

was especially meaningful as it marked New Prairie's very first State title in any sport.

In their big win, the Cougars were led by star pitcher Ava Geyer, who struck out nine batters to close out a season where she amassed an incredible 28–2 record.

On offense this year, the Cougars were carried by senior slugger Abby Robakowski, who broke the State's home run record and is headed to play at Indiana State in the fall.

Congratulations to Head Coach Derek Hicks and all the players for bringing home the hardware and another State championship to Indiana's Second Congressional District.

Thank you for making the New Prairie community and all of LaPorte County very proud. God bless you, and go Cougars.

IN SUPPORT OF PLACING BUFFALO'S DL&W TERMINAL ON THE NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES

(Mr. HIGGINS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of placing Buffalo's DL&W Terminal on the National Registry of Historic Places.

Built in 1917 to accommodate bustling freight and passenger rail, the long-dormant train shed is a vital component to Buffalo's renaissance.

Positioned along the Buffalo River at the foot of Main Street in downtown Buffalo, the massive structure is undergoing a transformation, including construction of a new Metro Rail station on the ground floor.

Historic designation will make planned private sector development of the second floor eligible for Federal and State historic tax credits.

A nomination would allow the DL&W Terminal to join the list of over 250 historic tax credit rehab projects injecting \$1.2 billion into western New York over the last two decades.

I urge the National Park Service to support the submission of the DL&W Terminal, advancing a critical linchpin to the revitalization of Buffalo's downtown waterfront.

RECOGNIZING THE OHIO NARCOTICS INTELLIGENCE CENTER

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

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the work of the Ohio Narcotics Intelligence Center, or ONIC. I had the pleasure of meeting their team to learn about how their research and advocacy is creating a safer Ohio.

ONIC's team of criminal intelligence analysts and computer forensic specialists assist law enforcement agencies and drug task forces. They provide edu-

cational outreach on dangerous counterfeit prescriptions, fentanyl, and cryptocurrency scams. Additionally, ONIC works with community organizations like RecoveryOhio on programs for law enforcement to comprehensively combat the narcotic crisis.

Recently, ONIC hosted a Law Enforcement Drug Summit where criminal justice professionals learned about drug trends and reduction strategies. Furthermore, this month they will host their inaugural BRIDGE Day to make connections from law enforcement to prevention, treatment, and recovery centers in all 88 Ohio counties.

ONIC's programs provide invaluable support and education to the brave men and women in law enforcement who lay down their lives to keep our communities safe. I am thankful for their work addressing the narcotics epidemic and look forward to continued partnership as we work toward a safer northeast Ohio.

GUN VIOLENCE MUST BE STOPPED

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

Mrs. MCBATH. Mr. Speaker, this past week, Americans gathered nationwide with friends and family to celebrate the founding of our democracy. They enjoyed days off to spend time with their loved ones, and they celebrated our national values as red, white, and blue lit up the sky.

Yet again, the joyful celebrations of Americans were met with further acts of senseless gun violence, because for far too many across the country, gunshots were confused for fireworks on our day of independence, leaving countless numbers dead and over 100 injured.

Mass shootings have marred our Nation more times than there have been days this year.

Mr. Speaker, there is no freedom in living in fear. There is no celebration when our holidays transform into tragedy. Gun violence must be stopped, and this body must act once again to save lives.

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2670, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2024

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 583 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 583

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 further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2670) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2024 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construc-

tion, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

SEC. 2. (a) No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution and amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution.

(b) Each further amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules 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, shall not be subject to amendment, 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 the further amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules or 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 Armed Services or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

SEC. 4. 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. 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 one motion to recommit.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 583.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Rules Committee met and reported out a rule, House Resolution 583, providing for further consideration of H.R. 2670, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2024, or NDAA, under a structured rule. It makes in

order 80 amendments for consideration on the floor, and it provides for one motion to recommit.

I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the House passed a rule setting the parameters for general debate on H.R. 2670 and making in order 289 amendments. At the time, we made clear that the work of the Rules Committee was not yet finished. There was additional work that was left to be done, additional considerations to be had, and additional member priorities to take into consideration.

After a robust discussion, we reported out the rule that is before us today. Taking up this rule will allow us to advance our work forward and will move H.R. 2670 toward a vote on final passage.

Mr. Speaker, I know some in this House will express frustration with the process. Yes, perhaps it would have been more convenient for us to have done our work more quickly.

As this House is well aware, the NDAA is one of the most critical pieces of legislation the House considers each year. It sets overall policy for the Department of Defense and the armed services and allows Congress to set our defense priorities for the year. Perhaps most importantly, it authorizes spending levels on national defense for the fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, on a bill that is this critical to the Nation, it is much more important for us to get things right rather than to do things quickly. When dealing with national defense, we have a sacred obligation to give the American people our best efforts. Although this may have taken a bit longer than anyone, including myself, would have liked, I am proud to say that the rule fulfills that obligation.

I like to think of this, Mr. Speaker, as a process where the House has been working its will. Frankly, we will have a pretty spirited debate here, I suspect, but it is worth noting that the underlying bill that came out of the House Armed Services Committee is pretty much intact. In other words, it has been changed very little in the amendment process yesterday, and I would argue it will be changed relatively little by the amendment process today.

The majority of the items that we deal with today are going to shift. These aren't going to be straight partisan debates in many cases. My friend, Mr. MCGOVERN, and I will probably be on the same side when it comes to helping Ukraine in what we think is a very important struggle. We will probably be on different sides when we come to cluster munitions and whether they should or should not be used. Uncharacteristically, I will be on the President's side, and my friend will have a different opinion on that.

I say that just to say that that's how this place is supposed to work. You move back and forth, you pick the right decisions, and at the end of the

day, there will be a final product and we will have a straight up or down.

□ 1230

Before anybody gets too elated or too disappointed, I will remind everyone that it is not as if this is the last day. This is a vehicle, if it passes, that we will take into conference, and that will be a conference between a Republican House, a Democratic Senate, and it will involve a Democratic President.

Mr. Speaker, I say all that to say that I suspect the process will continue to change the product as we move along. Again, I wouldn't be too giddy if I won today, and I wouldn't be too disappointed, no matter what your particular issue is, if I lost. I do think it is critically important that the vehicle move and that we push forward and sit down and work with our colleagues on the other side of the Rotunda in the Senate, and work with the President of the United States at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue. We need to make sure that we do—for the 63rd consecutive year—what we have done for 62 years, and that is provide for the common defense of the country.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is worth remembering that this is going to be a bipartisan product at the end of the day. There is no way a Republican House, a Democratic Senate, and a Democratic President are going to do anything on any issue that is not essentially bipartisan. That is the way the process works.

No matter what is happening at a given moment, I think we are pre-ordained to come to an agreement that broadly reflects compromise.

Mr. Speaker, we have had two very late nights at the Rules Committee, and I thank particularly my friend, the ranking member, and each and every member of that committee for putting in the hours that it took. I thank our staffs on both sides of the aisle who worked really, really hard.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the staff of the House, particularly our overworked stenographers that were staying there late at night to make sure that we got our job done.

Again, I credit my friend, the ranking member, for this. We have had the good fortune to serve together on this committee for a long time. We had a contentious debate last night, but it was always a civil debate and it was always a professional debate.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the tenor he set for our committee when he was chairman. I am proud of the manner in which he approaches his work each and every day. I am very proud to have the opportunity to work with him in the House.

Again, we will have our differences today—fair enough. I thank my friend for the kind of committee member that he is and, frankly, his commitment to the institution. I say that about each and every member on the Rules Committee on both sides of the aisle, and about their staff and about the staff of

the full House that facilitates our ability to work together and produce a product.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, before I light up the Republican Conference for an absolutely awful process that made a series of offensive amendments in order and blocked some very reasonable amendments, I want the record to reflect that I have the deepest respect and affection for the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE). He always sounds reasonable, in part, because he is a reasonable person. Unfortunately, he is surrounded by Members who are not reasonable, who are not rational, and who are not fair.

Mr. Speaker, I return the compliment that he gave me. Dealing with him is always an exercise in civility and there is mutual respect here. I appreciate him. I appreciate the staff on both sides of the aisle who were up until 2:30 in the morning last night as we were dealing with this rule. I regret very much the process that has brought us to where we are right now.

Mr. Speaker, for the second time this week the Rules Committee was unexpectedly called back at 11 o'clock last night. We sat and waited for over an hour for the meeting to actually get underway, all because Republicans couldn't get their act together.

Republicans had to have yet another backroom meeting, another midnight seance to resurrect this rule because a dozen or so far right, MAGA wing nuts once again threw a fit and hijacked the bill when they realized they weren't going to get a bill that was perfect to them.

It should go without saying, but it is outrageous that a tiny minority of Republicans is getting to dictate exactly what amendments come to the floor. It is outrageous that the Rules Committee last night managed to mess up a bipartisan bill and put it on a path toward becoming a hyperpartisan one by loading it up with every divisive social issue under the Sun. Here is my word of wisdom to Republican leadership: When you have a razor-thin margin in one-half of one branch of government, you don't get your way on everything. Democracy means compromise. Divided government means compromise. Compromise means you don't get everything you want. There has to be a give and take.

I have to admit that I have never in all my time here experienced an NDAA process as outrageously bad as this one. This bill passed out of the House Armed Services Committee by a vote of 58-1. Let me repeat that. It passed with a bipartisan vote of 58-1.

Looking at how extreme most of the Republican amendments are that were made in order, I would be surprised if

this bill can even pass the House. I fear what this final bill is going to look like because of the amendments they are making in order today. This is honestly a disaster. I never ever want to hear lectures about process ever again.

Mr. Speaker, when I was chairman, Democrats made in order over 650 amendments. Democrats made in order over half of all amendments submitted because we believed in the radical idea that we ought to actually do our job and debate things.

Republicans in this NDAA have made in order fewer than a quarter of all the amendments submitted. In fact, despite a record number of amendment submissions this year, they made in order fewer amendments than every Democratic-led NDAA.

What is worse, these are the worst of the worst amendments. They blocked dozens and dozens of commonsense ideas, but they paved the way for the most radical amendments.

In the rule that we are considering today, they made in order 70 Republican amendments, 6 bipartisan amendments, and get this, drum roll, please, 4 Democratic amendments.

Some of these amendments made in order were submitted minutes before we held our markup. For all my Republican friends who rant and rave about how important it is to provide enough time for members to read and understand what they are voting on, we had minutes.

As I said, it is not just the number of amendments they are allowing to come to the floor, it is the type of amendments.

The amendments this rule makes in order are so extreme that it will be a wonder how Republicans will pass this bill if the amendments are included in the final version.

We are all supportive of putting more amendments up for votes. That is how this body should work. When Republicans block Democratic amendment after Democratic amendment, and then make in order dozens of the most extreme Republican proposals, they are not trying in good faith to pass a bipartisan bill. They are not being intellectually honest. They are merely serving up red meat to the most extreme fringe of the Republican base in this country.

Mr. Speaker, let me give you an example. Many of us supported a bipartisan amendment to allow an up or down vote on whether or not the United States should transfer cluster bombs to other countries. I personally do not think this country should be giving cluster munitions to any country because they can harm civilians, and they do harm civilians.

At the last second, our amendment was cut from the rule and replaced by an amendment that would only prevent the transfer of cluster bombs to Ukraine. That is really puzzling to me because when the Republican chair of the Armed Services Committee came to testify, and the ranking Democrat of

the Armed Services Committee came to testify, I asked them a specific question: whether or not they would allow this bipartisan amendment banning cluster munitions to be made in order. Do you know what they said? They had no problem with making it in order.

To have it all of a sudden removed is just puzzling to me. Why do we have hearings—why do we solicit answers on basic questions like: Do you think this would be a good thing to debate on? Are you okay debating on this amendment?—if these hearings mean nothing?

Mr. Speaker, this amendment is being offered by Congresswoman MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE, who has been vocal in her opposition to supporting Ukraine in their fight against Russian aggression. What is this all about?

We want to prevent cluster munitions from going to any country, Ukraine and other countries. Why the narrowing down of this amendment? Why give this amendment to somebody who I don't believe cares about the impact of cluster munitions but is only interested in undermining our policy toward Ukraine?

Forgive our skepticism in thinking that this isn't really about cluster bombs for the new amendment sponsor.

Mr. Speaker, I asked for both amendments to be made in order. I thought that was a fair deal, right? Keep the amendment that we originally had dealing with you can't send cluster bombs anywhere, and you can keep the MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE one. Let's have a debate on both. Let's see where people are. I was told "no." In fact, every single Republican voted "no."

It is clear to me that this is about buying off Members of the MAGA fringe. It is about appeasing a small group of radical, hard-right Members, the MAGA circus I call them, a group that is extorting the Speaker of the House and threatening to take down the bill, and maybe threatening to take down his speakership if they don't get every single thing that they want.

What they want is to load up the NDAA with every single divisive social issue under the sun. The group that is pushing these amendments is the so-called Freedom Caucus. I say so-called because they don't care about freedom.

They are demanding amendments that threaten a woman's access to abortion. They are demanding amendments that roll back LGBTQIA+ rights. They are demanding amendments that undermine diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts.

The Freedom Caucus doesn't care about freedom when it is a woman's freedom to make their decisions about their own bodies or someone's freedom to love who they want or be who they are, or people's freedom to not get shot at school, a grocery store, or a mall.

America needs to understand who the Freedom Caucus is and what they stand for. They do not care about your freedom. They care about their own freedom. They care about their free-

dom to do whatever the hell they want to do, the American people be damned. What an embarrassment. That is who KEVIN MCCARTHY has put in charge.

We are here debating social issues in a defense bill because the far right, the MAGA fringe, the Freedom Caucus are obsessed with these culture wars. They say Democrats are the ones injecting social issues into the military, but make no mistake, they are the ones who are doing that.

KEVIN MCCARTHY has ceded control of this body to the most extreme Members of his own Conference while hanging everyone else out to dry. It is all so that he can hold on to his power. I almost feel bad for our Republican colleagues who are closer to the center, if any of them still exist. KEVIN MCCARTHY may be the MAGA ringmaster, but it is clear that the clowns have taken over the circus.

Mr. Speaker, so many of the amendments this rule makes in order are simply offensive. They have the potential to really hurt people, and they are destructive. I hope that all my colleagues are well-read on what each does before they come to the floor over the next few days to vote.

Mr. Speaker, I will be voting "no" on this rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LANGWORTHY), my very good friend who was there for every minute of the Rules Committee hearings last night and the night before, and a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and consideration of the National Defense Authorization Act.

The legislation before us today makes historic progress to reinforce the strength of our military and to protect our national security in the face of an aggressive, ambitious Chinese Communist Party.

First, this year's NDAA counters the Biden administration's dangerous efforts to reduce the size of our Navy and focuses resources on rebuilding our Armed Forces and procuring munitions.

The bill also puts a firm ban on our military from contracting with companies that do business with the CCP, ensuring the security of our military cannot be internally compromised by our most dangerous adversary.

It accelerates the deployment of advanced radars to track threats to our homeland—like the Chinese spy balloon that this administration was so incapable of taking down.

The NDAA before us today protects our military from the Biden administration's efforts to reduce its strength and to lull our country into complacency while our adversaries pose a direct threat to our national security.

□ 1245

We cannot afford to underestimate the gravity of the situation in the

world today. We cannot have peace through strength without staying alert and ensuring that our men and women in uniform, who make up the strongest and most mighty military on the face of the Earth, have the resources and support that they deserve.

I strongly support the rule before us today, and I urge my colleagues to come together once again for the security of our great Nation.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ), who is a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in June, I went home to where Democrats announced \$670 million of investments in broadband that will grow our middle class in New Mexico. Then, I came back to a Congress controlled by the most extreme Members of the Republican Party who want to strip women of their ability to receive reproductive healthcare.

If these extreme Republicans succeed, it will be unreasonably difficult for servicewomen assigned to bases in States that ban abortion to travel and receive reproductive healthcare.

I came back to an extreme Republican Party that wants to take the culture wars to our military instead of preparing our servicemembers to protect Americans from war.

A travel ban for pregnant servicewomen, how un-American is that?

This rule and the extreme amendments in it are simply unpatriotic. They are un-American. The Republicans are waging culture wars against patriotic women, patriotic Latinos, Blacks, Native Americans, Asians, gays, lesbians, and trans Americans who serve in our military. These patriotic men and women are willing to fight and die for our country.

I call upon my colleagues to honor the sacrifice of these diverse Americans and vote against this rule and these horrible amendments.

I call upon my colleagues to reject the culture wars and instead to celebrate. Let's celebrate the diversity that is America. Let's honor all servicemembers, all servicewomen, and their sacrifice.

Democrats are supporting our troops, and Democrats are investing in our country and investing in our military while Republicans are dividing our country with these extreme amendments.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this extremism.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY), who is another member of the Rules Committee who has been fighting the good fight for the last two nights well past midnight.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I take issue with the characterization of what has transpired with respect to the legislation before us. We have passed, by

voice vote even, four bipartisan en bloc amendments with items like China, Taiwan, readiness, munitions, and Israel—a host of issues that do not fall into the category that the ranking member raises, which I am happy to address in a moment.

There are countless other amendments that we have raised and addressed. For example, my friend Mr. ROSENDALE's amendment, which I know is near and dear to the heart of Mr. GRIFFITH from Virginia, limits indefinite detention.

There are other amendments. For example, Mr. NORMAN's requires that any Department of Defense component that fails to pass an independent audit have 1½ percent of its budget returned to the Treasury for deficit reduction.

These are a lot of very good, commonsense amendments. We went through the process, combed through 1,500 amendments, and made decisions in the Rules Committee on how to equitably bring them to the floor. They cover the gamut of issues that the American people are concerned about when they see their Department of Defense no longer able to defend the United States.

That is the question.

I hear the ranking member talking about how we are injecting culture wars into the National Defense Authorization Act or injecting culture wars into the military when, in fact, it is this administration that has turned the Department of Defense into a social engineering experiment wrapped in a uniform. That is what is happening. That is what the American people see.

When the American people see advertisements in June with rainbow bullets strapped to helmets, when they see surgeries for transgender people being funded by taxpayers at the Department of Defense, and when they see the Department of Defense ignoring existing law, existing precedent, and existing traditionally historic bipartisan agreements on Hyde amendment protections, then they see the Department of Defense being turned into a social engineering experiment.

Of course, the people's House is responding to an executive branch that is making policy by executive fiat not just, of course, in this area but across the entirety of the Federal Government. So, yes, we are offering amendments to address these things.

An Air Force Academy deck slide instructs cadets to use language like "parents and caregivers" instead of "moms and dads." Well, that is a really great use of time for the Air Force Academy. Don't refer to the phrase "mom and dad." Boy, that will do it.

The United States Special Operations Command's diversity and inclusion strategic plan claims that diversity and inclusion are operational imperatives. The Marines tweeted a Pride Month image, as I pointed out, with rainbow-tipped bullets. This stuff is happening every day.

When I go talk to military recruits and talk to the recruiters, they are

struggling. They are not even able to make their recruiting goals. They are well under their numbers. Why? Because the target audience of people who want to serve in the military don't want to be preached to. They don't want to have their entire worldview being questioned by the leaders and the brass in the military.

We are trying to stop that. We would like to make the military focused on killing people and blowing stuff up again because that is what a military is supposed to be for—sparingly used and not in endless wars, but ready and able to defend the United States of America.

The American people I talk to back home don't want a weak military. They don't want a woke military. They don't want rainbow propaganda on bases. They don't want to pay for troops' sex changes. The American people want a military that can provide for security and win wars.

Mr. Speaker, that is what we are doing with this legislation, and I am proud to support the rule.

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

Mr. Speaker, I don't even know where to begin. I will just say to the gentleman that I actually do a lot of work on the issue of grandparents raising grandchildren because some kids don't have moms and dads. Aunts and uncles are raising their nieces and their nephews. So, I don't know even know what that rant was about.

Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order an amendment that prevents implementing the unanimous recommendations made by the bipartisan base renaming commission. The goal of the commission—for my colleagues to be informed—was to ensure that our bases do not celebrate Confederate officers who took up arms against the United States. That is right. The amendment actually stops us from implementing unanimous recommendations to rename bases named after Confederates, men who fought on the side of slavery.

Contrast that with some of the amendments that my Republican colleagues blocked last night. An amendment to provide veterans with free mental health visits was blocked. An amendment to provide funding to organizations to assist the transition of servicemembers back to civilian life was blocked because it was too woke. On my amendment to provide ride-sharing transportation for homeless veterans, they all voted no.

All of them were blocked, but this Confederate base renaming amendment was made in order. That is their priority, protecting the good name of Confederates, literal traitors to the United States? This is the big issue for the Republican Party on the NDAA.

I will say to the gentleman from Texas who was just shouting on the floor that when he talks about this being a good process, again, in this rule that we are considering right now and bringing to the floor right now, there

are 70 Republican amendments, 6 bipartisan amendments, and 4 Democratic amendments. How is that fair or reasonable under any measure?

I could go on and on about how awful some of the Republican amendments are. Let me just highlight another one. Mr. ROY, a member of the Rules Committee, submitted an amendment that says that we are not allowed to teach people that any part of the Constitution has ever been racist.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have to tell you that I was a history major in college. Do I have to explain to people what the three-fifths compromise was? When the Constitution was written, it counted enslaved African Americans as three-fifths of a person, for God's sake. The Constitution literally said that Black people weren't full people when it was written.

Does the author of this amendment just want us to pretend like it didn't happen?

I am someone who actually is proud that America has made progress since then. I am proud of the work that so many have done to right these wrongs. I find this attempt to diminish that progress and to pretend as if there was never any racism in this country incredibly offensive.

Slavery? Never happened.

Jim Crow? What is that? Racism doesn't exist.

Three-fifths compromise? Never heard of it.

This is all just so, so wrong.

For the record, it wasn't until the 14th Amendment passed in 1868 that the three-fifths compromise was explicitly repealed.

So, what is the point of this amendment? To imply that slavery didn't happen? To imply that racism wasn't a problem? To rewrite history and gloss over the three-fifths compromise?

There was a time when the racism of the Republican Party was more subtle. Now, it is just out in the open. They might as well have made in order an amendment to bring back the Confederacy.

I find it incredibly, incredibly disgusting that this was made in order. This is wrong. It is racist. It is really offensive.

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

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

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Having had some tenure on this floor, my recollection is that, in many instances, the NDAA has been a welcomed bipartisan initiative. We have worked together and formulated ways to improve the lives of the men and women of the United States military.

Let me just make it very clear that that is what the NDAA is supposed to be, strengthening our ability to be a fighting force. Who do you have as a

fighting force? The men and women of the United States military.

I take great offense at the suggestion that there are not young people in America who are willing to lay down their lives as our fathers, mothers, and grandparents did. They do want to join the United States military.

It is the ability of the military to govern itself within the civilian framework that we should be promoting in the NDAA. It is a terrible shame that Members of color on this floor will be forced to vote on something that takes us back to the dark ages, to not talking about how richly diverse we are.

All of these race amendments that have been allowed to come to the floor are literally a disgrace.

Did we talk about the diminishing returns when the Tuskegee Airmen took to the skies in the 1940s in World War II and were one of the most successful bombing units ever? Black—my father-in-law, Philip Ferguson Lee.

Did we find a diminishing in the military when Truman integrated legally to allow African Americans to join the United States military or to rise and not be discriminated against and others followed?

It was a magnificent move and a fearless move. Many thought Truman would lose his election.

How dare we come to the floor on this? This is about our men and women.

Why would my amendment be left out that talks about Black maternal mortality? There are Black women soldiers and officers who would benefit from that. Or \$10 million that I introduced dealing with triple-negative breast cancer that has been accepted and is in year after year because it is to save lives.

Mr. Speaker, \$2.5 million in post-traumatic stress disorder, it is to save our soldiers' lives and to be able to admit that there is PTSD continuing. We need to be able to help or to address injuries that come after someone comes out of the military and to connect them to military benefits, which we see many times.

□ 1300

Yes, I have an amendment in this that deals with providing emergency housing for those of us who live in the Gulf region or live in the West where these natural disasters are coming or on the East Coast in Connecticut, so that when people are totally displaced, we are very grateful for the fact that the bases would be open to providing disaster care.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this amendment that is in adds a report to be submitted within 220 days following enactment on capacity to provide disaster survivors with emergency short-term housing.

This bill should be a bill that builds the mighty fighting force. It should not deny women the right under their medical care, and Secretary Austin and the Pentagon to say quietly, you can have a medical decision. If it cannot be made in the State that you are forced to be assigned to, posted, you can go to another State.

It is a disgrace that they would interfere in private reproductive rights. This is undermining what we are here for: to build up a fighting force of men and women, and that is what this bill should be.

We will stand to the death to make sure this bill supports the men and women and the fighting forces of America.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, as I have said, this rule makes in order a number of truly, truly offensive amendments.

You know what? If the majority wants to do that and put this bipartisan bill at risk, that is their prerogative. It is, again, the contrast between what they are prioritizing and what they are blocking that astonishes me.

For example, the rule makes in order an amendment to restrict servicewomen from accessing abortion care when 40 percent of Active Duty servicewomen now serve in States that have banned or restricted access to abortion. These servicewomen are stationed based on the needs of our Nation and not on personal preference and deserve access to crucial reproductive healthcare services.

I look forward to voting "no" on that amendment, but an amendment I won't have a chance to vote on is my amendment that calls for an annual report to Congress on atrocity prevention and response in Sudan.

Why does this rule make room for a controversial amendment to prevent abortion care, which might threaten the passage of this bill, by the way, but it blocks dozens and dozens of non-controversial amendments like that one? What is wrong with a report on atrocity prevention?

I genuinely do not understand, Mr. Speaker. There is only one explanation that I have, and that is that rational people are not calling the shots here.

Mr. Speaker, rather than these culture wars designed to kind of relive the Confederacy that some of my colleagues seem hell-bent on doing, we ought to be talking about things that matter to the American people. We ought to be talking about how we protect Social Security and Medicare.

I am going to urge a "no" vote so that we can bring up an amendment to get Members on record saying that they do want to protect Social Security and Medicare.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. VASQUEZ).

Mr. VASQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in my hopeful support of the National Defense Authorization Act.

As a Member from New Mexico, the birthplace of nuclear research and the nuclear bomb, and also as a member of the Armed Services Committee, I have worked incredibly hard on this committee to draft a defense bill that delivers for our servicemembers, that improves military housing, that strengthens our national security, and that brings jobs to New Mexico. This is what the NDAA should be about.

That is why it is so disappointing that Republicans and the majority are threatening servicemembers' access to reproductive healthcare. Women's healthcare decisions are between them and their doctor, not the government.

Guess what? To my Republican colleagues, I will just remind you that the majority of the American people agree with us.

Why are we even debating taking away healthcare from our servicemembers who have dedicated their lives to our country? Our military personnel and their loved ones should have access to healthcare that they need and that they have earned and that they deserve.

Let me be clear. Reproductive healthcare is healthcare. Our servicemembers deserve to serve with dignity.

I look forward to supporting our servicemembers, by passing this NDAA, supporting those jobs, supporting nuclear research in New Mexico, supporting the advancement of hypersonics in places like White Sands Missile Range, supporting our military servicemembers at Holloman Air Force Base, but this amendment threatens the support for that.

I urge my colleagues to reject this rule that attacks our women in the military and puts our national security in jeopardy.

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

I want to go back to a point on this issue of abortion. Quite frankly, we look at this issue very differently. As my friend, Mr. ROY from Texas, said, we see the administration as having directly intervened and changed existing policy.

We have something called the Hyde amendment, which has been passed for years, decades, over and over again, and it prohibits using Federal tax dollars for abortion. Facilitating abortion is exactly what we are talking about here.

Now, was there any consultation with us when the executive branch decided to do that? No, there wasn't.

As my friend from Texas pointed out, there is a pretty big pushback on our side.

We have worked in a bipartisan fashion. That is why that bill came out of committee 58-1. Most of the amendments on this floor in the last couple days have been bipartisan, and we have worked together.

There are issues where we simply don't agree, and this is, at the end of the day, a majoritarian institution.

While my friend talks about the extremist this or the extremist that, if it is an extremist amendment, it won't win the majority.

These amendments that are going to come up here are either going to win or lose. Some of them are going to lose.

Some of the time, my friend and I are actually going to be voting the same way on those amendments. Other times, we will vote differently. We will certainly vote differently at the end of the day when it comes time to vote on the bill.

That is the way the game is played here. To say that some majority is being run by extremists, by definition, that is almost impossible because you can't be the majority on the House floor if it is true.

Again, you can disagree, and I respect the disagreement, but the initiator, particularly in the case of abortion and I would say some of the other culture clashes that we are having on this bill, has been the administration, has been policies that were decided in this administration and sometimes pushed on the military against their own wishes.

Again, it is the executive branch. They get to run the military. They get to do what they want to do. But please, when you get a response from people that genuinely disagree, to say they started it by responding is simply not the case.

Again, I look forward to this debate. I understand that people will have very different opinions. I do remind everybody that 95 percent of this bill is this bill, you know. It was bipartisan. It does deal with the military. Very little of much of the debate has dealt with the military.

I actually sit on the Defense Appropriations Committee. We spend a lot of time talking about what is the right mix of arms? What is going to happen in terms of artillery? What are we doing to update AWACS? I can go on and on. Most of the discussions in the House Armed Services Committee were similar.

Again, we are going to have these differences and let the chips fall where they may. I would suspect whatever product comes off this floor will be the product that the majority of this body chose.

Then we will go, as my friends well know, to sit down with the United States Senate, and they will have a different product, and the President will be part of that discussion because he has to sign the bill.

We are going to have a pretty good tussle here. To think this is the be-all and end-all today I think is a disservice

to the process and how it unfolds and how it actually works.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman how many more speakers he has on his side?

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close whenever my friend is.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, this process has shown us the priorities of the Republican majority; protecting the reputation of confederate leaders, banning books because they want to rewrite history, controlling women's bodies.

Overturning *Roe v. Wade* wasn't enough. They want to ban abortion nationwide. They want to restrict a servicemember's ability to get travel expenses covered, attacking LGBTQ+ servicemembers, cutting off aid to Ukraine in the middle of their fight against Putin, stifling diversity and equity in the military, and shrugging off climate change, which the Department of Defense says poses a direct threat to our national security.

You can't make this stuff up, Mr. Speaker. The thing is, many Republicans know that these amendments are offensive. They know these plans and these ideas are unpopular. That is why there has been so much whiplash the last few days to get this rule to the floor today.

What was not on their priority list in this bill? I will tell you what was not on their priority list; reducing the NDAA top line, which is far too high and wastes taxpayer dollars.

In the appropriations process, they are cutting moneys from WIC and from Meals on Wheels, but they boost up the defense budget.

What is not on their list is helping our veterans with post-traumatic stress disorder. They rejected an amendment on that yesterday in the Rules Committee.

What is not on their list is protecting access to reproductive healthcare or ensuring the ability for transgender individuals to serve their country or encouraging diversity and equity in all military ranks or preventing the transfer of cluster munitions to all countries.

That is not even to mention the dozens of noncontroversial Democratic amendments that would simply authorize reports on our national defense.

This is ridiculous. Let me again remind everybody in this rule, there are 70 Republican amendments, 6 bipartisan amendments, and 4 Democratic amendments. On what planet is that even considered reasonably fair? This is outrageous.

Again, a big chunk of the Democratic amendments, you may not agree with them, but we ought to have 10 minutes

of debate and a vote up or down on them.

As they say, this is about getting “woke” out of the military. They blocked my amendment to help homeless vets get rides to medical appointments. What the hell is woke about that? They blocked it because it was woke. I mean, I don’t even know what they are thinking.

Look, if the extreme MAGA amendments pass and this NDAA bill passes on a partisan vote, it should not be seen as a victory for Speaker MCCARTHY.

Barely passing a bill that usually passes with a supermajority is not a victory. I wish him luck in negotiations with the Senate where some of these policies will be nonstarters.

The Speaker of the House needs to grow a spine, not for his own reputation but for the good of this country. This is a terrible, terrible process. These amendments are pathetic that have been made in order. They are offensive. It disrespects and diminishes this institution.

It is sad to see the small group of extremists calling the shots here, but that is what is happening right now. They have turned this defense bill into a place for them to launch their culture wars.

What a disservice to our country; what an insult to the Members of this Chamber; what an insult to the men and women who serve our country that these are the priorities that we are debating here today. I mean, give me a break.

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

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

In closing, I urge all my colleagues to support this resolution. Today’s rule makes in order 80 amendments reflecting Member priorities on both sides of the aisle.

Although I would have liked to have worked more quickly, on a matter that is so critical as the annual NDAA we owe the American people no less than whatever time is necessary to complete this important task.

I remind the House that the NDAA has been passed into law every year for 62 consecutive years. I am confident that with today’s rule, we are well on the way to making it 63.

□ 1315

Mr. Speaker, again, I want to point out and emphasize several important facts that sometimes get lost in the spirited debate.

The first one is that about 95 percent of this bill is exactly what passed out of the House Armed Services Committee 58-1, as my friends have pointed out, and I agree. Most of this bill is extraordinarily bipartisan. Most of the amendments that have come to this floor, 300 yesterday, or 290, roughly, were bipartisan and were accepted no matter who authored them, Democrat or Republican, by either side.

As I said yesterday, this was going to be more contentious today, and that is fine. But to suggest that anything you disagree with that passes is extreme, I think, frankly, you are leaping to a conclusion.

Some of these amendments that my friend points to the most probably won’t pass, probably won’t make it. Again, there is nothing inappropriate about that. I mean, I have come down here—and I know my friend has—plenty of times and fought for things that we believed in that may have been right or wrong, but we lost or won. What comes out of here will be what a majority of the House decides is appropriate.

Now, as I have said multiple times in the course of the debate, this is a process, not an event. The reality is, we are going to sit down at some point, almost certainly, with the Senate and the President. The Senate is Democratic, and the President is a Democrat. We are going to have a discussion and a debate, and I suspect the product that comes out of that will be different than the one that emerges here. That is okay. It will be different than what the Senate writes, and it will be different than what the President’s budget was and what he proposed.

Nobody is going to get everything they want. At the end of the day, everybody is going to have to give and take, and the reality is if we get to a bill, which I think we will because we have for 62 consecutive years, it is going to be a bipartisan compromise.

We can have all the theatrics and all the flailing of arms. That is part of the process, too. At the end of the day, almost all of this bill is bipartisan, and almost all of this bill is supported by the majority of both sides of the aisle. There are individual flash points where we disagree.

I know about getting rolled in debates. I remember my Democratic friends spending \$1.9 trillion without a single Republican vote and unleashing the worst inflation we have seen in 40 years. I remember them bringing a bill to this floor called the Inflation Reduction Act that had zero to do with inflation and was everything about green climate. Fair enough. If you want to do that, that is okay. You didn’t get a single Republican vote, but you won, and you got it through the Senate and got the President of the United States to sign it.

There are plenty of times that one side has steamrolled the other. There are other times when we negotiate together. Welcome to the House of Representatives and to American politics.

What we are going to deal with today, there will be a lot of sound. There will be a lot of noise.

Most of the bill is bipartisan. It is an extraordinarily good bill. As a matter of fact, lost in the course of this debate is one of the areas where my friends and I do disagree, and I disagree with the bill, and that is that we are coming in at the President’s number. This out-

rageous, terrible bill is going to be at the number the President proposed. I think that number is too low—I really do—but I am going to vote for it because it is still better than last year and better than a CR, and it moves the country in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, again, I have enjoyed the debate. I always do. I will close by thanking my friend. I mean this with all sincerity. I will end where I began. We have been through a couple of challenging days in the Rules Committee, very long nights. I very much appreciate the professionalism of my friend and his colleagues and my colleagues on my side of the aisle. I very much appreciate the staff that worked very hard on both sides of the aisle and also the wonderful House support staff that we had facilitating our meetings. I thank them all, and I particularly thank my friend.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 583 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 5. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the resolution (H. Res. 178) affirming the House of Representatives’ commitment to protect and strengthen Social Security and Medicare. 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 Ways and Means or their respective designees.

SEC. 6. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H. Res. 178.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 12, 2023.

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on