

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7900, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2023; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 3373, PROTECTING OUR GOLD STAR FAMILIES EDUCATION ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8296, WOMEN'S HEALTH PROTECTION ACT OF 2022; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8297, ENSURING ACCESS TO ABORTION ACT OF 2022; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6538, ACTIVE SHOOTER ALERT ACT OF 2022; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. MORELLE. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1224 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1224

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 7900) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 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 117-54 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 2 of this resolution; (3) the amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution; and (4) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. After debate pursuant to the first section of this resolution, each further amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier considered as part of amendments en bloc pursuant to section 3 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debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before the question is put thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the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. 3. It shall be in order at any time after debate pursuant to the first section 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 A 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. 4. All points of order against the further amendments printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules or amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 5. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (S. 3373) to improve the Iraq and Afghanistan Service Grant and the Children of Fallen Heroes Grant. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117-56 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 Veterans' Affairs or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to commit.

SEC. 6. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 8296) to protect a person's ability to determine whether to continue or end a pregnancy, and to protect a health care provider's ability to provide abortion services. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 7. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 8297) to prohibit the interference, under color of State law, with the provision of interstate abortion services, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules 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. 8. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 6538) to create an Active Shooter Alert Communications Network, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Ju-

diciary or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 9. (a) At any time through the legislative day of Friday, July 15, 2022, 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 June 21, 2022, or July 12, 2022, 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. 10. House Resolution 188, agreed to March 8, 2021 (as most recently amended by House Resolution 1191, agreed to June 22, 2022), is amended by striking "July 13, 2022" each place it appears and inserting (in each instance) "July 19, 2022".

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SCHRIER). The gentleman from New York is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MORELLE. Madam 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

Mr. MORELLE. Madam 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 gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORELLE. Madam Speaker, yesterday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 1224, for five measures.

First, it provides for consideration of H.R. 7900 under a structured rule. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, makes in order a record 650 amendments, and provides en bloc authority and one motion to recommit.

The rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 8296 and H.R. 8297 under closed rules. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate for each bill equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, provides one motion to recommit for each bill, and self-executes a manager's amendment on H.R. 8297.

The rule further provides for consideration of H.R. 6538 under a closed rule. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary and provides one motion to recommit.

The rule also provides for consideration of S. 3373 under a closed rule. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and provides one motion to commit.

Finally, the rule extends recess instructions, suspension authority, and same-day authority through July 19, 2022, and provides the majority leader or his designee the ability to en bloc requested votes on suspension bills this week.

Madam Speaker, this rule provides for consideration of meaningful legislation that I look forward to discussing with my colleagues today. I would like to start by sharing a few words on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023.

Our Nation faces real and serious global challenges to our security every day, and safeguarding our national defense is vital and necessary. The Russian Federation has launched an unprovoked invasion of the free and democratic Nation of Ukraine, while an emboldened Chinese military threatens our allies in the Pacific.

America must be prepared to face these threats by promoting political stability and diplomatic engagement and ensuring our military is prepared to meet increased threats to global stability.

I am a proud member of the House Armed Services Committee, and this year, for the 62nd consecutive year in a row, the committee has marked up and reported a National Defense Authorization Act to address our national defense needs.

The fiscal year 2023 NDAA includes critical investments in our servicemembers, bolsters our position as a leader in technological innovation to compete with countries like China, and ensures we are prepared to face the coercions of adversaries who already threaten global peace and stability.

I thank the leadership of Chairman SMITH and Ranking Member ROGERS for delivering a bipartisan bill that prioritizes the needs of our servicemembers and provides the resources to protect global security and peace.

Today, we are also considering the rule for the Honoring our PACT Act. It has been a long road to get here, and I thank Chairman TAKANO and Ranking Member BOST for their efforts to get this done.

Back home, I have had the opportunity to meet with toxic-exposed veterans and their families, and I have heard loud and clear just how necessary this legislation is for our veterans.

When we send our servicemembers into harm's way, we make a promise that when they come home, we will take care of them.

Sadly, over 3.5 million veterans were exposed to toxic fumes and carcinogens while serving our Nation, resulting in life-threatening lung diseases and cancers. Right now, they are not getting

the care they need due to a disability benefits claims process that is cumbersome and places the burden to prove toxic exposure on veterans themselves.

□ 1045

By creating a presumption for disability, this legislation will help cut through the red tape and ensure nothing stands in the way of servicemembers receiving their care.

It is time we make good on our promise to ensure all veterans exposed to toxic substances during their service can access the essential care and benefits they have earned.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to support this bill and look forward to its passage.

Madam Speaker, the rule today also provides for consideration of the Active Shooter Alert Act, which, frankly, should have passed under suspension in June. This commonsense legislation would create a communications network to alert people when an active shooter is in their community.

It is tragic to think we even need such a system, but sadly, the fear of a mass shooting has become a persistent dark cloud shrouding our Nation.

Let's take a moment to reflect on the horrific scene on July 4 when the Highland Park community was attacked. What should have been a joyous occasion for families, friends, and community members instead became a nightmare when a dangerous person wielding a dangerous weapon fired into the crowd, killing seven and injuring dozens more.

There are those who, yet again, offered their thoughts and prayers in response to the Highland Park shooting, yet provided no real solutions. But there are solutions—in fact, this body has passed countless measures that could have helped prevent such a tragic event.

I have made my position clear—meaningful, commonsense gun reform is an absolute necessity. To my colleagues who regularly oppose solutions to gun violence, I ask: What are you willing to do to help protect our communities?

Let's at least come together on legislation that creates a warning system for communities when an active shooter is present so more innocent lives can be saved. We are talking about an alert system, just like those already in place for disasters like tornados, earthquakes, and AMBER Alerts. I can't imagine who would be opposed to such a commonsense step.

I thank the more than 40 Republicans who evaluated the merits of this straightforward bill and voted in favor this June, and I hope we can count on your vote again this week.

Any action is better than no action, which is why I am proud to support this legislation—but we also know it barely scratches the surface of the many other reforms that are needed, which is why I will continue fighting for measures to ban assault weapons,

limit high-capacity magazines, and enact universal background checks on every gun sale.

Madam Speaker, I would like to end my opening remarks with comments on two fundamental healthcare bills included in this rule: The Women's Health Protection Act and the Ensuring Women's Right to Reproductive Freedom Act.

These bills will empower women and reaffirm their right to make independent and informed healthcare decisions.

Over the past year we have seen an all-out assault on women's bodily autonomy. The appalling Supreme Court decision to overturn *Roe v. Wade* was just the beginning. We have seen States undertake efforts to criminalize a woman's right to make basic family planning decisions.

We have seen a 10-year-old child, a victim of rape, forced out of her State for the healthcare she desperately needs. We have seen increased Federal efforts to restrict access to women's healthcare, contraception, and the fundamental right to privacy.

These astounding restrictions on women are exactly why we need the Women's Health Protection Act.

The Federal law will codify the provisions of *Roe v. Wade* and establish a statutory right to access the healthcare all women need and deserve.

We also need to pass the Ensuring Women's Right to Reproductive Freedom Act, legislation I proudly cosponsor.

It is a sad state of affairs that we need to codify the fundamental right to interstate travel in this country, protecting women from civil and criminal liability, even when seeking an abortion in a State where it is lawful.

The fact that we have already seen efforts in State legislatures to prevent women from seeking lawful abortions across State lines completely contradicts the claim that overturning *Roe v. Wade* was about returning the decision to the States.

The radical right has and always will be about restricting women's rights. It is hard to believe we are living in 2022, not 1722. By passing this legislation, we are making it clear that this assault on women's rights cannot stand.

I urge my colleagues to show this country and the world that we respect women, we trust women, and we support women and their right to make informed and independent healthcare decisions.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Speaker of the House.

Ms. PELOSI, Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his leadership on the very important elements of the rule that will be brought to the floor today. I thank him, and I thank all the members of the Rules Committee. I particularly want to acknowledge the leadership of Chairman JIM MCGOVERN for his leadership in bringing so much

policy to bear in this one rule as we proceed with the week's legislation.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in what is a momentous week for our House Democratic majority as we carry on our work to defend Americans' health, security, and freedom.

The rule includes five pieces of landmark legislation, which the gentleman, Mr. MORELLE, has very clearly explained. I thank him and Mr. MCGOVERN for their skilled leadership in assembling this rule and steering this crucial legislation to the floor.

First, this week we will have our version of the NDAA. It supports our Nation's servicemen and service-women, it strengthens our national security, and promotes national leadership in the global arena.

Our majority is delivering new pay raises for heroic men and women in uniform, while securing more investments in next-generation defense technology to keep us strong and qualitatively superior.

We are strengthening the security of DOD supply chains, while advancing new and fundamental research and development at HBCUs and MSIs.

We are further supporting the Ukrainian people in their fight for democracy with \$1 billion in additional security assistance.

I salute Chairman ADAM SMITH and the Armed Services Committee for their persistent patriotic leadership in assembling this legislation, which will help ensure that Americans are safe and our democracy is secure.

Again, when we are talking about our security, we have to talk about our veterans. As we have said, we promised them when they fight for us, we will protect them when they come home. This bill, the PACT Act, takes another monumental step to care for our brave men and women in uniform—who risked their lives to fight the enemy, but now face the deadly threat of exposure to dangerous toxins.

The legislation in this bill, I believe, will be strongly bipartisan, deliver access to VA healthcare to millions of veterans suffering from dangerous diseases caused by their exposures.

Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman MARK TAKANO for making and addressing toxic exposure as a top priority in Congress—the PACT Act.

Next, the Active Shooter Alert Act, which the gentleman from New York very clearly spelled out. We will pass the Active Shooter Alert Act—Mr. MORELLE described it very well—and I agree, it is a step, and we must have what he said he supports, and I do, too—the ban on assault weapons and other lethality.

This Federal legislation that we are doing today will quickly warn communities when a gunman opens fire. It is a commonsense, lifesaving measure widely supported by law enforcement.

Let us recognize Congressman DAVID CICILLINE, a longtime champion in the fight against gun violence, for spearheading this legislation, and also being the author of the assault weapons ban.

The fourth and fifth bills that our Democratic majority will pass this week take strong action to defend women's health and freedom.

Our Caucus has been hard at work assembling a robust and resolute legislative response to the Supreme Court's assault on reproductive rights. We passed this legislation before, the WHPA, the Women's Health Protection Act, which will enshrine the essential protections of *Roe v. Wade* as the law of the land.

And with our Ensuring Women's Right to Reproductive Freedom Act, we will reaffirm the constitutional right to travel and have access to the abortion pill.

Let us salute Congresswoman JUDY CHU for her leadership. We passed this bill in the fall and we need to pass it again. We thank Congresswomen FLETCHER and STRICKLAND and Congressman RASKIN for their tireless, determined leadership on the Ensuring Women's Right to Reproductive Freedom Act.

Madam Speaker, this legislation that the House Democrats will pass this week is the latest in our work to defend Americans' health, security, and freedom. Our majority will never relent in this fight—now and in the future.

Madam Speaker, I urge a strong "yes" vote on the rule today and "yes" votes on the five bills that we are considering in the days ahead.

Mr. COLE, Madam Speaker, I thank my very good friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MORELLE) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, today's rule covers several major items. The first that I will discuss, H.R. 7900, the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2023, is of the greatest importance to the Nation and to the world.

For 61 years in a row the NDAA has become law. As I reminded my colleagues in the Rules Committee yesterday, this record of achievement has only been possible because of the immense cooperation from both sides of the aisle and is a testament to what we can accomplish when we focus on our shared goals as a Nation.

Working together, Democrats and Republicans on the Armed Services Committee produced a bipartisan product. I applaud Chairman SMITH, Ranking Member ROGERS, and all the members of the Armed Services Committee for their efforts.

Madam Speaker, it is no secret that the world has become a more dangerous place in recent years. Last year saw the Taliban—a corrupt and militant organization known for supporting and providing sanctuary to terrorists—complete its takeover of Afghanistan.

Earlier this year, the world was shocked by Vladimir Putin's brazen, unprovoked, and indeed outright criminal invasion of Ukraine, Russia's democratic neighbor to the west.

Communist China continues its history of aggression in Asia and the Pacific Rim, including increasingly aggressive acts toward Taiwan.

North Korea has continued an aggressive posturing toward the United States and our democratic allies in Asia.

Iran continues its long march toward becoming a nuclear state.

It is more important than ever that Congress speaks with one voice when it comes to setting our national defense policy and funding priorities each year so that we can ensure we counter aggressive actors and offer our allies the support they need to protect themselves.

One of the most important things accomplished in this year's NDAA is actually what it did not do. For the second year in a row, the Armed Services Committee rejected President Biden's proposed defense budget number and authorized a better, higher number to ensure that our national defense is properly funded.

Indeed, President Biden's first two budget proposals looked set to continue the chronic underfunding of the Obama-Biden years, during which time our military readiness declined and our rivals on the international stage were empowered.

The increased funding in this bill will go a long way toward ensuring that America's military is ready to confront any challenge. It will ensure that our armed services personnel receive a 4.6 percent pay raise, the largest in history, with additional pay bonuses to personnel who make the least to offset the inflation caused by this administration's policies.

On the whole, I am proud to support this legislation and I encourage the entire House to support this measure and send it on to the Senate.

Madam Speaker, our second item in the House is S. 3373, the Honoring our PACT Act. While this bill has gone through a frustratingly long process to get to this point, I believe we have failed to provide our Nation's toxic-exposed veterans with the care that they need for far too long.

I will be the first to admit that this bill is not perfect. I share the concerns of many about the use of mandatory spending in this bill. Given the importance of this issue to veterans nationwide, and to those in my district, I cannot let the perfect be the enemy of the good. Imperfect though it is, this bill does take important strides forward, and I plan to support it on final passage.

Unfortunately, two other bills contained in this rule are partisan and stand no chance of becoming law. The Democratic majority is attempting to insert a right to an abortion into Federal law, preempting every State law that seeks to protect life.

They want to require all States to permit abortion on demand at any time up to the point of birth. They want to outlaw commonsense restrictions, like

preventing late-term abortions, preventing sex-selective abortions, and preventing abortions targeting fetuses with Down syndrome.

They want to prevent States from adopting commonsense protections for the unborn, such as banning mail-order and telemedicine abortion services. They want to limit the rights of parents by creating a cause of action for outsiders to interfere with the parent-child relationship. That would be an unconscionable state of affairs, Madam Speaker.

I remind my colleagues of the words of the Declaration of Independence: that the right to life is one of those inalienable rights endowed upon us all, including unborn children, by our Creator.

I will always stand strongly in favor of defending life, and I proudly stand in opposition to these bills today.

Madam Speaker, I urge opposition to this rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1100

Mr. MORELLE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I will make a couple of points on what I think is one of the most important issues that we will face in this Congress and in the future years.

Abortion access in America changed overnight after the Supreme Court took away a woman's constitutional right to make her own reproductive health decisions. Nearly 34 million people of reproductive age now live in a State where abortion is banned or severely restricted—one of the only times that I know of that the Supreme Court of the United States in our history took away a fundamental constitutional right to more than half of America. My 86-year-old mother who is a grandmother and great-grandmother will have had more right over her body and more decision-making under this decision than her granddaughters and great-granddaughters.

It is unconscionable, and the impact of this decision will have horrific consequences for millions of people, particularly people with the greatest burden: low-income individuals, people of color, and victims of incest and abuse. I am genuinely concerned, as are millions of people, for women's rights in this country. We refuse to be complacent, and we refuse to stand silent. We will keep fighting every single day however I can and however we can. Today that means supporting the advancement of the Women's Health Protection Act.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON), who is a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, it has been less than 3 weeks since MITCH MCCONNELL's hand-picked, rightwing Supreme Court overturned *Roe v. Wade* and with it 50 years of settled law regarding the fundamental privacy right of women to make their own decisions

regarding their own healthcare. That decision has also called into question a host of other privacy rights that Americans had taken for granted, including the right to obtain contraception and the right to interracial and same-sex marriage.

Not surprisingly, the result has been chaos.

Why?

Because this decision is deeply unpopular and goes against the values of a strong majority of Americans: that a woman should have the essential freedom to decide when and if to bear children and how many and that politicians should not be in the business of mandating that women carry dangerous or unwanted pregnancies to term.

But in the wake of that extremist decision, we are already seeing politicians across the country seize this moment to substitute their own religious, economic, and, frankly, misogynistic views for that of women who have to live with the consequences of those reproductive healthcare decisions.

The vast majority of Americans understand that we don't need or want politicians invading our doctors' offices and a woman's privacy to impose an extremist, minority view because the reality is that these decisions are complicated. They are complicated by the physical health of both the woman and the fetus. They are complicated by the mental and financial health of the family. They are complicated by whether or not the pregnancy was the result of abuse or criminal activity. They are complicated by the religious beliefs of those involved because the rightwing views on pregnancy that the conservative Court has adopted are not shared by most Americans or by the medical profession or even by all major religions.

These decisions are complicated by whether or not there was access to birth control.

In a society that for decades has prioritized the well-being of unborn fetuses over that of children and families or even the health of pregnant women, it is complicated by whether or not a family has the means to provide for the basic needs of a mother or child, much less the opportunity for them to thrive or even enjoy life, liberty, or the pursuit of happiness.

Unfortunately, the Republican legislature in Pennsylvania has jumped on this rightwing bandwagon, as well. Last week, in the middle of the night, Republican lawmakers in Pennsylvania changed the rules of their house forbidding votes after 11 p.m. in order to ram through a constitutional amendment to limit access to abortion care. They had to use a constitutional amendment to get around the Governor's veto and regular order because their proposal is deeply unpopular with the majority of Pennsylvanians.

These attacks on our essential American freedoms cannot stand. Our families and freedoms are on the line, and it

is more important than ever that we fight to protect and expand reproductive freedom.

The bills we are considering today are a critical fight for a world where all Americans—no matter who they are, where they live, or what they believe—have the freedom to make their own decisions about if and when to start or grow a family. So I am proud to support the passage of both the Women's Health Protection Act for a second time in this Congress and the Ensuring Access to Abortion Act.

As we see States start to pass laws that would limit the right of women to travel—think about that, the right to travel—to obtain healthcare, the Ensuring Access to Abortion Act makes it possible and safe for women needing abortion care to travel to States where it is accessible. These two bills are critical to enshrining a woman's right to an abortion and to reproductive healthcare into Federal law. I am proud to support these bills.

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

Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H. Res. 11 for immediate consideration. This resolution proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to require that the Supreme Court of the United States be composed of nine Justices.

Madam Speaker, the Supreme Court has been set at nine Justices for 153 years. Fundamentally changing the composition of the Court to satisfy the demands of one political party would permanently erode the independence of the judicial branch and forever alter the separation of powers, which is the very foundation our Constitution and our Nation were built upon.

The independence of the judicial branch is too sacred to subject it to the political issue of the day. The appointment of a Supreme Court Justice is not a popularity contest, and the Court's decisions should not be based on polls. The Supreme Court's duty is to the Constitution and ensuring that adherence to the laws of the land.

To further explain the amendment, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON), who is my very good friend and the author of the resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I thank leadership for making my bill a priority on the floor today.

We have heard from a number of earlier speakers that recent Supreme Court decisions have upset the majority. These are decisions that they disagree with.

Now, these are judicial decisions that were rendered under rules that have been in place for more than 150 years. But there seems to be a growing force of people who want to change the rules, that if we didn't get the decision we wanted under the rules that have been

in place since 1869, then let's go ahead and change the rules. Let's go ahead and pack the Court.

If nine Justices doesn't get what we want, then let's add two. Well, if maybe two more Justices doesn't get us what we want, then let's add four. Maybe we can get with four Justices the kinds of decisions we want.

Madam Speaker, this is not a hypothetical boogieman. This is an actual pending legislation introduced by none other than the chairman of the Judiciary Committee. It is an active attempt to pack the Court with 13 Justices.

Now, you might ask, Madam Speaker, is 13 the right number?

Does 13 come about because there has been some report or some analysis that 13 Justices would make the work of the Court more productive?

Or perhaps the Supreme Court itself, the Justices, have indicated that they would do a better job with 13?

No. No. It does not come about because of any independent analysis or request by the Court. This attempt to pack the Court is all about power. It is all about power. It is all about getting the kinds of decisions that the House majority wants.

Madam Speaker, I would submit that when Washington changes the rules only to acquire power or only to maintain power, then it undermines public trust in these institutions that bind Americans together. We don't need yet a further undermining of these institutions.

Frankly, where does it end?

Once this body establishes that the size of the Court can grow only so that we can secure the preferred judicial decisions of the House majority, where does it end?

You take it to 13. A few years later we take it to 15. You can take it to 17 after that.

Again, this is not a hypothetical boogieman. We have seen this happen in other countries.

Madam Speaker, this leads to madness. This is no way to run a judiciary.

Now, you don't need to take my word for it. Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg before her death made it clear that packing the Court would undermine and erode public trust in the Supreme Court. She was stridently opposed to it. Retiring Justice Stephen Breyer feels the same and has publicly been opposed to packing the Court.

This is not something that only Republicans oppose. It is something that reasonable and like-minded people who care about the independence and the public trust of the Court have opposed, as well.

So that is what my resolution would do. It would simply put into the Constitution what has already been the case since 1869, and that is nine Justices on the Supreme Court.

I guarantee you, Madam Speaker, that we will still find plenty of political screws to turn and leverage points for us to be able to fight and advance our political causes. But if we can just

put into the Constitution this one thing, to keep the nine, we will be able to, at least somehow, insulate the Court from the most corrosive political maneuvering that we know this body is capable of.

Now, I make it clear, a "no" vote on the previous question which I am urging does not submit this constitutional amendment to the States. All it does is allow this body 1 hour to debate the merits of keeping the nine.

What possible argument could there be against taking that 1 hour for us to discuss together what the right size of the Court is and how do we best maintain public trust in the Court going forward?

So, Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to heed the words of Ruth Bader Ginsburg, Stephen Breyer, Joe Biden, and so many of us on this side of the aisle to consider keeping the nine.

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

While this is not on the agenda, and I will remind people that we have a rule that stipulates which bills are in front of us, I note with alarm the suggestion that we ought to change the Constitution when it comes to the Supreme Court, and for fear that we are undermining the confidence of the Court, frankly, I am astonished.

How about following the current Constitution?

Forget about amending it.

How about following the one that we have?

I just note that when Merrick Garland was nominated by President Obama in March of 2016, 293 days his nomination went without any action in the United States Senate. Amy Coney Barrett was nominated September 26, a mere 6 weeks, 5 weeks before election day. Senator MCCONNELL and the Senate didn't follow the Constitution which says advise and consent on nominations sent by the President. They did absolutely nothing with the nominee Garland. They didn't seek to do anything. In fact, MITCH MCCONNELL talked about the politics of it.

Talk about undermining the confidence of the American public in the Supreme Court?

How about that?

Yet when President Trump just 5 weeks before a Presidential election made a nomination, it was swiftly pushed through.

Undermining confidence in the Supreme Court?

How about confirmation proceedings where Brett Kavanaugh or Neil Gorsuch both said that Roe is settled law; a precedent for 50 years?

They said it in confirmation hearings. They have said it as Senator COLLINS has indicated her vote hung on those words. Yet they had no intention of following those words. They misled the American public.

Undermining confidence in the Supreme Court?

I am astonished that anyone would even say it.

Frankly, when we talk about this, we know what the agenda here is. Justice Thomas gave us a clear roadmap of where this is all headed.

Undermining confidence in the Supreme Court?

Justice Thomas urged the Court to reconsider all of this Court's substantive due process precedence, including the right to contraception, the right to private consensual acts, and the right to same-sex marriage, characterizing the entire legal doctrine as particularly dangerous.

Undermining the confidence of the Supreme Court of the United States?

Now, Justice Kavanaugh, I will say to his credit in his concurrence, said that the Court won't go that far. But we have heard these same assurances from Justice Kavanaugh before, and I think they aren't worth the words on the paper that this is printed.

We should be very, very concerned. We should be concerned that the American public has lost confidence in the Supreme Court, but not because of the actions of anyone here or the suggestions here.

How about because of the actions of the United States Senate and the actions of the Supreme Court itself?

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. ALLRED).

□ 1115

Mr. ALLRED. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of one of the most fundamental rights imaginable in a free society, the right to bodily autonomy and the freedom to choose when and how to begin a family.

As I stand here today, Texas women do not have that right. In Texas right now, a woman is required, by law, to either carry to term the offspring of their rapist or their abuser or drive 5 hours or more to Kansas, New Mexico, Colorado, or anywhere they can get access to abortion services.

Now, some extremist Republicans in Texas want to prevent Texans from leaving the State to obtain an abortion. The same so-called conservatives who talk about Big Government want to tell Texas women where they can travel or are threatening the employers of those women who offer to pay for their travel.

What is next, Madam Speaker? Will they place checkpoints on our interstate highways, or question women boarding a plane or a train about the nature of their travel?

Does this sound like freedom to anyone?

I will not stand for it. My colleagues and I will not stand for it. The Ensuring Access to Abortion Act ensures that all American women have the right to travel within the United States, a right that we should not have to be affirming today but one that we will.

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

Madam Speaker, as has become all too common with the Democratic majority, when the status quo doesn't lead to the outcome they want, they simply change the rules to suit their needs.

You need to only look at the last 2 years for evidence: fundamentally changing the way the House operates through the use of proxy voting; a complete lockdown of alternative ideas; fewer and fewer committees doing the work to make the law rather than score political points—all aimed at protecting their razor-thin majority at the expense of the institution and the Nation.

Democrats' current obsession with the Supreme Court is no different, but instead of accepting the independence of the judiciary, the majority is, instead, intent on fixing the rules of the game to ensure their own victory. This amendment to the Constitution would prevent that from happening and would ensure, once and for all, that the Supreme Court will be independent and free of meddling based on the political ideas of the day.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question, and I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ARMSTRONG), my very good friend.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Madam Speaker, the Constitution grants Congress the power over the size and composition of the judiciary. The Judiciary Act of 1789 and subsequent laws established this structure.

Since 1869, the number of Justices has been fixed at nine. Congress has the authority to change that number. Whether Congress should exercise this authority is another question entirely, and whether Congress should exercise that authority in a 50/50 Senate and a single-digit majority in the House is another question.

In *Sykes v. United States*, Justice Scalia wrote: "It should be no surprise that as the volume" of law "increases, so do the number of imprecise laws. . . . Fuzzy, leave-the-details-to-be-sorted-out-by-the-courts legislation is attractive to the Congressman who wants credit" without dealing with "the nitty-gritty."

The real problem is that Congress doesn't want to deal with the nitty-gritty. We want to fundraise off of top-line messages and vague legislative text.

We write ambiguous law that leaves important details and major questions to unelected bureaucrats. The decisions of those unelected bureaucrats inevitably are left to be sorted out by the

courts. The Court is merely doing its job to say what the law is.

Our reaction should be to take back our Article I authority and to clearly articulate congressional intent. If we write detailed laws, judges will properly implement Congress' intent.

Instead, too many in this body seek to exploit congressional inaction, choosing to double down on fundraising pleas by bashing the courts and promising to pack judges onto the Court to guarantee their preferred outcome.

Here is a better idea. If you can't pass the Clean Power Plan through Congress, don't ask the EPA to implement it and then feign outrage when the Court says, no, that is not how a democratic republic is supposed to work.

James Madison said Congress would fight to the death to protect its Article I authority. Unfortunately, I think what we have seen is that Congress will fight to the death to maintain their membership in Congress.

Now, the one way in which far too many on the left want to exert our Article I authority is to pack the Court so Congress can continue to outsource legislating to the bureaucratic state and then ensure the Court gives them the decision they would like.

Madam Speaker, I urge everyone to defeat the previous question.

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

I appreciate the distinguished gentleman and his comments. I note, just in passing, that Article I authority given to us by the Framers actually gave us the authority to identify the size of the Supreme Court.

Constitutional amendments are not Article I. They are an extensive process that involves ratification. Article I authority, actually—I think he would make my argument—Article I authority would be the Congress making the decision on the size of the Supreme Court, which has been changed many times, from as few as six to as many as nine judges.

But having said that, and just making that point, let's talk about some of the real issues that need addressing that, frankly, are before us, because the size of the Supreme Court is not before us, as interesting as that conversation might be. Let's talk, instead, about issues that real Americans face.

While bravely serving our country, many veterans were exposed to hazards, from burn pits, PFAS, and radiation, toxic exposures that have caused cancers, infertility, respiratory conditions, and unexplained chronic illnesses. As many as 3.5 million service-members have been exposed to dangerous toxic fumes.

The cost of war goes far beyond the battlefield, and we have a duty to uphold our promises to toxic-exposed veterans by investing in the healthcare they need and so richly deserve.

In their time of need, veterans should be receiving high-quality care. Instead,

they are being burdened with proving that their illness is connected to their service.

I have had the privilege of meeting with many veterans in my community, and the families of veterans who have been lost because of exposure, while they continue the work of having to prove that their illness is a result of exposure to toxic chemicals, to carcinogens, to burn pits.

The Honoring our PACT Act is included in this rule, and this legislation will address the wide range of issues impacting toxic-exposed veterans and their access to earned benefits and care. You can bet I am voting "yes."

That is one of the bills being discussed before us today, and I think people watching us on television, people watching this later, seeing clips, would be curious as to why suddenly we are talking about an issue not on the floor, not before us. But this is, the Honoring our PACT Act, before us today.

We can all do something to safeguard those who have served in our Armed Forces and their families by doing the right thing, passing this rule, and passing the underlying legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), my very good friend and a distinguished member of the Rules Committee and the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

Before coming to Congress, I practiced medicine for nearly 30 years. I had the privilege of delivering 3,000 babies. I dedicated my career as a physician to protecting the lives of children and families and running a pro-life practice in north Texas. I have seen both sides of this argument, both as a doctor and a policymaker.

Indeed, the chairman of the Department of OB/GYN at Parkland Hospital's Southwestern Medical School, when I was a resident, pointed out to us that those of us who were privileged to begin the practice of obstetrics were unique in medicine in that we are going to be charged with taking care of two patients, with a combined life expectancy of over 100 years, and almost nowhere else in medicine do you have that ability to impact the future.

Back in 2002, I decided to run for Congress because I saw lawmakers, particularly in Congress, who have never experienced taking care of a patient, discussing and setting the stage for how you are supposed to run a medical practice.

Today is no different. It is deeply frustrating to see individuals discussing procedures with little understanding of how or why they are performed and how they affect the patients involved, both the mother and the baby.

Throughout my time as an OB/GYN, I have taken care of women with ectopic

pregnancies—never any hesitation. That does not change after a Supreme Court decision.

I have taken care of women who, unfortunately, were suffering from miscarriages. That will not change after a Supreme Court decision.

I have had cases where a woman had an abortion at another location and then presented to my hospital in a crisis because of complications. Without hesitation, I would render care to those patients, irrespective of any Supreme Court decision.

Many of those cases, indeed, were life-threatening, but each and every time, my responsibility was to step in and save a life. Again, that is done without hesitation. The Supreme Court decision changes none of that, despite the heated rhetoric we are hearing from the other side.

It seems like a simple answer: Have an abortion, take care of a problem.

Back in 1973, when *Roe v. Wade* was first decided, medical sonography was really just beginning. In the time since then, it has really developed into a science unto itself.

In fact, two generations of Americans since *Roe v. Wade* was decided have as their first picture in their baby book an ultrasound picture or maybe a videotape of themselves as an unborn child. Indeed, two generations of Americans have no trouble assigning agency to that pregnancy because they know from whence they came.

An abortion is a highly complex and deeply emotional decision. The decision affects, yes, the mother. No question that it affects the baby and affects other family members. Yes, it affects the provider as well.

My belief in the right to life has influenced my professional career for much longer than my time in Congress, and I will remain committed to that. After a lifetime dedicated to pro-life work, there is no question it is just the right thing to do. You always err on the side of life. You always give life a chance.

This rule also includes consideration of the National Defense Authorization Act. Yesterday, in the Rules Committee, there were a lot of amendments submitted. There are a lot of amendments we are going to debate on the floor. Most of them were amendments submitted by Democrats. Republicans got very few of those.

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

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURGESS. I submitted amendments to require reports to Congress on our military response in Ukraine and the chaotic withdrawal from Afghanistan last August, something that we cannot allow to be repeated.

Russia invaded Ukraine in February, yet we have not had another briefing by the generals and State Department as we did prior to that invasion. The situation is vastly different on the

ground. We were given to understand that it would not take long for Russia to completely overrun Ukraine. They didn't anticipate the response of the Ukrainian people. Now, we see a war of attrition evolving, but Congress is not read into any of the administration's plans.

Then, finally, we have to ensure that the chaotic withdrawal from Afghanistan is fully investigated and understood. What advice was the President receiving? From whom did he receive it? How do we prevent that from ever happening again?

I thank the gentleman for yielding me additional time.

□ 1130

Mr. MORELLE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I appreciate the comments from my distinguished colleague on the Rules Committee, Mr. BURGESS. But what he points out, in my mind, reminds me how deeply personal this decision is for women involving their body and their healthcare.

I would certainly never question his credentials as a doctor or as a professional, but I have heard from a number of obstetricians and gynecologists who raise, I think, what are really important questions.

For instance, in some States, the health of the mother is the only consideration to be given when it comes to an abortion or reproductive services. Some have raised the question: How long do you wait before you can make the judgment that that is the only determination that can be made? If you wait too long, do you actually jeopardize the health of the mother by waiting so long for fear of violating a State law that restricts the right of a woman to an abortion?

Then there is the question of miscarriages. Many, many women have miscarriages. And concerns have been expressed by their doctors of when we provide care after the fact or during a miscarriage, will there be questions raised about whether or not that was actually an abortion instead of a miscarriage? Will we be jeopardizing our careers? Will we be putting our professional license into question?

These are very difficult questions to answer. I am certainly no expert in them, but they raise, to me, significant questions.

As many have pointed out, there will be abortions in the United States. There will be abortions in Texas. There will be abortions in Mississippi. There will be abortions in every State in this country.

The question is: Are they going to be safe? Are women going to suffer unduly? Are there going to be deaths of women because they weren't given access to safe, reproductive care that is ultimately, as I said, so deeply personal, so deeply involved in their autonomy?

Those are the questions before us. They are deep-seated questions. They

are important questions. But, ultimately, we side with the right of a woman to make the decision for herself.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Mrs. BICE), my very good friend and a member of the House Armed Services Committee.

Mrs. BICE of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague for yielding.

I rise in opposition to the combined rule, although I support the underlying NDAA. This year's NDAA makes targeted investments in our defense to protect us from increasingly aggressive adversaries like China and Russia.

I was pleased to include a wide range of priorities for my home State of Oklahoma, and multiple amendments focused on supporting servicemembers, strengthening our cybersecurity posture, and deterring our enemies.

Many Oklahomans were concerned when President Biden announced his intent to divest half of the E-3 AWACS fleet at Tinker Air Force Base. I worked on this issue for months and secured an amendment to slow the divestment and to retain the training pipeline that will be needed as we transition to the new E-7.

I was also proud to work with my colleague and friend, TOM COLE, to secure \$30 million for the new B-21 depot maintenance campus at Tinker Air Force Base.

The NDAA also includes two bills I introduced: H.R. 7738 which would facilitate greater security clearance portability for departing servicemembers, and H. Res. 1143 which honors the USS *Oklahoma City* for three decades of service.

With that said, I am concerned that the combined rule has excluded many important amendments that deserve to be debated. This includes an amendment I offered to stop the Department of Defense from recouping bonuses to servicemembers based on their COVID-19 vaccination status. I have heard about this issue from my constituents, and this practice must be stopped.

Lastly, this combined rule provides for two abortion measures which I strongly oppose. I am deeply concerned that these measures would remove all pro-life protections at the Federal and State level. Constituents in my home State of Oklahoma overwhelmingly support these protections, and as a former State legislator myself, I find this approach to be unacceptable.

Madam Speaker, for these reasons, I urge my colleagues to reject the combined rule.

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

Madam Speaker, I want to talk about another important piece embodied in the rule, and it is related to the question of alerts and the Active Shooter Alert Act.

It is no secret our country is plagued by gun violence. This year alone, the Gun Violence Archive counted at least 323 mass shootings. It is hard to even process that—323 mass shootings in the United States. We are just halfway through the year.

On May 14, ten Black Americans were targeted in a racially motivated mass shooting at a local Tops grocery store 60 minutes from my home in Buffalo, New York.

Ten days later, the deadliest shooting since Sandy Hook took place in Uvalde, Texas, where 19 kids and 2 teachers were gunned down at Robb Elementary School.

Just a week ago, on July 4 in Highland Park, Illinois, seven people at a 4th of July parade were killed by a gunman during a mass shooting incident. Hard to imagine. So many of us were at parades and activities just like that in our hometowns. Seven people dead.

I have made my position and others have made their position very clear on gun reform, that meaningful, commonsense reform is an absolute necessity. I am committed to fighting for the change that will provide real change and save real lives, big changes.

But, in the meantime, I think this demonstrates our willingness to find common ground on solutions. Again, the Active Shooter Alert Act is bipartisan. It is something we should all be able to get behind on voting “yes.”

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for the time, and frankly, for the thoughtful and wide-ranging debate. It is not a surprise that a rule that covers five very different pieces of legislation would provoke that kind of discussion.

I want to begin in the areas we agree. There are actually three areas in this bill that I will be voting for. Most importantly, quite frankly, is the National Defense Authorization Act.

There is going to be some opposition to that. It was a give-and-take bill, but I remind my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that it actually came out of committee on a 57 to 1 vote; 57 to 1. That says a lot of wonderful things about the leadership of Chairman SMITH and Ranking Member ROGERS on that committee and its ability, after considering over 600 or 700 amendments itself, to find common ground and move forward.

For my colleagues that vote no, that is fine. Again, there is always something in a bill this size you can find to disagree with, but I will remind my friends on my side of the aisle that every single Republican on the committee voted for the bill. So I think it is going to pass and pass quite easily.

I also want to associate myself with my friend's support of the toxic burn pit bill. It is a bill that I have some serious problems with, such as the manner in which it was funded and some of

the procedures by which it moved, but it is a much better bill than we have seen before. It is a step in the right direction.

There is no question my friend is correct when he talks about our obligation as a Congress to look after the men and women who have put their lives on the line for us and suffered egregious harm.

I hope we can do better in the future. I hope we can even revisit some of the financing measures here, but it is important that it get done and that it passes, and I look forward to working with my friend to do that.

I agree with him on the AMBER Alert bill as well, and I will be supporting it. There are some concerns on my side of the aisle about that, and I understand those concerns. Again, I think this is a commonsense measure.

The area that I will not be able to join my friend on does deal with the fundamental protection of human life and the effort of this body to pass legislation that it knows will go nowhere in the Senate simply to make a point.

We ought to be working to find common ground, not to dig down the divisions that we have even more deeply. So I will oppose the rule partly because I oppose some of the measures in the rule; also, because I certainly would like the previous question to be considered.

I thought both of my friends from North and South Dakota made some excellent points on the need to codify the number nine or at least have a discussion about that in this body, and obviously, if we defeat the previous question, we intend to do that.

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

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

Madam Speaker, I begin by thanking the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma. We have the great privilege of serving together on the Rules Committee. We spend many hours together, and I almost always—almost always—find myself in agreement with him.

He is thoughtful. He is dedicated to this institution, committed to the important principles of our democracy and the Constitution, and I consider it a privilege to be able to serve with him and to learn from him, and I appreciate his thoughtfulness in this debate as well.

I also thank my colleagues for their words in support of the rule before us today. A vote in favor of the rule today, in my view, says volumes about what we value. Support for this rule shows we value our servicemembers who put their lives on the line for this country each and every day. When they come home, we will be here to take care of them.

A “yes” vote shows we value our defense preparedness and ensures our Nation is ready to face the very real and

serious global challenges threatening our security. It also demonstrates a willingness to do the bare minimum to address gun violence by ensuring our communities can effectively be able to alert people when an active shooter is in the area.

Last, but certainly not least, a vote in favor tells women in this country that we value and respect them. We support their right to manage their own healthcare.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle can attempt to misdirect and confuse the issues at hand all they want, but the reality is we are presenting concrete proposals to address real issues facing our Nation when it comes to national defense, and I appreciate the bipartisan support for that, the NDAA, gun reform, women's rights, support for veterans. I choose to be on the right side of history on these issues. I am voting “yes.”

Madam 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 1224

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 joint resolution (H.J. Res. 11) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to require that the Supreme Court of the United States be composed of nine justices. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution 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 the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to recommend.

SEC. 12. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 11.

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

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

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

Mr. COLE. Madam 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.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 218, nays 208, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 303]

YEAS—218

Adams	Garcia (TX)	Norcross
Aguilar	Golden	O'Halleran
Allred	Gomez	Omar
Auchincloss	Gonzalez,	Pallone
Axne	Vicente	Panetta
Barragan	Gottheimer	Pappas
Bass	Green, Al (TX)	Pascrell
Beatty	Grijalva	Payne
Bera	Harder (CA)	Perlmutter
Beyer	Hayes	Peters
Bishop (GA)	Higgins (NY)	Phillips
Blumenauer	Himes	Pingree
Blunt Rochester	Horsford	Pocan
Bonamici	Houlihan	Porter
Bourdeaux	Hoyer	Pressley
Bowman	Huffman	Price (NC)
Boyle, Brendan	Jackson Lee	Quigley
F.	Jacobs (CA)	Raskin
Brown (MD)	Jayapal	Rice (NY)
Brown (OH)	Jeffries	Ross
Brownley	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Bush	Johnson (TX)	Ruiz
Bustos	Jones	Ruppersberger
Butterfield	Kahele	Rush
Carbajal	Kaptur	Ryan
Cardenas	Keating	Sanchez
Carson	Kelly (IL)	Sarbanes
Carter (LA)	Khanna	Scanlon
Cartwright	Kildee	Schakowsky
Case	Kilmer	Schiff
Casten	Kim (NJ)	Schneider
Castor (FL)	Kind	Schrader
Castro (TX)	Kirkpatrick	Schrier
Cherfilus-	Krishnamoorthi	Scott (VA)
McCormick	Kuster	Scott, David
Chu	Lamb	Sewell
Ciulline	Langevin	Sherman
Clark (MA)	Larsen (WA)	Sherrill
Clarke (NY)	Larson (CT)	Sires
Cleaver	Lawrence	Slotkin
Clyburn	Lawson (FL)	Smith (WA)
Cohen	Lee (CA)	Smith (NY)
Connolly	Lee (NV)	Spanberger
Cooper	Leger Fernandez	Speier
Correa	Levin (CA)	Stansbury
Costa	Levin (MI)	Stanton
Courtney	Lieu	Stevens
Craig	Lofgren	Strickland
Crist	Lowenthal	Suozzi
Crow	Luria	Swalwell
Cuellar	Lynch	Takano
Davids (KS)	Malinowski	Thompson (CA)
Davis, Danny K.	Maloney,	Thompson (MS)
Dean	Carolyn B.	Titus
DeFazio	Maloney, Sean	Tlaib
DeGette	Manning	Tonko
DeLauro	Matsui	Torres (CA)
DelBene	McBath	Torres (NY)
Demings	McCollum	Trahan
DeSaulnier	McEachin	Trone
Deutch	McGovern	Underwood
Dingell	McNerney	Vargas
Doggett	Meeks	Veasey
Doyle, Michael	Meng	Velazquez
F.	Mfume	Wasserman
Escobar	Moore (WI)	Schultz
Eshoo	Morelle	Waters
Espallat	Moulton	Watson Coleman
Evans	Mrvan	Welch
Fletcher	Murphy (FL)	Wexton
Foster	Nadler	Wild
Frankel, Lois	Napolitano	Williams (GA)
Gallego	Neal	Wilson (FL)
Garamendi	Neguse	Yarmuth
Garcia (IL)	Newman	

NAYS—208

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

Fischbach	Joyce (PA)	Posey
Fitzgerald	Katko	Reschenthaler
Fitzpatrick	Keller	Rice (SC)
Fleischmann	Kelly (MS)	Rodgers (WA)
Flood	Kelly (PA)	Rogers (AL)
Flores	Kim (CA)	Rogers (KY)
Fox	Kinzinger	Rose
Franklin, C.	Kustoff	Rosendale
Scott	LaHood	Rouzer
Fulcher	LaMalfa	Roy
Gaetz	Lamborn	Rutherford
Gallagher	Latta	Salazar
Garbarino	LaTurner	Scalise
Garcia (CA)	Lesko	Schweikert
Gibbs	Letlow	Scott, Austin
Gimenez	Long	Sessions
Gohmert	Loudermill	Simpson
Gonzales, Tony	Lucas	Smith (MO)
Gonzalez (OH)	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NE)
Good (VA)	Mace	Smith (NJ)
Gooden (TX)	Malliotakis	Smucker
Gosar	Mann	Staubert
Granger	Massie	Steauber
Graves (LA)	Mast	Steel
Graves (MO)	McCarthy	Stefanik
Green (TN)	McCaul	Steil
Greene (GA)	McClain	Steube
Griffith	McClintock	Stewart
Grothman	McHenry	Taylor
Guest	McKinley	Tenney
Guthrie	Meijer	Thompson (PA)
Harris	Meuser	Tiffany
Harshbarger	Miller (IL)	Timmons
Hartzler	Miller (WV)	Turner
Hern	Miller-Meeks	Upton
Herrera Beutler	Moolenaar	Valadao
Hice (GA)	Mooney	Van Drew
Higgins (LA)	Moore (AL)	Van Duyn
Hill	Moore (UT)	Wagner
Hinson	Mullin	Walberg
Hollingsworth	Murphy (NC)	Walorski
Hudson	Nehls	Waltz
Huizenga	Newhouse	Weber (TX)
Issa	Norman	Webster (FL)
Jackson	Obernoite	Wenstrup
Jacobs (NY)	Owens	Westerman
Johnson (LA)	Palazzo	Williams (TX)
Johnson (OH)	Palmer	Wilson (SC)
Johnson (SD)	Pence	Wittman
Jordan	Perry	Womack
Joyce (OH)	Pfleger	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—4

Boebert	Ocasio-Cortez
Herrell	Spartz

□ 1221

Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia changed her vote from “yea” to “nay.” So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Barragan	Higgins (NY)	Payne (Pallone)
(Correa)	(Pallone)	Pingree (Kuster)
Bentz (LaMalfa)	Johnson (TX)	Porter (Neguse)
Bowman (Evans)	(Jeffries)	Ryan (Beyer)
Brown (MD)	Kahele (Correa)	Salazar
(Evans)	Katko (Meijer)	(Gimenez)
Cardenas	Kirkpatrick	Sires (Pallone)
(Correa)	(Pallone)	Soto (Castor
Carter (GA)	Lawrence	(FL))
(Mace)	(Stevens)	Speier (Correa)
Castro (TX)	Leger Fernandez	Steel (Obernoite)
(Neguse)	(Kuster)	Taylor (Pfluger)
Cherfilus-	Lieu (Beyer)	Timmons
McCormick	Meng (Kuster)	(Armstrong)
(Evans)	Moore (WI)	Torres (NY)
Cohen (Beyer)	(Beyer)	(Carter (LA))
Deutch	Moulton	Trahan (Stevens)
(Schneider)	(Stevens)	Walorski (Baird)
Doggett (Beyer)	Newman (Beyer)	Williams (GA)
Fallon (Gonzales,	Panetta (Beyer)	(Carter (LA))
Tony)	Pappas (Kuster)	Wilson (SC)
Hartzler (Bacon)	Pascrell	(Lamborn)
	(Pallone)	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. BOURDEAUX). 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. Madam 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.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HOYER was allowed to speak out of order.)

REGARDING TIME FOR VOTING

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, this is going to be a very busy week. There are over 600 amendments made in order to the defense bill.

Clearly, if we do what we just did, and we do it too often—take three times the time allotted to vote; this took about 47 minutes, 48 minutes to vote in the first vote—we will be here for a very long time. No one wants to shirk their duties, but they do want to do their duties on time.

I want to make it clear to the House that I have asked the leadership, the Speaker's Office, to join with me in ensuring that 5-minute votes are 5-minute votes.

My colleagues, invariably, that announcement brings cheers, and invariably, those cheers come after 10, 15, 20 minutes have elapsed on a 5-minute vote—not all of us, but some of us, and many of us sometimes.

In consideration of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle, some of you are going to be angry because you are going to miss a 5-minute vote.

Now, for those of you who are casting proxies, I ask you to cast them immediately upon the vote opening so that we can process the proxies at the desk.

Yelling at one another doesn't help trying to bring some self-respect to this institution. Each of us has to take personal responsibility to do our job, which is to put our card in the voting machine, to put our proxies in, to move along.

I ask all of us to respect that because I am going to try, to the extent humanly possible, to end votes at 5 minutes. Some of you are going to be upset. You are going to walk down the aisle.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I would like to speed this up, and with all due respect, not to yell anything else, but if we did eliminate proxies, we could go to 2-minute votes.

Now, with all due respect, the proxies were put in because of the pandemic. It was put in during the pandemic. You no longer have that from any procedure here. The proxies will take longer than 5 minutes. If we want to be able to—

Mr. HOYER. Ladies and gentlemen—

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, I thought the gentleman said yelling at one another doesn't help.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, I just admonished some people.

This is a serious issue of how the House operates and how your time is respected. We have proxies. We are going to keep proxies. We can debate that, but the fact of the matter is, as long as we have proxies, we are going to have to take into consideration proxies.

But we don't have to simply waste time by people not showing up, proxy or not. That is my whole point, so that we can respect one another's time, respect the work of this institution, respect the work of our committees.

□ 1230

I would urge—and I will yield again—I would urge us to respect one another, respect our time, and respect the constraints of voting within a timeframe, whether it is 15 minutes or 5 minutes.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY).

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, if we look in the Chamber right now, we have a large number of people here, not one person wearing a mask—all right, three or four—and you can continue to wear your mask to vote in person. I don't see how you are going to do a 5-minute vote with proxies.

I understand the lecture you are giving to everybody, but on this side of the aisle we will be here, we will vote, and we would gladly like to do it the same way every other Congress has done it in history, to be here and do the job like we expect the American people to do. And we won't break until the proxies are done.

Mr. HOYER. Let me conclude, Madam Speaker, by urging everybody to stay on the floor. What we are seeing happen many times is somebody votes, they are registered, and then when you go to the next vote they are 10 minutes, 15 minutes late. That is not what we ought to be doing.

We are going to hew to the time limits as closely as humanly possible within the constraints of our clerks who are working very, very hard to accommodate us.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7900, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2023; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 3373, PROTECTING OUR GOLD STAR FAMILIES EDUCATION ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8296, WOMEN'S HEALTH PROTECTION ACT OF 2022; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8297, ENSURING ACCESS TO ABORTION ACT OF 2022; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6538, ACTIVE SHOOTER ALERT ACT OF 2022; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on adoption

of the resolution (H. Res. 1224) providing for consideration of bill (H.R. 7900) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 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; (S. 3373) to improve the Iraq and Afghanistan Service Grant and the Children of Fallen Heroes Grant; (H.R. 8296) 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; (H.R. 8297) to prohibit the interference, under color of State law, with the provision of interstate abortion services, and for other purposes; and (H.R. 6538) to create an Active Shooter Alert Communications Network, and for other purposes; and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 217, nays 204, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 304]

YEAS—217

Adams	DeGette	Kuster
Aguilar	DeLauro	Lamb
Allred	DeBene	Langevin
Auchincloss	Demings	Larsen (WA)
Axne	DeSaulnier	Larson (CT)
Barragán	Deutch	Lawrence
Bass	Dingell	Lawson (FL)
Beatty	Doggett	Lee (CA)
Bera	Doyle, Michael	Lee (NV)
Beyer	F.	Leger Fernandez
Bishop (GA)	Escobar	Levin (CA)
Blumenauer	Eshoo	Levin (MI)
Blunt Rochester	Españillat	Lieu
Bonamici	Evans	Lofgren
Bourdeaux	Fletcher	Lowenthal
Bowman	Foster	Luria
Boyle, Brendan	Frankel, Lois	Lynch
F.	Gallego	Malinowski
Brown (MD)	Garamendi	Maloney,
Brown (OH)	Garcia (IL)	Carolyn B.
Brownley	Garcia (TX)	Maloney, Sean
Bush	Golden	Manning
Bustos	Gomez	Matsui
Butterfield	Gonzalez,	McBath
Carbajal	Vicente	McCollum
Cárdenas	Gottheimer	McEachin
Carson	Green, Al (TX)	McGovern
Carter (LA)	Grijalva	McNerney
Cartwright	Harder (CA)	Meeks
Case	Hayes	Meng
Casten	Higgins (NY)	Mfume
Castor (FL)	Himes	Moore (WI)
Castro (TX)	Horsford	Morelle
Cherfilus-	Houlahan	Moulton
McCormick	Hoyer	Mrvan
Chu	Huffman	Murphy (FL)
Cicilline	Jackson Lee	Nadler
Clark (MA)	Jacobs (CA)	Napolitano
Clarke (NY)	Jayapal	Neal
Cleaver	Jeffries	Neguse
Clyburn	Johnson (GA)	Newman
Cohen	Johnson (TX)	Norcross
Connolly	Jones	O'Halleran
Cooper	Kahele	Ocasio-Cortez
Correa	Kaptur	Omar
Costa	Keating	Pallone
Courtney	Kelly (IL)	Panetta
Craig	Khanna	Pappas
Crist	Kildee	Pascrell
Crow	Kilmer	Payne
Cuellar	Kim (NJ)	Perlmutter
Davids (KS)	Kind	Peters
Dean	Kirkpatrick	Phillips
DeFazio	Krishnamoorthi	Pingree

Pocan	Scott (VA)	Tonko
Porter	Scott, David	Torres (CA)
Pressley	Sewell	Torres (NY)
Price (NC)	Sherman	Trahan
Quigley	Sherrill	Trone
Raskin	Sires	Underwood
Rice (NY)	Slotkin	Vargas
Ross	Smith (WA)	Veasey
Roybal-Allard	Soto	Velázquez
Ruiz	Spanberger	Wasserman
Ruppersberger	Speier	Schultz
Rush	Stansbury	Waters
Ryan	Stanton	Watson Coleman
Sánchez	Stevens	Welch
Sarbanes	Strickland	Wexton
Scanlon	Suozi	Wild
Schakowsky	Swalwell	Williams (GA)
Schiff	Takano	Wilson (FL)
Schneider	Thompson (MS)	Yarmuth
Schrader	Titus	
Schrier	Tlaib	

NAYS—204

Aderholt	Gibbs	Miller (WV)
Allen	Gimenez	Miller-Meeks
Amodei	Gohmert	Moolenaar
Armstrong	Mooney	Mooney
Arrington	Gonzalez (OH)	Moore (AL)
Babin	Good (VA)	Moore (UT)
Bacon	Gooden (TX)	Mullin
Baird	Gosar	Murphy (NC)
Balderson	Graves (LA)	Nehls
Banks	Graves (MO)	Newhouse
Barr	Green (TN)	Norman
Bentz	Greene (GA)	Oberholte
Bergman	Griffith	Owens
Bice (OK)	Grothman	Palazzo
Biggs	Guest	Palmer
Bilirakis	Guthrie	Pence
Bishop (NC)	Harris	Perry
Boebert	Harshbarger	Pfluger
Bost	Hartzler	Posey
Buchanan	Hern	Reschenthaler
Buck	Herrera Beutler	Rodgers (WA)
Bucshon	Hice (GA)	Rogers (AL)
Budd	Higgins (LA)	Rogers (KY)
Burchett	Hill	Rose
Burgess	Hinson	Rosendale
Calvert	Hollingsworth	Rouzer
Cammack	Hudson	Roy
Carl	Huizenga	Rutherford
Carter (GA)	Issa	Salazar
Carter (TX)	Jackson	Scalise
Cawthorn	Jacobs (NY)	Schweikert
Chabot	Johnson (LA)	Scott, Austin
Cheney	Johnson (OH)	Sessions
Cline	Johnson (SD)	Simpson
Cloud	Jordan	Smith (MO)
Clyde	Joyce (OH)	Smith (NE)
Cole	Joyce (PA)	Smith (NJ)
Comer	Katko	Smucker
Conaway	Keller	Stauber
Crawford	Kelly (MS)	Stefanik
Crenshaw	Kelly (PA)	Steil
Curtis	Kim (CA)	Steube
Davidson	Kinzinger	Stewart
Davis, Rodney	Kustoff	Taylor
DesJarlais	LaHood	Tenney
Diaz-Balart	LaMalifa	Thompson (PA)
Donalds	Lamborn	Tiffany
Duncan	Latta	Timmons
Dunn	LaTurner	Turner
Ellzey	Lesko	Upton
Emmer	Letlow	Valadao
Estes	Long	Van Drew
Fallon	Loudermilk	Van Duyne
Feenstra	Lucas	Wagner
Ferguson	Luetkemeyer	Walberg
Fischbach	Mace	Walorski
Fitzgerald	Malliotakis	Waltz
Fitzpatrick	Mann	Weber (TX)
Fleischmann	Massie	Webster (FL)
Flood	Mast	Wenstrup
Flores	McCarthy	Westerman
Fox	McCaul	Williams (TX)
Franklin, C.	McClain	Wilson (SC)
Omar	McClintock	Wittman
Fulcher	McHenry	Womack
Gaetz	McKinley	Zeldin
Gallagher	Meuser	
Garbarino	Miller (IL)	
Garcia (CA)		

NOT VOTING—9

Brady	Davis, Danny K.	Rice (SC)
Brooks	Granger	Spartz
Carey	Herrell	Thompson (CA)