lesko	Steil	Neal	Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (SD)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
	Loudermilk	Steube	Wexton	Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (OH)	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
			Wild	Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (SD)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
			Womack	Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (OH)	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (SD)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (OH)	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (SD)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (OH)	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (SD)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (OH)	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (SD)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (OH)	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (SD)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (OH)	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (SD)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (OH)	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (SD)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (OH)	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (SD)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (OH)	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (SD)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (OH)	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (SD)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (OH)	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (SD)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (OH)	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (SD)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (OH)	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (SD)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (OH)	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (SD)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (OH)	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (SD)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (OH)	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (SD)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (OH)	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (SD)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (OH)	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (SD)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (OH)	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (SD)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (OH)	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (SD)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (OH)	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (SD)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (OH)	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (SD)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (OH)	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (SD)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (OH)	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (SD)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (OH)	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (SD)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (OH)	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (SD)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (OH)	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (SD)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (OH)	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (SD)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (OH)	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (SD)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (OH)	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (SD)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (OH)	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (SD)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (OH)	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (SD)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (OH)	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (SD)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (OH)	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (SD)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (OH)	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (SD)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (OH)	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (SD)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (OH)	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (SD)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (OH)	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (SD)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (OH)	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (SD)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (OH)	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (SD)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (OH)	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (SD)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (OH)	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (SD)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (OH)	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (SD)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (OH)	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (SD)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (OH)	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
				Watson Coleman	Stauber	Stauber	Johnson (SD)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise

NOT VOTING—10

Bush Luna Sablan
Carter (TX) Peltola Salazar
Gonzales, Tony Pence Radewagen
Griffith Radewagen

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2326

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 50 OFFERED BY MRS. BOEBERT

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 50, printed in part B of House Report 118-216 offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. BOEBERT), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 161, noes 268, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 453]

AYES—161

Aderholt	Fleischmann	Mast	Cleaver	Kuster	Sewell	Adams	Dean (PA)	Keating
Alford	Foxx	McCaull	Clyburn	Kustoff	Sherman	Aguilar	DeGette	Kelly (IL)
Allen	Franklin, C.	McClain	Cohen	LaLota	Sherrill	Allred	DeLauro	Khanna
Armstrong	Scott	McClintock	Cole	Landsman	Simpson	Auchincloss	DelBene	Kildee
Arrington	Fry	McCormick	Connolly	Larsen (WA)	Slotkin	Balint	Deluzio	Kilmer
Babin	Fulcher	McHenry	Correa	Larson (CT)	Smith (WA)	Barragán	DeSaulnier	Kim (NJ)
Balderson	Gaetz	Meuser	Costa	Lawler	Sorenson	Beatty	Dingell	Krishnamoorthi
Banks	Gallagher	Miller (IL)	Courtney	Lee (CA)	Soto	Bera	Doggett	Kuster
Barr	Gimenez	Miller (WV)	Craig	Lee (FL)	Spanberger	Beyer	Escobar	Landsman
Bean (FL)	Good (VA)	Mills	Crenshaw	Lee (NV)	Stansbury	Bishop (GA)	Eshoo	Larsen (WA)
Bentz	Gooden (TX)	Moolenaar	Crockett	Lee (PA)	Stanton	Blumenauer	Espaillat	Larson (CT)
Bergman	Gosar	Mooney	Crow	Leger Fernandez	Scott, Austin	Blunt Rochester	Evans	Lee (CA)
Bice	Graves (LA)	Moore (AL)	Cuellar	Letlow	Scott, David	Caraveo	Fletcher	Lee (NV)
Biggs	Graves (MO)	Moran	Curtis	Levin	Stevens	Castro (TX)	Foster	Lee (PA)
Bilirakis	Green (TN)	Murphy	D'Esposito	Lieu	Strickland	Boyle (PA)	Fousshee	Leger Fernandez
Bishop (NC)	Greene (GA)	Nehls	Davids (KS)	Lofgren	Swalwell	Brown	Frankel, Lois	Levin
Boebert	Grothman	Norman	Davis (IL)	McBath	Titus	Brownley	Frost	Lieu
Bost	Guest	Ogles	Davis (NC)	Thompson (PA)	Cárdenas	Budzinski	Gallego	Lofgren
Brecheen	Guthrie	Palmer	Dean (PA)	Magaziner	Thanedar	Caraveo	Garamendi	Lynch
Buchanan	Hageman	Perry	DeGette	Manning	Thompson (CA)	Castro (TX)	Garcia (IL)	Magaziner
Buck	Harris	Pfluger	DeLauro	Matsui	Tonko	Boyle (PA)	Garcia (TX)	Manning
Burchett	Harshbarger	Posey	DelBene	McBath	Torres (CA)	Brown	Garcia, Robert	Massie
Burgess	Hern	Reschenthaler	Deluzio	McClellan	Menendez	Brownley	Goldman (NY)	Matsui
Burlison	Higgins (LA)	Rodgers (WA)	DeSaulnier	McCollum	Titus	Budzinski	Carter (LA)	Gomez
Cammack	Hill	Rogers (AL)	Díaz-Balart	McGarvey	Torres (NY)	Caraveo	Cartwright	McBath
Carey	Houchin	Rose	Dingell	McGovern	Trone	Castro (TX)	Castro (FL)	Gonzalez, McClellan
Carl	Hudson	Rosendale	Doggett	Meeks	Turner	Boyle (PA)	Grijalva	McCollum
Carter (GA)	Huizenga	Rouzer	Edwards	Menendez	Valadao	Brown	Castro (FL)	McGarvey
Cline	Hunt	Roy	Ellzey	Evans	Underwood	Brownley	Grijalva	Green, Al (TX)
Cloud	Issa	Rutherford	Escobar	Molinaro	Van Orden	Budzinski	Castro (TX)	Meeks
Clyde	Jackson (TX)	Santos	Eshoo	Fitzpatrick	Moore (UT)	Caraveo	Boyle (PA)	Cherfilus-
Collins	Johnson (LA)	Scalise	Eshoo	Smith (MO)	Moore (WI)	Castro (TX)	McCormick	Harder (CA)
Comer	Johnson (OH)	Self	Espaillet	Smith (NE)	Waldado	Boyle (PA)	Hayes	Menendez
Crane	Johnson (SD)	Sessions	Fitzpatrick	Flood	Valadao	Brown	Higgins (NY)	Meng
Crawford	Jordan	Smith (MO)	Foster	Gallego	Van Orden	Brownley	Clark (MA)	Mfume
Davidson	Joyce (PA)	Smith (NE)	Foushee	Steibe	Vargas	Budzinski	Elliott (NY)	Moore (WI)
De La Cruz	Kelly (MS)	Smith (NJ)	Foust	Garamendi	Wasserman	Caraveo	Clark (NY)	Morelle
DesJarlais	LaHood	Smucker	Foust	Garbarino	Wasserman	Castro (TX)	Clarke (MA)	Morrelli
Donalds	LaMalfa	Spartz	Foushee	Garbarino	Wasserman	Boyle (PA)	Elliott (NY)	Moskowitz
Duarte	Lamborn	Stauber	Frankel, Lois	Garbarino	Wasserman	Brown	Clarke (NY)	Napolitano
Duncan	Langworthy	Stefanik	Frost	Garcia (IL)	Watson Coleman	Brownley	Carter (LA)	Neal
Dunn (FL)	Latta	Steil	Garcia (TX)	Garcia (IL)	Watson Coleman	Budzinski	Craig	Neguse
Emmer	LaTurner	Steube	Garcia (TX)	Garcia (TX)	Wild	Caraveo	Jackson (NC)	Nickel
Estes	Lesko	Strong	Garcia (TX)	Garcia (TX)	Williams (GA)	Castro (TX)	Craig	Nicoll
Ezell	Loudermilk	Tenney	Garcia (TX)	Garcia (TX)	Williams (GA)	Boyle (PA)	Jackson Lee	Nordin
Fallon	Luetkemeyer	Tiffany	Garcia (TX)	Garcia (TX)	Williams (NY)	Brown	Crockett	Norcross
Feenstra	Luttrell	Timmons	Garcia, Mike	Garcia, Mike	Williams (NY)	Brownley	Crow	Ocasio-Cortez
Ferguson	Mace	Van Drew	Garcia, Robert	Garcia, Robert	Williams (NY)	Budzinski	DeSaulnier	Omar
Finstad	Malliotakis	Van Duyne	Golden (ME)	Golden (ME)	Wilson (FL)	Caraveo	Davidis (KS)	Pallone
Fischbach	Mann	Walberg	Goldman (NY)	Norcross	Womack	Castro (TX)	Davidis (IL)	Kammlager-Dove
Fitzgerald	Massie	Waltz	Gomez	Nunn (IA)	Womack	Boyle (PA)	Davis (NC)	Kaptur

NOT VOTING—10

Weber (TX) Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Yakym
Zinke

NOES—268

Adams	Gonzalez, Vicente	Obernolte	NOT VOTING—9		
Allred	González-Colón	Ocasio-Cortez	Bush	Griffith	Pence
Amodei	Gottheimer	Omar	Carter (TX)	Luna	Radewagen
Auchincloss	Granger	Owens	Gonzales, Tony	Peltola	Salbian
Bacon	Green, Al (TX)	Pallone	ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR		
Baird	Grijalva	Panetta	The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).		
Balint	Harder (CA)	Pappas	There is 1 minute remaining.		
Barragán	Hayes	Pascrell	□ 2330		
Beatty	Higgins (NY)	Pelosi	Mr. McGOVERN changed his vote		
Bera	Himes	Perez	from “aye” to “no.”		
Beyer	Hinson	Peters	So the amendment was rejected.		
Bishop (GA)	Horsford	Pettersen	The result of the vote was announced		
Blumenauer	Houlihan	Phillips	as above recorded.		
Blunt Rochester	Hoyer	Pingree	AMENDMENT NO. 51 OFFERED BY MR. CASTRO OF		
Bonamici	Hoyle (OR)	Plaskett	TEXAS		
Bowman	Huffman	Pocan	The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished		
Boyle (PA)	Ivey	Porter	business is the demand for a recorded		
Brown	Jackson (IL)	Pressley	vote on amendment No. 51, printed in		
Brownley	Jackson (NC)	Quigley	part B of House Report 118-216 offered		
Bucshon	Jackson Lee	Ramirez	by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CAS-		
Budzinski	Jacobs	Raskin	TRO), on which further proceedings		
Calvert	James	Rogers (KY)	were postponed and on which the ayes		
Caraveo	Jayapal	Ross	prevailed by voice vote.		
Carbajal	Jeffries	Ruiz	The Clerk will redesignate the amend-		
Cárdenas	Johnson (GA)	Ruppersberger	ment.		
Carson	Joyce (OH)	Ryan	The Clerk redesignated the amend-		
Carter (LA)	Kammlager-Dove	Salazar	ment.		
Cartwright	Kaptur	Salinas	RECORDED VOTE		
Casar	Kean (NJ)	Sánchez	The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote		
Case	Keating	Barbanes	has been demanded.		
Casten	Kelly (IL)	Scanlon	A recorded vote was ordered.		
Castor (FL)	Kelly (PA)	Shakowsky	The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-		
Castro (TX)	Khanna	Scalise	minute vote.		
Chavez-DeRemer	Kiggans (VA)	Shiff	The vote was taken by electronic de-		
Cherfilus-	Kildee	Schneider	vice, and there were—ayes 211, noes 220,		
McCormick	Kiley	Scholten	not voting 8, as follows:		
Chu	Kilmers	Schrier	[Roll No. 454]		
Ciscomani	Kim (CA)	Schweikert	AYES—211		
Clark (MA)	Kim (NJ)	Scott (VA)	Adams		
Clarke (NY)	Krishnamoorthi	Scott, Austin	Dean (PA)		
Cleaver	Lofgren	Scott, David	Aguilar		
Clyburn	McBath	Stewell	DeGette		
Cole	Thompson (PA)	Sewell	Allred		
Connolly	Thompson (WA)	Sherman	Auchincloss		
Correa	Lee (CA)	Sherrill	Balint		
Costa	Lee (FL)	Simpson	Barragán		
Costa	Lee (NV)	Slotkin	Beatty		
Costa	Lee (PA)	Smith (WA)	Bera		
Crockett	Lee (PA)	Sorenson	Beyer		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Stansbury	Bishop (GA)		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Stanton	Blumenauer		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Stefanik	Blunt Rochester		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Takano	Caraveo		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Thanedar	Carbajal		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Trone	Castro (TX)		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Tonko	Boyle (PA)		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Underwood	Brown		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Van Orden	Brownley		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Vargas	Budzinski		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Vasquez	Caraveo		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Watson Coleman	Castro (TX)		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Watson Coleman	Boyle (PA)		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Wild	Browne		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Williams (GA)	Carbajal		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Williams (NY)	Castro (TX)		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Williams (NY)	Boyle (PA)		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Brown		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Brownley		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Caraveo		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Castro (TX)		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Boyle (PA)		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Brown		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Brownley		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Caraveo		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Castro (TX)		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Boyle (PA)		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Brown		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Brownley		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Caraveo		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Castro (TX)		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Boyle (PA)		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Brown		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Brownley		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Caraveo		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Castro (TX)		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Boyle (PA)		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Brown		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Brownley		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Caraveo		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Castro (TX)		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Boyle (PA)		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Brown		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Brownley		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Caraveo		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Castro (TX)		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Boyle (PA)		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Brown		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Brownley		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Caraveo		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Castro (TX)		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Boyle (PA)		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Brown		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Brownley		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Caraveo		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Castro (TX)		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Boyle (PA)		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Brown		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Brownley		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Caraveo		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Castro (TX)		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Boyle (PA)		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Brown		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Brownley		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Caraveo		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Castro (TX)		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Boyle (PA)		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Brown		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Brownley		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Caraveo		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Castro (TX)		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Boyle (PA)		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Brown		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Brownley		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Caraveo		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Castro (TX)		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Boyle (PA)		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Brown		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Brownley		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Caraveo		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Castro (TX)		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Boyle (PA)		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Brown		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Brownley		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Caraveo		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Castro (TX)		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Boyle (PA)		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Brown		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Brownley		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Caraveo		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Castro (TX)		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Boyle (PA)		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Brown		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Brownley		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Caraveo		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Castro (TX)		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Boyle (PA)		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Brown		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Brownley		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Caraveo		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Castro (TX)		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Boyle (PA)		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Brown		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Brownley		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Caraveo		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Castro (TX)		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Boyle (PA)		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Brown		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Brownley		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Caraveo		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Castro (TX)		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Boyle (PA)		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Brown		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Brownley		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Caraveo		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Castro (TX)		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Boyle (PA)		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Brown		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Brownley		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Caraveo		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Castro (TX)		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Boyle (PA)		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Brown		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Brownley		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Caraveo		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Castro (TX)		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Boyle (PA)		
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Womack	Brown		
Crow	Leger Fernandez</td				

Watson Coleman	Wild	Williams (NY)
Wexton	Williams (GA)	Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

Bush	Luna	Pence
Carter (TX)	Murphy	Radewagen
Gonzales, Tony	Peltola	Sablan

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2387

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. BUSH. Madam Chair, I was not present during today's first or second vote series. Had I been present, I would have voted: YEA on Roll Call No. 417, NAY on Roll Call No. 418, NAY on Roll Call No. 419, NAY on Roll Call No. 420, NAY on Roll Call No. 421, NAY on Roll Call No. 422, NAY on Roll Call No. 423, NAY on Roll Call No. 424, NAY on Roll Call No. 425, NAY on Roll Call No. 426, NAY on Roll Call No. 427, NAY on Roll Call No. 428, NAY on Roll Call No. 429, NAY on Roll Call No. 430, NAY on Roll Call No. 431, NAY on Roll Call No. 432, NAY on Roll Call No. 433, NAY on Roll Call No. 434, NAY on Roll Call No. 435, NAY on Roll Call No. 436, YEA on Roll Call No. 437, NAY on Roll Call No. 438, YEA on Roll Call No. 439, YEA on Roll Call No. 440, NAY on Roll Call No. 441, NAY on Roll Call No. 442, YEA on Roll Call No. 443, YEA on Roll Call No. 444, NAY on Roll Call No. 445, NAY on Roll Call No. 446, NAY on Roll Call No. 447, NAY on Roll Call No. 448, NAY on Roll Call No. 449, NAY on Roll Call No. 450, NAY on Roll Call No. 451, NAY on Roll Call No. 452, NAY on Roll Call No. 453, YEA on Roll Call No. 454 and NAY on Roll Call No. 455.

□ 2345

AMENDMENT NO. 66 OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 66 printed in part B of House Report 118-216.

Mr. NORMAN. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. The salary of Kristie Canegallo, Deputy Secretary of Homeland Security, shall be reduced to \$1.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 723, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. NORMAN. Madam Chair, my amendment reduces the salary of Kristie Canegallo, Deputy Secretary of Homeland Security, to \$1.

A little background on who she is:

She has served as Chief of Staff at DHS since January 2022.

She recently took on the role of Deputy Secretary in July of this year.

Her job is to oversee the agency and work to advance the Department's mission and organizational priorities.

Her salary in 2022 was \$183,100.

As stated, her job is to oversee and enforce the mission of DHS, which is to safeguard the American people, our homeland, and our values.

Dereliction of duty, as this is simply not the case.

She is the number two individual at DHS. Her job is to assist the priorities of Mayorkas in securing our homeland, our values, and our people. She has simply been asleep at the switch and has not done the job.

Our homeland is less secure now than it was when she came into this role. In her first year in her role at DHS, over 2.76 million illegal individuals crossed the border. These were just the ones that they came in contact with.

In addition, 1.4 million individuals have been encountered, according to DHS, since January 1 of 2023.

We are witnessing an invasion of our homeland before our very eyes, and my Democratic colleagues are acting like it is a normal Wednesday with business as usual.

Is this effective leadership? No, it is not. This is a crisis in this country. This is an invasion. It is against our Constitution. It is against our core values that this country was built on.

Thus, that is the reason I am asking to cut the salary to \$1, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUELLAR. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUELLAR. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment, and I urge Members to vote "no."

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

Mr. NORMAN. Madam Chair, as we look at the challenges this country faces, we look at the reasons why our border is unsecure, why our national security is at risk, and it is because of the inaction of people in prominent roles such as Ms. Canegallo.

The only reason that she is in the job is for political reasons, which is to keep the power of the Democratic Party.

These illegals are getting drivers' licenses, they are getting Social Security numbers, and it is completely against everything that this country stands for.

For that reason, I hope Members will support this.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has the only time remaining.

Mr. NORMAN. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CUELLAR. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further pro-

ceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 67 OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 67 printed in part B of House Report 118-216.

Mr. NORMAN. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. The salary of Kimberly O'Connor, Executive Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, shall be reduced to \$1.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 723, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. NORMAN. Madam Chair, this amendment reduces the salary of Kimberly O'Connor, executive secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, to \$1.

Her role is executive secretary of DHS where she oversees the management of written communication intended for and originated by the Secretary and the Deputy Secretary of DHS.

Why should we implement the Holman rule regarding her salary? She co-signed a letter led by the House Oversight Committee from November 2, 2022, to Secretary Mayorkas about the abject failures at the southern border.

In her letter it was stated that: We have written DHS 15 times this Congress to conduct oversight over the border crisis. Again, we request documents and information to understand the Biden administration's plans, if any, to secure the border.

Her role is to manage written correspondence for Mayorkas. She can't bother to do her job and give timely and adequate responses about the abject failures at the border, so why do our tax dollars deserve to go to pay her salary?

She continues to not give the committee and Members answers to their questions. Failure to get us answers from DHS on the border is unacceptable, and it is creating a crisis at the border.

Madam Chair, I urge the cutting of her salary, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUELLAR. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUELLAR. Madam Chair, I urge Members to vote "no" on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NORMAN. Madam Chair, I urge that her salary be cut, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CUELLAR. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina will be postponed.

The Chair recognizes that amendment 68 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 69 OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 69 printed in part B of House Report 118-216.

Mr. NORMAN. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. The salary of Blas Nuñez-Neto, Assistant Secretary for Border and Immigration Policy, shall be reduced to \$1.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 723, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. NORMAN. Madam Chair, my amendment reduces the salary of Blas Nuñez-Neto, assistant secretary for border and immigration policy, to \$1.

He has worked at DHS since 2021. He served as an assistant secretary for border and immigration policy.

The reason to implement the Holman rule to reduce his salary is dereliction of duty to uphold the mission of DHS, to safeguard the American people, our homeland, and our values.

The border and our homeland have become less secure in his capacity of border policy at DHS.

Considering these facts of the crisis and invasion at our border, we think this individual is inadequately doing his job. Why should our tax dollars continue to pay him?

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUELLAR. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUELLAR. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

I urge Members to vote “no,” and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NORMAN. Madam Chair, I urge the reduction of the salary of this individual to secure our borders, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CUELLAR. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 70 OFFERED BY MR. OGLES

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 70 printed in part B of House Report 118-216.

Mr. OGLES. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out Executive Order 14019 (86 Fed. Reg. 13623; relating to promoting access to voting), except for sections 7, 8, and 10 of such Order.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 723, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. OGLES. Madam Chair, I rise in support of my amendment to prohibit taxpayer money from being used on President Biden’s nakedly political executive order allegedly promoting access to voting.

This dangerous executive order instructed a wide range of agencies, including the Department of Health and Human Services and the Small Business Administration to engage in voter turnout operations. Think about that for a moment, the government is engaging in voter turnout.

Worse, it instructs agencies to partner with approved third-party organizations to assist them in their voter registration and other election-focused efforts.

Who will approve these organizations? What criteria will be used? The executive order doesn’t say.

Congress has never granted the administration any authority to approve such groups or specify criteria therein.

This executive order is blatantly illegal.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 0000

Mr. CUELLAR. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUELLAR. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

This order on voting access will ensure that all Americans can exercise their right to vote, including voters in underserved communities; voters who are younger or older, in rural and urban areas; servicemembers and veterans; and other folks like voters with disabilities or language access concerns.

Madam Chair, I ask that we oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OGLES. Madam Chair, I agree with my colleague that I, too, would like all to participate in the voting process, all demographics across all spectrums.

It should also be noted that there are already provisions in the law to allow for soldiers deployed to vote.

Madam Chair, I urge adoption of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 71 OFFERED BY MR. OGLES

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 71 printed in part B of House Report 118-216.

Mr. OGLES. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the Homeland Intelligence Experts Group.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 723, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. OGLES. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment to prohibit funding for the so-called Homeland Intelligence Experts Group.

The conduct of certain members of the intelligence community, who behaved as political hacks, quite frankly, rather than sources of unbiased information, has undermined Americans’ faith in government. That concerns me.

Some of these officials peddled obvious falsehoods in an effort to undermine the American people’s confidence in the election of 2016, and some meddled in the 2020 election, as well.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUELLAR. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUELLAR. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

This amendment would undermine a recent effort by the Secretary—in fact, I believe it was only announced a few days ago—to convene private-sector experts in homeland and national security, some widely recognized, including former senior intelligence officials, who will provide the DHS with a wide range of views and perspectives on the Federal Government’s intelligence enterprise to DHS’ I&A and the Office of the Counterterrorism Coordinator. All

we are trying to do is get information from experts.

Madam Chair, I say that we vote “no” on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OGLES. Madam Chair, at a time when we see dysfunction in government and, quite frankly, in Congress, it is important that we restore faith in institutions.

At a time when there are ongoing investigations into, say, the Hunter Biden laptop, it is important that we let due process work its way and not interject so-called experts.

With that being said, I encourage, at a time when we desperately need to restore faith in institutions, let's do that thing. Let's trust the process as we move forward.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 72 OFFERED BY MR. PFLUGER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 72 printed in part B of House Report 118-216.

Mr. PFLUGER. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be made available to administer, implement, or enforce a “Remain-in-Texas” policy.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 723, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PFLUGER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PFLUGER. Madam Chair, I rise in support of my amendment to block any potential remain in Texas policy.

It appears Democrats are starting to realize the severity of the border crisis. On August 8, Massachusetts Governor Maura Healey declared a state of emergency due to an influx of illegal aliens. I think the number was 7,500. The next day, New York City Mayor Eric Adams stated that the illegal alien influx was “not sustainable” and would “destroy New York City.”

All it took for the President to realize there was a crisis at the border was a little complaining from his Democrat donors. They don't mind the border crisis as long as it stays far away from their blue State.

What is the President's solution? Instead of securing the border, the Biden administration is considering instating a remain in Texas policy. You heard that right—not a policy to thwart illegal immigration but one that would punish Texas and force our State to be the sole provider for millions of illegal immigrants crossing our southern border every single year.

Liberal sanctuary cities, like New York, that openly obstruct Federal immigration laws and have policies in place to shield criminals from Immigration and Customs Enforcement should not be immune to the crisis at our collective southern border.

President Biden's remain in Texas policy must remain in the trash can. My amendment ends this administration's attempt to force Texans to bear the brunt of the immigration crisis.

Secure the border and vote “yes” on this amendment.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUELLAR. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUELLAR. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition, with all due respect to my good friend from Texas.

First of all, this program is not in existence, so why are we going to try to prohibit funds for something that doesn't even exist?

One of the things that we ought to be looking at is trying to find an expedited way of removing folks who are not supposed to be here. As I said before, if you get 100 people before an immigration judge, you will see that 89 to 90 percent, generally speaking, are going to be rejected because, again, the law is very specific as to what persecution is.

What I am hoping the administration is trying to do is to make sure that we expedite removals. If you expedite removals, that is the repercussion that we all have been talking about. That is the consequence that we all have been talking about.

To say no funds will be used—for what? That program is not in. We need to fund expedited ways to remove people who, after they have their day in court, should be removed.

With all respect to my good friend from Texas, I urge my colleagues to vote “no,” and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PFLUGER. Madam Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), my good friend and colleague.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Chair, I thank Representative PFLUGER for yielding and for working on this issue. It is so critically important.

Maybe the President didn't have an absolute plan in mind, but he did say he wanted people to remain in Texas and not bother the mayor of New York City and the Governor of Massachusetts.

The gentleman knows this really well that that rainy Saturday we were working on this up in the Rules Committee, the President said he was going to veto the Homeland Security appropriations bill. Veto the Homeland Security appropriations bill when the Governor of Massachusetts says we have an emergency, the mayor of New York says we are losing our city, and

he is going to veto the Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill?

This policy that Mr. PFLUGER is attempting to prevent is wrong. The President should not have articulated it, and he certainly should not have articulated that he is going to veto the bill to protect the border.

Governor Abbott had to declare an invasion. He had to declare an emergency. He is having to spend Texans' billions on doing the job the United States Government should be doing. We need to fund this bill and pass this bill.

Mr. PFLUGER. Madam Chair, I also thank my colleague from Texas on the other side of aisle for bringing up a good point, that we should be thinking about how to remove people who come across illegally.

That is exactly what Border Patrol agents told me just this past weekend when I was in Eagle Pass. Their solution, which was the last solution of the administration, was deportation.

I think my colleague was actually the one on TV about a week ago who said—and I am not necessarily quoting exactly what my colleague said—until you see the images of people being deported, they are going to continue to come.

I couldn't agree with him more, that those images need to happen because that is the message that we need to send.

So, no, we don't need a remain in Texas policy. We need a remain in Mexico policy. We need to go back to the policies of the previous administration that were working before we had millions of people coming into this country illegally because they know that the border is wide open.

This is a symptom. Let's get to the root cause. Let's send H.R. 2 in the form that we passed it here in the House to the Senate and to the President and secure our border once and for all. Enough is enough.

Madam Chair, I urge a “yes” vote on this, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PFLUGER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 73 OFFERED BY MR. ROENDALE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 73 printed in part B of House Report 118-216.

Mr. ROENDALE. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out the Department of Homeland Security memorandum titled “Worksite Enforcement: The Strategy to Protect the American Labor Market, the Conditions of the American Worksite, and the Dignity of the Individual”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 723, the gentleman

from Montana (Mr. ROSENDALE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. ROSENDALE. Madam Chair, my amendment No. 73 would prohibit funds from being used to enforce Secretary Mayorkas' memo prohibiting workforce immigration enforcement.

With the stroke of a pen, Secretary Mayorkas eliminated a key method of interior enforcement and required our Immigration and Customs Enforcement agents, the ICE agents, to fight with one hand tied behind their back.

Right now, there are over 16.8 million illegal aliens in our country, and estimates suggest that upward of 65 percent of the illegal aliens are employed.

Businessowners and ranchers in Montana work hard to ensure they are in compliance with Federal immigration law, and this memo punishes law-abiding businesses that refuse to hire illegal aliens.

Additionally, Americans should not be expected to compete in the labor market with illegal aliens who are depressing wages and keeping good-paying jobs away from American citizens.

President Biden and Secretary Mayorkas' refusal to allow ICE to do their job and enforce our Nation's laws is a clear dereliction of duty and presents risk to our country's national security.

Simply put, my amendment would allow ICE agents to do their job enforcing immigration law with the most effective methods possible. Under President Trump, workforce enforcement operations were common practice, making it clear to illegal aliens and the employers that there would be consequences for breaking the law, putting all businesses on a level playing field.

It is time we protect small business owners and workers and force Secretary Mayorkas to let ICE do its job.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. CUELLAR. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUELLAR. Madam Chair, I stand against this amendment. I am in opposition. I support ICE. I support enforcing the law.

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

Mr. ROSENDALE. Madam Chair, Secretary Mayorkas acknowledges the threat of illegal labor in his memo ending workplace enforcement: "Unscrupulous employers create an unfair labor market. They also unfairly drive down their costs and disadvantage their business competitors who abide by the law."

These businesses are not abiding by the law. The illegal aliens who are

working there are not supposed to be employed. It is not fair to the labor market. It is not fair to the Americans who wanted to have these positions. It absolutely does suppress the wages and hurts everyone.

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

□ 0015

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana (Mr. ROSENDALE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 74 OFFERED BY MR. ROSENDALE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 74 printed in part B of House Report 118-216.

Mr. ROSENDALE. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. The total amount of appropriations made available by this Act is hereby reduced by \$8,722,000,000.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 723, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. ROSENDALE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. ROSENDALE. Madam Chair, my amendment No. 74 will reduce the total amount of funds appropriated by this bill to move our country toward fiscal responsibility, bringing spending toward fiscal year 2022 levels.

We all know that we are facing a \$33 trillion national debt, and at the spending levels that are being proposed by the appropriation bills that we have been going over the last several days, we very easily could be facing a \$3 trillion addition to that debt by the time we add the interest in.

It is clear that President Biden and Secretary Mayorkas have no interest in securing our border or enforcing immigration law. Instead, this administration is spending money to encourage illegal immigration through illegal migrant parole programs and cooperation with far-left NGOs.

Additionally, Secretary Mayorkas has issued countless memos handicapping law enforcement efforts from ICE and CBP.

I have gone down there and visited the border myself several times. As long as President Biden refuses to enforce immigration law and stop the invasion at our southern border, DHS should not be rewarded with a budget increase.

President Trump secured the border and provided for our national defense with significantly less money. It is abundantly clear that Biden's border crisis is a deliberate policy choice by this administration and not a funding issue.

This country, again, is \$33 trillion in debt. We cannot afford to continue

business as usual, primarily when President Biden and Secretary Mayorkas use taxpayer dollars to prevent our border from being secured.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Madam Chair, I appreciate my colleague's concern about the rampant Federal spending by the Democrats and this administration. However, this amendment is not the way to address the larger problem we face.

This bill makes targeted cuts to wasteful spending, eliminates funding for woke programs, and prohibits funding for policies and programs that encourage illegal immigration. In contrast, this amendment would indiscriminately cut the top-line spending of the Department of Homeland Security by \$8.7 billion, which is a 14 percent reduction to the discretionary funding in this bill.

These cuts would not be targeted to specific programs or activities. Instead, it would be left to the Biden administration to decide how and where to apply these reductions. Unfortunately, this administration would likely align such reductions into its proposals in the President's budget request.

The first cut the administration will make is to eliminate the \$2.1 billion for the border wall, followed by the 16,500 additional detention beds that were funded in this bill.

Funding for Border Patrol staffing would be slashed, as would funding for additional ICE deportation officers.

All the critical border security investments and immigration priorities we have included in this bill will be stripped out in favor of continuing the status quo.

Let's ensure that this bill we pass on the floor does what the Biden administration has failed to do—act to address the border security crisis, which has been raging for the last 2½ years.

Let's remember that true border security comes with a price tag, and I think we should all be willing to pay.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSENDALE. Madam Chair, in 2020, the DHS bill appropriated \$67.8 billion. In 2022, the DHS bill appropriated \$75.538 billion. The 2024 DHS appropriation bill includes \$91.5 billion.

While I certainly respect the work that has been done in that committee, we all are going to have to take a haircut. If not, we are going to add \$3 trillion a year to the national debt. Over the next 5 years, that will rise to \$50 trillion.

Madam Chair, \$50 trillion in just 5 years, not 20 years, not 50 years, and it will cost 50 percent of the annual revenue in interest payments alone to service that.

If you think that we are making difficult decisions right now, when 50 percent of the revenue that we collect on an annual basis is going to service that loan, we are going to have to make massive changes to the way that we run the Federal Government, and every single person in the country is going to feel it. It is going to be dramatic pain.

All I am asking is that we reduce by \$8.7 billion. I can't believe that I am saying only \$8.7 billion.

Again, I respect the work that has been done, but these are some difficult decisions that need to be taken care of, and I am willing to do my part to help us get there.

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

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Madam Chair, I appreciate the concerns of the gentleman from Montana, but I maintain that I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana (Mr. ROSENDALE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 75 OFFERED BY MR. ROY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 75 printed in part B of House Report 118-216.

Mr. ROY. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this act may be used to implement, enforce, or otherwise carry out Executive Orders 13678 ("Revision of Civil Immigration Enforcement Policies and Priorities"), 14010 ("Creating a Comprehensive Regional Framework To Address the Causes of Migration, To Manage Migration Throughout North and Central America, and To Provide Safe and Orderly Processing of Asylum Seekers at the United States Border"), or 14012 ("Restoring Faith in Our Legal Immigration Systems and Strengthening Integration and Inclusion Efforts for New Americans").

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 723, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROY. Madam Chair, the amendment I put forward prohibits funding in this act to President Biden's executive orders that put needless limits on immigration enforcement, scale back sound asylum policies, and establish its own set of immigration directives that Congress has not passed.

The executive orders that President Biden put in place as soon as he got into the White House have had an enormous negative impact on the ability of Border Patrol and ICE to carry out their job—in particular, ICE.

The results are pretty clear. Deportations of criminal aliens plummeted by 62 percent between fiscal year 2020 under President Trump and fiscal year 2021 under President Biden. It went from 150,000, 103,000, all the way to 38,000 under Biden.

The fact of the matter is this is not shocking. When you issue executive orders that place restrictions on the ability of ICE to do its job, shockingly, it can't do its job.

Congress, Article I in the Constitution, has not only the power but the duty to tell Article II in the Constitution: Hey, you don't get to use the funds that we are appropriating to not do your job.

This amendment would simply say to the President of the United States and the Secretary that we have this crazy idea that maybe, just maybe, the President should follow the law instead of issuing executive orders to undermine the ability of law enforcement personnel to do their job, leaving the American people exposed to dangers, fentanyl pouring into our communities, and criminal aliens being able to carry out crimes on the streets of the country.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUELLAR. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUELLAR. Madam Chair, I oppose this amendment, respectfully, to my friend from Texas.

I am looking at the language, and I assume that the first executive order that is referenced is 13678. That one deals with authority for criminal investigators of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives issued by President Obama, so I assume that is not the correct one. You are probably looking at 13768, which deals with ICE.

Nevertheless, even though he is referring to the wrong one here, this amendment is not doing what I think he intends to do. All I am saying is I trust ICE to prioritize and limit their resources where they can focus on the greatest threat.

Again, if we are worried about the border, I would emphasize that for the last 2 fiscal years, we have added \$2.4 billion to CBP budget authority, over a 15 percent increase.

I would say that except for two Members, who are not present here today, on the Republican side, everybody voted "no."

Again, I ask you to focus on what we have. I assume that the executive order that he is referring to—I would ask you if you want to withdraw the amendment and bring it back, we will consider it tomorrow.

Otherwise, I would oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time, with all due respect to my good friend from Texas (Mr. ROY).

Mr. ROY. Madam Chair, I appreciate my friend from Texas, and I will certainly review the amendment. I am not going to withdraw it.

I want to review the amendment and see if the reference is somehow incorrect, but the intent of the amendment—and it is now, I am being told, a leg counsel drafting error on the number, so it is probably the number that my friend is referring to.

The purpose of it is very clear, which is to turn away the executive orders of the President of the United States that have been undermining our security.

The gentleman, I think, properly referenced the number. I think on that one, given that there is a drafting error, and I have three other amendments that accomplish the same thing, I am actually going to withdraw the amendment.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time and withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 76 OFFERED BY MR. ROY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 76 printed in part B of House Report 118-216.

Mr. ROY. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used to terminate the Department of Homeland Security's Migration Protection Protocols.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 723, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROY. Madam Chair, the amendment that we have in front of us prohibits funding from the act to be used to terminate the Migrant Protection Protocols. This is one of the most important things that we need to address.

H.R. 2, which this body, led by Republicans, passed in the spring, addresses the need to return to use of Migrant Protection Protocols to put in place the return to Mexico and remain in Mexico policies of the previous administration, which, when combined with the use of title 42 authority, were effective in eliminating the flow coming across our border.

When the current administration completely abandoned on day one the use of Migrant Protection Protocols, the reality is we have seen the resulting chaos at our border.

It is hard for anybody who is objectively looking at the state of our border to find any defense for the current

policies of the administration allowing the abject failure to occur.

This amendment would assert our Article I authority to say to the President that the President must not use funds to terminate the Migrant Protection Protocols—that is, we should not be funding the failure of this administration to do its job.

Very simply put, as we put forward in H.R. 2, the choices before us should be to detain, to put in expedited removal, or to put in a migrant protection protocol-type system, remaining in Mexico. Otherwise, you have what we have, which is an utter disregard for the border using parole authority wrongly—instead of on a case-by-case basis, mass releases under parole.

We have the use of asylum, not for persecution but rather as a blanket release into the United States, to the point of 2 million releases over the last 2½ years under this administration.

□ 0030

This is a very simple policy that we can adopt as a Congress to restrain the abuse of this administration.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUELLAR. Madam Chair, I claim time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUELLAR. Madam Chair, I do not believe in catch and release, and I certainly want to give our men and women everything they need to have, and that is why it is important that we address this issue.

Your amendment deals with a program called remain in Mexico. The only problem is, we can't stop the funds in that program because it got terminated in February 2021. We had an opportunity to vote on this on May 22, but we did not bring this up at that time. Except for two Members, everybody voted "no" on this on the Republican side, and it is a little bit too late for this.

Madam Chair, I would say to my good friend from Texas, I do support the MPP, I do support it, but this program is gone. I think we need to have a little bit of discussion if we are going to be looking at ways to stop folks from coming in.

I would remind folks what happened in 2015 and what happened in 2019 under President Trump and under President Obama, that is, we worked with Mexico, not to keep them there, but actually for them to secure their southern border with Guatemala. We need to do that again.

If we are able to do that, I think we should be able to address that issue. I do support MPP, but this amendment is trying to stop funding for something that doesn't exist. For that reason, I will ask my colleagues to vote "no," and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROY. Madam Chair, the termination of this program resulted in a decrease by 64 percent for illegal alien

apprehensions between ports of entries or found inadmissible at ports of entry.

Border encounters with Central American families—the main driver of the crisis for the better part of the first 2 years, comprised the majority of the MPP-amenable aliens—dropped by 80 percent.

A report found MPP to be "an indispensable tool in addressing the ongoing crisis at the southern border and restoring integrity to the immigration system."

The purpose of the amendment is to ensure that we are not continuing to fund the ending of the kinds of programs that could be successful—that is the point. We are putting restrictions on the extent to which the administration can ignore the tools that it should be using.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 77 OFFERED BY MR. ROY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 77 printed in part B of House Report 118-216.

Mr. ROY. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out the Department of Homeland Security memorandum titled "Guidelines for Enforcement Actions in or Near Protected Areas".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 723, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROY. Madam Chair, the amendment before us is pretty simple. It prohibits funding from this Act to carry out the Department of Homeland Security's memo titled "Guidelines for Enforcement Actions in or Near Protected Areas."

The Biden administration issued a memo prohibiting ICE from arresting illegal migrants in most public places. If you look at a map, there are literally circles drawn that pretty much cover an entire geographic region. Effectively, they are making it impossible for ICE to do its job.

It is purposeful, and this amendment is pretty simple: Don't use money to do this stupid thing.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUELLAR. Madam Chair, I claim time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUELLAR. Madam Chair, we had an opportunity for the last 2 fiscal years to put \$2 billion to support CBP, including ICE, and that was a 15 per-

cent increase. We had an opportunity to vote on it, and there were folks that did not support these particular monies for Homeland.

I have full faith in the men and women that work for DHS, they are capable of carrying out their Federal law enforcement responsibilities and of carrying out their statutory authorities.

This amendment is not needed. I support ICE and they will carry out the work that needs to be done so they can enforce immigration law.

Madam Chair, I ask my colleagues to vote "no," and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROY. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 78 OFFERED BY MR. ROY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 78 printed in part B of House Report 118-216.

Mr. ROY. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to implement any of the following executive orders:

(1) Executive Order 13990, relating to Protecting Public Health and the Environment and Restoring Science To Tackle the Climate Crisis.

(2) Executive Order 14008, relating to Tackling the Climate Crisis at Home and Abroad.

(3) Section 6 of Executive Order 14013, relating to Rebuilding and Enhancing Programs To Resettle Refugees and Planning for the Impact of Climate Change on Migration.

(4) Executive Order 14030, relating to Climate-Related Financial Risk.

(5) Executive Order 14057, relating to Catalyzing Clean Energy Industries and Jobs Through Federal Sustainability.

(6) Executive Order 14082, relating to Implementation of the Energy and Infrastructure Provisions of the Inflation Reduction Act of 2022.

(7) Executive Order 14096, relating to Revitalizing Our Nation's Commitment to Environmental Justice for All.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 723, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROY. Madam Chair, this amendment prohibits—as I have done in a number of our other appropriations bills, successfully so far. This amendment prohibits any of the funding in the Homeland Security appropriations bill from being used to carry out President Biden's executive orders on climate change.

These executive orders are pursuing a climate fetish to the detriment of our ability to have national security and energy security. It is driving up the prices of energy and making us more

dependent on China and foreign sources of energy. It is making lives more difficult for the American people.

Alejandro Mayorkas, the Secretary of Homeland Security, has literally said, the climate crisis is the most prominent threat we face. Meanwhile, we have had 6 million migrant encounters, 2 million releases in our country, and 70-some-thousand Americans die from fentanyl poisoning. There are little girls and migrants getting abused in the sex trafficking trade and getting distributed through the United States. That is what the Secretary focuses on. It is absurd. This is pretty simple: Stop doing that.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUELLAR. Madam Chair, I claim time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUELLAR. Madam Chair, I stand in opposition, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROY. Madam Chair, I appreciate the brevity of my colleague, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 79 OFFERED BY MR. TIFFANY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 79 printed in part D of House Report 118-216.

Mr. TIFFANY. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used in contravention of section 642(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1373(a)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 723, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. TIFFANY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. TIFFANY. Madam Chair, my amendment would prevent State and local governments who refuse to cooperate with Federal immigration authorities from being able to obtain Federal funds under this Act.

These so-called sanctuary city policies are nothing new. They are also illegal. In fact, they have been illegal since Bill Clinton signed a law making them illegal in the 1990s.

As we have seen in recent months, these misguided policies serve as a magnet for illegal aliens—overwhelming schools, hospitals, and other local services.

New York Mayor Eric Adams recently conceded that the tidal wave of illegal immigrants flooding into his sanctuary city will cost Big Apple residents a staggering \$12 billion. He went

on to say the influx will destroy his city.

But there is more to this issue than dollars and cents. Because these policies prevent local law enforcement from reporting illegal aliens to ICE, police are often forced to release foreign criminals from custody who, of course, go on to target new victims. That doesn't just put sanctuary cities at risk, it puts every other neighboring community at risk, too.

Madam Chair, why are Americans being forced to finance the dangerous and illegal policies of sanctuary cities like New York and Chicago?

Why are we being asked to pick up the tab for the problems these jurisdictions are bringing upon themselves?

It is time to stop rewarding bad behavior.

If you make an affirmative decision to violate Federal law, then you should be prepared to forego Federal funds.

Madam Chair, I ask for a “yes” vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUELLAR. Madam Chair, I claim time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUELLAR. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TIFFANY. Madam Chair, I would just conclude by saying, let's take New York City as an example. In the Natural Resources Committee today we had a hearing in regards to a national park in New York that is now being used as an encampment for illegal aliens. What is next?

Is it Yosemite next? Is it Yellowstone next? Is it the national seashore that is in my district, the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore. Where next will they do this?

Plus, they ignore the NEPA process, something that the other side talks constantly about—we must follow the NEPA process. They are gutting it.

It shows what the goals of the Biden administration are. It is the-ends-that-justify-the-means mentality. They will do anything to continue the invasion of our country.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. TIFFANY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 80 OFFERED BY MS.

MALLIOTAKIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 80 printed in part B of House Report 118-216.

Ms. MALLIOTAKIS. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to provide assistance to the Department of Defense to house persons at military installations in the

United States, except in the case of a major disaster declaration made pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), or for U.S. Coast Guard personnel.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 723, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MALLIOTAKIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. MALLIOTAKIS. Madam Chair, my amendment would prohibit any funds from being used by the Department of Homeland Security to assist the Department of Defense to house illegal immigrants at military installations within the United States, specifically referring to Coast Guard bases.

I had an amendment earlier today that passed by voice vote with no opposition. The reason why this is needed, unfortunately, is because the Governor of New York State, which I represent, sent a letter on May 12 to President Biden requesting that national parks as well as military installations and naval resources in and across the northeast be utilized as available space to maintain critical and essential public services to shelter and house migrants.

I know that it is hard to believe that in a post-9/11 world, the Governor of New York, of all places, would actually want to house citizens of other countries on our military installations, but sadly, that is the reality of what my Governor is requesting of the administration.

It is not the first time that this has been considered. Under the Obama administration, they had identified a number of bases that were accommodating individuals who were citizens of other countries, including the Army base in Fort Sill, Oklahoma, an Air Force base in San Antonio, Texas, and a naval base in southern California.

I think it is particularly important to note that we found roughly 250 individuals on the terror watch list at the southern border, but that does not include those individuals who are among the 1.7 million who have entered our country without any interaction with our government or our law enforcement.

There is a concern there that we didn't know who they are, where they are, and what their intentions are. They could very well turn up in New York City and try to demand housing because our mayor continues to incentivize illegal immigration and people to come to New York City to do so.

□ 0045

Mr. Chair, I think, again, in a post-9/11 world, it would be ridiculous to allow citizens of other countries to become residents of our military installations. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUELLAR. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUELLAR. Madam Chair, I think I know what my friend from New York is trying to get to, but, again, I would ask that she please look at the language here. The language says section, and then there is a blank, followed by “None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to provide assistance to the Department of Defense to house persons . . .” Persons.

What do we mean by persons? Undocumented? Military folks? Or do we only house animals? But it says any person at military installations except if they are there because of the Stafford Act or U.S. Coast Guard personnel. Even that “personnel,” that means personnel, a Coast Guard officer can stay there, but their families or dependents cannot stay there.

Again, I know what they are trying to get at, but I think this language, the way it was drafted by the attorneys, will probably do more harm because, again, you cannot house any person except for Stafford or Coast Guard personnel, but not their families.

Again, I don’t know if you want to withdraw that or if we could consider this, but the way this is drafted, I would ask her to please look at this carefully.

For those reasons, I would oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MALLIOTAKIS. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MALLIOTAKIS).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Madam Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TIFFANY) having assumed the chair, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration 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, had come to no resolution thereon.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TODAY

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. today.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o’clock and 49 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until today, Thursday, September 28, 2023, at 9 a.m.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[September 28, (legislative day, September 27), 2023]

Mr. COLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 730. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5692) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes; providing for further 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; and providing for further 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 (Rept. 118-228), Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. FLOOD (for himself, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mr. HILL, and Mr. NICKEL):

H.R. 5741. A bill to prohibit certain Federal agencies from requiring certain institutions to include assets held in custody as a liability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MOOLENAAR:

H.R. 5742. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide that tasks and services performed by certain individuals in postsecondary vocational institutions not be treated as employment; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 5743. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to repay States for amounts expended by States to operate units of the National Park System during a Government shutdown; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CARBAJAL (for himself and Mr. PETERS):

H.R. 5744. A bill to create a Carbon Dividend Trust Fund for the American people in order to encourage market-driven innovation of clean energy technologies and market efficiencies which will reduce harmful pollution and leave a healthier, more stable, and more prosperous Nation for future generations; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BEYER:

H.R. 5745. A bill to provide for the regulation of digital assets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 5746. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to expand the availability of supplemental benefits to certain Medicare Advantage enrollees; to the Com-

mittee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself and Mr. NORMAN):

H.R. 5747. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to increase transparency with respect to crop insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. BOWMAN, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. WILD, Ms. BUSH, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CASTEN, Mr. MORELLE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. ROSS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. SWALWELL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. TRONE, Mr. TONKO, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Ms. CROCKETT, Ms. SEWELL, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. HARDER of California, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Ms. SALINAS, Mr. MOLINARO, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. McGARVEY, Mr. LIEU, Ms. MENG, and Mr. CARSON):

H.R. 5748. A bill to promote and ensure delivery of high-quality special education and related services to children and youth who are blind or visually impaired, deaf, hard of hearing, deafdisabled, or deafblind through instructional methodologies meeting their unique language and learning needs, to enhance accountability for the provision of such services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. DINGELL (for herself, Mr. VALADAO, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 5749. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with regard to research on asthma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DONALDS:

H.R. 5750. A bill to direct the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the Secretary of Energy, and the Secretary of Agriculture to collaborate to determine the feasibility of creating the Green Nuclear Fertilizer Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FERGUSON (for himself, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. ESTES, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mrs. STEEL, and Mr. NETTA):

H.R. 5751. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore the limitation on downward attribution of stock ownership in applying constructive ownership rules; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself and Mr. TRONE):

H.R. 5752. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow first-dollar coverage of mental health services for purposes of health savings accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 5753. A bill to reactivate and repurpose canceling funds to deter the Chinese Communist Party before such funds are extracted from the Department of Defense on October 1, 2023; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.