

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Democrats and their efforts today to protect women and their fundamental reproductive rights.

In my home State of Texas, more than 50,000 women had an abortion last year. These are women who made an extremely personal and intimate healthcare decision based on what is best for them, their families, and their future.

Yet, MAGA Republicans have never wanted these women to have these fundamental rights, and they aim to strip away their freedoms.

But to all the women and the families who may be scared and are listening across America right now, please hear me now:

House Democrats have your back. We trust women. We are fighting for you. We always have, and we always will.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8294, TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2023; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8373, RIGHT TO CONTRACEPTION ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8404, RESPECT FOR MARRIAGE ACT, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1232 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1232

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8294) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2023, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117-55 shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. Points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, for failure to comply with clause 2 or clause 5(a) of rule XXI are waived.

SEC. 2. (a) No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution considered pursuant to subsection (b), amendments en bloc described in section

3 of this resolution, and pro forma amendments described in section 4 of this resolution.

(b) Each further amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules 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 action thereon, shall not be subject to amendment except as provided by section 4 of this resolution, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

(c) All points of order against further amendments printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules or against amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or her designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of 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 Appropriations or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment except as provided by section 4 of this resolution, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

SEC. 4. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees may offer up to 5 pro forma amendments each at any point for the purpose of debate.

SEC. 5. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. In the case of sundry further amendments reported from the Committee, the question of their adoption shall be put to the House en gros and without division of the question. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SEC. 6. During consideration of H.R. 8294, the Chair may entertain a motion that the Committee rise only if offered by the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or her designee. The Chair may not entertain a motion to strike out the enacting words of the bill (as described in clause 9 of rule XVIII).

SEC. 7. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 8373) to protect a person's ability to access contraceptives and to engage in contraception, and to protect a health care provider's ability to provide contraceptives, contraception, and information related to contraception. 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 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. 8. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 8404) to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act and ensure respect for State regulation of marriage, 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 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 Judiciary or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 9. (a) At any time through the legislative day of Thursday, July 21, 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 July 18, 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 1230 is hereby adopted.

SEC. 11. Clause 7 of rule XIII shall not apply to any resolution introduced prior to the date of adoption of this resolution.

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

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. RESCHENTHALER), 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. SCANLON. 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 gentlewoman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, on Monday the Committee on Rules met and reported a rule, House Resolution 1232, for three measures.

First, it provides for consideration of H.R. 8294 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 Appropriations, makes in order 190 amendments, provides en bloc authority, allows the chair the ability to offer up to five pro

forma amendments, and provides one motion to recommit.

Second, the rule provides for consideration of H.R. 8373 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 Energy and Commerce, self-executes a manager's amendment, and provides one motion to recommit.

Third, the rule provides for consideration of H.R. 8404 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 for one motion to recommit.

Finally, the rule provides the majority leader or his designee the ability to en bloc requested votes on suspension bills this week and deems passage of House Resolution 1230.

Madam Speaker, today's rule provides for consideration of three important bills—one that is part of the regular process of funding the government for the next year, and two that are emergency measures to respond to the ongoing assault by an extremist right-wing minority against Americans' individual rights and liberties.

The first bill is a package of bills called the minibuss. This package of six annual appropriations bills provides funding for the Federal Government for the next fiscal year for a wide array of important government programs: Food and farming, transportation, housing, conservation and environmental protection, veterans programs, community development, and general operations of the Federal Government.

Thanks to the strong leadership of House Democrats on the Committee on Appropriations, today's bill makes major investments to meet the needs of Americans at this difficult point in time. When we talk about these huge budget bills each year, it can be overwhelming, so let's look at some concrete examples of how these bills are going to benefit our country.

This budget bill will increase funding for veterans' healthcare by \$20 billion, helping the VA to meet the health needs of our Nation's veterans. In addition to funding traditional health services for veterans, this bill will expand mental healthcare, including suicide prevention, improve women's healthcare, homeless assistance programs, substance use disorder programs, and invest in medical research to address veterans' unique health needs.

With the lack of affordable housing being one of the major issues impacting our communities across this country, this bill will increase funding for housing by \$9 billion and provide 140,000 more families and seniors with stable, affordable housing. It will get lead and radon out of public housing units and incentivize the construction of thousands of new units of affordable housing.

This bill will provide a \$7 billion boost for the Department of the Interior and the Environmental Protection Agency, which is funding for our national parks, our land and water conservation programs, and for enhanced enforcement of our environmental protection laws so that Americans of all ages and backgrounds—and our children—can have clean air to breathe and water to drink, and enjoy the natural wonders that our amazing country has to offer.

This bill provides a \$2 billion increase for programs that support public health, rural development, and fight hunger. Vital funding for SNAP and WIC will increase access to healthy foods for the 40 million Americans who rely upon our Nation's antihunger programs, improving their health and lowering the cost of living for those in need.

Funding for the FDA under this title will improve the safety and availability of baby formula. It will strengthen oversight of our food and drug safety laws and support supply chains for critical drugs and medical devices.

Funding for rural development will provide grants and low-cost financing to expand broadband and fix water infrastructure in rural communities, promoting community and economic development.

The bill also provides an additional \$4 billion in funding for government operations so that our Federal agencies can do the work that we all rely upon. Among other things, this boost will help the IRS improve its processing times and provide more taxpayers with help when filing. A stronger IRS will also be able to better enforce our tax laws to make sure that billionaires and large corporations pay their fair share.

This funding will more than triple the Election Security Grants program which provides funding to the States to secure our Federal elections by purchasing new technology and keeping ahead of bad actors who try to attack our elections. This funding has helped to make the U.S. elections so secure that anyone who says the 2020 election was stolen is either a liar or a fool.

This funding will encourage economic development by funding the Small Business Administration's lending programs and the Treasury Department's Community Development Financial Institutions. Combined, these programs are often the main source of financing for minority and women-owned small businesses, many of which are increasingly leading the way in creating jobs and economic opportunities.

The minibuss also makes major investments in our servicemembers by increasing funding for housing and childcare on military installations.

□ 1030

This funding will provide more childcare services for the 1.2 million children of Active-Duty servicemembers, as well as the ability to construct

and remediate thousands of substandard units of military family housing.

Finally, this year's appropriations bills build on last year's successes with community project funding, which allows Members of Congress to better represent their districts and exercise Congress' responsibility to direct Federal spending, rather than delegating it.

Community project funding allows Members to support smart, high-impact investments in their districts in a way that is transparent and ethically sound. I thank the Appropriations Committee for their work to responsibly reinstate this opportunity.

Because of these rule changes, I have been able to bring millions of dollars back to my district for a variety of locally backed efforts ranging from mental health programs to community centers to workforce development. This year, I am proud to have secured funding for 15 projects totaling \$20 million for Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District.

Madam Speaker, obviously, I could keep going on about the amazing things that this bill will do, but all together the minibuss is a strong investment in our country that will help working families, small businesses, and local communities, as well as helping to fight inflation, create jobs, and support economic development.

Funding the government is Congress' primary responsibility. It is right there in the beginning lines of Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution, that Congress has the power to provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

With the consideration of these six appropriations bills this week, and the other six later this month, House Democrats are meeting their responsibility to the American people by passing a budget on time.

I say House Democrats because I am concerned that my Republican colleagues may follow their recent practice of refusing to work in a bipartisan manner to fund the government or to solve problems for the American people, and then voting against this bill when it comes to the floor.

Of course, over in the 50-50 Senate, where 10 Republican votes are needed to pass a budget bill, the Senators have not even begun consideration of any appropriations packages. Just like last year, House Democrats are passing funding bills on time while Republicans in the Senate are holding up the process for months by slow-walking negotiations and refusing to compromise.

Last year, this obstructive behavior by Senate Republicans meant that Congress didn't pass its 2022 budget until we were halfway through that year. That meant by the time the Federal Government received its 2022 funding, it only had 6 months left to use it. That is irresponsible. That is not good business, and it is not sound government.

At every turn, the filibuster and stonewalling by Republican Senators squash every single legislative initiative that comes their way.

Madam Speaker, this rule also brings two other critically important bills to the floor. Today's rule also provides for consideration of the Right to Contraception Act, a bill that would codify fundamental privacy rights relating to purchasing, using, and providing contraception; and the Respect for Marriage Act, which would codify the right to same-sex marriage in Federal law.

These are two basic freedoms that the overwhelming majority of Americans support, and that most Americans are surprised to learn are now under threat from an extremist rightwing minority in our Supreme Court and many Republican State legislatures across the country.

In the wake of the Dobbs decision, we immediately saw a number of States implement or try to pass abortion bans. The practical and tragic consequences of those decisions are growing every day with women and girls unable to get the healthcare they need, whether it is a 10-year-old rape victim in Ohio being denied medical care in her home State or a woman with an ectopic pregnancy in Missouri whose healthcare providers are withholding what is standard medical care because they fear prosecution under these laws.

These tragic stories will continue, and they will get worse. This is the world we live in in the aftermath of the extremist Dobbs decision. But the impact of the Dobbs decision does not end with abortion care. The extremist rightwing majority on the Supreme Court has put our country down a perilous path. They have shown us the harsh reality of judicial review—no objectivity, no textualism or originalism, this is just politics by other means.

The majority in Dobbs and others who hold this minority view are pushing a rightwing agenda that can be summed up as this: for all their talk about States' rights and individual freedoms, the rightwing majority is going to uphold the rights they support and take away the rights they oppose.

The two bills we consider today respond to the immediate threat articulated by Justice Thomas in his concurrence in the Dobbs decision—that he wants to overturn decisions that protect rights to contraception, same-sex marriage, et cetera. It is not just Justice Thomas, Justice Alito has joined him in similar concurrences; and, of course, he wrote the majority decision in Dobbs.

Rightwing legislators and Members of Congress are saying exactly what they want to do and introducing bills to do exactly this—to undermine the right to contraception and to undermine the right to same-sex marriage. These are not hypotheticals but very real threats.

In response to this insanity, the House must vote this week on the Right to Contraception Act and the Re-

spect for Marriage Act. The Right to Contraception Act would prohibit States from banning or restricting possession, sale, purchase, transportation, use, prescription of contraception, including birth control, IUDs, condoms, and other products that aid in family planning.

The Respect for Marriage Act will codify the current law of the land and protect the thousands of same-sex marriages and families across this country, who are now justifiably afraid that their families are under attack. I can't tell you how many constituents, colleagues, friends, and their children that I am hearing from in the wake of this decision and in the wake of Justice Thomas' explicit threat.

Both of these bills will protect rights enjoyed by Americans that are now being threatened by the Supreme Court minority view and their co-conspirators in the Republican Party. I am glad we are bringing these bills up for a vote so we can see who is going to vote for them and who is going to vote against them.

I am confident that House Democrats will provide the votes necessary to pass the bills. It is time for our colleagues across the aisle to stand up and be counted. Will they vote to protect these fundamental freedoms, or will they vote to let States take those freedoms away?

Today we will find out. Then we will see what our colleagues in the Senate will do. We are going to put these bills up for a vote, and the public can see, on the record, how their Representatives and Senators respond. At least everyone will know where their elected officials stand.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from my home State of Pennsylvania for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, the rule before us today makes in order three pieces of legislation, including H.R. 8294, a bill to fund 6 of the 12 appropriations bills.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I want to just say I am extremely grateful to Ranking Member GRANGER and Chairwoman DELAURO for all the hard work that they put in, and also the committee staff. I know a lot of effort went into this legislation.

Unfortunately, the product before us was flawed from the very start. House Democrats drastically underfunded our national defense while providing major increases to the same social programs that have already received trillions of dollars in funding under the Biden administration.

It is clear that the Democrats' out-of-control spending has been the key driver to inflation. Don't take my word for it. Larry Summers, former economic adviser to President Biden, went so far as to call the American Rescue Plan "the least responsible macro-

economic policy we've had in the last 40 years." Again, that was Larry Summers, Democrat adviser to the President.

You know what? He was right. Last month, inflation hit 9.1 percent. That is the highest inflation rate in my lifetime. It is the highest inflation rate since 1981.

President Biden's inflation crisis has cost the American worker over \$3,000 in annual income, and the skyrocketing cost of goods and services will cost the average American family over \$6,000. That is what is so nefarious about inflation, it hits the working class and those on a fixed income the hardest.

Yet, the Big Government Democrats with their reckless spending policies have these six bills before us today included in the package. The six bills included in today's package received a total increase of 11 percent over the previous fiscal year with some accounts, like the Federal Trade Commission and the Office of Personnel Management, receiving double-digit and triple-digit percentage increases, which will, of course, fuel additional inflation.

Keep in mind, the Defense appropriations bill approved by the Appropriations Committee had just a 4.4 percent increase. Additionally, instead of addressing record-high gas prices, Democrats are pushing this partisan Green New Deal initiative that will only worsen Biden's energy crisis.

Under this measure, offshore oil and gas activities are restricted and oil and gas inspection fees are increased. This is just going to drive up the cost of energy for working families.

H.R. 8294 also includes numerous far-left, radical, liberal policies like allowing taxpayer dollars to fund abortions, and keeping our critical and strategic minerals in the ground. Alarming, it includes provisions that threaten our national security, including allowing for the closure of Guantanamo Bay, which houses some of the world's most dangerous terrorists. It also fails to modernize the nuclear weapons stockpile and complex, and provides incentives for illegal immigration.

Further, the rule before us today provides for consideration of H.R. 8373, which goes far beyond supporting access to contraception. Let me just be clear about this point. Not a single State in the Union, not a single general assembly in any State is debating considering making contraception illegal.

This poorly drafted bill has extreme provisions that could harm the health of women, send taxpayer dollars to Planned Parenthood and other abortion providers, and force people to violate their religious and sincerely held beliefs.

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

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, these appropriations bills are not going to make inflation worse. It is a bad-faith argument. Inflation is bad. It is

eating away at family paychecks not just here in America but all across the globe.

My colleague cited the recent inflation figures here in the U.S.—they are worse overseas. The economic shocks in supply chain disruptions caused by the pandemic and then exacerbated by Russia's invasion of Ukraine are hitting hard—yes, here at home and all across the world. There are things that we are doing to bring those prices down, and economic indicators show that prices are starting to come down. It doesn't deny the real pain that we are all feeling right now.

Second, which spending would he have eliminated? Would it have been the funding to develop vaccines and therapeutics? Maybe the funding to keep people in their homes during the pandemic? Would it be the funding that supported small businesses over the last several years, or maybe it is just the paycheck protection funding?

I think it is a hollow argument, and I think it is also worth noting that we are not seeing any alternative solutions.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ROSS), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. ROSS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to discuss the urgent need to protect access to contraception.

Just a few weeks ago, the Supreme Court's decision in *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization* stripped millions of women of the right to abortion care. After this decision, draconian abortion bans in States across the country immediately went into effect.

In my own State of North Carolina, Republican leaders have made it abundantly clear that they will take any opportunity to restrict our rights. Perhaps even more sinister than this decision are the opinions that accompanied it.

Justice Clarence Thomas' concurring opinion laid the groundwork for even greater government interference in the personal and family decisions of our people, including the right to use contraception. Make no mistake, the American people will not go backward on contraception.

We must codify *Griswold v. Connecticut*, which has protected women's right to make decisions about their own contraceptive healthcare for decades.

This week, we are considering the Right to Contraception Act. This critical legislation will safeguard contraception and its access in the face of these extreme attacks. Americans overwhelmingly support the right to contraception.

Madam Speaker, I hope to hear from my colleagues across the aisle about how they could do anything other than support expanding contraception in the wake of the *Dobbs* decision.

If my colleagues want to prevent abortions, why would they restrict resources to women who want to avoid unintended pregnancies?

Madam Speaker, I fought to expand access to contraception in North Carolina with support from legislators on both sides of the aisle. Twenty years later it is extremely disappointing that we could be going backward.

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

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

□ 1045

Ms. ROSS. Madam Speaker, women across the country are more determined than ever to combat these relentless attacks on our freedom. I support the rule and the underlying bills.

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

Madam Speaker, my friend and colleague from Pennsylvania asked me which programs I would cut funding from as if this were some kind of checkmate in floor debate. It is not because the answer is very obvious. I have an extensive list of where I would cut.

Just for starters, let's look at some of the increases in the appropriations package and, of course, where I would cut.

We have a 20 percent increase for the Environmental Protection Agency. That could be cut.

We have a \$1 billion increase for the Internal Revenue Service. That could be cut right there.

There is a 30 percent increase for the Federal Trade Commission. That could be cut. Don't take my word for it. Not one but two of the Commissioners of the FTC said that they don't even need this increase. There is money that you could cut right there, Madam Speaker.

There is a 12 percent increase to maintain and improve Federal buildings. I don't know if anybody across the aisle has been paying attention, but most of the people in these Federal buildings have been working remotely from home for the last 2 years. Yet, we need to increase funding to Federal buildings that are literally sitting empty as people work from home?

Then, we have a lot of bad ideas regarding climate. \$100 million is provided for the President's proposal to use the Defense Production Act authorities to accelerate domestic manufacturing of select clean energy technologies. That can be cut.

While we are talking about the shift to clean energy technologies, let's just be honest about who benefits from this. It is China because they are the ones who are selling the rare earth elements that are going into things like solar panels. By the way, they are bringing more nuclear power plants online and more coal-fired plants online while we hamstring our economy and our energy sector with these absurd climate change proposals.

I have more, actually, but for the sake of time and brevity, I will save them for later if the issue comes up.

Additionally, this notion that inflation is a worldwide issue, I am not sure when they stopped teaching economics in school, but we are the world's largest GDP. If we have inflation, then the world has inflation because we literally export it. That is just how economics works.

To blame Ukraine, Ukraine might play a part in this, but who is to blame for Ukraine? It is President Biden. It was the weakness and vacillation—his surrender in Afghanistan—that emboldened Putin. It was the vacillation. It was the “minor incursion” comment that he had that gave Vladimir Putin the green light to invade. Had he just been more resolute in our national security, then we could have deterred this invasion. So, he owns Ukraine, as well.

The gentlewoman from North Carolina brought up *Dobbs*. I want to quote the actual decision because I think a lot of the points in *Dobbs* were taken out of context. The Court made it clear in that decision that the decision on abortion should “not be misunderstood or mischaracterized . . . to cast doubt on precedents that do not concern abortion.”

The Court went out of its way to state that they are not concerned about contraception, despite the gentlewoman from North Carolina saying otherwise.

But let's go back to *Dobbs*. Since the point of the leak of the *Dobbs* draft Supreme Court decision, there have been 70 violent attacks and threats on churches, pregnancy centers, and pro-life organizations.

These attacks consist of vandalism. They consist of destruction of property, arson, and even included protesters breaching the Arizona State Capitol, forcing legislators to evacuate.

Radical pro-abortion groups have proudly declared “open season” on pro-life pregnancy centers while these organizations are providing critical resources to pregnant women, infants, and families.

Republicans want to protect public safety. We want to ensure pro-life organizations can continue helping women and babies in need. That is why if we defeat the previous question, I will personally offer an amendment to the rule to immediately consider H. Res. 1233, a resolution affirming the importance of pro-life crisis pregnancy centers, condemning the violent attacks by far-left extremist groups, and calling upon the Biden administration to use all law enforcement authorities to uphold public safety and protect the rights of pro-life facilities, groups, and churches.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RESCENTIALER. Madam Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSON). The vice chairman of the Republican Conference and sponsor of the resolution is here to explain the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I am grateful for the opportunity. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for handling the rule and highlighting this very important issue.

As he said, if the previous question is defeated, then Republicans will amend the rule to immediately consider H. Res. 1233. That is the resolution that condemns the spate of attacks that have recently occurred against pro-life facilities, groups, and churches in the wake of the Dobbs opinion.

Madam Speaker, these acts are reprehensible, but we shouldn't be surprised they are occurring all across the country. They have gone unchecked for far too long, ever since the draft Dobbs opinion was inexcusably leaked to the public in that unprecedented act.

Republicans immediately condemned that leak as a threat to the institution of the Court itself, as a threat to the Justices themselves as individuals, and as a threat to our very Republic. The Democrat leadership of this body did nothing.

Weeks went by as tensions grew. Protesters harassed sitting Supreme Court Justices, a clear violation of the black-letter Federal Law. Republicans filed a resolution condemning those acts. The Democrat leadership of this body did nothing even as threats continued to pour in against the Justices and their families.

The Senate acted. They unanimously passed legislation to extend security to the families of the Justices. I and many of my colleagues repeatedly called upon the Speaker of this House to bring this resolution to the floor so we could pass it here and send it to the President's desk. But do you know what we got, Madam Speaker? Nothing.

It was only when an attempt was actually made on the life of Justice Kavanaugh that the Speaker finally gave in. She finally brought that legislation to the floor so that we could push back against the angry mobs.

Madam Speaker, the leadership of this body has another opportunity before them today to, once again, push back against the mob. This has gotten out of hand.

Radical leftists were emboldened by the inaction of this body and the aftermath of a leaked opinion, and now they have targeted their violence against the very groups that care for women and their unborn children in their most vulnerable moments. It is unconscionable.

Here is a short list of some examples.

May 3, 2022: Individuals vandalized the Care Net Pregnancy Center in Frederick, Maryland, with pro-abortion graffiti, including the messages "not real clinic," "end forced motherhood," and go to Planned Parenthood instead.

May 5, 2022: Portland, Oregon, vandals smashed numerous windows and spray-painted graffiti on the Southeast Portland Pregnancy Resource Center.

May 7, 2022: Activists vandalized a crisis pregnancy center in Denton, Texas, with the radical pro-abortion messages "not a clinic" and "forced birth is murder."

May 7, 2022: In Fort Collins, Colorado, activists painted "my body, my choice" on the doors of a Catholic parish.

May 8, 2022, Mother's Day: Individuals attempted to break into the Oregon Right to Life office in Keizer, Oregon, reportedly igniting and throwing two Molotov cocktails at the building.

May 8, 2022: Vandals spray-painted pro-abortion messages such as "abortion is a right," "fake clinic," and "liars" on the side of a pro-life pregnancy center in Manassas, Virginia.

May 8, 2022: A pro-life nonprofit center in Madison, Wisconsin, was set ablaze and vandalized with the words "if abortions aren't safe, then you aren't either."

May 13, 2022: Activists left threatening messages on the front of the Alpha Pregnancy Center in Reisterstown, Maryland, including the messages "if abortions aren't safe, neither are you," "you're anti-choice, not pro-life," et cetera.

May 18, 2022: Vandals targeted a women's faith-based medical clinic in Auburn, Alabama, defacing the clinic's sign and staff members' vehicles.

May 25, 2022: In Lynnwood, Washington, anti-life activists smashed windows and vandalized the Next Step Pregnancy Center with the threat: "If abortion isn't safe, you aren't either."

June 2, 2022: Jane's Revenge claimed credit for an attack in which its members broke windows and scrawled messages, including "God loves abortion" and "fake clinic," at Agape Pregnancy Resource Center in Des Moines, Iowa.

June 3, 2022: Capitol Hill Crisis Pregnancy Center here in Washington, D.C., was the target of leftwing abortion extremists who threw red paint on the door, threw eggs at the window, and spray-painted the window with "Jane Says Revenge."

I have pages and pages of these. I don't think I need to belabor the point. It is every day now. It is out of control.

I am going to tell you, Madam Speaker, that this last one, July 11, on the list here, activists vandalized the Women's New Life Clinic in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, by spray-painting anti-life messages and "Jane's Revenge" on the exterior walls.

That last one is personal to me. The Women's New Life Clinic stands right next to the abortion provider in Baton Rouge and has offered hope to countless women over the years. Women's New Life Clinic is doing extraordinary work. I am proud to call many of the leaders of that clinic personal friends. They do not deserve the treatment that they have endured, but they certainly deserve the support of the House

of Representatives in condemning violence from the radical left.

America's pregnancy care centers provide absolutely essential services in all 50 States. There are 2,700 of these pregnancy centers. They serve millions of women every year. They are supported by over 10,000 medical professionals. I used to serve as legal counsel to a number of these groups, so I am telling you this from personal experience.

Madam Speaker, I can go on all day with these examples. I will spare you. I would assume that you recognize the obvious.

When will this body stand up against the mob? When will we restore law and order?

CHUCK SCHUMER stood on the steps of the Supreme Court itself and infamously called out Justices Kavanaugh and Gorsuch by name and said that we would release the whirlwind. Well, here it is. This shouldn't surprise us.

Madam Speaker, our side is ready to act. We are ready to do something. We have an obligation and responsibility to do it.

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

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I am so happy that my colleagues are rising to condemn political violence, but I find it disingenuous and maybe even a little one-sided when they only condemn political violence that they disagree with.

This previous question condemns violence, as my colleague just said, by the radical left but not the radical right. They are conveniently ignoring decades of violence, harassment, and even murder of abortion care providers and harassment of those seeking such care on a daily and weekly basis.

Why are they surprised by this political violence on this topic when this is a model that the anti-abortion forces have utilized for decades?

Also, on a more practical note, I am stunned that my colleague is seeking to reduce funding for the IRS. Any responsible Member of Congress who prioritizes constituent services knows that we receive hundreds and hundreds of calls every year, particularly in recent years, from people who are struggling to get a response from the IRS, who are struggling to get their much-needed tax refund, and who are struggling to get payments or straighten out difficulties. Why is that? It is because the IRS has been underfunded for decades.

The IRS is facing a crisis with retirements and with the inability to attract talent given the tight labor market. We need to fund the IRS again so that billionaires and large corporations pay their fair share.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Ms. GARCIA).

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Madam Speaker, it has been interesting to listen to

the debate. I feel like it is a rerun of the Judiciary Committee, which we all serve on.

I think we should tell the folks across the aisle to just spare us the indignation over this political violence because, as the manager so aptly characterized, they wrote the book on it. I can think of at least one doctor who was murdered and, I think, many others injured by bombings and harassment. It is just beyond the pale what has happened to abortion providers in the last decade.

I want to get back to appropriations because, Madam Speaker, that is really what I came to talk about.

The FY23 appropriations minibuss bill is something that I support. I am really pleased that many of the projects that were included in my request will come to fruition.

One of the six projects included in the bill is \$4 million for the Target Hunger Campus and Education Center, which will focus on hunger prevention and nutrition education for my constituents.

Also included is \$3 million for affordable housing construction projects in my district for Avenue Community Development, which, of course, will help us resolve some of the homelessness issues.

This bill also includes a request for almost \$3 million for enhancements to the University of Houston's Technology Bridge.

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

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Madam Speaker, those are just three of the 15 projects that were funded. I think that when they talk about cutting and inflation, is this what they want to do, to stop a hunger project in my district? Do they want to stop making sure our kids get a good education? Just what is it they are doing?

Finally, Madam Speaker, just quickly, I also support, of course, the bill to protect a woman's right to birth control and the right of same-sex couples to marriage. So, Madam Speaker, there are so many reasons to support this rule and the underlying bills.

□ 1100

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

There was an—I don't know if you want to call it an allegation—an insinuation that the only time I speak to condemn violence is when it is violence that I don't agree with.

I want to be clear about something. I condemn all acts of political violence. I have been very consistent on that; so have my colleagues across the aisle.

Great example: The first time I ever spoke here on the House floor was in support of a resolution rejecting white supremacy, and I talked at length at that time of the Tree of Life synagogue

shooting that occurred in Squirrel Hill, Pennsylvania.

As you know, I am from the South Hills of Pittsburgh. I have a lot of friends that actually attend that synagogue. And again, the first time I spoke on the House floor was to condemn violence.

So I just want the RECORD to reflect my consistency on this issue and the consistency of my colleagues.

I wish my friends on the left would condemn violence that the left has done. It seems that they cherry-pick their own outrage.

But let's just get back to economics. Again, there was this notion floated that inflation is not as bad here as it is internationally, and this is a global problem. Again, it is a global problem because we are the world's largest GDP. We are exporting inflation.

But even with that said, inflation is far worse here than it is in the developed world. Our inflation, by reference, is 9.1 percent. Japan is at 2.4 percent. The U.K. is at 9.1 percent; they are the same as we are. Italy is at 8 percent; Canada, 7.7 percent; France, 5.8 percent.

Again, all those countries I listed, those nations in the developed world have inflation that is lower than where we are, with the exception of the U.K., which is the same. In Brazil—I should say this about Brazil. It is at 11.9 percent in Brazil.

So this idea that everybody is experiencing inflation, and that we have it easier, is just not accurate when you look at the numbers.

Now, I gave a list of what I would cut from the budget. It wasn't an exhaustive list, and neither is this, but I just want to give a few more examples.

\$75 million is allocated for public housing, energy efficiency and climate resilience upgrades. That could be cut. There is 75 million right there.

Funding for the FDA—and let's not forget, the FDA was the agency that failed to prevent the infant formula crisis. The Democrats are rewarding the FDA with a 10 percent increase. That can be cut.

And what is so insulting about a 10 percent increase to the FDA is, at the same time Democrats want to increase the funding to the FDA—again, the agency that led to the baby formula shortage—you have farmers and ranchers that are struggling to make ends meet and to actually harvest food because of the rising food costs and fertilizer costs, and there is no increase to them.

And I think one of the most outrageous items that can be cut is the \$90 million that is going to The Presidio park, a park that is in an incredibly affluent area of San Francisco, arguably, one of the wealthiest areas in the entire United States. Yet, that park is getting \$90 million, when those around that park can fund it.

And again, what is so insulting about this is we are not even giving allocations to places like Yellowstone and

Yosemite that are actually national parks. So those are just some of the areas I would cut.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, let me rise in support of and with rebuttal to my good friend, my other good friend from Pennsylvania.

It is well-known that the appropriations process is an investment in America, and so I rise to support the appropriations that will be presented to us in this rule T-HUD, Agriculture, Energy and Water, Financial Services, Interior, Military Construction, and Veterans.

I ask the question: Is anyone going to suggest that our military personnel do not need better housing, better schools, better facilities, and bases, both in the United States and across the world?

And so, investment in the American people I will never run away from, and I hope the Senate does not, as well.

And on the question of inflation, I want to remind my good friend from Pennsylvania, my other good friend, that the prices of gas at the pump are going down, because inflation is not pertaining to one administration; it is continuing. And the past administration dug the hole of the inflation that we are now in today.

I also want to make sure that every aspect of reproductive freedom is protected, and the contraceptive legislation should be strongly supported because people are running for their lives. Women are running for their lives because they do not have the lack of fear that they could be arrested; that they could be stopped; or a doctor could say: I am sorry, I cannot help you in your desperate time of need.

This rule is very important, and I support the underlying bills.

And finally, let me—as I was here, as we debated this concept of whether or not you are free in your private rights to make a decision of who you love, I support H.R. 8404 the rule provides for this because it says the “full faith and credit given to marriage equality.”

I want the LGBTQ community in Houston to hear me, the caucus to hear me, we are hearing your voices as well. And I want you to know that this bill includes, for the purpose of Federal law, rule, or regulation in which marital status is a factor, an individual shall be considered married if that individual's marriage is valid in the State where the marriage was entered into or, in the case of a marriage entered into outside any State, if the marriage is valid in the place where entered into and the marriage could have been entered into, it is safe.

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

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I know we are running short on time, but I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I believe this law is key to rejecting the interpretation of Justice Clarence Thomas, who indicated, or speculated, that other provisions or rights under privacy may be in jeopardy.

We should not jeopardize someone's right to love who they want to love, interracial marriages, marriages of any kind. And I support the Respect for Marriage Act and the underlying rule. I thank the gentlewoman for her graciousness.

Mr. RESCENTIALER. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers at this time, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Since Democrats jammed through their \$1.9 trillion stimulus bill last year, inflation is at an over 40-year high; the value of American paychecks has also fallen; and families are paying more for just about everything.

Yet, the rule before us makes in order a funding package that provides double-digit and triple-digit increases for nondefense programs that will further fuel Biden's inflation crisis.

And by the way, while this bill is providing double-digit and triple-digit increases for nondefense programs, the defense budget has only increased 4.4 percent. That is appalling.

H.R. 8294 also is packed with far-left liberal wish list items like taxpayer-funded abortion, rather than policies that will address Biden's economic crisis and fix our supply chains, secure our border, and invest in national security, and bring down gas and electricity costs through domestic energy production.

Clearly, the Democrats' spending and policy priorities are out of touch with everyday Americans. And that is just not me saying that. According to a poll, a shocking 75 percent of Americans are experiencing hardship because of Joe Biden and House Democrats' inflation crisis. And the majority of Americans expect the economy to get worse this year.

This bill, like the Democratic Party, is tone-deaf and out of touch.

I, therefore, 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. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Today's rule is a testament to the hard work and leadership of the Appropriations Committee led by Chairwoman DELAUNO. I applaud the efforts of my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee and their staff to prepare legislation that meets the needs of everyday Americans; to grow our economy from the bottom up and the middle out, rather than relying, once again, on the failed trickle-down economics of the last 50 years.

Given the draconian consequences of failing to pass a budget, I encourage my colleagues in the House and Senate to move quickly in negotiating a final budget bill so we can fund the government on time. It is the responsible thing to do.

We cannot afford to govern from CR to CR, or to pass a budget bill halfway through the fiscal year.

And I am also incredibly grateful to my colleagues on the Energy and Commerce Committee and the Judiciary Committee for stepping up to present legislation to protect fundamental American freedoms that have been placed at risk by the rightwing majority of the Supreme Court in overturning *Roe v. Wade*.

I urge all of my colleagues to protect the right to contraception with the act of that name, and to repeal the statutory ban on same-sex marriage by approving the Respect for Marriage Act in its floor consideration.

At a time when Americans' rights are under attack by a well-funded, extremist minority which has seized control of the Supreme Court and some State legislatures, it is more important than ever for elected Members of Congress to use their legislative powers to protect and expand Americans' personal and fundamental freedoms.

So, Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to vote for the rule and the underlying legislation.

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

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 1232

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 12. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the resolution (H. Res. 1233) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives condemning the recent attacks on pro-life facilities, groups, and churches. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of House Resolution 1233.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON LEE). 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. RESCENTIALER. 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 yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 199, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 365]

YEAS—219

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

NAYS—199

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

Fitzpatrick Kelly (MS)
Fleischmann Kelly (PA)
Flood Kim (CA)
Flores Kustoff
Foxy LaHood
Franklin, C. LaMalfa
Scott Lamborn
Fulcher Latta
Gaetz LaTurner
Gallagher Lesko
Garbarino Letlow
Garcia (CA) Long
Gibbs Loudermilk
Gimenez Luetkemeyer
Gohmert Mace
Gonzales, Tony Malliotakis
Good (VA) Mann
Gooden (TX) Massie
Granger Mast
Graves (LA) McCarthy
Graves (MO) McCaul
Green (TN) McClain
Greene (GA) McClintock
Griffith McHenry
Grothman Meijer
Guest Meuser
Guthrie Miller (IL)
Harris Miller (WV)
Harshbarger Miller-Meeks
Hern Moolenaar
Herrell Mooney
Herrera Beutler Moore (AL)
Hill Moore (UT)
Hinson Mullin
Hollingsworth Murphy (NC)
Hudson Nehls
Huizenga Newhouse
Issa Norman
Jackson Obernolte
Jacobs (NY) Owens
Johnson (LA) Palazzo
Johnson (OH) Palmer
Johnson (SD) Pence
Jordan Perry
Joyce (OH) Pfluger
Joyce (PA) Posey
Katko Reschenthaler
Keller Rice (SC)

NOT VOTING—12

Burchett Gosar Kinzinger
Cheney Hartzler Lucas
Davis, Rodney Hice (GA) McKinley
Gonzalez (OH) Higgins (LA) Zeldin

□ 1155

Messrs. RUTHERFORD and CURTIS changed their 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

Barragán Foster Newman (Beyer)
(Correa) (Spanberger) Pascarelli
Boyle, Brendan Gohmert (Weber
F. (Beyer) (TX)) Payne (Pallone)
Brown (MD) Gottheimer Pingree (Kuster)
(Evans) (Spanberger) Porter (Neguse)
Carter (LA) Houlihan Salazar (Waltz)
(Beatty) (Spanberger) Sessions (Babin)
Carter (TX) Kahele (Correa) Sires (Pallone)
(Weber (TX)) Kind (Beyer) Smucker (Keller)
Castro (TX) Kirkpatrick Taylor
(Correa) (Pallone) (McHenry)
Cawthorn (Gaetz) Lawson (FL) Thompson (MS)
Connolly (Beyer) (Evans) (Bishop (GA))
Crist Leger Fernandez Walorski
(Wasserman) (Correa) (Fischbach)
Schultz McEachin (Beyer) Williams (GA)
Demings (Kelly) Meng (Kuster) (Neguse)
(IL) Mfume (Evans) Wilson (FL)
DesJarlais Miller (WV) (Evans)
(Fleischmann) (Mooney) Wilson (SC) (Nor-
Fallon (Green) Moore (WI) man)
(TN)) (Beyer)

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. RESCHENTHALER. 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.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 200, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 366]

YEAS—219

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

NAYS—200

Aderholt Bacon
Allen Baird
Amodei Balderson
Armstrong Banks
Arrington Barr
Babin Bentz

Bost Graves (MO)
Brady Green (TN)
Brooks Greene (GA)
Buchanan Griffith
Buck Grothman
Bucshon Guest
Budd Guthrie
Burgess Harris
Calvert Harshbarger
Cammack Hern
Carey Herrell
Carl Herrera Beutler
Carter (GA) Hill
Carter (TX) Hinson
Cawthorn Hollingsworth
Chabot Hudson
Cline Huizenga
Cloud Issa
Clyde Jackson
Cole Jacobs (NY)
Comer Johnson (LA)
Conway Johnson (OH)
Crawford Johnson (SD)
Crenshaw Jordan
Curtis Joyce (OH)
Davidson Joyce (PA)
Davis, Rodney Katko
DesJarlais Keller
Diaz-Balart Kelly (MS)
Donalds Kelly (PA)
Duncan Kim (CA)
Dunn Kustoff
Ellzey LaHood
Emmer LaMalfa
Estes Lamborn
Fallon Latta
Feenstra LaTurner
Ferguson Lesko
Fischbach Letlow
Fitzgerald Long
Fitzpatrick Loudermilk
Fleischmann Luetkemeyer
Flood Mace
Flores Malliotakis
Foxy Mann
Franklin, C. Massie
Scott Mast
Fulcher McCarthy
Gaetz McCaul
Gallagher McClain
Garbarino McClintock
Garcia (CA) McHenry
Gibbs Meijer
Gimenez Meuser
Gohmert Miller (IL)
Gonzales, Tony Miller (WV)
Good (VA) Miller-Meeks
Gooden (TX) Moolenaar
Gosar Mooney
Granger Moore (AL)
Graves (LA) Moore (UT)

NOT VOTING—11

Burchett Hice (GA) McKinley
Cheney Higgins (LA) Smith (MO)
Gonzalez (OH) Kinzinger
Hartzler Lucas Zeldin

□ 1206

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.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE
RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Barragán DesJarlais Leger Fernandez
(Correa) (Fleischmann) (Correa)
Boyle, Brendan Fallon (Green
F. (Beyer) (TN)) McEachin
(Beyer)
Brown (MD) Foster Meng (Kuster)
(Evans) (Spanberger) Mfume (Evans)
Carter (LA) Gohmert (Weber) Miller (WV)
(Beatty) (TX)) (Mooney)
Carter (TX) Gosar (Gaetz) Moore (WI)
(Weber (TX)) Gottheimer (Beyer)
Castro (TX) (Spanberger) Newman (Beyer)
(Correa) Houlihan Pascarelli
Cawthorn (Gaetz) (Spanberger) (Pallone)
Connolly (Beyer) Kahele (Correa) Pingree (Kuster)
Crist Kind (Beyer) Porter (Neguse)
(Wasserman) Kirkpatrick Salazar (Waltz)
Schultz (Pallone) Sessions (Babin)
Demings (Kelly) Lawson (FL) Sires (Pallone)
(IL) (Evans) Smucker (Keller)

Taylor (McHenry)	Walorski (Fischbach)	Wilson (FL) (Evans)
Thompson (MS) (Bishop (GA))	Williams (GA) (Neguse)	Wilson (SC) (Norman)

ADOPTING CHANGES TO THE STANDING RULES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. LAWRENCE). Pursuant to House Resolution 1232, H. Res. 1230 is hereby adopted.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1230

Resolved,

SECTION 1. SEPARATE ORDER.

On any legislative day through the remainder of the One Hundred Seventeenth Congress, the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 2. CHANGES TO THE STANDING RULES.

(a) PRIVILEGED REPORTS BY THE COMMITTEE ON RULES.—Clause 6(a) of rule XIII is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (2), by striking “; or” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (3) as subparagraph (4); and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (2) the following new subparagraph:

“(3) when the proposed text of such a report has been made available to Members, Delegates, and the Resident Commissioner prior to the convening of that legislative day; or”.

(b) SUSPENSIONS.—Clause 1(a) of rule XV is amended by striking the second sentence.

SEC. 3. REMOTE VOTING BY PROXY.

Section 3(s) of House Resolution 8 is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “and”;

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(4) any reference to ‘the House’ in sections 1(a) and 2(a)(2)(B) shall be construed to include a reference to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union;

“(5) section 3(a)(1) shall not apply; and

“(6) for purposes of sections 1, 2, and 3 and regulations issued pursuant to section 6, the term ‘Members’ shall include Delegates and the Resident Commissioner and the term ‘state’ shall include territories and the District of Columbia, except that—

“(A) nothing in this paragraph authorizes Delegates or the Resident Commissioner to cast a vote in the House or record their presence in the House; and

“(B) Delegates and the Resident Commissioner may only be designated as a proxy by a Delegate or the Resident Commissioner.”.

RESPECT FOR MARRIAGE ACT

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1232, I call up the bill (H.R. 8404) to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act and ensure respect for State regulation of marriage, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TORRES of New York). Pursuant to House Resolution 1232, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 8404

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Respect for Marriage Act”.

SEC. 2. REPEAL OF SECTION ADDED TO TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE, BY SECTION 2 OF THE DEFENSE OF MARRIAGE ACT.

Section 1738C of title 28, United States Code, is repealed.

SEC. 3. FULL FAITH AND CREDIT GIVEN TO MARRIAGE EQUALITY.

Chapter 115 of title 28, United States Code, as amended by this Act, is further amended by inserting after section 1738B the following:

“§ 1738C. Certain acts, records, and proceedings and the effect thereof

“(a) IN GENERAL.—No person acting under color of State law may deny—

“(1) full faith and credit to any public act, record, or judicial proceeding of any other State pertaining to a marriage between 2 individuals, on the basis of the sex, race, ethnicity, or national origin of those individuals; or

“(2) a right or claim arising from such a marriage on the basis that such marriage would not be recognized under the law of that State on the basis of the sex, race, ethnicity, or national origin of those individuals.

“(b) ENFORCEMENT BY ATTORNEY GENERAL.—The Attorney General may bring a civil action in the appropriate United States district court against any person who violates subsection (a) for declaratory and injunctive relief.

“(c) PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.—Any person who is harmed by a violation of subsection (a) may bring a civil action in the appropriate United States district court against the person who violated such subsection for declaratory and injunctive relief.

“(d) STATE DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘State’ has the meaning given such term under section 7 of title 1.”.

SEC. 4. MARRIAGE RECOGNITION.

Section 7 of title 1, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 7. Marriage

“(a) For the purposes of any Federal law, rule, or regulation in which marital status is a factor, an individual shall be considered married if that individual’s marriage is valid in the State where the marriage was entered into or, in the case of a marriage entered into outside any State, if the marriage is valid in the place where entered into and the marriage could have been entered into in a State.

“(b) In this section, the term ‘State’ means a State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or any other territory or possession of the United States.

“(c) For purposes of subsection (a), in determining whether a marriage is valid in a State or the place where entered into, if outside of any State, only the law of the jurisdiction applicable at the time the marriage was entered into may be considered.”.

SEC. 5. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act, or any amendment made by this Act, or the application of such provision to any person, entity, government, or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this Act, or any amendment made thereby, or the application of such provision to all other persons, entities, governments, or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 8404.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 8404 the Respect for Marriage Act would reaffirm that marriage equality is, and must remain, the law of the land.

Over the past several decades, millions of LGBTQ people in loving and supportive relationships have married and formed families, particularly after the Supreme Court ruled, in *Obergefell v. Hodges*, that the Constitution protects marriage equality.

An estimated 2 million children are being raised by LGBTQ families today. An enormous body of research shows that stable and loving families are the foundation for children’s well-being and success, and children do best when their families have the critical legal protections to care for one another.

Thankfully, marriage equality remains constitutionally protected, and there is no indication that it will be overturned in the foreseeable future. It is—and should forever be considered—settled law.

Nonetheless, the Supreme Court’s recent position in *Dobbs v. Jackson Women’s Health*, which extinguished the constitutional right to abortion, has raised concerns among some people that other rights rooted in the constitutional right to privacy may be at risk, notwithstanding the Court’s assurance that *Dobbs* was limited to abortion. This includes the right to marriage equality.

In fact, in a concurring opinion in *Dobbs*, Justice Clarence Thomas explicitly called on the Court to reconsider its decisions protecting other fundamental rights, including the right to same-sex marriage. And although Justice Thomas did not mention the right to interracial marriage, that right relies on the same constitutional doctrines as the right to same-sex marriage, and, therefore, it could be vulnerable to a legal challenge in the future as well.

Even if we accept the Court’s assurance in *Dobbs* that its decision does not call other rights into question, Congress should provide additional reassurance that marriage equality is a