

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

□ 1445

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chair, bad behavior is not being rewarded. Public servants are doing their jobs, and they are carrying out the policies of the United States of America.

This is a personnel decision. All of these would be personnel decisions. Unfortunately, they are being politicized, and it is really a shame and disgrace that our public servants, who represent us so well, are the subject of these despicable attacks.

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.

Ms. LEE of California. 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.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALFORD) having assumed the chair, Mr. LUTTRELL, 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. 4665) making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5692, UKRAINE SECURITY ASSISTANCE AND OVERSIGHT SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2024; PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4365, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2024; AND PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4367, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2024

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 730 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 730

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5692) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order

against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) 30 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. During 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, pursuant to House Resolution 723, the further amendment specified in section 3 shall be considered as adopted.

SEC. 3. The amendments referred to in section 2 is as follows:

(1) "On Page 10, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$300,000,000)"; and

(2) "Strike section 8104."

SEC. 4. During 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, pursuant to House Resolution 723, the further amendment specified in section 5 shall be considered as adopted.

SEC. 5. The amendment referred to in section 4 is as follows:

"Strike section 406 and strike section 407 and insert SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Notwithstanding the numerical limitation set forth in section 214(g)(1)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1184(g)(1)(B)), the Secretary of Homeland Security, after consultation with the Secretary of Labor, and upon determining that the needs of American businesses cannot be satisfied during fiscal year 2024 with United States workers who are willing, qualified, and able to perform temporary nonagricultural labor, may increase the total number of aliens who may receive a visa under section 101(a)(15)(H)(ii)(b) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(H)(ii)(b)) in such fiscal year above such limitation by not more than the highest number of H-2B nonimmigrants who participated in the H-2B returning worker program in any fiscal year in which returning workers were exempt from such numerical limitation."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), my very good friend, the ranking member of the full committee, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 730.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, last night, the Rules Committee met and reported out a rule, House Resolution 730, providing for the consideration of H.R. 5692, the Ukraine Security Assistance and Oversight Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2024, under a closed rule.

It provides 30 minutes of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees, and it provides for one motion to recommit.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, in order to support that rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, although I know my friends in the minority will express some consternation about today's rule, it sets up a discussion that I think is important to have.

The rule takes \$300 million in funds intended to support Ukraine out of the current Defense appropriations process. It then makes in order a separate vote on those funds through H.R. 5692.

The bill also creates a special inspector general for Ukraine assistance, ensuring that American dollars going to Ukraine receive appropriate oversight and supervision.

Now, as my friends across the aisle are well aware, there is no mystery about how I will vote on this question. Ukraine has been and remains the victim of Vladimir Putin's unprovoked, unjust, and illegal invasion of his neighbor to the West. I firmly support continuing to provide funding to Ukraine so that they can continue to resist that invasion. It is not only in America's national interests to do so, but it is also the right thing to do.

For other Members of the House and for their constituents, a vote on funding for Ukraine is a matter of conscience. Shifting these funds out of the Defense appropriations process and into a separate bill allows those Members for whom there is a question of conscience to vote to support our troops through an otherwise robust Defense appropriations bill while also allowing all Members to vote separately on providing funding to Ukraine.

Mr. Speaker, it is never a bad thing to have all Members of the House take a vote on a question. It is especially helpful in this instance to give all Members the chance to be heard.

Some of my Republican colleagues are supportive of the overall Defense appropriations bill but want to vote separately on Ukraine. Conversely, the vast majority of my friends across the aisle support funding for Ukraine but are opposed to the Defense appropriations bill. Voting on this issue separately through H.R. 5692 gives everyone a chance to be recorded on this important topic.

This resolution does something else that I think is very important. It sets up a debate about American policy toward Ukraine. This is a very valuable discussion to have, Mr. Speaker, and one that the American people would assuredly benefit from.

A debate on American policy toward Ukraine is important. It would help answer certain key questions that Americans are asking, such as: What is America's overall strategy? How are funds being used in Ukraine? What oversight policies are in place?

President Biden has never given a formal address to the American people outlining America's overall strategy with respect to Ukraine, but that does not mean the House cannot have such a discussion. In fact, the opposite is true. The Biden administration's failure to adequately explain to the American people what our overall strategy is means that it is imperative for the House to discuss the topic on the House floor.

Today's rule will give the House and, more importantly, the American people just that opportunity. We can have an open and honest discussion about American policy toward Ukraine and about American dollars supporting Ukraine in its fight against Russian aggression. When the debate is over, all Members of the House will have the opportunity to vote on this important question.

I am confident that, at the end of the day, the House will pass this measure to appropriate these funds to support Ukraine. The only difference will be that we had a full, open, and honest debate about it on the House floor.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support both the rule and the underlying measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma, my good friend, the chairman of the Rules Committee, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in 57 hours, this government will shut down. Federal workers will be sent home. Members of the Armed Forces will defend our country without pay. Programs that feed hungry moms and newborns will stop. Travelers will face airport delays. Critical research on diseases like cancer and Alzheimer's will grind to a halt.

You would think that last night, when the Rules Committee held an emergency meeting, that it would be on stopping the shutdown. That is the actual emergency, Mr. Speaker, that is facing our country. You would be wrong. Instead of a bipartisan CR that can pass, we are back at the eleventh hour to amend a rule, the first rule this majority passed in weeks, because, once again, Speaker McCarthy is letting extreme MAGA Republicans blackmail him.

What we are doing here is absurd. This assistance for Ukraine has been in the Defense bill for years, well before the latest invasion by Russia. This isn't even the Ukraine funding that President Zelenskyy asked for or the funding the administration requested. This shouldn't be controversial.

First, it was in the bill, then it wasn't, then it was. Then, yesterday, we had a standalone vote on Ukraine funding, and the House voted overwhelmingly, 339-93, a majority of the majority, an overwhelming vote against stripping the Ukraine assistance in this bill.

Instead of accepting that loss, extreme MAGA Republicans are black-

mailing KEVIN MCCARTHY. Here we are, rigging the rules to undo that vote.

They want to overturn the will of this House. They refuse to accept the fact that they lost. What is it with Republicans refusing to accept when they lose? Why can't you accept a loss? Why can't you respect the vote?

I guess there is a pattern here. We saw it when they didn't want to accept the Presidential election. Here on the House floor, we see when extreme MAGA, rightwing Republicans don't get their way, when they lose overwhelmingly, they can't accept a loss. They go to the Rules Committee and say: Rig the process.

Did Trump call them and tell them to do this? I mean, this is so unbelievably wrong.

The gentleman from Oklahoma has said some Members have very strong moral objections to assisting Ukraine. Okay. I have strong moral objections to the billions and billions of dollars of blank checks that were given to the Pentagon.

□ 1500

I have strong moral objections to the fact that we refuse to ban the transfer of cluster munitions to other countries around the world, but guess what? It is our job as Members of Congress to weigh the pros and cons and vote yes or no. If people do not want to make those tough decisions, don't run for Congress.

I appreciate that the gentleman from Oklahoma voted for and supports giving Ukraine the tools they need to defend themselves, but what the gentleman is doing here is making it exponentially more likely that this Ukraine funding will not become law.

Because if this doesn't make a difference, if these bills are moving together and this is all just about giving people yet another chance to vote on something they already voted on, what is the point?

The rule provides 30 minutes of debate on this sidecar Ukraine funding bill, 30 minutes, 15 minutes on each side. What a debate that is going to be.

I will tell you what the point of all of this is. Let me read you the words of our colleague MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE when she left the Republican Conference meeting this morning. She told the reporter: "We are not funding Ukraine. That is what I heard in there."

Let me inform the gentlewoman: We all had a chance to vote our conscience, up or down. Those who voted to strike Ukraine aid can go home and tell their constituents that they voted to strike Ukraine aid. It is not that complicated.

What concerns many of us is the signal these extreme MAGA Republicans are sending to Putin. Putin is an authoritarian thug. What he is doing in Ukraine is sick. His troops are shelling nuclear power plants, killing civilians, bombing hospitals, abducting women, massacring people. My MAGA colleagues want to send him a message,

and that message is: Just hold on a little longer. Wait a little longer and you can do whatever you want.

This House had a vote, and we are here to overturn it, all because Speaker MCCARTHY is letting extreme MAGA Republicans blackmail him because he cares more about keeping his job than doing his job.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by reminding my friend that, again, we agree on this issue. We both feel strongly in support of Ukraine. I know my friend will vote accordingly. So will I.

The reality is, this measure actually makes it more likely that Ukraine will get support, not less likely. As a part of the Defense bill, that bill may or may not pass. My friends are united in their opposition against that bill for a variety of reasons. That is certainly their right, but they actually do support this particular measure almost unanimously. Why not take it out of a bill that may or may not pass the floor and have a separate vote?

My friends will actually be able to vote to move forward something they agree with and, quite frankly, something the majority of my Conference agrees with. I don't see how this imperils Ukrainian funding. It makes it almost certain.

Moreover, I do believe discussion on this floor has considerable merit on this issue. The reality is that we haven't had that discussion, and it is time we did. I wished the President, who I happen to support in this instance—I don't support every nuance of his policy. I think he was too slow to commit here, too slow to get aid there. He has been unclear about what the final objectives of this exercise are, an exercise I remind everyone is extraordinarily expensive. It is over \$100 billion invested and a request for more. I wish the President would do that. The House is going to endeavor to do that, at least to some degree, through this discussion.

Again, I think it is important to note that if you support Ukraine, you should support this measure because my friends, who I know sincerely do support that effort, are going to almost and probably unanimously oppose the Defense bill in which it is contained.

Why in the world would they be upset because we take it out, put it on its own, make it more likely to pass, and, frankly, do what we are supposed to do around here, which is actually let every American see how his or her Member of Congress votes on this issue and how they choose to defend it. I just simply think it is the appropriate way to go.

Now, I will be candid with my friend, as I always try to be. It also helps us pass the Defense bill. We have some people, because they feel very strongly about this particular issue, who might

not vote for the Defense bill that otherwise will. I am not going to apologize because we strengthen our ability to actually move an important piece of legislation through. The one thing we do, and it is really not disputable, is we increase the chances that Ukraine will get at least this \$300 million of additional training aid that I think they ought to get and that my friends agree with.

Having one more vote on the House floor, particularly at a time when we are having so many, does not seem to me to be a high price to pay.

Mr. Speaker, let me quickly address one other point that my friend made. He talked about an imminent shutdown. We are coming close, and my friend is absolutely correct in that. I do remind him that the Rules Committee passed a measure roughly a week ago, I believe, that actually is an amendment that would continue funding the government while we work out our motions. That amendment can come out of the Rules Committee. It can be placed on the floor at whatever time the Speaker and the leadership of the majority choose to do that. There are vehicles in place to act.

I also remind my friend that the United States Senate is doing the same thing. I would prefer that we not get as close to the deadline as we are, but we are here. It is not as if nothing is being done and time in other areas is being wasted.

I suspect we will have a vote relatively soon on continuing to support the government. It may or may not pass. I suspect the United States Senate will have a similar vote. I suspect that one probably will pass and move to this Chamber.

The idea that nothing is being done while trivialities are being debated, I dismiss that out of hand. I don't think that is the truth.

Those issues are coming to a head right now, but again, I end once more with the obvious point: If you care about Ukraine, you ought to be voting for this measure. I will. I know my friends almost unanimously will, and that will ensure that that important funding moves forward. We have a fuller debate on the House floor about American objectives, goals, the price tag associated with that.

I think these are all good things, all things where the House is actually doing the right thing and, frankly, where I think the majority is giving the minority an opportunity to move forward, something I know they feel passionate about. I share that passion, and many on our side do, too.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the rule, which makes this possible, and the underlying resolution. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments from my good friend from Oklahoma, and he knows I have great affection for him, but I am dizzy from all the spin, quite frankly.

First, about the CR, what we know is that what may or may not pass in the

House, based on the fact that the Freedom Caucus seems to be calling the shots, will never pass the Senate. We know whatever will come out of the Rules Committee in the next 24 hours or 48 hours or whatever, if anything, if ever, will not be able to get the votes not just amongst Democrats but amongst Republicans in the Senate.

Secondly, we do know that the Senate is working in a bipartisan way. They already have clotured and moved forward with the process to bring up a CR, with an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote, but we know what they pass would pass this House if put on the floor. The reason why this government will, in all likelihood, shut down is because the Speaker of the House is so beholden to a small group of the most extreme Members that he won't put that on the floor. He will rig it so that we do not have a chance to be able to vote on it. That is how this government will shut down.

My good friend talks about how this is really no big deal. It is just another vote, and everybody should be happy, but let me ask, if this were good for Ukraine and Ukraine's ability to defend itself against Russia's illegal war, then why would members of the pro-Putin caucus even agree to this? If everyone genuinely thought there was no difference between keeping the funding in the Defense bill and moving it separately, why insist on all of this?

The answer is really simple: Republicans who seem to be enamored with Putin want this funding sent separately to the Senate because they know that is their best shot to prevent this money from going to Ukraine at all.

In fact, when MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE left the Republican Conference meeting this morning—I quoted her already, but I will quote it again. She said: “We are not funding Ukraine. That is what I heard in there.”

Plus, we all know that there are Senators like RAND PAUL and TOMMY TUBERVILLE who will block a separate Ukraine funding bill from moving forward. They are actively preventing the Senate from completing its work as we speak. This is not a flaw in the sidecar plan. It is a main feature and a goal.

Let's be clear. This funding that we are talking about here is longstanding security assistance. It has been in the Defense bill for years, even before Putin invaded Ukraine. This is not the supplemental funding that President Zelenskyy requested when he met with Speaker MCCARTHY last week. This is not the supplemental funding the administration requested in their emergency funding request. It is not the supplemental funding that the Senate is trying to put in their bipartisan CR.

Spare me the argument that somehow this is a good thing and gives everybody a chance for their voice to be heard on this topic. If everybody wanted their voice to be heard on this topic, you would have speaker after speaker right now speaking on this bill and

speaking about their concerns about our Ukraine policy. There is no one over there.

Let's all be real about what is happening. The House already had its voice heard, and it overwhelmingly voted to support funding in the Defense bill, a three-fourths majority. You can't get that many people to agree on lunch in this place, and it is a majority of your majority. The pro-Putin extremists didn't like the outcome, so they talked the Speaker into rigging the vote. That is what this is all about.

Mr. Speaker, I am here to offer the House the opportunity to demonstrate for a third time that we stand by Ukraine in their time of need, and I urge that we defeat the previous question. If we do, I will offer an amendment that would strike the provision of the rule eliminating security assistance funding for Ukraine.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM) to discuss this proposal.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, Republicans spent 3 weeks trying to bring the Defense appropriations act to the floor. Three times it went to the Rules Committee. The first two times, the rule failed on the floor, and it failed, in part, because a small minority of Republicans do not support any Ukrainian assistance, including support for Ukraine that has been in the base Defense bill for 9 years.

The Republican Conference knew for weeks that this was a problem for them, and that is why they have created this pseudo minibus that we have been working on the past few days. It is loaded with extreme social policy riders to appease the far right so that their party can advance a Defense bill.

Earlier this week, Republicans could have used the Rules Committee to strip out the Ukraine funding from the Defense bill. They chose not to do so then. Instead, the Rules Committee made two Republican amendments in order to strike any Ukrainian funding. Then that amendment came to the floor, and they asked the House to do its will.

The Biggs amendment was rejected by this House by a vote of 104–330. The Gaetz amendment was also rejected 93–339. In a closely divided Congress, this is about as clearly a bipartisan vote as you can get. In both cases, the Republicans and the Democrats stood together with Ukraine, but the Republicans found out that they still had a problem with the extreme right in their party.

Even after the votes, the vocal Republican minority threatened the

Speaker again to take down the Defense bill, all because the votes didn't go their way, so here we are today.

The Speaker has sent the Defense bill back to the Rules Committee to override the will of this House in its most basic democratic process of amending bills.

□ 1515

It is ironic that the Speaker is so focused on passing the defense bill in such an undemocratic way. He has wasted weeks letting the far right abuse the Republican majority, while at the same time failing to address the impending government shutdown.

Today, these extreme Members are abusing the entire House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, Members, the lessons from the last 3 weeks could not be more clear. When you don't stand up to bullies, they continue to bully you. That is what is happening here. The bullies in the Republican Conference have won once again at the expense of this institution. That is why I would ask my colleagues to defeat the previous question.

Let's stand up to the bullies in this Chamber. Let's strip this outrageous provision from the rule and return this House to regular order where every vote matters, and when the vote of the majority of the House speaks, it is respected.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to address two points, one that my friend from Massachusetts made about the potential of a government shutdown.

As my friend knows, because we have spent a lot of time together, particularly recently, I am very much opposed to a government shutdown. I am pleased we have a vehicle out of the Rules Committee to address that. It is not up to me to decide when it comes to the floor, but there is one prepared, and hopefully, we will have an opportunity to vote on this.

I remind my friends that during the debt ceiling crisis, they said, oh, my gosh, we will never get out of this without defaulting on the debt. My gosh, it is the end of the world.

What did the House do?

It actually passed its bill and had a negotiating position and sat down with the Senate and the administration and negotiated a settlement. Some like it. Some don't like it. It is like anything around here in divided government, it is a compromise. The reality is that we moved and acted before the deadline. We have that ability, and I suspect we will do that before the deadline.

I also remind my friends—and again, I think they would agree with this—the United States Senate is moving and will present a vehicle. We may be in a negotiating position. They, by the way, never passed anything on the debt ceiling on their own. They waited to have a negotiating position from the House and then finally woke up and sat down

with us. They never moved their own vehicle.

This is normal legislative process. That is an important question, but I agree with my friends about the virtue of a shutdown. I think that is actually the sentiment of the overwhelming majority of the House on both sides of the aisle.

We have got something working on that. The Senate has something, and we will see how that plays out over the next few days.

In terms of this measure, I am mystified by my friend's position. They are overwhelmingly in favor of support for Ukraine. I share that position, as does the majority of my side of the aisle.

Right now, \$300 million of that support is embedded in a defense bill that they themselves will oppose unanimously, and we may or may not get everybody on our side. The reality is, it is a very narrow majority. People can have a different opinion, and we might or might not be able to pass it, but they support that particular measure almost uniformly.

Now when we take it out and say, here is something you support and the majority of us support, why don't we not risk this in a bill that could go either way?

Why don't we just advance this portion of it? That somehow is a problem?

I actually see it as something that ensures this particular issue will almost certainly move through the House. Moreover, I think it ensures a more robust discussion and an education on this important measure.

The reality is, it is hard for the average American to follow this. We have not had a Presidential address laying out the goals, the reasons, and the strategy for this. I think more discussion about Ukraine on the House floor would be helpful, not unhelpful, particularly when I think the majority in the Chamber would very strongly come out in support.

I don't see this in any way as somehow damaging our ability. Rather, it sort of clarifies our opinion on this issue in a very narrowly divided House. I think that is a good thing. I am not going to apologize, quite frankly, if this helps us get another couple of votes on a defense bill that I think is a good defense bill and a move toward a conference with the Senate on the appropriations front—that is all to the good. I don't have any problem with that.

If I can remove somebody's moral objection or concern and give them an opportunity to express their opinion, whether I agree with it or not, and recruit additional support, I think that is just smart politics and good procedure.

More importantly, I want to reemphasize that if you care about Ukraine, you should like this. You should say: Gosh, let's at least make sure that training money is going to get there. I won't have to vote against a bill that contains a measure I support. That measure has got to be taken out. I can

support that measure and still oppose the bill if I want to. At least this thing that I care about deeply is actually going to be passed.

I think that is a prudent way to proceed. I think it is the right thing to do for Ukraine. I look forward at that time and that vote to actually voting with my friends on that measure.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I have nothing but great affection for the gentleman from Oklahoma, but we have to deal with the reality that we are now living in.

This quote from Minority Leader MCCONNELL was just tweeted out today with a message to the House Republicans on how a shutdown would impact the border. Mr. MCCONNELL says: "Shutting down the government is a choice, and it is a choice that would make the crisis at the southern border even worse."

He says it is a choice because he sees what is happening here. He sees that the Republicans in this Chamber have made a choice to shut the government down. We didn't hear anything today about the border, but yesterday or the day before we did hear a lot about the border. Senator MCCONNELL says that it would make the crisis at our southern border even worse.

He is concerned. He is the Republican leader in the Senate. He is concerned by the action of the Republicans in this House. He sees that a small group of Republicans are calling the shots. They don't even represent the majority of the majority here. It is really quite extraordinary that we are at this moment.

Rather than moving in a direction where we can get a bipartisan CR passed in both the House and the Senate and one that will be signed by the President, my Republican friends in the House are going in the wrong direction. We are running out of time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY).

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this rule. It concerns me that my friend, the chairman of the Rules Committee—and I believe that I say this correctly—described this as part of the normal democratic process. If that is true, then that is the new normal and it is more evidence of dysfunction and the inability to govern than it is anything else.

A few years ago, Fiona Hill said that polarization in this country is now a national security threat because it shows the rest of the world that we can't function, we can't govern. No one outside this body is going to see this rule and this tactic as anything other than at least an attempt to defund the efforts to help Ukraine.

I get it. The Speaker has the sword of Damocles over his head because of a few Members in the far right that have disproportionate control. We are not

talking about the tail wagging the dog, it is the tip of the dog's tail. The rest of the world is watching this, understanding the underlying reasons why this so matters.

Ukraine's fight is the reason we fought the Second World War. It is the reason we formed NATO, and it is the reason we formed the United Nations. We simply cannot let a sovereign democratic country get wiped off the face of the Earth. We grew up hearing and believing "Never again." Yet, as I stood in Bucha in Ukraine and saw the mass grave and heard the horrors there, it made me think that it will happen on a more massive scale if we don't act.

To quote FDR in his last, shortest inaugural address: "We have learned that we cannot live alone, at peace; that our own well-being is dependent on the well-being of other nations far away." He was right then and he is right now.

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

Mr. Speaker, I didn't particularly come down here to discuss the border, but I am delighted to discuss the border. I am glad my friends are finally interested in the border.

We have watched for 2 years as this administration has turned a green light on the border and has dramatically escalated the crossings. The border has been the biggest single disaster of an administration that, frankly, has been a failure in many different areas. The border, incontestably, is a problem that is created by the administration, owned by the administration, and my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle that actually have presided over this mess.

As a matter of fact, when we bring something onto the floor to keep the government open, I suspect there will be a border measure attached to it. My friends could then eagerly embrace that and actually do something to help on the border, a place where they fought us on, H.R. 2, our border security bill, where they have done nothing but support the administration that has engineered this incredible crisis.

I remind my friends that former Democratic Secretary of Homeland Security, who I admire a lot, Jeh Johnson, was once asked: What constitutes a crisis at the border?

A thousand illegal entries a day.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday that number was 10,000–11,000. Have my friends done anything about it? No.

We will probably put something on this floor pretty quickly, we already have with H.R. 2. You didn't vote for that. We will now give you an opportunity to both keep the government open and vote for border security. You should be happy about that. If you want to talk about the border, we will do it all day long on our side of the aisle.

Finally, with all due respect to my friends, you are not going to support the defense bill. I don't have any problem with that. That is your right. You

have some concerns. You have some criticisms.

You are going to support—you do support aid for Ukraine, so we take it out and we put it out there. This is something you can support. The majority of our Members support it, too, but we have some that certainly do not and are vocal in that opposition. Why don't we make sure this gets through?

I am just mystified that this is somehow a problem. We guarantee you something you want is going to pass the House and you are upset about it.

You can express your displeasure in whatever way you want. I suspect when the deal is here, the measure is on the floor, you will actually vote for it. I will be happy and proud to vote with my friends on that because on this issue I share their point of view.

As somebody who supports Ukraine, I think it is a good thing to make sure this portion is going to pass for sure, this portion is going to be visible to the world. There is strong bipartisan support and we can move on.

Finally, I will just go back to the shutdown discussion. If we are going to have that discussion, I suspect it will be in the next day or two. They are having it in the United States Senate. Let's see how that plays out.

I do remember my friends telling me the sky was falling on the debt ceiling, but it didn't exactly happen that way. Once the House actually passed something, it triggered a serious discussion, and it actually got the Senate—which had done nothing—to actually act and sit down. We bargained the position, and we got it through. Not everybody on my side of the aisle agreed with that. Not everybody on my friends' side agreed with it, but it got done.

I see the same process, I hope, working out now. On this one, at least, why don't we make sure we take care of this particular piece of Ukraine funding. I am sure at some point in the not too distant future we will have a discussion about a larger supplemental, and I look forward to that particular debate and discussion.

Please don't be upset because we are giving you what you want in this area and ensuring that it actually passes and are trying to work with you on it.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, a lot of Democrats were sounding the alarm bells over the debt ceiling issue because our credit was actually downgraded. That is not a good thing. After we got a deal, which thank God we did, the extreme MAGA Republicans blackmailed the Speaker of the House into not respecting that deal. We have a problem right now.

I should also point out that we had a long discussion on the border, and I am still puzzled why you are bringing a Homeland Security appropriations bill to the floor that actually cuts funding for border security. I don't quite get that.

You added a provision that says that if you pass an appropriations bill on Homeland Security, it is kept at the desk, and it can't go to the Senate for a vote unless this crazy bill, H.R. 2, is passed by the Senate and signed into law by the President, without even changing a comma. I don't know what brilliant legislative mind thought that up. The bottom line is, this is not serious.

□ 1530

Let me again read a quote from Senator McCONNELL. He said: A vote against a standard short-term funding measure is a vote against paying over \$1 billion in salary for CBP and ICE agents.

I don't know how my Republican friends are going to defend the border. Maybe with volunteers. Come on; I mean, at some point we have to get serious.

Let me also just say—and, again, you can't make this stuff up—Republicans are holding their first impeachment hearing today with just hours to go until a shutdown.

What is wrong with them?

Breaking news indicates it was a failure. The hearing was a total failure. Republican staffers are telling reporters that it was, "an unmitigated disaster."

Another GOP staffer says, "Comer has lost control."

Another GOP person said, "Comer botched this bad."

This was supposed to be their big bombshell, and it was a total dud. Not a single one of their witnesses could come up with a shred of evidence against the President.

Let's see what they said. Their lead witness, Jonathan Turley, who they roll out every chance they can, was on FOX News constantly, said: I do not believe that the current evidence would support Articles of Impeachment. That is their star witness.

Their other lead witness, Bruce Dubinsky, said: I am not here today to even suggest that there was corruption, fraud, or any wrongdoing.

The list of Members on the other side saying this impeachment inquiry is a sham is getting longer and longer by the hour, and the clock keeps ticking toward a shutdown. Instead of a bipartisan CR that can pass, here we are wasting time.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD an article from The Daily Beast, "Star GOP Witness Immediately Pours Cold Water on Biden Impeachment."

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

There was no objection.

[From the Daily Beast, Sept. 28, 2023]

STAR GOP WITNESS IMMEDIATELY POURS COLD WATER ON BIDEN IMPEACHMENT

(By Josh Fiallo)

Republicans' longshot attempt to impeach President Joe Biden got off to a rocky start Thursday, with their star witness, legal expert Jonathan Turley, outright saying he

doesn't see any evidence to support impeachment.

"I do not believe that the current evidence would support articles of impeachment," he testified.

Turley, a Fox News legal analyst and D.C. lawyer who argued against Donald Trump's 2019 impeachment, was called on by House Republicans to testify in the first hearing of an inquiry into whether Biden should be impeached. Republicans have been desperately searching for evidence of wrongdoing since well before Biden was elected, and the inquiry gives them the ability to obtain materials like bank records.

While he conceded there was no evidence to support impeachment, Turley did say that he believed the House had "passed the threshold" for holding an inquiry.

He speculated that information *could* emerge if an official impeachment inquiry was launched. This, he said, should be enough for Republicans to launch an official probe into the president.

The less-than-convincing comment was seized on by the Biden campaign, which shared a video of the quote to its social channels.

Impeachment talks have swirled for nearly a year, with a cohort of Republicans centering their claims around Hunter Biden's shady business dealings and so-far-unsubstantiated suspicions that his father engaged in corruption and abuse of public office.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Again, the gentleman mentioned what is wrong with sending this separate bill to the Senate. I thought I explained that. Let me explain it in two words: Paul and Tuberville. I mean, these Senators are unhinged. Tuberville is holding up military promotions and Paul delays everything. We see that he is trying to delay Senate consideration on the CR.

Sending this over and expecting that there is quick action? I mean, we all know what is going to happen, and we all know that people like MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE, who insisted on this, did so because they think they have a better chance of derailing everything.

I find it interesting, Mr. Speaker, that nobody put their name on this amendment. I don't know whose idea this was. I don't know who the author of this particular provision is to strip out Ukraine money, but anyway, that is a mystery that we will have to try to solve.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH), the distinguished ranking member of the Armed Services Committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from personal attacks on Members of this body or the U.S. Senate.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, if you support Ukraine, you cannot support this rule. My overarching concern here is for Ukraine. I mean, let's start with the fact that there is a Ukrainian supplemental that is needed to continue our support that the House Republicans are refusing to bring to the floor in any form, and they have given no indication whatsoever that they are going to bring that bill to the floor.

That is frustrating because we have had a number of votes on support for

Ukraine, and it is very apparent that over 300 Members of this body support that, an overwhelming majority of Republicans. Yet, as of October 1, our ability to continue to support Ukraine also dies.

For all those Members on the other side of the aisle who support Ukraine, why are you letting that support die? Why aren't you insisting on moving forward with some kind of vote on the supplemental to help them?

Let's focus on this particular rule. What this rule does is it takes out the funding for Ukraine. If you support Ukraine, you can't vote for this rule because it undoes the vote that we did yesterday. It very publicly, for Putin and all the world to see, shows the U.S. House voting to cut the funding for Ukraine. That is what it does. The only reason it is here is because the people who don't support Ukraine want it to be here.

Now, tip of the hat to MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE and MATT GAETZ and all the other folks who don't support Ukraine, who seem sympathetic to Putin for reasons that I really don't want to think about, are forcing this vote to advance their interests, and that is fine.

However, for all the people who claim to support Ukraine on the other side of the aisle, how can they vote to take out the money that they voted in favor of yesterday? I share the chairman's mystification at what is going on here.

Now, I know there is a separate bill that will then fund Ukraine except that that separate bill is dead on arrival in the Senate. It is not going anywhere. Also, the vote on the rule, the rule strips out the money from Ukraine. That is what it does. It undoes the vote from yesterday.

Believe me, the Russians are good at propaganda. I have seen this propaganda, and I guarantee you that what they will use and what a lot of our allies will wonder about, why did the United States House vote to strip the money away from Ukraine that it had voted for the day before? It will be played as America backing off of its commitment from Ukraine.

If you support Ukraine, you have to vote "no." The people who don't support Ukraine are the ones who brought this motion. It is a free world. If you want to not support Ukraine, that is fine. Good for you for advancing this. However, the people who support Ukraine standing up here and voting for this? It is just unbelievable to me that we would undermine the support for Ukraine given how important that fight is.

We should support Ukraine. Please vote against this rule.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, again, we have talked a little bit about the border, which we are always delighted to talk about. We are happy to see our friends interested in it because they have been so uninterested.

I appreciate what Leader MCCONNELL in the Senate had to say about it.

Frankly, it would help anything that he sends over here in terms of keeping the government open to actually put some border security measures in that particular piece of legislation. I understand there is some consideration about that in the Senate. I would encourage the Senate to do that. I think that would be a good thing.

Again, the reality is my friends haven't cared about the border. We are going to try to give them a couple opportunities here in the coming days to show us that they do because the policies they have pursued and supported and this administration have advanced have been a disaster. You know it, I know it, we know it.

There are 70,000 dead Americans thanks to the fentanyl flow. There are tens of thousands of children that have been illegally trafficked across the border. Many border agents will tell you we don't have operational control on the border.

The other side doesn't want to do anything about that. If we are going to put it in a measure to keep the government open, you know, then maybe they will vote for that. We are going to hopefully give them that opportunity. Again, we would encourage our friends in the Senate, a Democratically-controlled Senate, to be fair, that have not done anything about the border, they have not taken up any legislation, maybe they will finally do something. That is part of the frustration over here.

I have, frankly, great admiration and respect for the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH). I think he is one of the best legislators in this Chamber. I just disagree. The reality is, none of the Members on the other side are going to vote for the Defense bill that this money is in. What kind of message will that send overseas?

If they bring down the bill with Ukrainian support—and they are going to vote against it unanimously—that is a great message: We are for Ukraine, but we are not for the vehicle that has Ukrainian support and the defense of the United States? That is their choice. They disagree with the bill, I get it. That is fair. Now they are concerned because we actually put it in a format that they can vote for and that it will pass with an overwhelming majority? That mystifies me. That is just bizarre to me.

If they are worried about Russian propaganda, the reality is when and if—and I hope they do not, but if they manage to bring down the Defense bill with Ukrainian money in it, do they think Russian propaganda will say, oh, well, gosh, that is okay, we won't say anything about that—of course they will—and Democratic Members will have voted to do it. We are offering an opportunity here to actually make sure the money moves through the legislative process. I think it is an incredibly fair thing to do.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have had a robust debate on the border

and on keeping the government open. The reality here is, we ought to do this for Ukraine, we ought to make sure the money is going to be set aside and move forward with a bipartisan majority. I look forward to voting for that. I suspect my friends will certainly oppose the rule. However, when that legislation comes down here, I bet they all vote for it. I hope they do, and I am going to encourage them to do that.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. How much time do I have remaining, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 5½ minutes remaining.

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

First of all, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma. I think he did the best job he could defending this. He is very skillful in utilizing the English language. I always appreciate listening to him on these matters, but we all know what this is really about.

We all had a chance to vote our conscience up or down. Those who voted to strike Ukraine aid can go home and tell their constituents they voted to strike Ukraine's aid. It is not that complicated.

The fact of the matter is, Republicans have not done a single productive thing this week. They passed only one appropriations bill all year, and they are sitting here wasting time while the clock runs out.

It is not just me saying that. Listen to our Republican colleagues. Listen to MIKE LAWLER. He said, "This is not conservative Republicanism. This is stupidity, the idea we are going to shut the government down when we don't control the Senate, we don't control the White House. If the clown show of colleagues that refuse to actually govern does not want to pass a CR, I will do everything we need to do to make sure a CR passes."

Congressman MARC MOLINARO says, "The goal here is to avert a shutdown." Guess what? This procedural vote is his chance to stand up and show the extremists. Instead of wasting our time in the clown show, vote against this rule.

Congressman ANTHONY D'ESPOSITO says he is ready to explore each and every option possible to make sure that we don't shut the government down. If Mr. D'ESPOSITO is watching, vote against this rule.

Congressman DUSTY JOHNSON says, "The government should not shut down. That would be an exceptionally stupid thing to do." Well, I agree. He should vote down this rule so we can get to work on preventing a shutdown.

I am going to say directly to all of my colleagues, this vote is their chance to end the clown show. The only thing that matters around here is their votes. Everything else is BS. Maybe they should focus less on getting quotes and more on how they vote. Vote against this clown show. Vote against this rule.

By the way, it works. It works for the Freedom Caucus and for the most extreme elements of this Chamber. They vote down rules, and they get these crazy things put into rules. They get everything they want. It is enough of the talk. If there are moderate Republicans out there who do not want this government to shut down, now is the time to put their vote where their rhetoric is. Enough of the talk. We need action.

Finally, let me say to the chairman of the Rules Committee, the chairman said 5 days ago, "We will see how this week unfolds." Well, this week has unfolded, and the Republican Party is still at war with itself. We are still no closer to avoiding a shutdown.

What is happening here is so painfully transparent to anyone that is watching. It is because all KEVIN MCCARTHY seems to care about is keeping his job. He should care about what a shutdown would do to his constituents, but he doesn't. He appears to care more about keeping his job than doing his job.

As I said last night, and I will say again, calling Republican leadership a clown show is doing a disservice to actual working clowns. This process is one of the most rotten, corrupt, rigged things I have seen in all my time here. Shame on the Speaker. I have never seen anything like this: Using the rules to overturn a democratic vote on the House floor. Again, the vote was 339-93. 339-93. I mean, we don't get votes like that around here. Yet, one Member—we don't even know who is responsible for the language that we are dealing with here today. No one put their name on it, but this is awful, and I strongly reject this whole process.

I again make an appeal to the moderate Republicans, if there are any out there, you know, stand with us, show us with their vote that they want things to change now, that they do not want a shutdown. Vote down this sham rule and force the leadership to go back up to the Rules Committee and do what they should have done a long time ago, work on a CR that can get a bipartisan vote in the House, a bipartisan vote in the Senate, and we can avoid a shutdown, and we can prevent a lot of misery for millions and millions of people in this country.

Shutdowns, contrary to what you hear by many on the other side of the aisle, are a bad thing. It represents a failure of this institution to do its most basic job, and that is keep the lights on. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1545

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

I certainly want to begin by returning my respect to my good friend, the ranking member of the Rules Committee.

We argue, fight, disagree, but I know we have great respect for one another.

I certainly do for my friend. I have great personal affection for him.

When we disagree, the tone might go up a little bit, but we remain good friends. The reality is that we have a good working relationship, one which I treasure.

I will say, on this one, I didn't come here particularly to talk about the shutdown, but let's wait and see what happens.

This has nothing to do with the shutdown, absolutely nothing. There is nothing saying: Beat this rule to say where you stand on the shutdown.

They don't connect. This rule is about something else. It is about Ukrainian aid, and frankly, it is also about enhancing the prospect that the Defense appropriations bill will actually pass this body.

I think that if you look at what this does, it enhances the chance that Ukraine aid will survive, no matter what.

My friends care about that. They are going to vote against a Defense bill where the current money is. They are going to vote against it, every one of them. It is their right to do that.

They have disagreements with other parts of the bill, so we took a part of the bill they like and put it out on its own.

We are going to get a bipartisan vote on it. I think that is a good thing. I think that is something that should be celebrated.

I think Congress will have a chance to make a strong statement about Ukraine. I will actually be voting with my friends on the substance of the bill.

That will probably be lost in the debate over the rule, but the reality is that we will be on the same side. That is because we have the same view of the issue. I think that is a very good thing.

I think more discussion about Ukraine in the Congress of the United States is a very good thing because I think we have some profound differences on our side of the aisle about the merits of this.

I actually agree more with my friends, but I want to have the American people more involved in the debate. Sadly, the administration has really not done that very effectively. They have been afraid for the President to address the issue, for whatever reason. He ought to lay out our goals, lay out our timelines, lay out the resources he thinks we need to be committed.

I give him the benefit of the doubt. I think a war is pretty hard to plan and lay out. It is not like you are building a bridge and you know where you start, where you end, what you need. War is a contest of wills.

To the President, my free advice would be that it is time for you to talk to the American people and get them more deeply engaged in a project that you and I happen to agree on. We need you to use the bully pulpit more effectively than you have.

In the meantime, let's do what we can in the House of Representatives to educate people on this particular issue.

Again, I remind my friends, on the government shutdown issue, we are probably going to put something on the floor and give you a chance to help on the border because you seem so anxious to do it.

We certainly hope that Senator MCCONNELL—and I know he is working in good faith; I have great respect for Senator MCCONNELL—adds some border security to whatever the Senate does.

I hope we do what we did on the debt ceiling: Sit down, negotiate, find some common elements.

I thank my friend for reading all the Republicans that think a government shutdown is a bad idea. He probably didn't know that the Speaker thinks that, too. Most of us on our side do.

How you avoid that, how you fund the government, what other things you do, is another matter entirely. We are working on that, and we will see how the weekend goes.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, before I yield back the balance of my time, I once again thank my friend for a robust debate. I look forward to working with him on the Ukrainian issue on a variety of fronts going forward.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my friends who care about Ukraine to look at the Defense bill, as well. It needs to pass. If you are worried about \$300 million, it is a lot more important to pass an \$880 billion bill that defends our country and puts us in a position to defend liberty. Do that and you will help Ukraine, and we can help them separately with these funds.

I will work with my friends on the supplemental.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 730 OFFERED BY  
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

Strike sections 2 and 3 (and redesignate the following sections accordingly).

In section 2 (as redesignated), strike “section 5” and insert “section 3”.

In section 3 (as redesignated), strike “section 4” and insert “section 2”.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 214, nays 210, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 456]

YEAS—214

Aderholt	Gallagher	Miller-Meeks
Alford	Garbarino	Mills
Allen	Garcia, Mike	Molinaro
Amodei	Gimenez	Moolenaar
Armstrong	Good (VA)	Mooney
Arrington	Gooden (TX)	Moore (AL)
Babin	Granger	Moore (UT)
Bacon	Graves (LA)	Moran
Baird	Graves (MO)	Murphy
Balderson	Green (TN)	Nehls
Banks	Greene (GA)	Newhouse
Barr	Griffith	Norman
Bean (FL)	Grothman	Nunn (IA)
Bentz	Guest	Oberholte
Bergman	Guthrie	Ogles
Bice	Hageman	Owens
Biggs	Harris	Palmer
Bilirakis	Harshbarger	Pence
Bishop (NC)	Hern	Perry
Boebert	Higgins (LA)	Pfluger
Bost	Hill	Posey
Brecheen	Hinson	Reschenthaler
Buchanan	Houchin	Rodgers (WA)
Buck	Hudson	Rogers (AL)
Bucshon	Huizenga	Rogers (KY)
Burchett	Hunt	Rose
Burgess	Issa	Rosendale
Burlison	Jackson (TX)	Rouzer
Calvert	James	Roy
Cammack	Johnson (LA)	Rutherford
Carey	Johnson (OH)	Salazar
Carl	Johnson (SD)	Santos
Carter (GA)	Jordan	Scalise
Chavez-DeRemer	Joyce (OH)	Schweikert
Ciscomani	Joyce (PA)	Scott, Austin
Cline	Kean (NJ)	Self
Cloud	Kelly (MS)	Sessions
Clyde	Kelly (PA)	Simpson
Cole	Kiggans (VA)	Smith (MO)
Collins	Kiley	Smith (NE)
Crane	Kim (CA)	Smith (NJ)
Crawford	Kustoff	Smucker
Crenshaw	LaHood	Spartz
Curtis	LaLota	Staubert
D'Esposito	LaMalfa	Steel
Davidson	Lamborn	Stefanik
De La Cruz	Langworthy	Steil
DesJarlais	Latta	Steube
Diaz-Balart	LaTurner	Strong
Donalds	Lawler	Tenney
Duarte	Lee (FL)	Thompson (PA)
Duncan	Lesko	Tiffany
Dunn (FL)	Letlow	Timmons
Edwards	Loudermilk	Turner
Ellzey	Lucas	Valadao
Emmer	Luetkemeyer	Van Drew
Estes	Luttrell	Van Dwyne
Ezell	Mace	Van Orden
Fallon	Malliotakis	Wagner
Feenstra	Mann	Walberg
Ferguson	Massie	Waltz
Finstad	Mast	Weber (TX)
Fischbach	McCarthy	Webster (FL)
Fitzgerald	McCaul	Wenstrup
Fitzpatrick	McClain	Westerman
Fleischmann	McClintock	Williams (TX)
Flood	McCormick	Wilson (SC)
Franklin, C.	McHenry	Wittman
Scott	Meuser	Womack
Fry	Miller (IL)	Yakym
Fulcher	Miller (OH)	Zinke
Gaetz	Miller (WV)	

NAYS—210

Adams	Carter (LA)	Cuellar
Aguilar	Cartwright	Davids (KS)
Alfred	Casas	Davis (IL)
Auchincloss	Case	Davis (NC)
Balint	Casten	Dean (PA)
Barragán	Castor (FL)	DeGette
Beatty	Castro (TX)	DeLauro
Bera	Cherfilus	DelBene
Beyer	McCormick	Deluzio
Bishop (GA)	Chu	DeSaulnier
Blumenauer	Clark (MA)	Dingell
Blunt Rochester	Clarke (NY)	Doggett
Bonamici	Cleaver	Escobar
Bowman	Clyburn	Eshoo
Boyle (PA)	Cohen	Espallat
Brown	Connolly	Evans
Brownley	Correa	Fletcher
Budzinski	Costa	Foster
Caraveo	Courtney	Foushee
Carbajal	Craig	Frankel, Lois
Cárdenas	Crockett	Frost
Carson	Crow	Gallego

Garamendi	Lynch	Sánchez
Garcia (IL)	Magaziner	Sarbanes
Garcia (TX)	Manning	Scanlon
Garcia, Robert	Matsui	Schakowsky
Golden (ME)	McBath	Schiff
Goldman (NY)	McClellan	Schneider
Gomez	McCollum	Scholten
Gonzalez,	McGarvey	Schrier
Vicente	McGovern	Scott (VA)
Gottheimer	Meeks	Scott, David
Green, Al (TX)	Menendez	Sewell
Grijalva	Meng	Sherman
Harder (CA)	Mfume	Sherrill
Hayes	Moore (WI)	Slotkin
Higgins (NY)	Morelle	Smith (WA)
Himes	Moskowitz	Sorensen
Horsford	Moulton	Soto
Houlahan	Mrvan	Spanberger
Ogles	Mullin	Stansbury
Hoyer	Nadler	Stanton
Hoyle (OR)	Napolitano	Stevens
Huffman	Neal	Strickland
Ivey	Neguse	Swalwell
Jackson (IL)	Nickel	Sykes
Jackson (NC)	Norcross	Takano
Jackson Lee	Ocasio-Cortez	Thanedar
Jacobs	Omar	Thompson (CA)
Jayapal	Pallone	Thompson (MS)
Jeffries	Panetta	Titus
Johnson (GA)	Pappas	Tlaib
Kamllager-Dove	Pascarell	Tokuda
Kaptur	Payne	Tonko
Keating	Pelosi	Torres (CA)
Kelly (IL)	Perez	Torres (NY)
Khanna	Peters	Trahan
Kildee	Pettersen	Trone
Kilmer	Phillips	Underwood
Kim (NJ)	Pingree	Vargas
Krishnamoorthi	Pocan	Vasquez
Kuster	Porter	Veasey
Landsman	Pressley	Velázquez
Larsen (WA)	Quigley	Wasserman
Larson (CT)	Ramirez	Schultz
Lee (CA)	Raskin	Waters
Lee (NV)	Ross	Watson Coleman
Lee (PA)	Ruiz	Wexton
Leger Fernandez	Ruppersberger	Wild
Levin	Ryan	Williams (GA)
Lieu	Salinas	Wilson (FL)
Lofgren		

NOT VOTING—9

Bush	Foxx	Luna
Carter (TX)	Gonzales, Tony	Peltola
Comer	Gosar	Williams (NY)

□ 1621

Messrs. JACKSON of Illinois and Pascarell changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. WEBER of Texas and Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 217, noes 211, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 457]

AYES—217

Aderholt	Baird	Biggs
Alford	Balderson	Bilirakis
Allen	Banks	Bishop (NC)
Amodei	Barr	Boebert
Armstrong	Bean (FL)	Bost
Arrington	Bentz	Brecheen
Babin	Bergman	Buchanan
Bacon	Bice	Buck

Bucshon  
Burchett  
Burgess  
Burlison  
Calvert  
Cammack  
Carey  
Carl  
Carter (GA)  
Chavez-DeRemer  
Ciscomani  
Cline  
Cloud  
Clyde  
Cole  
Collins  
Comer  
Crane  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Curtis  
D'Esposito  
Davidson  
De La Cruz  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Donalds  
Duarte  
Duncan  
Dunn (FL)  
Edwards  
Ellzey  
Emmer  
Estes  
Ezell  
Fallon  
Feenstra  
Ferguson  
Finstad  
Fischbach  
Fitzgerald  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Flood  
Foxx  
Franklin, C.  
Scott  
Fry  
Fulcher  
Gaetz  
Gallagher  
Garbarino  
Garcia, Mike  
Gimenez  
Good (VA)  
Gooden (TX)  
Gosar  
Granger  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green (TN)  
Greene (GA)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guest

## NOES—211

Adams  
Aguilar  
Allred  
Auchincloss  
Balint  
Barragán  
Beatty  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Blunt Rochester  
Bonamici  
Bowman  
Boyle (PA)  
Brown  
Brownley  
Budzinski  
Caraveo  
Carbajal  
Cardenas  
Carson  
Carter (LA)  
Cartwright  
Casar  
Case  
Casten  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Cherfilus-  
McCormick  
Chu

Guthrie  
Hageman  
Harris  
Harshbarger  
Hern  
Higgins (LA)  
Hill  
Hinson  
Houchin  
Hudson  
Huizenga  
Hunt  
Issa  
Jackson (TX)  
James  
Johnson (LA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson (SD)  
Jordan  
Joyce (OH)  
Joyce (PA)  
Kean (NJ)  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
Kiggans (VA)  
Kiley  
Kim (CA)  
Kustoff  
LaHood  
LaLota  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Langworthy  
Latta  
LaTurner  
Lawler  
Lee (FL)  
Lesko  
Letlow  
Loudermilk  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Luttrell  
Mace  
Malliotakis  
Mann  
Massie  
Mast  
McCarthy  
McCaul  
McClain  
McClintock  
McCormick  
McHenry  
Meuser  
Miller (IL)  
Miller (OH)  
Miller (WV)  
Miller-Meeks  
Mills  
Molinaro  
Moolenaar  
Mooney  
Moore (AL)  
Moore (UT)

Moran  
Murphy  
Newhouse  
Norman  
Nunn (IA)  
Oberholte  
Ogles  
Owens  
Palmer  
Pence  
Perry  
Pfluger  
Posey  
Reschenthaler  
James  
Rodgers (WA)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rose  
Rosendale  
Rouzer  
Roy  
Rutherford  
Salazar  
Santos  
Scalise  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Self  
Sessions  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smucker  
Spartz  
Stauber  
Steel  
Stefanik  
Steil  
Steube  
Strong  
Tenneny  
Thompson (PA)  
Tiffany  
Timmons  
Turner  
Valadao  
Van Drew  
Van Duynne  
Van Orden  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Waltz  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams (NY)  
Williams (TX)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Yakym  
Zinke

Frost  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Garcia (IL)  
Garcia (TX)  
Garcia, Robert  
Golden (ME)  
Goldman (NY)  
Gomez  
Gonzalez,  
Vicente  
Gottheimer  
Green, Al (TX)  
Grijalva  
Harder (CA)  
Hayes  
Higgins (NY)  
Himes  
Horsford  
Houlahan  
Hoyer  
Hoyle (OR)  
Huffman  
Ivey  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson (NC)  
Jackson Lee  
Jacobs  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Kamlager-Dove

Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Khanna  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kim (NJ)  
Krishnamoorthi  
Kuster  
Landsman  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lee (CA)  
Lee (NV)  
Lee (PA)  
Leger Fernandez  
Levin  
Lieu  
Lofgren  
Lynch  
Magaziner  
Manning  
Matsui  
McBath  
McClellan  
McCollum  
McGarvey  
McGovern  
Meeks  
Menendez  
Meng  
Mfume  
Moore (WI)  
Morelle  
Moskowitz  
Moulton  
Mrvan  
Mullin  
Nadler  
Napolitano

Bush  
Carter (TX)

Neal  
Neguse  
Nehls  
Nickel  
Norcross  
Ocasio-Cortez  
Omar  
Pallone  
Panetta  
Pappas  
Pascrell  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perez  
Peters  
Pettersen  
Phillips  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Porter  
Pressley  
Quigley  
Ramirez  
Raskin  
Ross  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Ryan  
Salinas  
Sánchez  
Sarbanes  
Scanlon  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Scholten  
Schrier  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Sewell

## NOT VOTING—5

Gonzales, Tony  
Luna

□ 1629

So the resolution was agreed to.  
The result of the vote was announced  
as above recorded.  
A motion to reconsider was laid on  
the table.

## 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 Texas (Mr. WEBER) kindly take the chair.

□ 1635

## 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. WEBER of Texas (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on the legislative day of Wednesday, September 27, 2023, amendment No. 80 printed in part B of House Report 118–216 offered by gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MALLIOTAKIS) had been disposed of.

## 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. 66 by Mr. NORMAN of South Carolina.

Amendment No. 67 by Mr. NORMAN of South Carolina.

Amendment No. 69 by Mr. NORMAN of South Carolina.

Amendment No. 74 by Mr. ROSENDALE of Montana.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote in this series.

## AMENDMENT NO. 66 OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 66, printed in part B of House Report 118–216 offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN), 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 will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 169, noes 261, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 458]

## AYES—169

Aderholt	Finstad	LaTurner
Alford	Fischbach	Lesko
Allen	Fitzgerald	Letlow
Armstrong	Flood	Loudermilk
Arrington	Foxx	Luetkemeyer
Babin	Franklin, C.	Luttrell
Balderson	Scott	Mace
Banks	Fry	Malliotakis
Barr	Fulcher	Mann
Bean (FL)	Gaetz	Massie
Bentz	Gallagher	Mast
Bergman	Garcia, Mike	McCaul
Bice	Gimenez	McClain
Biggs	Good (VA)	McClintock
Bilirakis	Gooden (TX)	McCormick
Bishop (NC)	Gosar	McHenry
Boebert	Granger	Meuser
Bost	Graves (LA)	Miller (IL)
Brecheen	Graves (MO)	Miller (WV)
Buck	Green (TN)	Mills
Burchett	Greene (GA)	Moolenaar
Burgess	Grothman	Mooney
Burlison	Guest	Moore (AL)
Cammack	Guthrie	Moore (UT)
Carey	Hageman	Murphy
Carl	Harris	Nehls
Carter (GA)	Harshbarger	Norman
Cline	Hern	Ogles
Cloud	Higgins (LA)	Palmer
Clyde	Hill	Pence
Collins	Houchin	Perry
Comer	Hudson	Pfluger
Crane	Huizenga	Posey
Crawford	Hunt	Radewagen
Curtis	Issa	Reschenthaler
Davidson	Jackson (TX)	Rodgers (WA)
De La Cruz	Johnson (LA)	Rogers (AL)
DesJarlais	Johnson (OH)	Rose
Donalds	Johnson (SD)	Rosendale
Duarte	Jordan	Rouzer
Duncan	Joyce (PA)	Roy
Dunn (FL)	Kelly (MS)	Rutherford
Emmer	Kustoff	Santos
Estes	LaHood	Scalise
Ezell	LaMalfa	Schweikert
Fallon	Lamborn	Self
Feenstra	Langworthy	Sessions
Ferguson	Latta	Smith (MO)