

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Speaker, as we celebrate Hispanic Heritage Month, I wish to recognize the extraordinary contributions of Cesar Millan. Cesar has transformed the lives of countless people and dogs and has also touched the hearts of people all over the world.

From humble beginnings in Culiacan, Sinaloa, Mexico, working on his grandfather Teodoro Millan Angulo's farm, Cesar came to the United States undocumented and unable to speak English. He lives his dream right here in America doing the job that he has always wanted to do, to be the best dog and human trainer in the world.

Through his television series, "The Dog Whisperer with Cesar Millan," Cesar taught us how to understand our four-legged friends and to better understand ourselves. He launched the Cesar Millan Foundation, a nonprofit organization designed to support the rescue, rehabilitation, and placement of abused and abandoned animals.

Cesar Millan has inspired us to become more compassionate, more understanding, and more forgiving. As Cesar would say, better human, better dog, better together.

Cesar is both a proud immigrant and a proud United States citizen.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings or other audible conversation is a violation of the rules of the House.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4365, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2024; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1130, UNLOCKING OUR DOMESTIC LNG POTENTIAL ACT OF 2023; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.RES. 684, CONDEMNING THE ACTIONS OF GOVERNOR OF NEW MEXICO, MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM, FOR SUBVERTING THE SECOND AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION AND DEPRIVING THE CITIZENS OF NEW MEXICO OF THEIR RIGHT TO BEAR ARMS

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 712 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 712

*Resolved*, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4365) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30,

2024, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived.

SEC. 2. (a) No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution, and pro forma amendments described in section 4 of this resolution.

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

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

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or her designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment except as provided by section 4 of this resolution, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

SEC. 4. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees may offer up to 10 pro forma amendments each at any point for the purpose of debate.

SEC. 5. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SEC. 6. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1130) to repeal restrictions on the export and import of natural gas. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendment in the nature of a sub-

stitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such further amendment may be offered 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. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. 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.

SEC. 7. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 684) condemning the actions of Governor of New Mexico, Michelle Lujan Grisham, for subverting the Second Amendment to the Constitution and depriving the citizens of New Mexico of their right to bear arms. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees.

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

Mr. COLE. Madam 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. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 712.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, last night the Rules Committee met and reported out a rule, House Resolution 712, providing for consideration of H.R. 4365, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2024, under a structured rule.

It provides 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the

chair and ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees. It also makes in order 184 amendments, more than 75 percent of those eligible for consideration. Finally, it provides for one motion to recommit.

The rule also makes in order H.R. 1130, the Unlocking our Domestic LNG Potential Act of 2023 under a structured rule. It provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees. It provides for one motion to recommit.

Finally, the rule makes in order H. Res. 684 under a closed rule. It provides 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees.

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

Madam Speaker, as Members are aware, the House has previously debated an identical rule covering H.R. 4365. This was a fulsome and passionate debate, and I said most of what was needed to be said from my point of view during that debate, but I will make a few key points about this bill again now.

The bill before us provides full funding for our national defense. It appropriates \$826 billion in new discretionary spending, which is a modest increase of \$300 million over the President's budget request of nearly \$29 billion or 3.6 percent over the FY 2023 enacted level.

Madam Speaker, this truly is a good bill, one that I think the House can and should be proud of. It makes appropriate investments in the military and ensures that dollars are being directed where they are needed the most. It invests heavily in our servicemembers, providing them with a 5.2 percent pay raise. It provides continued funding for new advanced weapons systems, ensuring that the military has the force it needs to confront any foe anywhere in the world at any time, and it continues to expand the Navy to protect the freedom of the seas and invests heavily in Asia and the Pacific theater where China continues to expand its own military might in anticipation of a confrontation with the United States and our allies.

Madam Speaker, providing funding for our national defense is both Congress' privilege and its responsibility. In order for our brave men and women in uniform to do their jobs, Congress must do its job. Today, we can take that first step toward doing so.

The rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 1130, the Unlocking our Domestic LNG Potential Act of 2023. This bill removes regulatory barriers for the construction and licensing of new liquid natural gas or LNG import and export terminals.

Madam Speaker, when the Republican majority took over in January, we committed to unleashing America's energy potential. For too long, regulatory roadblocks and active hostility of the Biden administration have made it difficult to expand production of America's abundant energy resources, but despite the Biden administration's hostility, America is today the top producer of natural gas in the world.

From my home State of Oklahoma, this is not an academic point. Oklahoma is the fifth largest natural gas producing State in the country, with nearly 350,000 jobs in the State tied directly to natural gas production. It is a critical part of my home State's economy.

In recent years, innovation and new technology have revolutionized and expanded the production of natural gas, both in Oklahoma and in the United States as a whole. The people of my district are very proud to be part of that revolution. There is still more to be done, and the passage of H.R. 1130 will help make it easier, cheaper, and quicker to bring new LNG export terminals online.

It is no exaggeration to say that American natural gas is a critical part of the world's energy mix, particularly in Europe, which previously sourced much of its natural gas from Russia, and we are capable of achieving more. The end result will be a strong future for us as we create more high-paying jobs and maintain America's energy independence and a strong future for our friends and allies around the world who can source their energy needs from us rather than from vicious dictators like Vladimir Putin.

Madam Speaker, all in all, this is a strong bill, one that I am certainly proud to support.

Finally, the rule makes in order H. Res. 684, which condemns New Mexico Governor Michelle Lujan Grisham for her executive order attempting to subvert the Second Amendment rights of New Mexico's citizens.

As Members are aware, earlier this month, Governor Grisham issued an executive order purporting to suspend the right of New Mexicans to open and concealed carry of firearms. Governor Grisham claimed that this was necessary in order to deal with a public health emergency.

Of course, this claim is patently absurd, and there is not now, nor has there ever been, a public health emergency and exception for constitutional rights. The right of Americans to bear arms is protected by the Second Amendment to the Constitution, and a constitutional right cannot be subverted at the whim of an elected official.

□ 0930

Last week, a Federal judge in New Mexico agreed and issued a restraining order blocking implementation of this patently unconstitutional order.

Governor Grisham has rightly received condemnation on a bipartisan

basis for her actions. H. Res. 684 will give all Members of Congress an opportunity to do so officially and on the record.

It is always appropriate for the House to take time to reaffirm our values as a country and to protect the constitutional rights that form the foundation of our Republic.

Indeed, I urge all Members to do so and speak with one voice, reminding all Americans that when it comes to their constitutional rights, the House of Representatives has their back.

Madam Speaker, I urge Members to support both the rule and the underlying bills, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Is this Groundhog Day, Madam Speaker? Back again once more to debate a rule for bills that were considered and failed to make it to the floor.

You can't make this stuff up.

So what changed? Not the bill text, not the fact that we have less than a week before the government shuts down. Maybe the minds of a few of our colleagues across the aisle? I guess we will see later today.

Look, none of my remarks are directed to the gentleman from Oklahoma. I respect him personally and professionally. I think the world of him. I don't envy the task he has of trying to defend these bills or this process, but what the hell is going on in his Conference?

The truth is that under Speaker MCCARTHY's weak leadership, this Republican majority is a total failure; an unmitigated disaster.

Those aren't even my words. That is what one of your own Members said on TV a few nights ago about the process playing out in this Chamber right now.

First, we have this absurd non-binding resolution condemning the Governor of New Mexico for trying to keep her constituents safe from gun violence.

Just to explain to folks who may be watching, this resolution does nothing—not a thing.

It is a press release. It doesn't go to the Senate. It doesn't go to the President. It does nothing.

So we are doing that, and we are doing nothing right now to avert a government shutdown. This place is becoming a Chamber where we debate trivial issues passionately and important ones not at all.

Then we have a ridiculous bill about liquified natural gas. The House has already passed this bill not once, but twice. Of course, it makes sense to waste more time passing it again when a shutdown is looming and Republicans have no plan to keep the government running, right?

This rule will also bring to the floor the Republicans' Department of Defense appropriations bill. Yes, this bill

has horrible, harmful policy riders that strip people's rights and push MAGA culture wars. It also reaffirms the Pentagon's bloated budget at a time when the far-right wing nuts are holding up all other appropriation bills because they feel they don't cut enough money for programs that help everyday Americans. We still don't have a plan to fund the government.

Madam Speaker, I know if some of my Republican colleagues had their way, we would pass their continuing resolution that contains mindless, across-the-board spending cuts.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to cut funding for cancer research, for our Head Start programs, for air traffic safety, for border security, and a 65-percent cut to heating assistance for families just as it is starting to get cold. Talk about cruel.

Now, these cuts aren't just cuts, they cost us. Do people realize what Head Start does? It invests in kids from low-income families so they can have more opportunity in life. The return on investment is almost \$10 for every \$1 spent.

Cancer research. Do Republicans realize that investing in cancer research saves us healthcare costs not just now but down the road, and it saves lives.

Their appropriation agenda cuts all this and more.

Madam Speaker, you know where Republicans refuse to cut from? This bill, the Pentagon, the biggest, most expensive bureaucracy in our Federal Government: the Department of Defense.

So for whatever reason, it is okay to cut programs like WIC that help feed pregnant moms, but they can't find a single weapon system where there is any waste? I am happy to provide numerous articles and reports from my colleagues about the cost overruns in so many of these wasteful missile systems.

The Defense spending bill, which is the most extravagant Defense spending bill ever, failed a rule vote on Tuesday because the Republican Conference is in absolute chaos. Best I can tell, no one on the other side of the aisle has any objection to the top-line number in the Pentagon bill, but yet they voted down the rule just the other day.

I know that whipping votes can be difficult, but the number of backroom secret deals and late-night seances Republicans have had to hold this year to revive bills from the dead is astounding, and I am afraid things will only get worse as we near September 30.

Republicans are acting like the end of the fiscal year just snuck up on them.

News flash: The deadline to fund the government isn't some big secret. They have had months to prevent a government shutdown. The reality is that not once—not once—have Republicans given us a bill that could keep the government open.

Republicans barely control one-half of one branch of government. Yet, they act like they are king of the hill, like

it is their way or the highway, that nothing else matters.

The only way this slim House Republican majority can keep the lights on is if they get Senate Democrats and the President to agree, but they haven't even begun to reach across the aisle to negotiate because they are busy negotiating amongst themselves.

Hell, at this rate, they might not even be able to get Senate Republicans to agree given how extreme their Conference has become.

Madam Speaker, this majority is a failure. The clowns are running the circus. The day Speaker MCCARTHY handed his gavel over to the clown show, this was the inevitable outcome. There is a different path that we can choose right here and right now: Work with Democrats to prevent a shutdown; work with us to keep the government open; work with us to honor the deal you made earlier this year.

It is time for the ringmaster of this circus, KEVIN MCCARTHY, to stand up to the clowns and say enough with the extremism and the blackmail. Stop wasting time and work with us to get this done in a bipartisan way.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I would again return my friend's compliments. I enjoy working with him on the Rules Committee. We have been there together a long time. There is nobody I have a higher professional and personal regard for than my good friend.

Now honestly, Madam Speaker, I wish I had his talent for colorful rhetoric. I particularly like the "Groundhog Day" reference. I remind my friend, while there are some similarities, the movie had a happy ending. Everybody learned some lessons and they got to where they needed to be. I think we may be involved in a process something like that.

I disagree with my friend that the issues being brought up in this bill are trivial. Defending the United States of America is not a trivial thing. You can agree or disagree with the bill, and I will talk about that in a minute. That is fair enough. I don't consider that trivial.

Providing natural gas in abundance and at modest prices to Americans and having that resource to deal with our adversaries overseas, who often use energy as a weapon, and to be able to provide for our friends and allies reliable energy is not a trivial matter. It is an extraordinarily important matter.

The 10 million Americans that work in the domestic energy industry think what we are doing here is the right thing to do. I don't consider their interests and their views trivial. I am just very privileged to represent many people that have that point of view and are involved in that particular profession.

Finally, I don't consider standing up for the Second Amendment a trivial

thing. We have a Governor that issued an order that a Federal judge immediately overturned and Democrats in New Mexico condemned—elected Democrats, law enforcement officials. It is actually one of the areas that is usually a contentious issue that we had really strong bipartisan agreement. We think it is important to make my point.

My friends have a different point of view. That is fair enough. Just express it, and we will move on. Again, we don't consider defense of the Constitution to be trivial.

I agree with my friend about a number of things, and we have had this discussion, frankly, as friends in the Rules Committee.

I agree with him about shutdowns. I do not think it is an appropriate tactic, and I hope that we are able to avoid one. There will be an appropriate time, I am sure, when we discuss with our friends how to do that, but we need a negotiating position. We are working toward that, and we hope we will get there.

Believe me, I am well aware that we have a Democratic Senate. This House has done wonderful work on things like H.R. 1 to deal with energy, H.R. 2 to deal with our border. We send them over there and they are never picked up, never heard of again unless we can snatch pieces out of them here or there and attach them to one of these broader agreements, as we were able to do on the debt ceiling crisis over permitting of facilities, both for renewable and nonrenewable energy.

Again, it is a difficult legislative process, and I agree it is going to be complicated, but our goal is to get to the same place; that is, to make sure that the government is funded, and also, that we advance shared values that we have and have an open and honest discussion with the United States Senate. When we do that, we have been able to find some agreement.

My friend likes to point out—all my Democratic friends like to point out regularly—well, gosh, why are you passing appropriations bills that are less than to the letter agreed on? Well, gee whiz, where I come from, if you can do something for less money, that is usually a good thing to do. I am never going to apologize. If we see a different way to get to a policy objective that costs less money, that is a good thing to do.

Now, I know when we discussed this last night, the Senate is consistently appropriating above the agreed-upon number. All the appropriations bills, or pretty much all of them that they have dealt with so far, are at higher levels. So guess what? We will get into negotiation. My guess is they will come down some. We will come up some, and we will find some sort of common deal. That is just the way politics work. I am never going to be critical of my colleagues for trying to do something cheaper and save money.

I remind my friend of the condition in which the Democratic majority left

our fiscal finances. We are running a \$1.7 trillion deficit this year. That is bigger than all the discretionary budget of the United States of America. We have not had a Democratic President submit a budget that comes into balance—not in a decade, but ever, since Bill Clinton.

President Obama never did. President Biden never has. I don't think any future Democrat will.

We used to have Democrats in the 1990s that we disagreed with, that we fought, but they said, well, let's try to get to a balanced budget within 10 years, and they managed to do that.

My friends have basically abdicated that debate. They just let it go on and on out to infinity. Even President Trump submitted budgets that within a decade came into balance. I didn't always agree with some of the decisions. I don't think either party has done a very good job.

My friend and I have had this discussion in dealing with the real drivers of debt: that is mandatory spending; that is Social Security, Medicaid, and Medicare. We need to have that debate. I hope the Presidential contest has it. I note at least some of the discussions we have been having in our caucus talk about having a debt commission attached to some of this, so perhaps we can make some modest steps.

My friends heard me talk about my Social Security bill, which is really modeled after what was done in 1983 by Ronald Reagan, Tip O'Neill, and Howard Baker working together, a commission, then Congress voting—including, by the way, the President of the United States at that time who liked commissions, voting for the commission, for the deal, and it worked. It improved the fiscal solvency of the country. It extended the life of Social Security, a program I know that we both support.

Again, you may think these are trivial issues. We don't. We think we have a long process in front of us. These are steps in the right direction on the appropriate end that won't be enough.

Madam Speaker, the last point I will make—and my friend and I just disagree here—look, defense is a very different thing than any other part of the appropriations process. Most appropriations process is about things that are desirable and good.

I have worked pretty hard on cancer research, so my friend's points are well made there. I think those are valuable investments.

Defense is about threats. We had a peace dividend in the 1990s. You know why we had it? Because the Soviet Union had collapsed, and we could prudently save money in defense.

I will tell you right now, I would go higher than the number here; but if the number we have on defense is outrageous, your first call ought to be to the White House because it is basically the President's number. We actually pulled back from where our defense appropriators wanted to go and a lot of our defense hawks wanted to go be-

cause we did think addressing the horrific deficits that were inherited from the last Democratic era meant we even had to make sacrifices here.

□ 0945

I am not really comfortable with it, but it is a step in the right direction. We might not even had to have that if you hadn't, through reckless spending, unleashed the worst inflation in 40 years. I actually have a 40-year-old son. He had never seen anything like what happened in the Biden administration because of irresponsibly passing the \$1.9 trillion American Rescue Plan and another \$700 billion much-misnamed Inflation Reduction Act.

We inherited a mess. We inherited inflation. We inherited record deficits.

It is a pretty tough deal. My friends don't want to address it. Well, this majority is going to do its best to address those issues. We do struggle and disagree, and sometimes I get frustrated with some of my friends on my side of the aisle about tactics.

My colleague is right about one thing, and I will agree 100 percent. There is no objection to this rule on the basis of the rule. There is nothing wrong with it. It has 184 amendments. You can agree or disagree with the bill, but it is a good rule.

In my view, there is nothing wrong with the bill, other than I would like to have spent a little bit more money. Like any bill that spends this amount of money, everybody could do it a little bit differently.

People are trying to make other points unrelated to the bill, and I will agree with my friend that that is unfortunate. I don't think that is a good way to legislate. I think my colleagues should look at the legislation in front of them. If they agree with the rule, they ought to vote for it. If they disagree, it is fair enough to vote against it. However, if they agree with the basic bill, don't relate it to something else and try to use it as a weapon. We don't have many Members who do that, but we have a few.

As my friend knows, we have a very narrow majority. He has been here once or twice himself when they had narrow majorities. It is part of the legislative process. We will continue to work it.

My hope today is we will advance this rule. It will open the way to advance what I think is a good Defense appropriations bill, and we will continue to move legislatively as rapidly as we can. We will work and, at the appropriate time, I am sure, work across the rotunda with Democrats in the Senate and probably in this Chamber with some of my Democratic friends. Hopefully, we will avoid a government shutdown.

The most important thing today: Move the rule. Move the bill. That is what we are going to try to do.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Before I yield to my next speaker, I want to clarify for the record because I don't want to be misunderstood or mischaracterized because I have great respect for the gentleman. I never said the Defense appropriations bill was trivial. I said the Defense appropriations bill was bloated and filled with the kitchen sink of MAGA culture wars.

On the second bill, the LNG bill, I said it was repetitive because we have passed it twice already. It is going nowhere. We are going to pass it a third time, and that is going nowhere at a time when our government is about to shut down. To take up a bill that is repetitive and that is going nowhere seems like not a good use of our time.

I did say that the nonbinding resolution on guns was trivial because it doesn't do a damn thing. We are living in a country where we have massacres occur on a regular basis, and we can't get any legislation to the floor. The only bill we get to the floor on guns is a nonbinding resolution that does nothing and that doesn't even go anywhere. It doesn't go to the Senate. It doesn't go to the President.

I want to be clear on what I said because I think it is important. I do believe that this bill, this nonbinding resolution, is an example of how trivial issues get debated passionately here and important ones not at all.

Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BOYLE), the ranking member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend from that other Commonwealth, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, for yielding.

We are 9 days away—9 days and maybe call it 14 hours—from a government shutdown. It is completely unnecessary.

In this Chamber just 3 months ago, we had a vote. We voted to raise the debt ceiling, and we also voted to set the parameters and the figures for what next year's budget would be. That vote was overwhelmingly bipartisan. Eighty percent of House Democrats and almost two-thirds of House Republicans voted for it. There was a similarly large bipartisan vote in the Senate, and it was then signed into law by the President.

I thought at that point: Well, this is good news. Not only are we ensuring we didn't go over the cliff in terms of the debt ceiling, but it looks like we won't have another Republican-forced government shutdown.

Yet, here we are. Why? Because the Speaker of the House reneged on that deal even though two-thirds of their side of the aisle joined 80 percent of us in voting for it.

Honor the agreement that we had and that you voted for. This is completely unnecessary.

Yesterday in the Budget Committee, we marked up a completely partisan, one-sided budget resolution in an all-

day markup—\$16 trillion worth of cuts, completely unrealistic. The Congressional Budget Office itself labeled it a cuts-only approach.

During that hearing, I pointed out that in previous government shutdowns, the Republican government shutdown in 2013 cost the economy upward of \$6 billion. There were more than 120,000 fewer jobs as a result of that government shutdown. A subsequent Republican-forced government shutdown also cost the economy billions of dollars and also cost us jobs.

While it might be a game for some in Washington, D.C.—there are quotes from a number of Members on the other side of the aisle, by the way, saying they want a government shutdown. Don't take my word for it, just read the quotes of some of the Republican Members of the House cheering a government shutdown, saying that there will be no problem at all.

If only that were so. It costs us billions of dollars. Nothing good comes out of it.

Actually, I take that back. There is one thing that is good that comes out of it. Each and every time over the last 30 years that Republicans have forced a government shutdown, in the subsequent election, they are punished by the voters.

That was the case back in 1995. It was the beginning of Bill Clinton's comeback. He was losing at the polls at that moment to Bob Dole. Then the government shut down, the Gingrich-Dole shutdown, and Bill Clinton came back and went on to win reelection by over 8 points.

Similarly, in 2011, Barack Obama, at that moment, the polls showed him losing to MITT ROMNEY. Republican extremism forced the shutdown. Their extremism in playing around with the debt ceiling led to the first-ever downgrade in American history. Barack Obama ends up coming back and beats MITT ROMNEY a year later by 4 points.

So maybe there is one good thing that comes out of Republican extremism.

If there is anything clear over the last 9 months, it is that this side doesn't have a clue about governing. I keep hearing about the small majority. We know what it is like to have a small majority. We had the exact same five-seat majority last term. What did we do with it? We passed the most ambitious domestic policy legislation since 1965.

What has this side done? It takes them 15 votes just to elect their own guy Speaker. Now, they keep haranguing the poor guy, keep threatening him with the job day after day. Now, he is reneging on his own agreement that he brought here and voted for and that we passed in June.

By the way, we all know the way this is going to end, whether it is before a shutdown or afterward. The only thing that can pass the Senate, pass the House, and be signed into law by the President looks a lot like that legislation that passed here in June.

I hope that it doesn't take a government shutdown for the other side to finally get with it and learn these lessons.

The reality is ordinary Americans will suffer as a result of a government shutdown. It is completely unnecessary, and if it happens, it is solely the blame of the House Republican leadership.

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

I want to respond to some of my good friend from Pennsylvania's points, and some of them I agree with. I do think shutting down the government is not an appropriate tactic. We agree on that.

You know, linking them to election results is really an interesting exercise. The government shutdown that I think my friend thought was in 2011, if I am correct, and I may be wrong, was really the one in 2013. We actually picked up seats in 2014. I don't think that is why we picked up seats. My friends always forget that they shut down the government in 2017, and they won seats in 2018. So you can pretty much play these numbers however you want.

The important point, which my friend makes and I agree with, is that shutting down the government is bad for the American people. It is an abdication of our responsibility. It is something we should not do. I have never supported it in the past. I hope we manage to avoid one now. I think that is exactly what the Speaker is engaged in trying to accomplish, whether my friends agree with his methods or not.

I will tell you, I am mystified by this concern about the agreement. Again, we agreed on top-line numbers. We didn't say we are going to the top-line numbers. This is the top-line number, and if we can do it for less and persuade the Senate that that is a good idea, then I don't see that as a bad thing.

If my friends are concerned about keeping agreements, maybe they ought to call over to their friends in the United States Senate who are producing bill after bill that are above these numbers.

Guess what? I suspect each side is positioning for a negotiation, and magically, we probably won't be too far off, if we come to an agreement, of the numbers that are laid out in the debt ceiling deal.

I am not telling you this is the most efficient way to legislate, but I have seen it before, and we are seeing it from both sides right now.

In terms of the budget, I tell you what, I am interested in the opinions my friends have on the budget because they didn't bother to do one for the 4 years they were in the majority. I am thrilled they are actually marking up a budget in the Budget Committee. I give Chairman ARRINGTON a lot of credit for doing it. It is hard to do. My friends didn't do it for 4 years because they couldn't do it because they couldn't come to an agreement.

As a matter of fact, I remember those 4 years I used to serve on the Budget Committee. You couldn't get a budget out of the Budget Committee that you controlled.

Do you want to talk about dysfunction? The Budget Committee sets the top-line number for all spending. Maybe that is why we overspent so much. As a matter of fact, you deemed budgets in the rule.

So I would agree with you. We should probably be sitting down and figuring out ways to run our fiscal affairs better and particularly do it in a more cooperative way because, as my friends point out, they do control the United States Senate and the United States Presidency.

However, please don't lecture me on how you do budgets when you had the House, the Senate, and the Presidency and could not write a budget in 4 years and get it out of your own committee, let alone bring it to this floor. Some of those years you weren't operating with a five-seat majority. You just couldn't get the job done.

We are trying. I commend the Budget Committee. I hope they bring one out here. I will be disappointed if they don't, but at least they are making the effort.

Finally, again, to my friends, I can't figure out whether you want the Speaker to succeed or not because there are lots of expressions that you feel sorry for him in the job he has. Don't worry, he likes the job he has. He works hard at it every day.

I think he is a good Speaker. He delivered on a debt ceiling deal that my friends even in the end came around and voted for. He delivered one that was a heck of a lot better because it had some genuine concessions in it, in terms of energy production and in terms of setting top lines.

We are on the eve of another kind of negotiation, and maybe we can find common ground again. I genuinely, quite frankly, hope that we do. In that process, there will be plenty of people on both sides of the aisle who don't like what the end product is, and they will vote accordingly. That is fair enough.

This is just kind of the way it works around here right now, and I think the Speaker is doing a terrific job of trying to work the process, trying to make sure legislation moves across the floor in regular order, and trying to get to numbers that begin to bring down this horrific deficit that my friends left the country with, with no plan to deal with it.

Nobody in the White House has a plan. The President has never submitted a budget that comes into balance. He won't talk about entitlement reform. He rules it out.

Sorry, if you are serious about the budget deficit, you do control two-thirds of this process. I know it is inconvenient when we bring up the fact that we are spending a lot more money and you have no plan to deal with it, but that is what we are going to do.

We will see. The American people can make a choice in the next election about that, but I am not going to be critical of my friends. Even when I am critical of their tactics, and I am sometimes, I am not critical of people who are trying to lower the budget deficit and trying to restore a measure of fiscal sanity to this country. That is something the Democrats used to care about, did care about when I first got here. They totally abandoned it during the Obama Presidency.

When my friends want to get serious, they will have a willing negotiating partner on the budget.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DESJARLAIS). Members are reminded to direct their comments to the Chair.

□ 1000

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the concern we have over here on this side of the aisle is that there are Members on the Republican side who seem to be cheering on a shutdown.

The other day, in an interview with "PBS NewsHour," a fellow colleague on the Rules Committee, Mr. NORMAN of South Carolina, was asked how likely a shutdown is, and his response was: It is 100 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a Truth Social post from yesterday by Donald Trump opposing the GOP's continuing resolution.

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

There was no objection.

A very important deadline is approaching at the end of the month. Republicans in Congress can and must defund all aspects of Crooked Joe Biden's weaponized Government that refuses to close the Border, and treats half the Country as Enemies of the State. This is also the last chance to defund these political prosecutions against me and other Patriots. They failed on the debt limit, but they must not fail now. Use the power of the purse and defend the Country.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the twice-impeached, four-times-indicted former President is weighing in on the funding fights within his party, and ultimately he is endorsing actions that will shut down the government.

Now, I have a strange feeling my Republican counterparts will gladly comply at the expense of the American people because everybody on that side of the aisle is so frightened of him.

The gentleman from Oklahoma was talking about a shutdown in 2018. I don't disagree with my friend that there was a brief shutdown in early 2018 that a lot of people don't remember because it was so short. I should point out that Republicans were in charge of the House and in charge of the Senate at the time. I know some Democrats were pushing to help Dreamers as part of a funding deal, but that brief, symbolic shutdown lasted less than 72 hours, mostly over the weekend and, if I remember correctly, had no lasting impact.

Now, compare that to the 5-week Republican shutdown in 2018 which reduced economic output by \$11 billion in the following 2 quarters, including \$3 billion that the United States economy never regained. That was a partial shutdown. Then the 2013 full Republican shutdown reduced GDP growth by \$20 billion, according to Moody's Analytics. \$20 billion. I think it is a little more than unfair to play both sides of the card here, because it doesn't apply.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans claim that they are trying to save money but continually weaken the United States Government's creditworthiness at a cost to the United States taxpayers.

In August, Fitch cited a decline in governance as a key reason for the United States' downgrade due to repeated battles over the past two decades that have led to government shutdowns or even taken the government to the brink of a debt default. Republicans need to get serious about governing and protect the United States' creditworthiness.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an article from the AP titled: "The U.S. government's debt has been downgraded. Here's what to know."

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

There was no objection.

[From the Associated Press, Aug. 2, 2023]

THE U.S. GOVERNMENT'S DEBT HAS BEEN DOWNGRADED. HERE'S WHAT TO KNOW

(By Christopher Rugaber)

WASHINGTON (AP).—Late Tuesday, Fitch Ratings became the second of the three major credit-rating firms to remove its coveted triple-A assessment of the United States government's credit worthiness, a move that spurred debate in Washington about spending and tax policies.

Fitch cited the federal government's rising debt burden and the political difficulties that the U.S. government has had in addressing spending and tax policies as the principal reasons for reducing its rating from AAA to AA+.

Fitch said its decision "reflects the expected fiscal deterioration over the next three years, a high and growing general government debt burden, and the erosion of governance" compared with other countries with similar debt ratings.

The downgrade may have little impact on financial markets long-term or on the interest rates the U.S. government will pay. Here's what you need to know:

HOW DID THE GOVERNMENT GET TO THIS POINT?

Fitch's move comes just weeks after the White House and Congress resolved a standoff on whether to raise the government's borrowing limit. An agreement reached in late May suspended the debt limit for two years and cut about \$1.5 trillion in spending over the next decade. The agreement came after negotiations approached a cutoff date after which Treasury Secretary Janet Yellen had warned the government would default on its debt.

The Biden administration reacted angrily to the move. Yellen said Wednesday that Fitch's "flawed assessment is based on outdated data and fails to reflect improvements across a range of indicators, including those related to governance, that we've seen over the past two and a half years."

"Despite the gridlock, we have seen both parties come together to pass legislation to resolve the debt limit," Yellen said.

But Douglas Holtz-Eakin, president of the American Action Forum and former director of the Congressional Budget Office, said that Fitch's decision was the right one, given that there are few efforts in Washington to address the government's longstanding budget deficit.

"This is about a fundamental mismatch over the long term between our spending growth and our revenue capabilities," he said.

Standard & Poor's removed its coveted triple-A rating of U.S. debt in 2011, after a similar standoff over the borrowing limit.

Fitch said that the ratio of U.S. government debt relative to the size of its economy will likely rise from nearly 113% this year to more than 118% in 2025, which it said is more than two-and-a-half times higher than is typically the case for governments with triple-A and even double-A ratings.

WHAT TYPICALLY HAPPENS WHEN DEBT IS DOWNGRADED?

Ratings agencies like Fitch and its counterparts, Standard & Poor's and Moody's Investors Service, rate all kinds of corporate and government debt, ranging from local government bonds to debt issued by huge banks.

In general, when an issuer of debt has its credit rating downgraded, that often means it has to pay a higher interest rate to compensate for the potentially higher risk of default it poses.

WHAT COULD THAT MEAN FOR U.S. TAXPAYERS?

Many pension funds and other investment vehicles are required to only hold investments with high credit ratings. If a city or state, for example, sees its credit rating fall too low, those investment funds would have to sell any holdings of those bonds. That would force the government issuing those bonds to pay a higher interest rate on its future bonds to attract other investors.

If that were to happen to U.S. Treasury securities, the federal government could be required to pay higher interest rates, which would push up interest costs for the government and taxpayers.

WILL U.S. BORROWING COSTS RISE?

Few economists think that such an outcome will actually occur. Instead, they think Fitch's downgrade will have little impact. Few pension funds are limited to holding just triple-A rated debt, according to Goldman Sachs, which means the current AA+ from Fitch and Standard & Poor's will be sufficient to maintain demand for Treasuries.

"We do not believe there are any meaningful holders of Treasury securities who will be forced to sell due to a downgrade," Alec Phillips, chief political economist for Goldman Sachs, wrote in a research note.

Large U.S. banks that are required by regulators to hold Treasuries won't see any changes in those rules just because of the downgrade, Phillips added in an interview, because regulators will still see them as safe investments.

For most investors, U.S. Treasury securities are essentially in a class by themselves. The U.S. government bond market is the largest in the world, which makes it easy for investors to buy and sell Treasuries as needed. The United States' large economy and historic political stability has led many investors to see Treasuries as nearly the equivalent of cash.

Rating agency downgrades typically have more impact on smaller, lesser-known debt issuers, such as municipal governments. In those cases, even large investors may not have much information about the creditworthiness of the bond and are more reliant on the ratings agencies, Phillips said.



Yet that isn't really the case for Treasury bonds and notes, he said. Large investment funds and banks form their own opinions about Treasury securities and don't rely on the ratings agencies, he said. Fitch's analysis also didn't provide much new information, he added. Other entities, such as the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, have made similar projections about where U.S. government debt is headed.

"Nobody's holding Treasuries because of the ratings," Phillips added.

WHAT DOES FITCH MEAN BY 'GOVERNANCE'?

Fitch cited a decline in "governance" as a key reason for its downgrade, a reference to the repeated battles in Washington over the past two decades that have led to government shutdowns or even taken the government to the brink of a debt default.

"The repeated debt-limit political standoffs and last-minute resolutions have eroded confidence in fiscal management," Fitch said.

At the same time, Fitch is referring to the inability of even compromise legislation to meaningfully address the long-term drivers of federal government debt, specifically entitlement programs for the elderly such as Social Security and Medicaid.

"There has been only limited progress in tackling medium-term challenges related to rising social security and Medicare costs due to an aging population," Fitch said:

MR. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, there are consequences to these games that people on the right are playing, and the consequences are detrimental to our economy, which in turn are detrimental to the American people.

The gentleman from Oklahoma also talked about the Senate. I wish we were behaving more like the Senate than behaving like we are here in the House.

In the Senate, the Chair of the Appropriations Committee, Senator MURRAY, is actually working with the Republican Vice Chair, Senator COLLINS. There is a statement from Senator MURRAY saying: "Vice Chair COLLINS and I have discussed how best to address these concerns, and we have agreed to make use of additional emergency appropriations—just as we do every year, and is fully allowed under the debt ceiling deal—to address in a bipartisan way some of the pressing challenges our Nation faces."

"In order to take these concerns regarding our defense and nondefense needs seriously, and to ensure we deliver the strongest bills possible with the broadest bipartisan support possible, Vice Chair COLLINS"—a Republican—"and I agreed to add \$13.7 billion in additional emergency appropriations, including \$8 billion for defense, and \$5.7 billion for nondefense spread across four subcommittees, including the State/Foreign Ops bill we are considering today."

This is in response to that.

The bottom line is what they are doing in the Senate is what we should be doing here. Even though Democrats control the Senate, they are sitting down with Republicans and they are having conversations. They are trying to come to deals. They are trying to not only get a short-term bill done to keep our government from shutting

down, they are trying to figure out a long-term way forward.

The Senate has used the Fiscal Responsibility Act as a starting point for meaningful bipartisan dialogue and compromise. They reached an agreement to stay within the 1 percent of the Fiscal Responsibility Act and collaborated to report out 12 bills with near bipartisan unanimity.

Meanwhile, House Republicans haven't taken a single meaningful step to engage Democrats on necessary compromise. They failed to garner a single Democratic vote for their bills in committee and haven't been able to bring two of their bills to the full committee for consideration because the cuts were too deep.

Even moderates on your side don't want to vote for those things.

This is about the Senate following a bipartisan, collaborative process versus House Republicans turning their backs on that process and negotiating amongst themselves to make their bills more partisan.

There is a way to do this, but, unfortunately, you have a small group of the most extreme of the extreme calling all the shots. They are moving this place in the wrong direction. These are the people cheering for a government shutdown. These are the people who don't care how much they hurt the American people with across-the-board, mindless cuts in programs like Head Start and WIC and medical research and LIHEAP, cutting it by 65 percent.

I come from a State up north, Massachusetts. Tell my constituents, who depend on LIHEAP to heat their homes, the thinking behind gutting LIHEAP by 65 percent.

Talk about cruel. There are consequences to your actions. There are consequences to your words, the downgrading of our credit. If you succeed in getting some of these cuts, people are going to lose benefits that they not only rely on to do things like heat their homes, they need them to survive.

Enough of the nonsense. Let's come together and let's stop wasting time bringing another extreme CR to the House Rules Committee to bring on this floor that makes the crummy bill you brought the other night look like it is reasonable. Come on. We are running out of time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are again reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

MR. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ALFORD), my very good friend.

MR. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, I want to get one thing straight for our Members on the other side of the aisle. The only shutdown that we are in favor of is a shutdown of the woke indoctrination in our military, the shutdown of the infection of socialism propagated by the other side, and a shutdown of the

bloated government spending and the overreach of regulation in America.

Now, on to my main point.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to condemn, in the strongest terms possible, the blatant attacks on the Second Amendment from the Governor of New Mexico.

We saw with COVID unprecedented government overreach that infringed on the rights of millions of Americans.

Let me be crystal clear, Mr. Speaker: There is no such thing as a state public health emergency exception in the U.S. Constitution.

The Second Amendment is a God-given right to the American people. We will not sit idly by as the people of New Mexico have their rights trampled by an unhinged lunatic.

Throughout history, countless populations have been rendered vulnerable due to their inability to defend themselves from both external and internal threats.

Our Founding Fathers, with great foresight and understanding of history's lessons, enshrined the right to bear arms not only as a protection from foreign invaders but also as a safeguard against potential domestic tyranny.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 684 and push back against the attacks on we the people's God-given rights.

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

I am not going to engage in the frivolous part of what this rule provides. I think Mr. COLE and I were having a serious debate about things that really matter here in terms of our economy and whether or not we can fund our government. I am not going to waste time talking about a nonbinding resolution that is nothing more than a press release.

Mr. Speaker, let's be honest with each other. We are only a few days away from a shutdown, and we are in chaos because the Republican Party is in the middle of a civil war. That is just a fact.

Speaker MCCARTHY cut a deal on spending levels back in May. That is what the Senate has acted on in a bipartisan way. The only people not holding up the bargain are House Republicans.

Speaker MCCARTHY is breaking his word, and I get it. I mean, he handed over the gavel to the most extreme in his party. He put the patients in charge of the hospital, and now he is getting blackmailed. Good luck to him getting out of the mess that he has made.

The American people deserve better, and they deserve to know that there is a difference here, a very clear difference. We may not always agree on every single issue, but Democrats come to this place every single day and we worry. We worry about making sure that people get better jobs. We worry because we want people to have better healthcare and we want people to have higher wages. We worry because we

want to make sure that people have clean air and water and great schools where we know our kids will make it home from school that day, they will be safe, and we want to make sure that everybody has access to affordable housing.

Republicans worry, too, but it seems that this Republican majority worries mostly about their own power. They worry about fighting with each other, trying to shut down the government, impeach the President, and remove their own Speaker.

The Republican majority in this House is a joke. They wasted weeks talking about gas stoves, weeks arguing about book bans, weeks telling kids what soccer team they can play on, and now we are on the eve of a shutdown and they are doing nothing to stop it. In fact, they are moving in the wrong direction.

We have Members on the other side of the aisle who go on network news and say “shut it down,” telling people that it is 100 percent certain that there will be a government shutdown. Who cares, they say.

Really?

Earlier, I talked about a seance. After looking at what is happening on the other side of the aisle, I think what this place needs is an exorcism. The Republican Party has gone to war with itself, and it doesn't matter which side wins because either way, they are not worried about anybody but themselves.

This is a serious consequential moment for this Congress. There are real impacts if there is a government shutdown. There are impacts to our credit rating. There are impacts to job creation. There are impacts to a whole bunch of things. Most importantly, Mr. Speaker, there are negative impacts for the people of this country. We have seen this movie before. It doesn't have a good ending.

In these last few days that we have, rather than fighting amongst yourselves, why don't you try something radical, and that is sitting down in a bipartisan way and coming to a deal that will get a majority of votes in this House. It requires the Speaker of the House to stand up to the extremists. It requires him to demonstrate some leadership. That is what is needed.

The Speaker of the House must lead. It is the obligation of everybody in this Chamber to, at a minimum, keep the lights on. This is the moment where we need some leadership, where the Speaker needs to stand up and tell the extremists no.

I said before, it is like the clowns are running the circus, and there is no ringmaster. Enough of this. This is a bad movie.

By the way, it is not just Democrats who are expressing concern about what is going on, and it is not just independents as well that are expressing concern, but I hear it from Members of their own Conference who have been on TV basically sounding the alarm bells saying, this is dysfunction, this is an

unmitigated disaster. These are the words of Republican Members who are warning your leadership to get their act together.

We will see how things work out this weekend, but if the reports that we are reading are true, we are going to see a CR come to the Rules Committee that is even more extreme than the extreme CR that we dealt with and that was pulled the other day.

□ 1015

Mr. McGOVERN. I mean, at the end of the day, I think people need to know that, when you cut some of these programs, when you cut LIHEAP, that means there are people who will not be able to heat their homes in the winter-time.

When you cut Head Start, that means there are countless kids who will not have an opportunity to succeed in the future.

When you cut programs like WIC, it means that there are pregnant mothers and newborn babies that will not have access to good nutrition.

When you cut medical research, you are not only putting farther off the day where we find a cure to some of these dreaded diseases that kill people, but you are also making it certain that the costs of healthcare will continue to rise.

None of this makes any sense. I know that there are adults on the other side of the aisle that want to do the right thing. Again, I plead with my colleagues. We will go through this, whatever we are going to do, a bill that is nonbinding that means nothing, an LNG bill that we have done twice before that is going nowhere fast, and then we will do this Defense appropriations bill, again, that represents the kitchen sink of MAGA culture wars.

We will go through all of that, but, while we are doing that, I hope that people are sitting down and getting serious to avoid a government shutdown, and then let's get together and do what the American people elected us to do.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge a strong “no” vote on this rule.

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 of my colleagues to support the resolution.

The rule will make in order three bills.

First, it makes in order the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2024. It will provide full and complete funding for our Armed Forces and Defense needs and provides the resources necessary to defend freedom around the world.

It makes in order H.R. 1130, Unlocking our Domestic LNG Potential Act. We think that is important.

My friend had an interesting discussion about LIHEAP. I actually share my friend's view. It is an important program. I remember when I chaired the subcommittee on Appropriations, I

had to actually reverse a cut ordered by President Obama of \$300 million in his own budget, and we stopped that from happening.

People throw out numbers, and then you work it through. I always call a Presidential budget a bargaining position. I think the same thing tends to be true of congressional budgets, but we will work that through.

The real cause of lack of heating, though—let's be real about this—is not LIHEAP and whether it is funded or not. It is whether or not there is natural gas to heat it in the first place. My friends have done everything possible to increase the cost and limit the availability of the very product that they want to provide with a government program.

It would be better for every single American if you would just simply be pro-energy production in our country. It is okay to be for renewables. I am for renewables. My State is number one or two in the country in wind power, well ahead of a lot of other progressive States.

We just think what works is what you ought to do. We have got a lot of wind in Oklahoma. It makes a lot of sense, so we use it, and, if it lowers emissions, we think that is good. Natural gas, by the way, has been the single biggest driver of lowering emissions. My friends have done nothing but make it harder in that industry. Frankly—and I mean this with all due respect—I hear people in that industry and companies in that industry vilified routinely. If I said those things about people in your respective States engaged in energy or in other kinds of production, you would be appalled, because you know those people.

I have got millions of people in the energy industry. I have thousands of people in my district that go out and work on rigs. They go out and lay pipeline. They go out and find oil and gas. It is hard work. They do that, and they give many parts of the country that don't have energy production the cheapest energy in the world outside of a couple of petrostates, and the most secure product, and they have tripled production in petroleum since about 2006. Yet, the price of gas goes up—it is a lot less here than it is almost anywhere in the world—and then they say, oh, my gosh, they are profiteering. No, there are market forces out there. That is off the subject.

I would just say my friends are worried about the cost of heating. LIHEAP is a good program. I support it. I have proven that over and over again. Please, let's make sure that we have the gas in the first place.

Finally, my friends dismiss the importance of the Second Amendment because they disagree with it for the most part. That is fair enough. All we are saying is we want the opportunity to actually invest things.

My friend made a couple of other points I just want to quickly address, because I want him to be under no—



and I don't think he is—under any illusion. I hold Senator MURRAY and Senator COLLINS in very high regard. I have worked with them both. I have worked with Senator MURRAY, in particular, for 8 years, either as chair, or ranking member of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies when she held the same respective position. We came to a deal almost every year. The gentlewoman is a good legislator, and Senator COLLINS is legendary.

What the Senate is crafting over there right now is well above the agreement that my friend thinks we are violating. It is pretty easy to declare emergencies. Yes, I would love to spend more money on defense. I have said that on this floor. I have said that during this debate. Let's call it emergency and heap it on.

They are laying out a negotiating position. It is fair enough. My guess is we are going to end up pretty close to the numbers we agreed upon.

My friends have been very critical of my leader, the Speaker of the House, and that is fair enough. This is politics. I will tell you this: You guys said he wouldn't get elected, and he did. You said he wouldn't get a bill across the floor to deal with the debt ceiling and then negotiate a deal, but he did. Let's wait and see how this plays out.

My friends need to remember, when it comes to these fiscal issues, they are the ones that never passed a budget for 4 years. They are the ones that left us with a \$1.7 trillion deficit, and they have got the White House and the Senate and have not produced any plan to address it, nor have they been willing to sit down and talk to us about, in a bipartisan way, how could we start dealing with what we all know is the big driver, and that is entitlement programs.

We have a lot of problems in front of us. We can point a lot of fingers. Let's do the right thing today, though, and start addressing them.

The right thing today is to move ahead and pass this rule, get onto a debate about what we think are important issues. Defending the country is certainly an important issue. Securing our energy future is important, and dealing with constitutional rights, and we will continue to discuss and work on these other matters.

I will agree with my friend. I am not for shutting down the government. I hope we don't get there, and I always worry about that as we approach these kind of deadlines.

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 will be postponed.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 23 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1031

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. AMODEI) at 10 o'clock and 31 minutes a.m.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 712; and

Adoption of House Resolution 712, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4365, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2024; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1130, UNLOCKING OUR DOMESTIC LNG POTENTIAL ACT OF 2023; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 684, CONDEMNING THE ACTIONS OF GOVERNOR OF NEW MEXICO, MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM, FOR SUBVERTING THE SECOND AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION AND DEPRIVING THE CITIZENS OF NEW MEXICO OF THEIR RIGHT TO BEAR ARMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 712) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4365) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1130) to repeal restrictions on the export and import of natural gas; and providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 684) condemning the actions of Governor of New Mexico, Michelle Lujan Grisham, for subverting the Second Amendment to the Constitution and depriving the citizens of New Mexico of their right to bear arms, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 216, nays 202, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 402]

## YEAS—216

Aderholt	Gaetz	Miller-Meeks
Alford	Gallagher	Mills
Allen	Garbarino	Molinaro
Amodei	Garcia, Mike	Moolenaar
Armstrong	Jimenez	Mooney
Arrington	Gonzales, Tony	Moore (AL)
Babin	Good (VA)	Moore (UT)
Bacon	Gooden (TX)	Moran
Baird	Gosar	Murphy
Balderson	Granger	Nehls
Banks	Graves (LA)	Newhouse
Barr	Graves (MO)	Norman
Bean (FL)	Green (TN)	Nunn (IA)
Bergman	Greene (GA)	Obernolte
Bice	Griffith	Ogles
Biggs	Grothman	Owens
Billirakis	Guest	Palmer
Bishop (NC)	Guthrie	Pence
Boebert	Hagaman	Perry
Bost	Harris	Pfleger
Brecheen	Harshbarger	Posey
Buchanan	Hern	Reschenthaler
Buck	Higgins (LA)	Rodgers (WA)
Bucshon	Hill	Rogers (AL)
Burchett	Hinson	Rogers (KY)
Burgess	Houchin	Rose
Burlison	Hudson	Rosendale
Calvert	Huizenga	Rouzer
Cammack	Hunt	Roy
Carey	Issa	Rutherford
Carl	Jackson (TX)	Salazar
Carter (GA)	James	Santos
Carter (TX)	Johnson (LA)	Schweikert
Chavez-DeRemer	Johnson (OH)	Scott, Austin
Ciscomani	Johnson (SD)	Self
Cline	Jordan	Sessions
Cloud	Joyce (OH)	Simpson
Clyde	Joyce (PA)	Smith (MO)
Cole	Kean (NJ)	Smith (NE)
Collins	Kelly (MS)	Smith (NJ)
Comer	Kelly (PA)	Smucker
Crane	Kiggans (VA)	Spartz
Crawford	Kiley	Stauber
Crenshaw	Kim (CA)	Steel
Curtis	Kustoff	Stefanik
D'Esposito	LaHood	Steil
Davidson	LaLota	Steube
De La Cruz	Lamborn	Strong
DesJarlais	Langworthy	Tenney
Diaz-Balart	Latta	Thompson (PA)
Donalds	LaTurner	Tiffany
Duarte	Lawler	Timmons
Duncan	Lee (FL)	Turner
Dunn (FL)	Lesko	Valadao
Edwards	Letlow	Van Drew
Ellzey	Loudermilk	Van Dyne
Emmer	Luetkemeyer	Van Orden
Estes	Luttrell	Wagner
Ezell	Mace	Walberg
Fallon	Malliotakis	Waltz
Feenstra	Mann	Weber (TX)
Ferguson	Massie	Webster (FL)
Finstad	Mast	Wenstrup
Fischbach	McCarthy	Westerman
Fitzgerald	McCaul	Williams (NY)
Fitzpatrick	McClain	Williams (TX)
Fleischmann	McClintock	Wilson (SC)
Flood	McCormick	Wittman
Fox	McHenry	Womack
Franklin, C.	Meuser	Yakym
Scott	Miller (IL)	Zinke
Fry	Miller (OH)	
Fulcher	Miller (WV)	

## NAYS—202

Adams	Bush	Clyburn
Aguilar	Caraveo	Cohen
Allred	Carbajal	Connolly
Auchincloss	Cárdenas	Correa
Balint	Carson	Costa
Barragán	Carter (LA)	Courtney
Beatty	Cartwright	Craig
Bera	Casar	Crockett
Beyer	Case	Crow
Blumenauer	Casten	Cuellar
Blunt Rochester	Castor (FL)	Daids (KS)
Bonamici	Castro (TX)	Davis (IL)
Bowman	Cherfilus	Davis (NC)
Boyle (PA)	McCormick	Dean (PA)
Brown	Chu	DeGette
Brownley	Clark (MA)	DeLauro
Budzinski	Cleaver	DelBene