

health crisis must be addressed, and unfortunately, President Biden and his appointed border czar, Vice President HARRIS, have been missing in action.

For the sake of all involved, more must be done.

□ 1600

TEXAS ANTI-ABORTION LAW

(Mr. RASKIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I rise in very strong support of the Women's Health Protection Act.

Today in Texas a law has been put into place that transforms essentially everyone in the country into potential bounty hunters who can go and collect \$10,000 by reporting on doctors, nurses, or family members who helped a woman exercise her constitutional right to seek an abortion in consultation with her physician.

There is not even an exception for rape and incest under the draconian Texas anti-abortion law. A 15-year-old girl could be raped by her father or her uncle and then have her mother go and take her to get an abortion, and the rapist—her father or uncle—could sue them for \$10,000. Or anybody could sue them for \$10,000.

We need to codify *Roe v. Wade* and Planned Parenthood v. Casey to guarantee the constitutional rights of women against the new onslaught against reproductive freedom and women's healthcare in the United States.

OPPOSING THE ABORTION ON DEMAND UNTIL BIRTH ACT

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

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong opposition to the Democrats' abortion on demand until birth act, because as a father of four and foster parent, I am reminded each day that every life is precious and must be protected.

For me, a huge part of my pro-life story is my son Isaac. Isaac was born with Down syndrome, and he brings so much joy to our family. That is why it breaks my heart that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are promoting this legislation that would allow for discriminatory abortions on the basis of sex, race, and disability.

It is disgraceful that there are people in this very Chamber who don't believe that children like my son deserve the right to life. To perform abortion violence on defenseless babies is unthinkable, and it is especially horrifying that this legislation would allow abortion up until the moment of birth.

This is not the direction our country should be headed, and 80 percent of Americans agree. I will be voting against the Democrats' abortion on demand until birth act because this legislation is nothing less than barbaric.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do the same.

ARMY STAFF SERGEANT RYAN KNAUSS

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

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker, this is a photo of United States Army Staff Sergeant Ryan Knauss. He was one of the 13 servicemembers killed outside the Kabul Airport on August 26.

Staff Sergeant Knauss grew up where I live in Corryton, Tennessee. He always dreamed of joining the American military and did so after graduating from Gibbs High School.

When the Taliban rapidly took control of Afghanistan last month, it created a dangerous situation for American citizens and our allies in the country. In response, our military ramped up its presence at Hamid Karzai International Airport to assist with the evacuation efforts. Staff Sergeant Knauss, who previously served a 9-month deployment in Afghanistan, volunteered to go back for this mission.

Outside that airport was where Staff Sergeant Knauss would selflessly give his life so civilians could escape to safety. He was there helping complete strangers, but this wasn't out of character for him. He loved helping people, and he died doing it.

Following his death, Staff Sergeant Knauss returned home to east Tennessee for a memorial service on September 11. Hundreds from our community lined the procession route in honor of his heroism. And this afternoon, at Arlington National Cemetery, Staff Sergeant Knauss was laid to rest.

Look one more time at this picture behind me. This is what a true American hero looks like. It is not somebody who dribbles a basketball or hits a baseball or throws a football or acts or sings on stage. Remember the last American military casualty from the war in Afghanistan. Remember Staff Sergeant Ryan Knauss.

DEBT CEILING

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

Mr. HERN. Mr. Speaker, since gaining complete control of the U.S. Federal Government with the presidency, a narrow majority in the House, and the deciding vote in an equally split Senate, Democrats have started on a big and historic deficit spending spree. The national debt exceeds \$28.7 trillion, and it is growing fast. There is no end in sight.

To continue doing what the government has done for decades—recklessly spending money with no regard to the impact on future generations—is the coward's way out. True leadership takes courage. It doesn't take much ef-

fort to stand here today and tell you about how stupid this kind of spending is, Mr. Speaker. The real challenge is actually doing something about it. Writing a budget, passing the budget, and appropriating money according to the budget is a process we have not completed on time since the nineties.

Secretary Treasurer Janet Yellen recently said that failing to raise the debt ceiling risked "irreparable harm to the U.S. economy and the livelihoods of all Americans."

Ignoring their own Treasury Secretary's warning, Democrats decided to leave the debt ceiling increase out of their partisan budget reconciliation bill, risking financial disaster for the entire Nation.

I recently led a letter to over 100 colleagues asking them to suspend this continuing resolution. While the Democrats want to wave a magic wand and pretend the debt doesn't exist, our debts are very real. Our Democrat colleagues need to do something about this.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLUMENAUER). Members are reminded to heed the gavel.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3755, WOMEN'S HEALTH PROTECTION ACT OF 2021; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4350, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2022; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5305, EXTENDING GOVERNMENT FUNDING AND DELIVERING EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE ACT; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Ms. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 667 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 667

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3755) to protect a person's ability to determine whether to continue or end a pregnancy, and to protect a health care provider's ability to provide abortion services. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4350) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2022 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other

purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Armed Services now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117-13, modified by the amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services or their respective designees; (2) the further amendments described in section 3 of this resolution; (3) the amendments en bloc described in section 4 of this resolution; and (4) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. After debate pursuant to section 2 of this resolution, each further amendment printed in part C of the report of the Committee on Rules not earlier considered as part of amendments en bloc pursuant to section 4 of this resolution shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before the question is put thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

SEC. 4. It shall be in order at any time after debate pursuant to section 2 of this resolution for the chair of the Committee on Armed Services or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of further amendments printed in part C of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

SEC. 5. All points of order against the further amendments printed in part C of the report of the Committee on Rules or amendments en bloc described in section 4 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 6. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5305) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2022, and for providing emergency assistance, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 7. (a) At any time through the legislative day of Friday, September 24, 2021, the Speaker may entertain motions offered by the Majority Leader or a designee that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV with respect to multiple measures described in subsection (b), and the

Chair shall put the question on any such motion without debate or intervening motion.

(b) A measure referred to in subsection (a) includes any measure that was the object of a motion to suspend the rules on the legislative day of July 26, 2021, July 27, 2021, or September 21, 2021, in the form as so offered, on which the yeas and nays were ordered and further proceedings postponed pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX.

(c) Upon the offering of a motion pursuant to subsection (a) concerning multiple measures, the ordering of the yeas and nays on postponed motions to suspend the rules with respect to such measures is vacated to the end that all such motions are considered as withdrawn.

SEC. 8. (a) Notwithstanding clause 8 of rule XX or section 7 of House Resolution 555, further proceedings on a vote by the yeas and nays on the question of adoption of a motion that the House suspend the rules offered on the legislative day of July 26, 2021, or July 27, 2021, may continue to be postponed through the legislative day of October 1, 2021.

(b) Notwithstanding clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on a vote by the yeas and nays on the question of adoption of a motion that the House suspend the rules offered on the legislative day of September 21, 2021 may be postponed through the legislative day of October 1, 2021.

SEC. 9. House Resolution 188, agreed to March 8, 2021 (as most recently amended by House Resolution 555, agreed to July 27, 2021), is amended by striking "September 22, 2021" each place it appears and inserting (in each instance) "October 27, 2021".

SEC. 10. The ordering of the yeas and nays on the motion that the House suspend the rules and pass S. 2382 is vacated to the end that the motion be considered as withdrawn.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1615

Ms. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 667, providing for consideration of three measures.

First, H.R. 3755, the Women's Health Protection Act, under a closed rule. The rule self-executes a manager's amendment from Chairman PALLONE, provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and provides one motion to recommit.

The rule also provides for the consideration of H.R. 4350, the National Defense Authorization Act, under a struc-

tured rule. The rule self-executes a manager's amendment from Chairman SMITH, provides 1 hour of debate on the bill equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, and provides one motion to recommit. The rule makes in order 476 amendments, provides en bloc authority, and provides one motion to recommit.

The rule further provides for consideration of H.R. 5305, the Extending Government Funding and Delivering Emergency Assistance Act, under a closed rule. The rule provides 1 hour of debate on the bill equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, and provides one motion to recommit.

The rule provides the majority leader or his designee the ability to en bloc requested roll call votes on certain suspension bills through September 24. Requested roll call votes on certain suspension bills may be postponed through October 1.

Finally, the rule extends recess instructions, suspension authority, and same day authority to October 27 and provides that the ordering of the yeas and nays on the motion that the House suspend the rules and pass S. 2382 is vacated.

Mr. Speaker, I stand in support of the three bills in this rule, H.R. 4350, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2022; H.R. 5305, the continuing resolution; and H.R. 3755, the Women's Health Protection Act.

I want to start by recognizing the contributions of the North Carolinians and all American servicemembers who served in Afghanistan over the past 20 years. Your sacrifices will never be forgotten.

It is in honor of these American heroes that I am proud to support the Fiscal Year 2022 National Defense Authorization Act. This bill invests in our servicemembers and their families and ensures that the United States is ready to confront future threats to our Nation.

This NDAA provides our men and women in uniform with a 2.7 percent pay increase; makes critical changes to how the military addresses sexual assault; and improves TRICARE coverage and benefits, including by removing cost sharing for contraceptive coverage.

I am grateful that three of my amendments were made in order. Two of these amendments aim to support military women and families by requiring reports on access to menstrual products and accommodations and on potential TRICARE coverage of preconception and prenatal genetic carrier screening tests.

My other amendment expands the definition of PFAS to better align with the current science. This change will help keep our servicemembers and all Americans safe from toxic chemicals.

In addition to supporting our military personnel, this legislation supports American innovation through a 32 percent increase in defense-wide research, development, testing, and evaluation. It also ensures that our HBCUs and other minority institutions are more able to contribute to DOD research and development.

Finally, this bill continues our commitment to supporting our Afghan allies by authorizing \$500 million for the Department of Defense to support the relocation of at-risk Afghans.

The continuing resolution included in this rule also supports efforts to evacuate our allies from Afghanistan. Afghans arriving to the U.S. or awaiting processing overseas need medical care, food, housing, and other assistance. This funding will ensure the government agencies involved in the resettlement process have the capacity necessary to help our Afghan allies build new lives in safety in the United States.

In addition, the continuing resolution ensures that our government remains funded, raises the debt ceiling, and provides relief to areas devastated by Hurricane Ida and other natural disasters.

Democrat or Republican, we are all Americans. We all benefit when our democracy and economy are healthy, and we all suffer when our country is in crisis.

Every Member in this body was elected to represent our fellow Americans. It would be a dishonor to the trust they bestowed upon us if we let the government shut down or allow the country to default on the full faith and credit of the United States.

This CR will provide much-needed relief to communities devastated by recent hurricanes and other disasters like the California wildfires.

Thousands of homes have been destroyed, and many Americans still have limited access to fresh water and electricity. Additional delays in relief could be the difference between life and death.

Lastly, this rule includes the Women's Health Protection Act, which safeguards reproductive freedom for people across this country.

Roe v. Wade has been the law of the land for nearly 50 years. With this bill, the House is stepping in following the Supreme Court's failure to uphold decades of American jurisprudence.

This bill affirms what our Constitution and international human rights bodies have long upheld: that access to reproductive care is central to health and equality. A woman living in Texas should have the same access to care as a woman living in California.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. Ross), my good friend, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to begin my remarks in a positive way by discussing H.R. 4350, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2022. I am glad that this bill has not been poisoned by all the partisanship that has plagued the House for the past year, and that, as they have done for the past 61 years, the House Armed Services Committee came together and produced a bill that both Republicans and Democrats can support. We saw this in the overwhelming 57-2 vote to report the bill out of committee.

This outcome wasn't always assured, Mr. Speaker. Unfortunately, President Biden proposed a defense budget number that was woefully inadequate for America's defense needs. At a time when we are facing new and emerging threats around the globe, from the Middle East, to Afghanistan, to the South China Sea, we cannot afford to underfund our national defense.

Chronic underfunding of national defense was a hallmark of the Obama-Biden administration, and it appears that President Biden himself is determined to continue down that path. Fortunately, both the House and Senate Armed Services Committees disagreed, and the House now has before it a bill that fully funds our defense needs for the coming fiscal year.

The bill before us funds continued acquisition of ships to ensure the U.S. Navy can meet its mission. It funds the procurement and development of new weapons systems, which ensures that our military will be well-prepared to meet any new and emerging challenges in the coming years. And it provides our servicemembers with a 2.7 percent pay raise.

And perhaps most important of all, it includes many provisions designed to provide much-needed oversight of President Biden's bungled withdrawal from Afghanistan. America deserves answers about the decisions that were made and the resulting failures of leadership that occurred at all levels. Thanks to this bill, they can be assured that they will get them.

And while I do not support every provision in the NDAA, I want to applaud the good work of the House Armed Services Committee. I think their process should serve as a model for all committees in the House. In an age when so much legislation is produced by one party behind closed doors in leadership offices, the committee did the hard work and produced a bill that both parties can support. Indeed, it is truly refreshing to be considering this bill today, and I want to commend Chairman ADAM SMITH and Ranking Member MIKE ROGERS for their good work and bipartisan working relationship.

Unfortunately, the next measure I will discuss isn't nearly so positive. This bill is a continuing resolution to fund the government through December 3, 2021. But rather than advancing a clean, negotiated CR, the majority is using the bill as a vehicle to push

through a suspension of the national debt limit. This is a nonstarter with Republicans, as the majority well knows and, as such, I expect all Republicans will oppose it.

Since taking control of the Presidency and the Senate in January, the majority has been on a spending spree unlike any other in our history. Earlier this year, the Democrats rammed through a partisan \$1.9 trillion reconciliation bill, ostensibly about COVID relief, but really about pushing forward a laundry list of progressive policies.

Last week, 13 authorizing committees met on another partisan reconciliation bill, this one larded up with a whopping \$3.5 trillion in progressive policies like those found in the Green New Deal. And sadly, even that wasn't enough for some committees, who, according to the CBO, spent more than double what the budget resolution told them to. These bloated spending measures come on top of normal Federal spending and on top of the large bipartisan COVID-19 relief packages passed last year.

The last suspension of the debt limit covered all the spending that was done in the past, along with the first 9 months of the Biden administration. But since then, the majority has opened the national checkbook. They have done so with only Democratic votes. That is their prerogative. After all, they control the White House, the House of Representatives, and the Senate.

But since the majority is spending this money over Republican objections, and without Republican cooperation, it is up to the majority to raise the debt limit. They should not expect Republican votes to help them cover their out-of-control spending.

Mr. Speaker, it is a sad state of affairs that what should be a relatively simple measure to fund the government is being used in this manner. I urge my friends across the aisle to rethink this plan, and I hope they will come to their senses before government funding runs out nine days from now.

Our last bill covered by this rule is somehow even more partisan and controversial than the CR. This is H.R. 3755, which the majority is pitching as a simple codification of the Supreme Court decision of Roe v. Wade. In reality, this measure goes far beyond that. It is the greatest threat to the protection of innocent, unborn life that we have seen in over 50 years.

The bill before us preempts any State law that seeks to protect life, including policies that those who identify as pro-choice support. Instead, every single State would be required to allow abortion on demand at any time up to the point of birth.

No more would States be able to protect conscience rights; no more would they be able to ban barbaric procedures like dismemberment abortions; and no more would they be able to prevent abortions targeting fetuses with Down

Syndrome, which 70 percent of the American people oppose.

I would call on all Members, Republicans and Democrats, to reject this measure.

Protecting the unborn has always been one of my highest priorities as a Member of Congress. We need only to look at the Declaration of Independence for a reminder that the right to life is one of those inalienable rights endowed upon all of us, even unborn children, by our Creator. I urge this House to remember those words, remember the unborn, and to reject this egregious attack on life.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to the rule and two of the underlying bills, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1630

Ms. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule and its underlying legislation. Specifically, I want to highlight H.R. 3755, the Women's Health Protection Act.

The passing of Ruth Bader Ginsburg just a year ago removed the last major impediment to an all-out assault by conservative extremists on the freedom of American women to make their own reproductive choices. With the culmination of a decades-long campaign to pack the Supreme Court with far-right abortion foes, championed by The Federalist Society and MITCH MCCONNELL, we have seen a tidal wave of legislation and court cases designed to overturn the constitutional protections outlined in *Roe v. Wade*.

Those efforts have included S.B. 8, the Texas bill outlawing abortion after 6 weeks and offering a bounty to vigilantes who seek to enforce that ban; the Supreme Court's refusal to block implementation of the Texas law; and the Court's scheduling of a December argument in a case that seeks to overturn *Roe v. Wade*. They all demonstrate a clear and present threat to women's reproductive rights in this country.

The decision to have, or not to have, a child is deeply personal and may profoundly impact a woman's mental, physical, and financial health and, in some instances, her very life. Women should have the freedom to make personal healthcare decisions with those they love and the doctors they trust, free from undue State interference and invasion of the woman's privacy.

With increasing attacks on women's reproductive freedom, we are once again seeing the urgent need for Federal legislation to codify *Roe v. Wade*. To ensure that *Roe*'s protections remain, we must absolutely pass the Women's Health Protection Act and protect a woman's freedom to choose a safe and legal abortion, no matter where she lives.

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

If we defeat the previous question, Mr. Speaker, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 4828, the Border Security for America Act, for immediate consideration.

The last couple of days have made it plainly obvious that the Federal Government has lost control of our southern border. More than 15,000 migrants have set up camp under the Del Rio International Bridge. Customs and Border Patrol have been completely overwhelmed, to the point that Texas Governor Abbott had to take things into his own hands and deploy both the National Guard and Texas Rangers to stop the flow.

Rather than allowing the President to simply fiddle, we must do something in Congress to address this unprecedented crisis. H.R. 4828 will address the ongoing crisis in three ways. It would require the immediate resumption of construction of the wall at the southern border; it would provide for new investments in technology; and it would ensure an appropriate level of Customs and Border Protection officers to fulfill CBP's mandate at all ports of entry and along the border.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PFLUGER), my good friend and a distinguished Member, to further explain the amendment.

Mr. PFLUGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the previous question. There is absolutely no denying that there is a crisis at our southern border.

I spent Saturday in Del Rio, Texas, where I would invite everyone in this House to go take a look for themselves at what I saw, nearly 15,000 people crammed under the bridge in unsafe, shanty-like structures after bum-rushing our border and getting into this country illegally. Meanwhile, the port of entry is closed, just a hundred yards from this bridge.

Most of these people are from the age of 18 to 35, but I spoke with many children, families, and even women who were expecting within the next day, multiple of whom have given birth this past week, all while suffering the sweltering heat, 100 degrees during that day.

You cannot fathom the horrific conditions—the rape, the assault, the crime, the drugs—right here on our border.

I spoke to migrants who told me that the U.S. border is easier to get into than that of Mexico, Honduras, El Salvador, and Guatemala. This is unacceptable and is a direct result of the Biden administration's disastrous crisis and policy at our border.

Just today, senior DHS officials have told us that the border is secure. It is not.

I am proud to join with Ranking Member KATKO and my colleagues on the Homeland Security Committee to offer a comprehensive border security solutions bill. It is time to stop playing political games with our security and with our immigration laws. We must return to policies that we know work to stem the flow of illegal immigration and regain operational control of our southern border.

Enough is enough. Something must be done. I urge my Democratic colleagues to call this what it is, a crisis, and to stand for our border security.

Ms. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a Military.com article entitled "Defense Bills Would Provide New Food Allowance for Low-Income Military Families."

[From Military.com, July 27, 2021]

DEFENSE BILLS WOULD PROVIDE NEW FOOD ALLOWANCE FOR LOW-INCOME MILITARY FAMILIES

(By Patricia Kime)

A House panel is weighing a \$770 billion defense policy bill that includes a provision to give lower-income military families a basic needs allowance—a stipend that advocacy groups say would relieve stress and "food insecurity" among U.S. troops.

The draft of the House's 2022 National Defense Authorization Act released Tuesday contains a provision similar to the Senate's proposal that would provide service members additional money for food and other basics if their household incomes do not exceed 130% of the federal poverty level—which in 2021 meant \$21,960 for a family of three, \$26,500 for a family of four, and slightly higher for even larger families.

This is the third time the proposal has been incorporated into the House defense policy bill; unlike previous years, it also has been included in the 2022 Senate defense bill, increasing the likelihood that it will pass later this year.

For an E-4 with several years in the military, a spouse and two children, the stipend could equate to roughly \$250 extra a month.

Advocates say the provision is needed as junior military service members face the stresses of supporting families in areas where spouse employment is low or childcare expenses make it difficult to pay monthly bills.

"When I got to the [Defense Department], I started talking about food insecurity, and I really did get a look that said to me, 'We really don't think we have a problem,'" Patty Barron, deputy assistant secretary of defense for Military Community and Family Policy, said at an event on military and veterans food insecurity Tuesday.

The data is mixed on the extent of food insecurity among military families. This year, the Defense Department's Quadrennial Review of Military Compensation found that an estimated 880 to 4,690 U.S. service members use the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP, a rate of between .08% and .42% of troops. Civilian usage of SNAP, also known as food stamps, is 9.6%.

Critics note, however, that the report pulled data from only two months in 2019, and the data does not include numbers from 40% of states, including several with large military populations such as California, Hawaii and Virginia.

"The reason we thought we didn't have a problem is, we were looking at the low SNAP numbers, and we believe we are compensating our people well, and if not, they will promote out of it and get those pay raises to solve the problem," Barron added.

"The department is much more aware of the issue now, and it is one of Secretary [Lloyd] Austin's biggest priorities," Barron said during the discussion hosted by the Center For Strategic and International Studies.

A survey released in May found that nearly 33% of more than 5,600 respondents at an unidentified Army installation were considered marginally food insecure, meaning they faced food hardship or had difficulties ensuring that their food budget stretched through the end of the month.

And according to a report from the organization Mazon: A Jewish Response to Hunger, one in eight military families experiences food insecurity compared with one in 10 in the U.S. civilian population.

"The mental health of our service members is key to their long-term connection to the military and the well-being of their families, and given that we find service members' mental health is associated with food insecurity, addressing food insecurity may be one way to address [mental health issues]," said Matthew Rabbitt, an economist with the USDA Economic Research Service, during the CSIS event.

The House Armed Services Personnel Subcommittee will consider its portion of the 2022 National Defense Authorization Act on Wednesday. The bill is expected to be debated by the full committee on Sept. 1 and must be reconciled with the Senate's version before it can become law.

The proposed legislation provides for a 2.7% pay raise for military personnel in 2022 and a number of other benefits, including an increase in parental leave for service members and designated caregivers as well as foster parents, expansion of the department's in-home, child-care pilot program and the establishment of an advisory council to support the services' Exceptional Family Member Programs.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is unconscionable that members of our armed services and their families are going hungry. I have heard about this in my home State of North Carolina, where there are food banks associated with military bases.

I am grateful that this 2022 NDAA will provide servicemembers additional money for food and other basic needs. No one in America should go hungry, especially those serving our country.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the Biden administration's reckless and dangerous policies have led to a crisis on the southern border, as the illegal flow of drugs, weapons, and people continues to threaten American communities.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. SPARTZ), my good friend and a distinguished Member, to speak more about this crisis and solutions contained in H.R. 4828.

Mrs. SPARTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my enormous dismay with the situation at our southern border.

I went to the border three times this spring and have seen firsthand the escalating human and national security crisis, but what I have seen from my colleagues going to the border this weekend is beyond any words.

Our government is becoming an accomplice to human and drug trafficking for Mexican cartels and is completely disregarding its duty to protect the American people.

I am an immigrant myself and value the contributions of immigrants to our country over the years, but what is happening at the border is an invasion of our country and complete lawlessness.

We are not an anarchy. We are a country with the rule of law. It is our duty as Congress to help the State of Texas protect our Republic. It is becoming even more urgent in light of the Afghanistan debacle and increased risk for terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so we can consider the Border Security for America Act.

Ms. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time. I also am most appreciative to the members of the Rules Committee, who have devoted an inordinate amount of time to bringing this legislation to the floor.

I am also appreciative for the consideration of three amendments that we will have in the NDAA.

Our first amendment, Homes for Heroes, requires the Department of Housing and Urban Development, as well as public housing agencies, to improve consideration of and reporting on the status of veterans.

Friends, outside of my office in Houston, there is an overpass. There are persons living under that overpass, some of whom claim to be veterans.

We need to know what is happening to our veterans in this country. We want to make sure everybody is given equal opportunities and equal access to the opportunities that we have in this country. But I especially am concerned about the veterans because, quite frankly, it hurts my heart to hear someone say, "I served my country, risked my life," and we find them sleeping under bridges. This will give us an opportunity to get more information on what is happening to them.

The second amendment is the Universal Residential Loan Application. This amendment will require housing enterprises to include a military service question on the Universal Residential Loan Application in a prominent position on the form.

This is done because many of our veterans are not aware of the VA loans that are available to them, and we want to make sure that before they sign that loan application, they understand that there are other opportunities available to them.

We also have an amendment that will deal with our merchant mariners. This amendment requires the Department of Veterans Affairs to distribute a payment to the U.S. merchant marines who engaged in qualified service during

World War II and who have not received their just desserts, in the sense of something positive, for something that they did for this country.

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

Ms. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, finally, the private student loan borrowers amendment, I am a cosponsor of this amendment with Representative ALMA ADAMS. This would extend the private student loan forbearance period to January 31, 2022, citing the COVID-19 pandemic as the rationale.

I think these amendments are exceedingly important. They are in this NDAA, and I will be supporting it in large part because these amendments are there, as well as for other reasons that I have not been able to discuss today.

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

Mr. Speaker, the crisis at the southern border is affecting communities across the United States, but nowhere is that more apparent than in those communities that are near the southern border.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TONY GONZALES), my good friend and a distinguished fellow member of the Appropriations Committee, to speak more about the need for the Border Security for America Act.

Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the humanitarian and national security crisis happening as we speak in my district.

The flood of migrants at the International Bridge in Del Rio has highlighted the vulnerabilities we have in both our immigration system and as a Nation. That is why I rise today to speak in opposition to the previous question.

We need much-needed commonsense reforms to provide the Border Patrol with more advanced technology, supplemental boots on the ground, and additional support to secure our southern border through infrastructure.

In order to prevent an event like this from happening again, there needs to be substantial policy changes.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the previous question.

Ms. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, to the members of the Rules Committee, I appreciate the hard work that you have put into getting this bill to the floor.

I am only going to speak about one issue in this particular NDAA, something that I have been working on for 10 years.

This is a helmet that was given to me by sexual assault victims in our military.

Since I started working on this issue, 200,000 soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen have been sexually assaulted in

the military, 20,000 a year. We have spent \$2 billion on programs in those 10 years that have yielded us nothing but more sexual assaults.

Finally, in this very bill, we are doing what we should have done 10 years ago. We are taking these cases out of the chain of command and making the decisions by those who are professionals, who are lawyers, who are trained, along with the investigators, so that we will have a situation where sexual assault victims feel like they can come forward and file their cases.

I have had too many servicemembers say to me that they were ready to fight against the enemy that was outside the wire; they never thought the enemy was going to be a fellow soldier.

I am grateful to all my Republican and Democratic colleagues who have recognized, finally, it is time to put their safety first.

□ 1645

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, it should be easy to agree that securing our southern border is vital for national security. Our next speaker will talk more about H.R. 4828 and the need for vital security improvements as part of an overall strategy to secure and protect the southern border.

I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. KATKO), the author of the bill, and the ranking Republican member on the Homeland Security Committee.

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the previous question and in support of immediately considering legislation I introduced with dozens of my colleagues to address the deadly, record-breaking crisis along the southwest border.

Specifically, this bill, H.R. 4828, requires the Department of Homeland Security to secure our Nation's borders through the immediate renewal of the border wall project that was initiated by the previous administration, major investments in security technologies, and increased hiring of frontline Border Patrol agents and Federal law enforcement officers.

The Border Security for America Act is a multifaceted solution to secure our borders and prioritize the safety of Americans.

As a result of President Biden's misguided and destructive border security policies, there were 208,887 encounters along the southwest border in August 2021. That is a 317 percent increase from the previous year.

August was the sixth straight month with more than 170,000 illegal encounters, a trend never before recorded. In a 24-hour period on August 1 of this year, the U.S. Border Patrol encountered over 5,900 individuals from 33 different countries trying to cross the border.

This is not seasonal migration from Northern Triangle countries, as this administration would have you believe. This is a self-inflicted disaster stemming from this administration's destruction of any semblance of border

security that began on President Biden's first day.

While many of us thought the border crisis couldn't possibly get any worse, just this week over 15,000 migrants illegally surged into Del Rio, Texas.

According to the recently departed chief of the Border Patrol, the front line is rapidly losing the situational awareness required to know who and what is entering our homeland. Border Patrol has already intercepted known or suspected terrorists trying to come across the border this year "at a level we have never seen before."

Illegal immigration is not the only threat along the border. This year CBP has already seized enough fentanyl at the border to kill every man, woman, and child in the United States seven times over. That is just what we caught at the border. Without adequate resources and personnel, fentanyl and other destructive drugs are able to flood into our communities all over this great Nation and poison our constituents, as has happened in my district in central New York.

In addition to ensuring preparedness along the border, the Border Security for America Act would resume construction of the border wall system, requiring the hiring and training of additional officers and agents to maintain an active-duty presence along the southwest border—something we don't have right now, an increased number of agricultural specialists, K-9 units, and support officers.

We know these policies work and that President Biden's negligence has already proven dangerous to our national security. That is why this bill has the support of the National Border Patrol Council, which represents 18,000 frontline Border Patrol agents and support staff. We are simply trying to provide the frontline agents with what they are asking for.

I often hear my friends on the other side of the aisle, whom I respect, accuse Republicans of complaining about problems without offering solutions. Well, here we are, giving you the opportunity to vote on a strong, commonsense solution to secure our borders and protect our communities.

I urge my colleagues to support the security of the United States and to support our frontline men and women by passing this bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, the fiscal year 2022 NDAA authorizes funding for cybersecurity investments in people, programs, and technology. It directs the executive branch to establish a cyber-threat information collaboration environment which will facilitate the transmission, sharing, and analysis of cyber-threat information, which is so crucial, particularly at this time.

This legislation implements key recommendations of the National Security Commission on Artificial Intelligence by authorizing funding for key AI-related initiatives, including invest-

ments in the workforce, emerging technologies research, and support for our small business contractors.

Additionally, the legislation authorizes funding to support biological threat reduction programs, requires a publicly available report on threats regarding weapons of mass destruction by China and Russia, and directs a report on biosecurity efforts across the Department of Defense, all needed and crucial investments.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), my good friend, and a fellow member of the Rules Committee, the Energy and Commerce Committee, and a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, the National Defense Authorization Act includes a provision requiring women now to register for the Selective Service. We all know that men have 30 days from their 18th birthday to register for the Selective Service in case a draft becomes necessary. Of course, we also know the last draft was during the Nixon administration in 1972.

We are fortunate to have an all-volunteer military force, and we know that our citizens unite in times of need. The Selective Service System has outlived its necessity.

However, since it remains a requirement, we must not fundamentally change the relationship between the government and the governed by adding a provision to add women to the draft in this massive defense bill.

A change of this magnitude requires its own vote by every Member representing their constituents. I supported an amendment to strike this language from the bill by the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. GREENE), but unfortunately the Democrats are not permitting its consideration on the floor.

I think this is a mistake. I think we should be heard. I think we should be transparent, we should be recorded, and then let's get on with the business of replacing the Selective Service System.

Ms. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for her leadership.

Let me make a proclamation here on the floor of the House, that when you have the responsibility of governing, you govern.

The President of the United States, President Biden, who believes in transformational government, the House and the Senate, the House under the leadership of Speaker PELOSI, the Senate under the leadership of CHUCK SCHUMER. You govern. Today, we are making an enforced, pointed, and open statement about governing.

Let me quickly start with the NDAA, the vehicle that helps the men and

women who put on the uniform unselfishly on our behalf. I am excited about the increase in quality-of-life dollars, the raise in personnel salaries, the concern about families. I am increasingly excited about cyber protection, and as well that we ask the hard questions about Afghanistan and how we will not see the return of such. But we are not afraid to govern by asking those questions so that we can move forward.

I am also excited about recognizing that the quality-of-life issues for our members in the military are important. The Jackson Lee amendments emphasize those points:

\$10 million to fight triple-negative breast cancer impacting our women in the United States military, particularly women of color.

\$2.5 million in PTSD. I have heard many times we give to PTSD, but it keeps growing and growing, and there are those in our constituency, our constituents who need these ongoing services. I have been working on this for a long time.

To recognize that we must treat our men and women that go into the United States military academies fairly. Does anyone know that they admit people with speech disorders? Good for them. But when they graduate, they are not given a command. My amendment, that I hope to become law, will determine that you analyze all of your military students to make sure they have a command when they graduate.

I am most excited about one that I will talk about quickly later.

And then, of course, we have done so much great work with the momnibus to look at maternal mortality rates for military members traveling around the world.

Space debris, to determine how we can remediate the risks and outline plans to reduce the incidence of space debris.

To be able to ensure that we stop students from being recruited when they go overseas to be engaged in spy operations. That happens. And we are glad to have that, as well as to begin looking at renaming some of these bases after historic African Americans.

Let me quickly say that amendment No. 194 should be one that we all come together on, tracing the history of the service of African Americans in the United States military, particularly in slavery, to recognize that they can be a vital legacy to the United States.

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

Ms. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I will talk further about that as we move into the NDAA, but let me talk about my original premise of governing.

The continuing appropriations is crucial, and I support the lifting of the debt ceiling not to spend money, but—when you have responsibility to govern, you govern—to pay our bills. Does anyone want to suggest that we should not?

I am looking for a few good men and women on the other side of the aisle that will stand with us as Americans and be responsible to our fellow Americans, governing, so that we can ensure we have a supplemental food program and other aspects of it, but we have to govern.

More response to COVID-19.

And finally, it is important to give women back their rights. *Roe v. Wade* is the law of the land, and we are going to pass that legislation along with my anti-stalking and vigilante bill because people are suffering with the Texas law. It has no place in society. It is a violation of the Constitution of the United States, and it should be quashed, with the *Roe v. Wade* codification. I ask the other body to support us in that. I ask everyone to support the underlying bills.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. JACKSON), my good friend, and a distinguished member of the House Armed Services Committee.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of one of the most important bills that comes before Congress, the NDAA. This year's NDAA follows the National Defense Strategy by modernizing our military, providing a pay raise for servicemembers, and restoring readiness.

This legislation will modernize our nuclear triad, supporting the work done at the Pantex plant in Amarillo.

The NDAA also includes provisions that will support Sheppard Air Force Base by funding the new fighter trainer and authorizing military construction for a new child development center.

Also included are countless provisions I authored that put servicemembers first and ensure the safety of all soldiers, airmen, marines, and guardians.

The NDAA continues efforts on the Future Vertical Lift to make sure we have a rotary aircraft that can operate in future conflicts with China or Russia.

As we consider amendments, I hope that this bill remains focused on national security and can be passed in a good-faith manner as we did almost unanimously in committee.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman SMITH and Ranking Member ROGERS for their leadership in putting together a bipartisan defense bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to highlight an amendment that is sponsored by several of our colleagues that will be in the NDAA and that we will hear more about this evening and tomorrow. It deals with PFAS, forever chemicals. We have debated issues about PFAS on this floor, but unfortunately members of our armed services sometimes end up being human guinea pigs for these PFAS.

This amendment will deal with many of these concerns. It directs the Secretary of Defense to provide DOD med-

ical providers with mandatory training with respect to the potential health effects of PFAS. We have seen this in North Carolina, particularly at Fort Bragg.

It requires the EPA to obtain analytical reference standards for PFAS, for the development of protocols and methodologies and enforcement activities.

It clarifies the scope of PFAS data reporting from the 2020 NDAA.

It amends title III, section 318 to clarify that DOD must comply with safe incineration of PFAS as enacted in section 330 of the NDAA of fiscal year 2020.

It requires the report on DOD progress to comply with EPA safe PFAS disposal guidelines, and it requires that this report be submitted one year after enactment of the act, and it includes that they report to the Committee on Armed Services.

□ 1700

It requires the report to include the actions the DOD has taken to comply with that section. It defines the scope of prohibition to ensure that PFAS materials sent to third-parties for disposal are also covered by the provisions.

It expresses the sense of Congress that the Air Force has contaminated real property with PFOS and PFOA chemicals, and it should use existing authority to acquire property and provide relocation assistance.

It requires a report detailing contamination sites and acquisition and relocation status.

It requires a national primary drinking water regulation for PFAS, and clarifies congressional intent by requiring manufacturers to disclose all PFAS discharges over 100 pounds.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER), my good friend and the distinguished ranking member of the Oversight Committee.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in opposition to certain PFAS-related provisions that are included in the National Defense Authorization Act.

While it is important to provide funding for cleanup, it is also critical that efforts to regulate PFAS do so in a way that defines the chemicals consistently, adequately, and properly as supported by sound science. In this current version of the NDAA, what is defined as PFAS is left open to interpretation or defined under an extremely broad definition.

Broad definition risks subjecting thousands of chemicals to unnecessary restrictions and create regulatory uncertainty for numerous products. A few products that could fall under this overly broad definition include lithium ion batteries, semiconductors, refrigerants, and medical devices. These products that could be impacted, provide critical benefits to our military

and our broader society and should be manufactured in the United States.

In the NDAA and with all legislation it is essential that we properly define PFAS up front so that implementing regulations can focus on materials such as PFOA and PFOS where there is scientific consensus for regulation. Throughout bicameral negotiations, I urge the careful consideration of drafting PFAS definitions that are properly focused, targeted, and supported by sound science.

Ms. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to point out some additional benefits of this NDAA in dealing with global challenges.

H.R. 4350 invests in tools to combat the unprecedented challenge of a global pandemic, racial inequities, and a deepening climate emergency.

The NDAA authorizes funding for national defense and prioritizes programs and policies to confront the growing threat of China and Russia.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. OBERNOLTE), my good friend.

Mr. OBERNOLTE. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned that the continuing resolution we are debating this afternoon includes a suspension of the limit on our national debt through the end of next year.

Our national debt is already at historic levels. In fact, today our national debt represents about \$85,000 for every American man, woman, and child, and it is going to get worse.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that at the rate we are going in just a few short years that debt will more than double, and just paying interest on that debt will consume 10 percent of everything our country makes.

Every other time we have considered raising this debt ceiling that conversation has been accompanied by a discussion of how we are going to pay that money back. But, unfortunately, that is not occurring today.

I have introduced a constitutional amendment that would require the Federal budget to be balanced, which would help us pay down this national debt over time. But absent discussion of getting our fiscal house in order, it is unconscionable to leave that legacy of debt to our children and kick the can down the road.

Mr. Speaker, I must urge a “no” vote.

Ms. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, there are additional wonderful amendments dealing with cybersecurity that are in the NDAA.

We will hear again about another cybersecurity training pilot program for the Department of Veterans Affairs for veterans and members of the Armed Forces transitioning from service to civilian life. It creates a registered apprenticeship program at the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency focused on cybersecurity and infra-

structure security. Both programs will be established in coordination with the Department of Defense.

We know that we do not have enough people in civilian life with this cybersecurity training as we face these threats like we saw in my home State of North Carolina with the Colonial Pipeline.

Having this transition from DOD to civilian life and having supportive apprenticeship programs will go a long way to fighting cybersecurity.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. JACOBS), my good friend.

Mr. JACOBS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4350, the National Defense Authorization Act.

Our Nation faces many challenges in the coming years, from the growing threat of terrorism brought on by our reckless withdrawal from Afghanistan to Chinese aggression.

This bill reverses defense cuts proposed by the Biden administration to fund our military and ensure our Nation can counter any threat.

It also addresses President Biden's disastrous withdrawal from Afghanistan by prohibiting financial support to the Taliban and allocating resources for counterterrorism operations.

In addition, it provides our troops a pay raise and supports the procurement of essential equipment.

Finally, the bill includes a bill I introduced to improve retention and readiness for providing opportunities for reservists, and the rule makes in order my amendment that will get more small and innovative companies access to DOD contracts.

Mr. Speaker, we face numerous challenges both today and in the future. This legislation prioritizes resources for our military at a critical time, and I urge its passage.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH), my very good friend and the distinguished Republican ranking member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for yielding.

For months, Democrats have been pursuing a radical partisan agenda that will pile on trillions to our debt, and we are here today where they are asking Republicans to basically help them get a loan.

They are pushing the most expensive piece of legislation in the history of the United States with the largest tax increase in the history of the United States. And yet Democrats are demanding we hold the door open so that they can ram through this partisan reckless agenda.

The debt limit is a chance for Congress to address government spending, something we have done since 1985.

Sadly, today, the Democrats are playing chicken with a government shutdown by tying the debt ceiling to a CR so they can enact their multi-trillion-dollar partisan tax and spending plan, which currently clocks in at \$4.3 trillion, no matter the harm it will do, no matter how it will fuel more inflation that is crippling family budgets.

Budget Republicans sent a letter to Congressional leaders back in July outlining over half a dozen approaches Congress has taken in the past to address government spending with a debt limit increase.

But they have ignored all of our suggestions, because the fact of the matter is my colleagues have one goal in mind, an agenda of more spending, more debt, and more taxes on working-class Americans.

Democrats control the White House, they control the Senate, and they control the House. If they want to spend trillions of Americans' tax dollars, they can stand alone and ask for that loan.

But Republicans will not cosign a loan for the Democrats' reckless agenda that harms working families, fuels more record inflation, and rewards their political allies and donors.

Ms. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from 101 faith-based religious and civil rights organizations expressing their support for H.R. 3755, the Women's Health Protection Act.

JUNE 16, 2021.

Hon. DICK DURBIN,
Chair, Senate Committee on the Judiciary,
Washington, DC.

Hon. RICHARD BLUMENTHAL,
Chair, Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on The Constitution,
Washington, DC.

Hon. CHUCK GRASSLEY,
Ranking Member, Senate Committee on the Judiciary,
Washington, DC.

Hon. TED CRUZ,
Ranking Member, Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on The Constitution,
Washington, DC.

101 FAITH-BASED, RELIGIOUS, & CIVIL RIGHTS ORGANIZATIONS EXPRESS SUPPORT FOR THE WOMEN'S HEALTH PROTECTION ACT

DEAR SENATORS DURBIN, GRASSLEY, BLUMENTHAL, CRUZ, AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS: As faith-based, religious, and civil rights organizations that share a commitment to religious freedom and the separation of religion and government, we write to express our strong and unequivocal support for S 1975, the Women's Health Protection Act.

We affirm our nation's founding principle of religious liberty, which is integrally bound to reproductive freedom. Religious liberty includes the right to follow one's own faith or moral code in making critical, personal reproductive health decisions, without political interference. While we respect the right of every individual, including our lawmakers, to hold their own personal and religious beliefs, our country's Constitution demands that no one impose a single religious viewpoint on all through civil law or regulation. The Women's Health Protection Act is essential legislation that embodies these shared ideals.

The Women's Health Protection Act is urgently needed. The nearly 500 abortion bans and restrictions enacted since 2011 have severely reduced or eliminated abortion access

in large swaths of the country and fall hardest on those who already face barriers to accessing health care—including women; Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC); those working to make ends meet; members of the LGBTQI+ community; immigrants; young people; those living in rural communities; and people with disabilities. The Women's Health Protection Act is an important bill that would enact protections on the federal level to safeguard access to high-quality care and to secure constitutional rights by protecting patients and providers from political or religious interference.

Rather than face onerous barriers due to their economic status, employment status, or zip code, this bill would ensure that each person can make a decision about abortion led by their own circumstances, faith, or beliefs. It would also protect the religious liberty of individual health care providers seeking to administer quality care to their patients and enable providers to deliver abortion services free from burdensome restrictions designed to impede access rather than improve patient health.

We believe in compassion, justice, and dignity for all, compelling us to speak out for social justice and the right of every person to access comprehensive, affordable, and equitable reproductive health care. A compassionate nation ensures equal access to quality, timely health abortion care for everyone, an essential factor to social and economic participation, reproductive and moral autonomy, and the right to determine our own lives. In contrast, laws that limit the availability of abortion disrespect human dignity, erode constitutional rights, exact far-reaching health and economic consequences, and ignore the moral agency of physicians seeking to provide compassionate care.

Furthermore, laws that eliminate options for some based on their geographic location are profoundly unjust, pushing care out of reach for the most marginalized among us. We cannot remain idle as state laws transform our country into a map of “haves and have-nots” with regard to access to reproductive health services. We call on Congress to pass Women's Health Protection Act to protect access to abortion and to help us build a society where all can participate equally and thrive in our communities with dignity.

Every day, we support equal, fair, and comprehensive access to health care and respect for personal decision-making. We support the Women's Health Protection Act as a means to this end and urge you and your colleagues to do the same. The 117th Congress must act in solidarity with people and communities fighting for racial, economic, and reproductive justice and commit to protecting the right of every person to make their own decisions about their bodies, free from discrimination and political interference. It is the right thing to do.

Please contact Shannon Russell, Legislative Counsel at the National Council of Jewish Women, with any questions or for additional information.

Respectfully,

National Council of Jewish Women, Catholics for Choice, Religious Coalition for Reproductive Choice, Union for Reform Judaism, Women of Reform Judaism.

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

A Critical Mass: Women Celebrating Eucharist; African American Ministers In Action (AAMIA); ALEPH: Alliance for Jewish Renewal; Ameinu; American Atheists; American Humanist Association; American Jewish World Service; Anti-Defamation League; Avodah; Bend the Arc; Jewish Action;

CenterLink: The Community of LGBT Centers; Central Conference of American Rabbis; Chicago Women-Church; Clergy Advocacy Board of Planned Parenthood Federation of America; CORPUS; Disciples Justice Action Network; Episcopal Women's Caucus; Freedom From Religion Foundation.

Global Justice Institute (MCC); Habonim Dror North America; Human Rights Campaign; Interfaith Voices for Reproductive Justice; Jewish Alliance for Law and Social Action; Jewish Council for Public Affairs (JCPA); Jewish Women International; Jews United for Justice; Keshet; Methodist Federation for Social Action; Metropolitan Community Churches (MCC); Moving Traditions; Muslim Advocates; Muslims for Progressive Values; National Center for Lesbian Rights; National Center for Transgender Equality; National Coalition of American Nuns (NCAN); National Organization for Women.

Network of Jewish Human Service Agencies; People For the American Way; Presbyterians Affirming Reproductive Options; Rabbinical Assembly; Reconstructing Judaism, Reconstructionist Rabbinical Association; Religious Institute; Society for Humanistic Judaism; Tivnu; Building Justice; T'ruah: The Rabbinic Call for Human Rights; Unitarian Universalist Women's Federation; United Church of Christ, Justice and Witness Ministries; Voices for Progress; We Testify; Women's Alliance for Theology, Ethics, and Ritual (WATER); Women's League for Conservative Judaism; Women's Ordination Conference.

STATE & LOCAL ORGANIZATIONS

Florida Interfaith Coalition for Reproductive Health and Justice; Jewish Community Action; Just Texas: Faith Voices for Reproductive Freedom; Michigan Organization on Adolescent Sexual Health (MOASH); Michigan Unitarian Universalist Social Justice Network (MUUSJN); National Council of Jewish Women, Arizona Section; National Council of Jewish Women, Atlanta Section; National Council of Jewish Women, Austin Section; National Council of Jewish Women, Chicago North Shore Section; National Council of Jewish Women, Cleveland Section; National Council of Jewish Women, Colorado Section; National Council of Jewish Women, Essex County Section; National Council of Jewish Women, Greater Dallas Section; National Council of Jewish Women, Greater Long Beach & West Orange County Section; National Council of Jewish Women, Greater New Orleans Section.

National Council of Jewish Women, Houston Section; National Council of Jewish Women, Jersey Hills Section; National Council of Jewish Women, Kansas City Section; National Council of Jewish Women, Maine Section; National Council of Jewish Women, Milwaukee Section; National Council of Jewish Women, Minnesota Section; National Council of Jewish Women, Nashville Section; National Council of Jewish Women, New York Section; National Council of Jewish Women, Northern Virginia; National Council of Jewish Women, Palm Beach Section; National Council of Jewish Women, Peninsula Section; National Council of Jewish Women, Pittsburgh Section; National Council of Jewish Women, Sacramento Section; National Council of Jewish Women, San Antonio Section; National Council of Jewish Women, Sarasota-Manatee Section; National Council of Jewish Women, Southeast Atlantic Section.

National Council of Jewish Women, South Cook Section; National Council of Jewish Women, St. Louis Section; Nebraska Religious Council for Reproductive Freedom; New Mexico Religious Coalition for Reproductive Choice; Ohio Religious Coalition for Reproductive Choice; PA Religious Coalition

for Reproductive Justice; Religious Coalition for Reproductive Choice of Connecticut, Inc.; Rhode Island Religious Coalition for Reproductive Freedom; Sister Reach; South Carolina Religious Coalition for Reproductive Choice; Texas Freedom Network; United Church of Christ Detroit Area Social Justice Team.

Ms. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the National Nurses United, dated September 21 expressing their resounding support for H.R. 3755.

The letter states: “On behalf of the 175,000 registered nurses represented by the National Nurses United, we write to you today to endorse the Women's Health Protection Act of 2021 sponsored by Representative CHU. We strongly urge you to vote ‘yes’ on this critical piece of legislation when it is brought to the floor of the House of Representatives.”

NATIONAL NURSES UNITED,

September 21, 2021.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: National Nurses United supports the right of all women and people who can get pregnant to full and equal healthcare services, including reproductive and family planning health services as a fundamental human right. On behalf of the 175,000 registered nurses represented by National Nurses United (NNU), we write to you today to endorse the Women's Health Protection Act of 2021 (HR 3755) sponsored by Representative Judy Chu. We strongly urge you to vote yes on this critical piece of legislation when it is brought to a vote on the floor of the House of Representatives.

The Women's Health Protection Act (WHPA) establishes a statutory right for health professionals to provide abortion care without any medically unnecessary restrictions or limitations that impede access to abortion. With increasing attacks on reproductive rights, it is critical that Congress swiftly takes steps to protect access to abortion and reproductive health care.

Nurses, the majority of whom are women, play an essential role in the delivery of reproductive health services for millions of patients every day, and we have a duty to advocate for the health and safety of our patients. Without access to abortion services, patients who are pregnant may be at risk of illness and death due to pregnancy, or may be at risk of avoidable complications from unsafe and illegal abortion practices. Further, access to quality reproductive healthcare allows people to make decisions for themselves on whether and when to have children, an essential component of equality that enables full participation in our society. Nurses know that unless we bring down the barriers to care, people will go without the necessary healthcare they deserve.

The decision to have an abortion is a decision that should be made between a person and their healthcare providers—it is not a decision that politicians have any right to be engaged in. Patients have the right to seek abortion care with the counsel of a trusted healthcare provider, regardless of where they live, and it is critical that Congress protects that right.

We urge you to stand with nurses and vote yes on HR 3755 to protect the right of all people to access abortion care and reproductive health services.

Sincerely,

BONNIE CASTILLO, RN,
Executive Director,
National Nurses
United.

DEBORAH BURGER, RN,

President, National Nurses United.
ZENEE CORTEZ, RN,
President, National Nurses United.
JEAN ROSS, RN,
President, National Nurses United.

Ms. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from 20 medical organizations, including the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, the American College of Physicians, and the American Medical Women's Association, to name a few, expressing their support for H.R. 3755, the Women's Health Protection Act.

JUNE 14, 2021.

Hon. RICHARD BLUMENTHAL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.
Hon. JUDY CHU,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR BLUMENTHAL AND REPRESENTATIVE CHU: On behalf of the undersigned medical organizations, representing physicians dedicated to advancing the health of our patients, thank you for introducing the Women's Health Protection Act (S. 1975/H.R. 3755). The purpose of your legislation—to protect the patient-physician relationship and preserve the ability of physicians to provide evidence-based care to their patients—is critically important.

Federal, state, and local lawmakers have long played an important role in our health care system. The myriad policies aimed at addressing the ongoing COVID-19 public health emergency provide a prime example of legislators acting to improve the health of their constituents. However, physician leaders have long raised concerns, including in a New England Journal of Medicine commentary nearly a decade ago, about the alarming increase in legislators "overstepping the proper limits of their role in the health care of Americans to dictate the nature and content of patients' interactions with their physicians." This overreach has taken many forms, including creating unnecessary obstacles for patients trying to access medically appropriate care, forcing physicians to practice outside the bounds of evidence-based medicine, and criminalizing physicians for providing compassionate and evidence-based care. The communities most impacted by these barriers are those already experiencing grave inequities in the health care system. The Women's Health Protection Act would address an area of medicine systematically targeted with government overregulation—reproductive health care—by prohibiting these inappropriate restrictions and restoring the ability of patients to receive comprehensive care free from legislative intrusion.

Thank you again for sponsoring this important legislation to prevent legislative interference in the practice of medicine and protect the patient-physician relationship.

Sincerely,

American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists; American Academy of Family Physicians; American Academy of Pediatrics; American College of Physicians; American Gynecological & Obstetrical Society (AGOS); American Medical Women's Association (AMWA); American Psychiatric Association; American Society for Reproductive Medicine; Council of University Chairs of Obstetrics and Gynecology (CUCOG); Infectious Diseases Society for Obstetrics and Gynecology (IDSOG).

North American Society for Pediatric and Adolescent Gynecology; Society of Academic

Specialists in General Obstetrics and Gynecology; Society for Adolescent Health and Medicine; Society of Family Planning; Society of Gynecologic Oncology; Society for Maternal-Fetal Medicine; Society of OB/GYN Hospitalists; Society of Reproductive Endocrinology and Infertility; Western Association of Gynecologic Oncologists (WAGO); Womxn's Health Collaborative.

Ms. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from 16 attorneys general expressing their support for H.R. 3755, the Women's Health Protection Act.

STATE OF NEW YORK,
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
June 16, 2021.

Hon. DICK DURBIN,
Chair, Senate Committee on the Judiciary,
Washington, DC.
Hon. RICHARD BLUMENTHAL,
Chair, Senate Committee on the Constitution,
Washington, DC.
Hon. CHUCK GRASSLEY,
Ranking Member, Senate Committee on the Judiciary,
Washington, DC.
Hon. TED CRUZ,
Ranking Member, Senate Committee on the Judiciary,
Subcommittee on the Constitution,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRS AND RANKING MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE AND SUBCOMMITTEE: As the Supreme Court has consistently recognized, "[t]he ability of women to participate equally in the economic and social life of the Nation has been facilitated by their ability to control their reproductive lives." Accordingly, laws that impose an undue burden on a woman's right to choose to terminate a pregnancy are unconstitutional. Nonetheless, many states across the country have enacted laws in the name of promoting women's health that do not, in fact, advance women's health or safety but are instead designed to restrict access to abortion services. These include laws requiring physicians have admitting privileges at hospitals and setting arbitrary requirements at women's health clinics for the size of procedure rooms and corridors. As the Attorneys General of our respective states, we write in support of the Women's Health Protection Act, which would protect the constitutional right to abortion by prohibiting medically unnecessary restrictions that specifically target abortion providers and undermine the availability of abortion services.

The Women's Health Protection Act (WHPA) targets onerous state laws that have been adopted in a concerted strategy to restrict access to abortion. In *Whole Woman's Health v. Hellerstedt*, 136 S. Ct. 2292 (2016), the Supreme Court ruled that a Texas law that required abortion providers to maintain admitting privileges at a local hospital failed to advance women's health and posed an undue burden on women seeking an abortion. Last year, a coalition of 22 attorneys general helped to win another victory in *June Medical Services v. Gee*, 140 S. Ct. 2103 (2020), in which the Supreme Court held that a similar law in Louisiana was unconstitutional. Rather than waiting for medically unnecessary restrictions to continue to be challenged in the courts—a process that can often take years—Congress should pass the WHPA to ensure that such restrictions are not imposed in the first place. Medically unnecessary restrictions targeting abortion providers actually disserve women's health and safety and pose challenges for states that aim to provide a full range of reproductive health services, including abortion services.

Often, strict requirements imposed on abortion providers are presented as measures to protect and advance women's health. Yet

evidence shows that these restrictions instead lead to worse health outcomes for women. One recent study in Texas found that the maternal mortality rate in the state doubled between 2010 and 2012, a period in which access to women's health care services, including abortion services, had become more difficult to obtain. Women who find themselves too far from an abortion provider may have to delay obtaining an abortion, which can lead to health risks and add to the cost of the procedure. Alternatively, some women may resort to "black market" or self-induced abortions, which can be extremely dangerous and lead to serious injury or even death. And women who are forced to carry a pregnancy to term after being denied abortion services are four times more likely to develop potentially life-threatening health conditions and are substantially more likely to experience physical violence from abusive partners or family members. These statistics illustrate the very real cost to women throughout the United States from burdensome laws that restrict the availability of safe and legal abortion care. The widely known negative effects of laws targeting abortion providers undermines any argument that such laws are intended to promote women's health.

At the same time, the consequences of these laws are already evident across the country. Research from 2017 found that thirty-eight percent of women between the ages of 15 to 44 live in counties without an abortion clinic. Between 2014 and 2017, twenty-five abortion clinics shuttered in the South and the Midwest. As of June 2019, six states have only a single abortion clinic remaining. As providers close due to the impact of medically unnecessary restrictions, women are likely to be forced to travel farther and make greater sacrifices to get access to services. Unfortunately, these burdens often fall disproportionately on lower-income women who cannot afford to travel, take time off work, or find childcare in order to get to the nearest provider.

As Attorneys General, we are committed to ensuring that each state satisfies its constitutional obligation to protect the right to choose to terminate a pregnancy within its borders. Among other things, we are deeply concerned about protecting the constitutional rights of our residents who may need medical care while present as students, workers, or visitors in states with drastically restricted abortion access. In addition, a substantial reduction in the availability of abortion services in some states can cause women to seek medical care in other states, thereby straining their health care systems. Indeed, history shows that many women will cross state lines, if they have the means to do so, when abortions are unavailable in the states where they live. For example, in the nearly three years between New York State's liberalization of its abortion laws in 1970 and 1973 when the United States Supreme Court in *Roe v. Wade* ruled that the right to choose was constitutionally protected, close to 350,000 women came to New York from other states where abortions were entirely or largely unavailable. In the wake of recent abortion restrictions, some states, including several of our own, have experienced a substantial influx of out-of-state patients seeking abortions as a result of reduced access in their home states.

Our states stand ready and willing to provide reproductive care services to those who need them. However, a significant and sudden increase in patients seeking abortions, especially as a consequence of laws that do not advance women's health and decrease available services, runs the risk of straining the health care systems of less restrictive states. This in turn can impair the availability of care and affect the reproductive

choices of both residents and non-residents alike in those states. Our states aim to continue providing a wide range of reproductive health care services, including abortion services, but our ability to do so could be substantially burdened by the responsibility of ensuring that all women in need of abortions are able to safely obtain one. The WHPA would address this problem by safeguarding access to abortion services in all states.

We support the passage of the WHPA given how it will help to restore and facilitate access to abortion services throughout the United States, upholding this critical constitutional right. We look forward to working with you and your committees as you consider this legislation. Please let us know how we may be of assistance during this process.

Sincerely,

Letitia James, New York Attorney General; Rob Bonta, California Attorney General; Philip Weiser, Colorado Attorney General; William Tong, Connecticut Attorney General; Kathleen Jennings, Delaware Attorney General; Karl A. Racine, District of Columbia Attorney General; Kwame Raoul, Illinois Attorney General; Aaron Frey, Maine Attorney General; Brian E. Frosh, Maryland Attorney General; Maura Healey, Massachusetts Attorney General; Aaron Ford, Nevada Attorney General; Hector Balderas, New Mexico Attorney General; Ellen F. Rosenblum, Oregon Attorney General; Thomas J. Donovan, Jr., Vermont Attorney General; Mark R. Herring, Virginia Attorney General; Bob Ferguson, Washington State Attorney General.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by thanking my good friend from North Carolina. We don't agree obviously on the rule, we don't agree on every piece of legislation, but I appreciate the civility and the quality of the debate.

Mr. Speaker, to me, as I look at both the rule and the underlying legislation, the phrase that immediately comes to my mind is the good, the bad, and the ugly.

Let's start with the good. There is no question that the National Defense Authorization Act is a product of bipartisan cooperation of the highest order on the House Armed Services Committee. Nobody got everything they wanted, but there are a lot of things in there that both sides worked together on to achieve. I particularly want to commend Chairman SMITH and Ranking Member ROGERS for the manner in which they approached this bill. I want to commend them for the additional \$25 billion. I know that the chairman didn't support that, but obviously many Democratic Members did. I think that was an important sign that the country is united on the idea that we need to spend more on defense in these very dangerous times.

Again, the quality of the compromise and some of the legislation that is included in this is extraordinarily important. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) mentioned the issue of sexual assault. It is addressed in this bill in a bipartisan, thoughtful way. I

thank her for her tireless work on that very important subject.

I also thank those Members that worked hard to reposition our defense where we focus on our emerging threats, our near-peer threats of China and Russia while also dealing with North Korea, Iran, and the threat of global terrorism.

It is a good bill. Not everybody will support it, but I think it will get overwhelming support on both sides of the aisle, and I look forward to voting for it.

To me, the bad is H.R. 3755. I make no bones about it, Mr. Speaker. I am strongly pro-life. I have a 100 percent pro-life voting record. I respect those with a different point of view, but this is not a codification of *Roe v. Wade*. This is a radical abortion bill that would allow abortion-on-demand in every State under almost any circumstances that the provider of the abortion deems appropriate.

Quite frankly, it is an enormous overreach, and it will overturn dozens of State laws in many States all around the country, laws that have been constitutionally approved in the past. That is unfortunate, and I think many on our side that certainly work on women's health are not going to vote in support of abortion-on-demand.

□ 1715

Mr. Speaker, finally, to me, the continuing resolution unquestionably is the ugly. It is not all ugly. There are actually some good things in there. I actually commend my friends for voting to keep the government open. I would normally do that as well. No partisan debate there, at least not from me.

I also very much support the relief for those Americans who have been the victims of natural disasters, which is contained in the bill. That, too, was negotiated by the Committee on Appropriations. It is an appropriate measure.

So, too, is the money set aside to help those fleeing from the Taliban, those who worked with our forces in Afghanistan and who now come to our country and to other countries seeking refuge and support. We should honor the commitment and the sacrifice they made on our behalf.

We could have passed a bill like that in a united, bipartisan fashion. Indeed, the Committee on Appropriations had essentially negotiated the deal. Then a decision was made by Democratic leadership to interject a debt ceiling resolution without any discussion, any negotiation, any way to lower that debt or offset it or slow it down or reform the process. That is what many of my friends object to.

I voted for debt ceiling increases in the past under both Republican and Democratic Presidents. I certainly would be prepared to do so again, but not without addressing some of the drivers of the debt, and certainly not as a sign off on a \$3.5 trillion reconciliation bill that is on top of our normal

appropriations, on top of the bipartisan release given and the coronavirus crisis thus far.

That is a stretch too far. My friends know that it won't work, yet we are going to kick it over to the Senate, where we know the support is not there.

Mr. Speaker, I suspect we will be back on this floor dealing with this matter again, hopefully in a fashion where the two parties can work together and keep the government open and operational.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question and "no" on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Following the withdrawal from Afghanistan, we have a solemn duty to provide for our servicemembers and to keep our promise to our Afghan allies. The fiscal year 2022 National Defense Authorization Act will do both.

This NDAA will also invest in our Nation's defense by promoting cutting-edge research and development, much of which happens at our institutions of higher education, such as those in North Carolina's Research Triangle.

We also must pass the continuing resolution in order to support our Afghan allies, provide relief to regions recovering from Hurricane Ida and other natural disasters, suspend the debt limit, and keep our government funded.

Finally, we must pass the Women's Health Protection Act to enable women across the country to access reproductive healthcare, including abortion care.

I want to highlight a discrepancy between the rhetoric and policies of opponents of reproductive freedom, particularly those from States like mine, including Texas. These opponents claim to be pro-life, to be working to protect families and babies, but almost always, these are the same people who oppose Medicaid expansion, universal childcare, and the expansion of the child tax credit.

In the United States today, babies that do not get prenatal care are five times more likely to die than babies that do get prenatal care. Prenatal care is one of the many critical forms of healthcare that Medicaid covers.

Medicaid also provides postpartum care coverage to new mothers, and the American Rescue Plan gave States the option to extend that coverage from 60 days to 12 months. Postpartum care is key to protecting new mothers from a variety of serious conditions that can develop after birth. Similarly, universal childcare and the child tax credit are investments in babies and in families.

Today, in America, supporting children and families means supporting Medicaid expansion, affordable childcare, tax benefits for families—all of which are included in the Build Back Better Act.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on the rule and the previous question.

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

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 667

At the end of the resolution, add the following;

SEC. 11. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 4828) to secure the international borders of the United States, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Homeland Security; and (2) one motion to recommend.

SEC. 12. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 4828.

Ms. ROSS. 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. COLE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 218, nays 210, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 263]

YEAS—218

Adams	Crist	Jacobs (CA)
Aguilar	Crow	Jayapal
Allred	Cuellar	Jeffries
Auchincloss	Davids (KS)	Johnson (GA)
Axne	Davis, Danny K.	Johnson (TX)
Barragán	Dean	Jones
Bass	DeFazio	Kahele
Beatty	DeGette	Kaptur
Bera	DeLauro	Keating
Beyer	DelBene	Kelly (IL)
Bishop (GA)	Delgado	Khanna
Blumenauer	Demings	Kildee
Blunt Rochester	DeSaulnier	Kilmer
Bonamici	Deutch	Kim (NJ)
Bourdeaux	Dingell	Kind
Bowman	Doggett	Kirkpatrick
Boyle, Brendan F.	Doyle, Michael F.	Krishnamoorthi
Brown	Escobar	Lamb
Brownley	Eshoo	Langevin
Bush	Espallat	Larsen (WA)
Bustos	Evans	Larson (CT)
Butterfield	Fletcher	Lawrence
Carbajal	Foster	Lawson (FL)
Cárdenas	Frankel, Lois	Lee (NV)
Carson	Galleo	Leger Fernandez
Carter (LA)	Garamendi	Levin (CA)
Cartwright	Garcia (IL)	Levin (MI)
Case	Garcia (TX)	Lieu
Casten	Golden	Lofgren
Castor (FL)	Gomez	Lowenthal
Castro (TX)	Gonzalez,	Luria
Chu	Vicente	Lynch
Ciulline	Gottheimer	Malinowski
Clark (MA)	Green, Al (TX)	Maloney,
Clarke (NY)	Grijalva	Carolyn B.
Cleaver	Harder (CA)	Maloney, Sean
Clyburn	Hayes	Manning
Cohen	Higgins (NY)	Matsui
Connolly	Himes	McBath
Cooper	Horsford	McCollum
Correa	Houlihan	McEachin
Costa	Hoyer	McGovern
Courtney	Huffman	McNerney
Craig	Jackson Lee	Meeks

Meng	Raskin	Strickland	Weber (TX)	Williams (TX)	Young
Mfume	Rice (NY)	Suozzi	Webster (FL)	Wilson (SC)	Zeldin
Moore (WI)	Ross	Swallow	Wenstrup	Wittman	
Morelle	Roybal-Allard	Takano	Westerman	Womack	
Moulton	Ruiz	Thompson (CA)			
Mrvan	Ruppersberger	Thompson (MS)			
Murphy (FL)	Rush	Titus			
Nadler	Ryan	Tlaib			
Napolitano	Sánchez	Tonko			
Neal	Sarbanes	Torres (CA)			
Neguse	Scanlon	Torres (NY)			
Newman	Schakowsky	Trahan			
Norcross	Schiff	Trone			
O'Halleran	Schneider	Underwood			
Ocasio-Cortez	Schrader	Vargas			
Omar	Schrier	Veasey			
Pallone	Scott (VA)	Vela			
Panetta	Scott, David	Velázquez			
Pappas	Sewell	Wasserman			
Pascarell	Sherman	Schultz			
Payne	Sherrill	Sires			
Perlmutter	Sires	Watson Coleman			
Peters	Slotkin	Welch			
Phillips	Smith (WA)	Wexton			
Pingree	Soto	Wild			
Pocan	Spanberger	Williams (GA)			
Porter	Speier	Wilson (FL)			
Pressley	Stansbury	Yarmuth			
Price (NC)	Stanton				
Quigley	Stevens				

NAYS—210

Aderholt	Garbarino	McHenry
Allen	Garcia (CA)	McKinley
Amodei	Gibbs	Meijer
Armstrong	Gimenez	Meuser
Arrington	Gohmert	Miller (IL)
Babin	Gonzales, Tony	Miller (WV)
Bacon	Gonzalez (OH)	Miller-Meeks
Baird	Good (VA)	Mooleenaar
Balderson	Gooden (TX)	Mooney
Banks	Gosar	Moore (AL)
Barr	Granger	Moore (UT)
Bentz	Graves (LA)	Mullin
Bergman	Graves (MO)	Murphy (NC)
Bice (OK)	Green (TN)	Nehls
Biggs	Greene (GA)	Newhouse
Bilirakis	Griffith	Norman
Bishop (NC)	Grothman	Nunes
Boebert	Guest	Obermole
Bost	Guthrie	Owens
Brady	Hagedorn	Palazzo
Brooks	Harris	Palmer
Buchanan	Harshbarger	Pence
Buck	Hartzler	Perry
Bucshon	Hern	Pfleger
Budd	Herrell	Posey
Burchett	Herrera Beutler	Reed
Burgess	Hice (GA)	Reschenthaler
Higgins (LA)	Hill	Rice (SC)
Hill	Hinson	Rodgers (WA)
Hollingsworth	Hollingsworth	Rogers (AL)
Hudson	Hudson	Rogers (KY)
Huizenga	Issa	Rose
Chabot	Jackson	Rosendale
Cheney	Jacobs (NY)	Rouzer
Cline	Johnson (LA)	Roy
Cloud	Johnson (OH)	Rutherford
Clyde	Johnson (SD)	Salazar
Cole	Jordan	Scalise
Comer	Joyce (OH)	Schweikert
Crawford	Joyce (PA)	Scott, Austin
Crenshaw	Katko	Sessions
Curtis	Keller	Simpson
Davidson	Kelly (MS)	Smith (MO)
Davis, Rodney	Kelly (PA)	Smith (NE)
DesJarlais	Kim (CA)	Smith (NJ)
Diaz-Balart	Kustoff	Smucker
Donalds	LaHood	Spartz
Duncan	LaMalfa	Staubert
Dunn	Lamborn	Steel
Elizey	Latta	Stefanik
Emmer	LaTurner	Stell
Estes	Letlow	Steube
Fallon	Long	Stewart
Feenstra	Loudermilk	Taylor
Ferguson	Lucas	Tenney
Fischbach	Luetkemeyer	Thompson (PA)
Fitzgerald	Mace	Tiffany
Fitzpatrick	Malliotakis	Timmons
Fleischmann	Mann	Turner
Fortenberry	Mast	Upton
Fox	McCarthy	Valadao
Franklin, C.	McCauley	Van Drew
Scott	McClain	Van Dune
Fulcher	McClintock	Wagner
Gaetz		Walberg
Gallagher		Walorski
		Waltz

Weber (TX)	Williams (TX)	Young
Webster (FL)	Wilson (SC)	Zeldin
Wenstrup	Wittman	
Westerman	Womack	

NOT VOTING—3

Kinzinger	Lee (CA)	Lesko
-----------	----------	-------

□ 1753

Messrs. WILSON of South Carolina and CRENSHAW changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, on roll call vote 263, I was not present because I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes” on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 667.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Burgess (Jackson)	Grijalva (García (IL))	Rush (Underwood)
Cárdenas (Gomez)	Kirkpatrick (Levin (CA))	Ryan (Kildee)
Carter (TX)	Latta (Walberg)	Smith (NJ) (Van Drew)
(Calvert)	Lawson (FL)	Smith (WA)
Cooper (Clark (MA))	(Evans)	(Kilmer)
Courtney	McEachin	Stanton (Levin (CA))
(Perlmutter)	(Wexton)	Stefanik
DeSaulnier	Meng (Jeffries)	(Reschenthaler)
(Thompson (CA))	Morelle (Tonko)	Strickland
(Correa)	Napolitano	(Torres (NY))
Frankel, Lois	Payne	Swallow
(Clark (MA))	(Wasserman)	(Veasey)
Fulcher (Johnson (OH))	Schultz	Wilson (FL)
Gonzalez (OH)	Reed (Garbarino)	(Hayes)
(Timmons)	Rice (SC)	(Wilson (SC))

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 217, nays 207, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 264]

YEAS—217

Adams	Chu	Eshoo
Aguilar	Ciulline	Espallat
Allred	Clark (MA)	Evans
Auchincloss	Clarke (NY)	Fletcher
Axne	Cleaver	Foster
Barragán	Clyburn	Frankel, Lois
Bass	Cohen	Gallego
Beatty	Connolly	Garamendi
Bera	Cooper	Garcia (IL)
Beyer	Correa	Garcia (TX)
Bishop (GA)	Costa	Golden
Blumenauer	Courtney	Gomez
Blunt Rochester	Craig	Gonzalez,
Bonamici	Crist	Vicente
Bourdeaux	Crow	Gottheimer
Bowman	Cuellar	Green, Al (TX)
Boyle, Brendan F.	Davids (KS)	Grijalva
Brown	Davis, Danny K.	Harder (CA)
Brownley	Dean	Hayes
Bush	DeFazio	Higgins (NY)
Bustos	DeGette	Himes
Butterfield	DeLauro	Houlihan
Carbajal	DelBene	Hoyer
Cárdenas	Delgado	Huffman
Carson	Demings	Jackson Lee
Carter (LA)	DeSaulnier	Jacobs (CA)
Cartwright	Deutch	Jayapal
Case	Dingell	Jeffries
Casten	Doggett	Johnson (GA)
Castor (FL)	Doyle, Michael F.	Johnson (TX)
Castro (TX)	Escobar	Kahele

Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle

Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier

Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozi
Swallow
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—207

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brady
Brooks
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Cammack
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra

Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franklin, C.
Scott
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)

Kelly (PA)
Kim (CA)
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
LaTurner
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Letlow
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Luetkemeyer
Luria
Lynch
Mace

Roy
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel

Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Dyne
Wagner

Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—7

Grothman
Horsford
Jackson

LaMalfa
Lee (NV)
Lesko

□ 1817

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS changed her vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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.

Stated against:

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was engaged in an important meeting. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 264.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Burgess (Jackson)
Cárdenas (Gomez)
Carter (TX) (Calvert)
Cooper (Clark) (MA)
Courtney (Perlmutter)
DeSaulnier (Thompson) (CA)
Frankel, Lois (Clark) (MA)
Fulcher (Johnson) (OH)

Gonzalez (OH) (Timmons)
Grijalva (Garcia) (IL)
Kirkpatrick (Levin) (CA)
Latta (Walberg) (FL)
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
McEachin (Wexton)
Meng (Jeffries)
Morelle (Tonko)
Napolitano (Correa)
Payne (Wasserman)
Schultz (Hayes)

Reed (Garbarino) (SC)
Rice (SC) (Wilson) (SC)
Rush (Underwood)
Ryan (Kildee)
Smith (NJ) (Van Drew)
Stanton (Levin) (CA)
Stefanik (Reschenthaler)
Strickland (Torres) (NY)
Swallow (Veasey)
Wilson (FL) (Hayes)

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEMBRANCE OF THE VICTIMS OF HURRICANE IDA

The SPEAKER. The Chair asks all Members in the Chamber, as well as Members and staff throughout the Capitol, to rise for a moment of silence in remembrance of the victims of Hurricane Ida, both in the Gulf States and throughout the mid-Atlantic and northeast regions and throughout the country.

HELPING AMERICAN VICTIMS AFFLICTED BY NEUROLOGICAL ATTACKS ACT OF 2021

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1828) to amend the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 to authorize the provision of payment to personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency who incur qualifying injuries to the brain, to authorize the provision of payment to personnel of the Department of State who incur similar injuries, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LEVIN of Michigan). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 427, nays 0, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 265]

YEAS—427

Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Allred
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Auchincloss
Axne
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bentz
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NC)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Boebert
Bonamici
Bost
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady
Brooks
Brown
Brownley
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Cammack
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carl
Carson
Carter (GA)
Carter (LA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cheney
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Cline
Cloud
Clyburn
Clyde
Cohen
Cole
Comer
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney

Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davidson
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donalds
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duncan
Dunn
Ellzey
Emmer
Escobar
Eshoo
Español
Estes
Evans
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Frankel, Lois
Franklin, C.
Scott
Fulcher
Gaezt
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Golden
Gomez
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez, Vicente
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Green, Al (TX)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie

Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hayes
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jacobs (NY)
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kahele
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Keller
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (CA)
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kustoff
Kuster
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
LaTurner
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Letlow
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Luetkemeyer
Luria
Lynch
Mace