

Raja Chari, a native of Cedar Falls, Iowa, a decorated Air Force pilot, and commander of the NASA SpaceX Crew-3 mission.

Raja recently returned from a successful mission to the International Space Station, a milestone in U.S. space exploration. I had the privilege of meeting Raja yesterday to hear more about his mission with his team, and I appreciate his passion for ensuring that the U.S. wins the 21st century space race—not China.

Raja is an inspiration to the next generation of aspiring astronauts, fighter pilots, and scientists. He is a role model for my two boys, Max and Jax, and other young Iowans who truly want to shoot for the stars.

From Cedar Falls, Iowa, to the International Space Station, Raja has made America proud, and he has made Iowa proud.

#### AMERICANS DESERVE TRANSPARENCY AND OVERSIGHT

(Mrs. GREENE of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, since 9/11 over 13.5 million border encounters have occurred at our border. Over 1 million Americans have died from drug overdoses, and CNN reports that the cartels take in \$19 to \$29 billion annually from drug sales to the United States of America.

Since 9/11 the United States has spent \$8 trillion on foreign wars, and over 7,000 U.S. servicemembers have died defending foreign lands and foreign borders.

Now we have sent over \$50 billion to Ukraine, and President Biden wants another \$37 billion to Ukraine. This will be pushing it to over \$90 billion.

Yesterday Democrats voted “no” on my House resolution to audit Ukraine. The American people deserve transparency and oversight on where their money is going.

I also want to point out that America deserves our borders to be defended so that if we are going to support any war, we should support a war on the cartels that are killing Americans and invading our country.

#### SUPPORTING MEDICARE PROVIDERS

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, as we end this session of Congress in the next few weeks, I remind all Members we are acutely aware that without congressional action, the entire healthcare clinician community faces a cumulative Medicare payment cut in reduction of approximately 8.5 percent on January 1, 2023.

Without congressional action, these cuts will continue to drive hospital consolidation, limit patient access, and

harm physicians’ ability to run their own small businesses.

These outdated cuts in a time when considerable stress is placed upon physicians has meant that they are affected. They are affected because of the costs that they have on their business.

So at a time when we look for this access and the care for our most vulnerable populations, it is up to Congress to make sure that we pass H.R. 8800, the Supporting Medicare Providers Act of 2022.

#### HUMANITARIAN CRISIS AT OUR BORDER

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

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I want to focus a light today on the ongoing humanitarian crisis unfolding at our southern border. This week, President Biden once again refused to visit the border saying: “There are more important things going on.”

It is no surprise the President doesn’t want to go to the border because he would have to confront the crisis that his rhetoric and policies have created.

Unlike the President, I have visited the border. During my visit, one thing became crystal clear: his catch-and-release policies have dramatically escalated the crisis. Law enforcement told me about how coyotes bring women and children across the border trafficking and sexually abusing them along the journey.

Data underscores the impact that President Biden’s rhetoric has had. CBP reports show that Southwest land border encounters have increased almost fivefold in 2 years.

I have a message to the President: It is time to address the border crisis. It is time to stop the drug and human trafficking. And it is time, Mr. President, to finish the wall and reinstate the policies to remain in Mexico.

#### FIRE VICTIMS TRUST

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Throughout California there are tens of thousands of residents who lost their homes, their belongings, and, for some, even their loved ones due to wildfires.

In 2020, the fire victims trust was established to compensate survivors of the 2015 Butte, the 2017 North Bay, and the 2018 Camp fires with a total of \$13.5 billion of settlement award money.

Survivors have waited years for compensation to rebuild their lives, and they have long awaited these funds. Instead, to add insult, many of them are facing immense tax burdens and navigating the uncertainty of our ambiguous tax code trying to find concrete answers of how much they may or may not owe the Government in taxes.

We should not force survivors to pay Federal taxes on compensation they

would otherwise use to rebuild their lives, and we certainly should not be forcing them to pay taxes on funds that are going to the lawyers involved as well.

Congressman MIKE THOMPSON and I have introduced H.R. 7305 to correct this injustice. I am urging all my colleagues in the House to support this bipartisan legislation and bring much-needed financial reprieve to these wildfire survivors.

They shouldn’t have to live with this uncertainty over their heads. This needs to be passed by the end of this year.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o’clock and 34 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1903

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JONES) at 7 o’clock and 3 minutes p.m.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PRO- VIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8404, RESPECT FOR MAR- RIAGE ACT

Ms. SCANLON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 117–608) on the resolution (H. Res. 1510) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8404) to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act and ensure respect for State regulation of marriage, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8404, RESPECT FOR MAR- RIAGE ACT

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1510 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1510

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker’s table the bill (H.R. 8404) to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act and ensure respect for State regulation of marriage, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on the Judiciary or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees. The previous

question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion.

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

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), 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. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which 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. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today, the Committee on Rules met and reported a rule, House Resolution 1510, providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to H.R. 8404, the Respect for Marriage Act. The rule makes in order a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on the Judiciary that the House concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 8404 and provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. Speaker, tonight's rule provides for the consideration of the Respect for Marriage Act, and I am proud to support this rule to move that bill to the floor.

The Respect for Marriage Act will repeal the discriminatory Defense of Marriage Act once and for all and ensure that all across America, families in same-sex and interracial marriage are afforded the respect and legal rights and protections they deserve.

Passage of this bill is a critical step to protect the rights and freedoms of all Americans, regardless of their sexual orientation or race, following the Supreme Court's recent decision in *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization*. That decision and recent statements by the Supreme Court's new rightwing majority have left families across the country and in my district worried about the future of marriage equality.

The Respect for Marriage Act will ensure long-term stability and important statutory protection for all marriages. The Respect for Marriage Act will safeguard the protections laid out in *Obergefell v. Hodges*, as well as prior case law, that protect important fundamental privacy and liberty rights, all of which were improperly called into question in the *Dobbs* decision and related dicta.

This is a matter of respecting the fundamental rights, freedoms, and liberties of our neighbors, family members, and fellow citizens. Everyone should have the right to marry the per-

son they love and live free from discrimination, regardless of where in this great land they live or travel.

In addition to securing the respect for those marriages, this bill will also secure respect for families across America and in all of our communities and families.

The issues addressed by this bill have been thoroughly debated in this body, in the Senate, and by the American public. The Respect for Marriage Act will ensure long-term stability and important statutory protections for all.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this commonsense legislation and to reaffirm the fundamental right to marriage equality.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I will yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to speak on the bill included within this rule, Senate amendment to H.R. 3404, the Respect for Marriage Act.

Mr. Speaker, as you well know, this bill previously came before the House. Unfortunately, at the time, the legislation was a byproduct of a very truncated process, having received no committee markup and being parachuted from the Speaker's office straight to the floor.

In response to the rushed House process, the Senate actually undertook a more comprehensive amendment process on the floor, giving Senators the opportunity to amend the legislation, something we did not have the opportunity to do. I am encouraged that the amended version from the Senate has tried to address some of the religious liberty concerns that myself and other Members have highlighted.

Even though I can report that this bill is much improved from its original form, there are still problems with this legislation and its possible implications for religious institutions and matters of conscience.

It is regrettable that certain amendments that would safeguard religious liberty, such as Senator LEE's and Congressman ROY's amendments prohibiting the government from removing a nonprofit organization's tax-exempt status based on religious beliefs, those were all blocked.

Had those additional amendments received a fair hearing and as a result been adopted, we could have made significant progress toward addressing the very serious and legitimate concerns about the consequences of this legislation and its potential curtailment of a fundamental American right.

Today's bill, while a better product than before, should have been better, and it is regrettable that we are at this point and this is the case.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, families in my community are justly skeptical of process arguments which have been regularly weaponized to roll back the rights, the freedoms, the liberties that they so richly deserve to exercise. So I think at this point, there has been plenty of process. There has been amendment process in both Chambers, and it is time to pass this legislation.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY), a colleague and certainly a well-spoken member of the House Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, obviously, I rise in opposition to the rule. I made my position clear in the Committee on Rules earlier this week, and I think it is very much a position held by a large number of my colleagues.

It is a shame that we are sitting here debating the institution of marriage but without actual debate. We are here, we are going to debate this rule, it will be a few minutes, and then boom, we are going to go vote. We are not going to have any real debate on this tomorrow either.

I offered an amendment in the Committee on Rules, an amendment to add protections for religious liberty, and it was killed on a budget point of order, a budget point of order that it said would cost around \$500,000 or more. For what? For damages that an individual American might receive if successful in challenging the Department of Justice if their rights were being infringed.

Let me be clear. It was going to be killed on a point of order out of the Committee on Rules because it could be successful in protecting the rights of Americans, when you have got a piece of legislation that has a private right of action put into it, a sword to be used against the American people if they exercise their closely held religious beliefs. And that is the truth.

It is a bill that was passed off of this floor with no hearing in the House Committee on the Judiciary, sent to the Senate in July, with no protection for religious liberty in it, and then provisions were added in the Senate to provide some very bare minimum, narrow religious liberty protections, only for the solemnization of marriage.

When an individual tries to offer an amendment to try to protect the rights of all Americans to be free from persecution—if, for example, you are a school, a religious school, that might not want to hire somebody in a same-sex marriage because it is against your closely held religious beliefs, you might have to litigate that now. The response by the other side is: Oh, my gosh, the Constitution exists; oh, my gosh, RFRA, the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, exists.

So the shield that people had before is now the thing that you have to go litigate in court and hire lawyers to defend yourself for exercising your closely held religious beliefs against the

sword that this legislation provides. That is the truth of what we are dealing with here.

We offered an amendment in good faith, just like Senator MIKE LEE did, a bipartisan amendment, by the way. We are getting no debate, no ability to offer that amendment on the floor, no ability to have a debate on that amendment, no ability to actually have a conversation about the free exercise of religion and protecting people's closely held religious beliefs.

That is why people are sick of this institution. We do not debate. We do not amend. We simply jam stuff through the Committee on Rules and then we walk away and go give speeches on the steps. That is no way to do business. I hope we change that in the new Congress. But this is not the way to do business in the House of Representatives.

□ 1915

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, we believe that the gentleman's amendment is both duplicative and unnecessary.

The Senate spent months crafting a bipartisan compromise to amend H.R. 8404 to address the religious liberty concerns that were raised by Republicans in the House and Senate. Sections 6 and 7 of this legislation ensure no impact on religious liberty.

Adopting this new and unnecessary amendment would unsettle the Senate's carefully crafted compromise and delay the enactment of this necessary, historic, and bipartisan legislation.

If the House passes this legislation, it will be sent straight to the President's desk to become law. This Congress is coming to a close, and we don't have the time to make changes to this legislation.

This bill has gone through both the House and Senate and through the American public, and I believe it needs to be signed into law as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters in support of this legislation from the Interfaith Alliance, from U.S. Jewish organizations, and from eight leaders of faith-based organizations representing tens of millions of Americans and hundreds of religious institutions.

NOVEMBER 28, 2022.

Hon. TAMMY BALDWIN,  
*Hart Senate Office Building,*  
*Washington, DC.*

Hon. SUSAN COLLINS,  
*Dirksen Senate Office Building,*  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR SENATORS BALDWIN AND COLLINS: The Respect for Marriage Act is a simple way to provide legal stability for all married couples and their families. Within our communities, we approach matters of marriage, family, and identity differently. This bill recognizes this diversity of belief while ensuring that same-sex and interracial couples are treated with equal respect by federal and state governments.

As faith-based organizations, we recognize that the First Amendment right to religious freedom is a cornerstone of our democracy.

The bipartisan substitute amendment provides important clarification around the interaction between the Respect for Marriage Act and the robust religious freedom protections guaranteed under federal law. Crafted in the spirit of collaboration, the amendment protects the right to believe as we choose while leaving intact the core mission of the legislation to respect marriages.

The freedom to marry who one loves is a matter of human dignity and supported by a majority of almost every major religious tradition in the United States. We urge the Senate to adopt the bipartisan amendment in full, without further amendment needed to protect religious freedom.

Respectfully,

Interfaith Alliance, ADL (The Anti-Defamation League), Bend the Arc: Jewish Action, Center for Faith, Justice, and Reconciliation, The Episcopal Church, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, Faithful America, Hindu American Foundation, Hindus for Human Rights, Jewish Women International, Keshet.

Muslims for Progressive Values, National Council of Jewish Women, NETWORK Catholic Social Justice Lobby, Presbyterian Church (USA) Office of Public Witness, Reconstructionist Rabbinical Association, The Sikh Coalition, Sojourners, Union for Reform Judaism, Unitarian Universalist Association, United Church of Christ.

Washington, DC, September 6, 2022.

U.S. JEWISH ORGANIZATIONS' LETTER TO SENATE SUPPORTING RESPECT FOR MARRIAGE ACT

On behalf of the Union for Reform Judaism, Keshet, and 108 additional Jewish organizations, the following letter was shared in support of the Respect for Marriage Act (S. 4556):

DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of the 100 undersigned national, state, and local Jewish organizations, we write to express our support for the Respect for Marriage Act (S. 4556). Driven by our Jewish values, we are committed to supporting laws that protect the civil rights and individual liberties of all people. The Respect for Marriage Act would codify three landmark Supreme Court cases, *Obergefell v. Hodges*; *Windsor v. United States*; and *Loving v. Virginia*, and therefore the basic rights of same-sex and interracial marriage. We urge Congress to swiftly pass this important bill.

Jewish tradition teaches that all people are created *b'tzelem Elohim*, in the Divine image, and are worthy of dignity and respect. As organizations grounded in Jewish values and beliefs, we have an ethical and moral responsibility to fight for a society that ensures the humanity of all people. Every person is entitled to marry who they love—regardless of sexual orientation or race.

Indeed, support for same-sex marriage protections extends across the faith community, and throughout the country. A majority of all faith groups—including 77 percent of Jews, 57 percent of mainline Protestants, and 57 percent of Catholics support same sex marriage. This view is shared by seven in ten Americans—including 83 percent of Democrats, 73 percent of independents, and 55 percent of Republicans.

Additionally, the Respect for Marriage Act would ensure that all federal benefits are available to married couples regardless of the state in which they live. Congress has a responsibility to pursue economic equity for all, regardless of geographical location, and include historically marginalized groups in this pursuit.

The right to marry who one loves is a matter of human dignity. Our faith teaches us

the *kol yisrael arevim ezh bazeh*, we are all responsible for each other, and therefore must take action to create a community for which we all can take pride.

As Jewish organizations, we believe firmly that all people deserve the right to marry who they love, regardless of sexual orientation or race. We urge Congress to pass the Respect for Marriage Act.

Sincerely,

Union for Reform Judaism, Keshet, ADL (Anti-Defamation League), ADL Austin Region, ADL Florida, ADL New England, ADL New York/New Jersey, ADL San Diego, ADL Southeast, ADL Southwest, ADL Texoma, ALEPH: Alliance for Jewish Renewal, Ameinu, American Conference of Cantors, American Jewish World Service, Avodah, Aytzim, Bend the Arc: Jewish Action, Beth Chayim Chadashim, B'nai B'rith Connect, California Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism (RAC-CA), Carolina Jews for Justice, Central Conference of American Rabbis, Charles and Lynn Schusterman Family Philanthropies, Coastal Roots Farm, Columbia Jewish Congregation, Congregation Agudas Achim, Austin Texas, Congregation Har HaShem, Boulder, CO; Congregation Rodeph Shalom, Congregation Sha'ar Zahav, Florida Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism (RAC-FL), Greater Miami Jewish Federation, Hadassah, The Women's Zionist Organization of America, Havurat Shalom, Andover MA, IKAR, Illinois Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism (RAC-IL), J Street, Jewish Alliance for Law and Social Action, Jewish Community Action, Jewish Community Center of Asheville, Jewish Community Federation and Endowment Fund, Jewish Community Relations Council (JCRC) of the Jewish Federation of Greater Philadelphia, Jewish Community Relations Council of Broward County, Jewish Community Relations Council of Greater Boston, Jewish Community Relations Council of San Francisco, the Peninsula, Marin, Sonoma, Alameda, and Contra Costa Counties, Jewish Council for Public Affairs (JCPA), Jewish Council on Urban Affairs.

Jewish Emergent Network, Jewish Family Service Houston, Jewish Family Service of Greater New Orleans, Jewish Family Service of Los Angeles, Jewish Family Service of San Diego, Jewish Federation of Greater Ann Arbor, Jewish Federation of Greater Portland, Jewish Labor Committee, Jewish Teen Education and Engagement Network, LLC (JTENN), Jewish Women International, Jewish Youth Climate Movement, Jews for a Secular Democracy, Jews United for Justice (JUFJ), Jewtina y Co., JQY (Jewish Queer Youth), JYCA (Jewish Youth for Community Action), Kane Street Synagogue, Lab/Shul, Makom Shelanu.

Malkhut: progressive Jewish spirituality in Queens, Massachusetts Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism (RAC-MA), MAZON: A Jewish Response to Hunger, Men of Reform Judaism, Milwaukee Jewish Federation, Mishkan Chicago, Moving Traditions, National Council of Jewish Women, National Council of Jewish Women New York, Network of Jewish Human Service Agencies, New Israel Fund, New Jersey Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism (RAC-NJ), New York Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism (RAC-NY), Ohio Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism (RAC-OH), Peninsula Jewish Community Center, Pennsylvania Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism (RAC-PA), Rabbinical Assembly, Reconstructing Judaism, Reconstructionist Rabbinical Association.

Romemu, SAI-Judaism that Stands for All, Saul Mirowitz Jewish Community School, Shalom Austin, Sixth Circle Consulting, Society for Humanistic Judaism, St. Paul Jewish Federation, T'ruah: The Rabbinic Call for

Human Rights, TBE, Temple Beth Ahm Yisrael, Temple Beth El (Tacoma), Temple Beth El of Boca Raton, Temple Emanu-El of Westfield, Temple Kol Emeth, Temple Ohabei Shalom, Temple Shir Tikva, Texas Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism (RAC-TX), The Shalom Center, The Temple—Atlanta GA, The Workers Circle, Tivnu: Building Justice, Tribe 12, Tzedek Georgia, USY, Women of Reform Judaism.

NOVEMBER 15, 2022.

Re The Respect for Marriage Act (H.R. 8404)  
*U.S. Senate,*  
*Washington, DC 20515*

DEAR SENATORS: We are leaders of faith-based organizations representing tens of millions of Americans and hundreds of religious institutions. All our organizations hold to an understanding of marriage as between one man and one woman. Many of us privately expressed concerns about the House-passed version of the Respect for Marriage Act.

We are gratified by the substitute religious freedom language offered by Senators Collins, Baldwin, Sinema, Portman, Tillis, and Romney. It adequately protects the core religious freedom concerns raised by the bill, including tax exempt status, educational funding, government grants and contracts, and eligibility for licenses, certification, and accreditation. If passed, it would continue to build on the congressional wisdom represented by the Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993 (RFRA).

Attached are many statements from individual organizations.

Sincerely,

ELDER JACK N. GERARD,  
*The Quorum of the*  
*Seventy, The Church*  
*of Jesus Christ of*  
*Latter-day Saints.*

MELISSA REID,  
*Director of Govern-*  
*ment Affairs, Sev-*  
*enth-day Adventist*  
*Church—North American*  
*Division.*

NATHAN J. DIAMENT,  
*Executive Director for*  
*Public Policy, Union*  
*of Orthodox Jewish*  
*Congregations of*  
*America.*

SHIRLEY HOOGSTRA,  
*President, Council for*  
*Christian Colleges*  
*and Universities.*

REV. JUSTIN E. GIBONEY,  
*President, AND Cam-*  
*paign.*

STANLEY CARLSON-THIES,  
*Founder and Senior*  
*Director, Institu-*  
*tional Religious*  
*Freedom Alliance.*

STEPHANIE SUMMERS,  
*CEO, Center for Public*  
*Justice.*

TIM SCHULTZ,  
*President, 1st Amend-*  
*ment Partnership.*

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, if I could, I would inquire as to whether or not the gentlewoman has additional speakers.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I have one additional speaker.

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

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), the

distinguished chairwoman of the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for her leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule for the Respect for Marriage Act.

In all my decades of public service, I have never wavered in my support for the LGBTQ+ community. In 1990, I introduced the first legislation in New York State history to grant legal recognition to same-sex couples. When the Defense of Marriage Act was introduced in 1996, I was one of 67 House Members to vote against it. I knew then what I know now: DOMA was a bigoted, discriminatory solution to a problem that never existed.

It never made sense that I could get into a cab and meet someone that I have never met before, a cab driver, and marry a complete stranger. You could marry the driver that day. Yet a bold, brave New Yorker, and a friend of mine, named Edie Windsor could not have her marriage recognized. She took that fight to the Supreme Court and won.

Mr. Speaker, the Respect for Marriage Act will ensure LGBTQ equality, but much more work needs to be done. I thank Chairman NADLER for this bill.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), a former chairman of the Rules Committee.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, it is important what we are doing here because our friends, the Democrats, were arguing that there is no additional rights of action, that this isn't going to change anything. In fact, this same discussion that we are having, if that is true, and we are going to say that we take them at their word, that would mean no rights of action would take place as a result of this law.

Any judge would be able to look at the reason why we are passing this and the intent that would be on the floor of the House of Representatives, and that is what is being stated here tonight: No right of action; that is not what this is about.

I would hope that we would understand, just as when I was the chairman of the Rules Committee, that what we did and the way we talked on this floor is what the intent would be for a judge, for a lawsuit. If something were to happen, they would open up the RECORD, just as we are doing here tonight, Mr. Speaker, and a judge, magistrate, Federal judge, State district judge, anyone ruling on this constitutional right would be able to see that this is not about a right of action.

So, let's be clear. That was stated point blank in this discussion on the floor of the House of Representatives. It was reiterated up at the Rules Committee at the time that the rule came to the floor. That is what is stated. I will accept that as their word.

I thank the gentleman from Lewisville, Texas, for his time and

service to the Rules Committee. I spent 20 years on the darn committee, 6 years as chairman, and I understood when we handled matters that we spoke clearly and that we spoke directly about the intent of the law. I have heard enough to understand that, and I appreciate Mr. BURGESS for yielding to me.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I would again inquire whether my colleague has any further testimony.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, if the gentlewoman is prepared to close.

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

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

In closing, I would note that today's rule is, in fact, the product of a very rushed legislative process. The bill should have been subject to regular order so that it could be improved to address religious liberty concerns noted by my fellow Members.

The very fact that we have had this discussion here on the floor to me indicates that there is some ambiguity. I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY) and Chairman SESSIONS for coming and raising the argument.

Section 6 of this bill provides protection of religious liberty, but only if you are religious enough. If you are a church, you are protected. If you are an individual or a school, you may not be, and you may be subject to that private right of action.

What we are voting on today is emblematic of how this one-party Democratic rule has been enforced in Washington, D.C., over the past 2 years. I am discouraged to see the majority is still focused on passing partisan messaging bills which will not address the problems they purportedly claim to want to solve.

This week, we are considering partisan bills instead of focusing our efforts on things like funding the Federal Government, maybe even the authorization for the Nation's defense, one of the requirements under the Constitution that we fulfill.

Unfortunately, tonight, this is a continuation of a discouraging and regrettable trend that I hope will be revisited by a new Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, tonight's vote should be an easy one. The Respect for Marriage Act passed the Senate with broad bipartisan support, and the bill is supported by over 70 percent of Americans. It provides critical safeguards for a right that many Americans have already exercised and rely upon for the protection and prosperity of their families.

The Respect for Marriage Act is historic legislation to protect the marriages of same-sex and interracial couples. I don't think history will look kindly on those who, when given the

ability to protect the rights and freedoms of their constituents, chose to say no.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the LGBTQ community, my cousins, my dearest friends and neighbors, religious communities across the country, and, of course, the city of brotherly love and sisterly affection, which I am so proud to represent, I stand in strong support of the Respect for Marriage Act, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote “yes” on this rule and the bill.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 217, nays 204, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 512]

YEAS—217

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

Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schrader  
Schrier  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Sewell  
Sherman  
Sherrill  
Sires  
Slotkin  
Smith (WA)  
Soto  
Spanberger  
Speier

Aderholt  
Allen  
Amodei  
Armstrong  
Arrington  
Babin  
Bacon  
Baird  
Balderson  
Banks  
Barr  
Bentz  
Bice (OK)  
Biggs  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (NC)  
Boebert  
Bost  
Brady  
Brooks  
Buchanan  
Bucshon  
Budd  
Burchett  
Burgess  
Calvert  
Cammack  
Carey  
Carl  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Cawthorn  
Chabot  
Cline  
Cloud  
Clyde  
Cole  
Comer  
Conway  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Curtis  
Davidson  
Davis, Rodney  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Ellzey  
Emmer  
Estes  
Fallon  
Feenstra  
Ferguson  
Finstad  
Fischbach  
Fitzgerald  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Flood  
Flores  
Fox  
Franklin, C.  
Scott  
Fulcher  
Gaetz  
Gallagher  
Garbarino  
Garcia (CA)

Gibbs  
Gimenez  
Gohmert  
Gonzales, Tony  
Gonzalez (OH)  
Good (VA)  
Gooden (TX)  
Gosar  
Granger  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green (TN)  
Greene (GA)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guest  
Guthrie  
Harris  
Harshbarger  
Hartzler  
Hern  
Herrell  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice (GA)  
Higgins (LA)  
Hill  
Hinson  
Hollingsworth  
Hudson  
Huizenga  
Issa  
Jackson  
Jacobs (NY)  
Johnson (LA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson (SD)  
Jordan  
Joyce (OH)  
Joyce (PA)  
Katko  
Keller  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
Kim (CA)  
Kustoff  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Latta  
LaTurner  
Lesko  
Letlow  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Mace  
Malliotakis  
Mann  
Massie  
Mast  
McCarthy  
McCaul  
McClain  
McClintock  
McKinley  
Meijer  
Meuser  
Miller (IL)

Bergman  
Buck  
Cheney  
Donalds

Stansbury  
Stanton  
Stevens  
Strickland  
Suozi  
Swalwell  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tlaib  
Tonko  
Torres (CA)  
Torres (NY)  
Trahan  
Trone

NAYS—204

Miller (WV)  
Miller-Meeks  
Moolenaar  
Mooney  
Moore (AL)  
Moore (UT)  
Mullin  
Nehls  
Newhouse  
Norman  
Oberholte  
Owens  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Pence  
Perry  
Pfluger  
Posey  
Reschenthaler  
Rodgers (WA)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rose  
Rosendale  
Rouzer  
Roy  
Salazar  
Scalise  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sempolinski  
Sessions  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smucker  
Spartz  
Staubert  
Steel  
Stefanik  
Steil  
Steube  
Stewart  
Taylor  
Tenney  
Thompson (PA)  
Tiffany  
Timmons  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Van Drew  
Van Dune  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Waltz  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams (TX)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Yakym  
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—10

Kinzinger  
McHenry  
Murphy (NC)  
Rice (SC)  
Rutherford  
Ryan (OH)

□ 2001

So the resolution was agreed to.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, please accept this personal explanation as I was unexpectedly detained during vote proceedings. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 512.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE

RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Axne (Pappas)	Jacobs (NY)	Palazzo
Baird (Bucshon)	(Sempolinski)	(Fleischmann)
Bass (Cicilline)	Johnson (TX)	Pascarell
Beatty (Neguse)	(Pallone)	(Pallone)
Brooks	Kahele (Correa)	Payne (Pallone)
(Fleischmann)	Kildee (Pappas)	Pressley
Brown (MD)	Kirkpatrick	(Neguse)
(Beyer)	(Pallone)	Roybal-Allard
DeFazio	Lawrence	(Correa)
(Pallone)	(Garcia (TX))	Ruppersberger
Doyle, Michael	Lawson (FL)	(Sarbanes)
F. (Pallone)	(Wasserman	Rush (Beyer)
Duncan	Schultz)	Simpson
(Norman)	Lieu (Beyer)	(Fulcher)
Dunn (Salazar)	Malliotakis	Sires (Pallone)
Evans (Beyer)	(Gimenez)	Swalwell
Gosar (Weber	Maloney, Sean P.	(Correa)
(TX))	(Pappas)	Titus (Pallone)
Grijalva (Neguse)	Mfume (Beyer)	Torres (NY)
Hayes (Neguse)	Napolitano	(Pappas)
Herrera Beutler	(Correa)	Wagner
(Stewart)	Neal (Beyer)	(Fleischmann)
Hice (GA)	Newman (Correa)	Welch (Pallone)
(Boebert)	O'Halleran	Wenstrup
Huffman (Levin	(Pappas)	(LaHood)
(CA))		Yarmuth (Beyer)

## ENSURING LIBERTY FOR UKRAINE

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, today is day number 286 of Russia's unprovoked, illegal terrorist war on Ukraine.

As Congress works to complete our 2023 appropriations bills, it is critical that the appropriation accounts for defense and energy security be fully funded. Let us be mindful that liberty has real enemies.

Our Nation, in alliance with the free nations of the world, cannot miss a beat in ensuring NATO remains the strongest defender of global liberty.

Vladimir Putin's criminal war on its innocent neighbor began in 2014. By crossing Ukraine's sovereign border, Putin violated every tenet of international law that has existed since World War II.

Then in February of this year, Russia unleashed its full terror. The free world must draw a bold line in the sand against Russia's illegal behavior.

Any nation that does not respect the sovereignty, territorial integrity, and independence of adjoining nations must be brought to full reckoning.

The free world cannot stand by idly. Putin's war machine must be defeated.

The people of Ukraine are fighting valiantly for their own freedom. May the bills being drafted as I speak ensure our Nation meets its obligation as liberty's primary defender.

### RECOGNIZING 81ST ANNIVERSARY OF NATIONAL BIBLE WEEK

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 81st anniversary of National Bible Week.

In 1941, weeks before the United States entered into World War II, Franklin D. Roosevelt declared the week of Thanksgiving as National Bible Week. This celebration recognizes the spiritual and historical significance of the Bible. It is a week where we can come together and celebrate this holy book. The Bible shaped our Nation's history and continues to provide guidance to the lives of so many.

Madam Speaker, I am grateful to live in a country where we can freely read Scripture and worship the Lord without fear of persecution. The Bible is timeless and continues to provide us with words of wisdom, comfort, and guidance as we navigate unprecedented times.

Madam Speaker, I leave you with this verse from 2 Timothy 3:16–17, one that I keep close to my heart: “All Scripture is breathed out by God and profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, and for training in righteousness, that the man of God may be competent, equipped for every good work.”

May God continue to bless the United States of America.

### RECOGNIZING LONDON SCHOOL THIRD GRADERS

(Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the third grade classes at Landon School.

In the class of Ms. Brown is my nephew, Jake, who, like his fellow classmates, works very hard to treat others with respect and honor.

That is one of the important principles of Landon because Landon holds firmly to the conviction that character matters, and they aim to graduate students who will positively impact their communities.

The Landon third graders are off to a good start, recently finishing a unit on the three branches of government.

I am honored they have asked me to join them over Zoom to tell them about what it is like being a Member of Congress.

I applaud Landon students for showing interest in the important work of serving in government, and I expect, Madam Speaker, that one day some of them will end up right here, speaking at the podium. Go Bears.

### CONGRATULATING TAKEITA TOLLMAN

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Savannah attorney Takeita Tollman for her placement on the Georgia Trend 40 Under 40 list.

Takeita is a very impressive young woman who has dedicated her life to public service. She began her career as a certified nurse assistant in high school, intending to become a doctor upon graduation.

Once she reached college, she realized that her passion was in writing and turned to a career in the legal profession.

Takeita attended law school at the University of Akron in Akron, Ohio. Takeita's legal specialties are Social Security disability, workers' compensation, and personal injury.

Takeita is serving some of the most vulnerable within our community. She is dedicated to helping people not just in the office but after hours, too.

She is a member of the Port City Bar Association and offers job shadowing to members of 100 Black Men of America. She also organized a sock drive for Savannah's homeless population.

I am proud to say that stories like Takeita's aren't uncommon in Savannah, though this makes them no less impressive. It just shows the kind of city we are.

I take this opportunity to thank Georgia Trend for recognizing Takeita's excellent work today and congratulate her on making the 40 Under 40 list.

### ONGOING CRISIS AT THE SOUTHERN BORDER

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

Mr. FULCHER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak on the ongoing crisis at our southern border.

Recently, Homeland Security Secretary Alejandro Mayorkas stated that the border is secure. No one, including the Border Patrol agents he is tasked with leading, believes that assertion.

The truth is, in the last month, border agents reported over 70,000 apprehensions at the southern border, the highest month on record.

Now, you may ask yourself: Why is a Member of Congress from Idaho concerned about what is happening 700 miles away?

The truth is, the Biden administration's dereliction of duty at the border has consequences for millions of Americans across the country, including my constituents in Idaho.

Idaho Sheriff Kieran Donahue raised the alarm on how our porous border and drug cartels are creating the

fentanyl crisis in so many communities, warning that due to these policies, fentanyl is at everyone's doorstep.

In 26 days, Republicans will take control of this Chamber, and the Biden administration should be prepared to take account for their complete failure to address this border crisis.

□ 2015

### WE ARE A NATION OF CARING AND HUMANITARIANISM

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, 18 days before this Nation turns its eyes toward a beautiful recognition—for those of us who practice the understanding of the birth of our Lord—Christmas—and the many other faiths that will celebrate their special days in their own way—Brittney Griner still remains incarcerated in the most devastating, horrific, cruel, and brutal conditions. She must come home, along with Paul Whelan.

At the same time, I stand with the defenders of democracy, Ukraine, and hope that we will provide the resources necessary and be able to accept their fight for democracy while our former President asks to suspend our Constitution. Let us do the support for Ukraine and not suspend the Constitution.

Finally, ravaging floods are still plaguing the people of Pakistan. We have asked for \$600 million. They deserve those dollars to be able to restore their lives—pregnant women, families, farmers suffering and starving. It is necessary, as an ally of the United States, that we try to respond in this funding cycle now—dollars needed for Pakistan.

I look forward to working with the administration to provide the relief that they need. We are a Nation of caring and humanitarianism.

Bring Brittney Griner home now.

### MAKE AMERICA MORE SAFE AND SECURE

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

Mr. FALLON. Madam Speaker, it shouldn't be a partisan issue when we talk about the border and border security.

You know what it really comes down to?

It is the United States of America versus the Mexican drug cartels.

In April of this year, we had 234,000 illegal border crossings. It was the worst on record, by the way, only to be exceeded the very next month, in May, by 241,000 illegal border crossings.

Why do I mention this?

Because we don't know who these people are. No one ever talks about the 3.8 million people in the world that are