

CONTINUE FEDERAL FUNDING FOR ALZHEIMER'S RESEARCH

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on a topic that I think is important to everyone in this institution. As most of my colleagues know, June is National Alzheimer's and Brain Awareness Month.

Mr. Speaker, if Members have been fortunate enough that they have not had a family member affected, then I hope they remain fortunate in that way because statistics suggest that each and every one of us is going to have a family member who is affected by Alzheimer's or brain health in one way or another.

The bill we are voting on today is our opportunity to fund that research. If Members have been following Alzheimer's research over the past 12 months, then they know it has been a disappointing 12 months not because we haven't been funding it properly—we have—and not because the research has not been going on—it has—but because things we thought were so promising have turned out not to be so. We are starting over again in a lot of different ways.

Mr. Speaker, if there is one thing I believe the American people can count on amidst all the partisan strife is the way that we come together to fund that fundamental health research that only the Federal Government can stand behind and succeed in.

I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their support of those accounts thus far. I hope that as we continue this appropriations season, that will continue as well.

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, June 12, 2019.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on June 12, 2019, at 11:25 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 395.

That the Senate passed S. 504.

That the Senate agreed to Relative to the death of Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, former Chaplain of the United States Senate S. Res. 240.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON.

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2740, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2020

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 436 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 436

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. 2740) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, 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, amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution, and available pro forma amendments described in section 4 of House Resolution 431.

(b) Each further 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, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before action thereon, shall not be subject to amendment except amendments described in section 4 of House Resolution 431, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

(c) Each further amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules may be offered at any time during the consideration of the bill for amendment, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before action thereon, shall not be subject to amendment except amendments described in section 4 of House Resolution 431, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

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

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or her designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of further amendments printed in 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 amendments described in section 4 of House Resolution 431, 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 and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), 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.

□ 1315

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, the Rules Committee met and reported the rule, House Resolution 436, providing for consideration of H.R. 2740, the Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, Defense, State, Foreign Operations, and Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2020.

The rule provides for further consideration of H.R. 2740 under a structured rule and makes in order 115 amendments. The rule provides no further general debate.

The chair of the Appropriations Committee may also offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments made in order by the rule and not earlier disposed of.

Finally, the rule includes one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, it was only a few months ago that we were standing here voting to end the longest government shutdown in the history of the United States, a shutdown that hurt so many of our constituents, constituents like David Pesko, an FAA air traffic controller at Ontario Airport.

He was in escrow to purchase a home, and, without a paycheck coming in, he had to rely on his family and friends' generosity in order to make ends meet.

We owe David and the American people much more, and that is why I am especially proud of the timely introduction of these appropriations bills. It exemplifies the hard work of my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee and this majority's commitment to good governance.

Mr. Speaker, in years past, we have relied strongly on omnibus spending

bills to fund the government. But now, with the hard work done by Members on both sides of the aisle, this majority is leading us in a return to regular order.

As has often been said on this very floor, the primary job of Congress is to fund the American government and keep it open and operating. Our constituents deserve no less.

With this package under consideration today, the House will do just that with respect to 4 of the 12 spending bills.

In passing this bill, we will provide crucial funding for services across broad areas of the government and fulfill our promises to the American people. That funding includes historic investments in programs that provide opportunities for millions of people, including my constituents in the Inland Empire.

Perhaps more important than what is included in this bill is what is not included. This minibus rejects the President's draconian budget cuts that would have hurt every American, but especially women and children.

Instead, we have won increased funding for a number of important priorities.

This bill boosts biomedical research at the National Institutes of Health, expands opioid abuse treatment and prevention programs, and launches new initiatives for maternal and child health.

I recently visited three health clinics in my district that provide 30,000 families with lifesaving care.

This bill provides \$400 million for the Title X Family Planning Program so that everyone in the Inland Empire and across America can continue to have access to cancer screenings, STI tests, reproductive care, and other lifesaving services.

It also protects against the administration's policies that prevent a woman from making choices about her future, like when to have a child.

When women do decide to become mothers, this bill supports them by investing in working families and our children with \$7.8 billion for the Childcare and Development Block Grant program.

Passing this bill will demonstrate our commitment to the ideal that all students deserve a quality, safe, and affordable education, and that commitment is realized in over \$24 billion in funding for Federal Student Aid programs, almost \$2 billion more than the President's insufficient request.

Just as important is this bill's acknowledgement of how far we have to go in helping underserved communities, the bill provides \$917 million to assist minority-serving institutions, including \$150 million for Hispanic-serving institutions like Cal Poly Pomona, Cal State San Bernardino, and UC Riverside, which prepare thousands of students in my district to be tomorrow's leaders.

Mr. Speaker, I am also happy to report that this legislation provides the

funding necessary for a 3.1 percent pay raise for our servicemembers, who continue to serve our Nation around the world.

As the mother of an Air Force veteran, it is wonderful news to hear that our servicemembers are being acknowledged for the hard work that they do keeping our Nation safe, at home and abroad.

In addition to paying our servicemembers more, this bill will protect our men and women in uniform from one of the most common harms that they encounter: sexual assault.

The \$38 million in additional funding for DOD'S sexual assault prevention and response programs will ensure that survivors have representation while navigating the complicated military justice process, that they will not have to wait years for a resolution—years, Mr. Speaker—as one of my constituents had to do.

This bill not only invests in our priorities at home; it advances our priorities abroad. I am particularly pleased with increased investments in certain areas, including global reproductive health and aid to Central American countries.

This bill empowers countless women who are the backbone of their families around the world by increasing funding for family planning programs, reversing the President's disastrous global gag rule, and contributing \$55.5 million to the United Nations Population Fund.

Robust funding is included for counter-narcotics and law enforcement efforts in Colombia, Mexico, Central America, and the Caribbean.

This bill also ensures that the funding provided goes to the right people—the right people, Mr. Speaker—instead of the corrupt officials that undermine democracy and misuse U.S. aid. This is especially important given the recent report regarding corruption in the Northern Triangle countries of Guatemala and Honduras.

And, finally, the last part of this bill that I would like to highlight is what we are doing to invest in our energy and water infrastructure.

The bill rejects the President's short-sighted proposed cuts to key energy and water programs and, instead, invests \$46.6 billion to rebuild our crumbling infrastructure, build the next generation of clean energy technologies, and combat the urgent threat that is climate change.

This is a good bill. This is a bill that should be signed into law, and I urge my colleagues to vote for this rule so that we can get back to regular order and avoid another costly shutdown.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from California for yielding me the time.

We finished up in the Rules Committee, I think, before 10 p.m. last night. I was optimistic that we finished up that early.

It is not the Members you need to worry about, Mr. Speaker. It is the staff of the Rules Committee you need to worry about, because they had hundreds upon hundreds upon hundreds of amendments submitted that they were going through all weekend long, trying to sort out what are those amendments that could be made in order, what are those amendments that would need waivers of the rules, what are those amendments that could be considered on the floor and not be repetitive.

It is an amazing burden on the staff to have to go through all those amendments, Mr. Speaker, and it is an unnecessary burden.

You weren't here at the time, Mr. Speaker, but I am looking right down here below me at the gentleman from Kentucky. He used to be the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and was the chairman of the Appropriations Committee the last time we came to the House floor under regular order, as my friend from California suggests, and we allowed every Member of this institution—everyone who had been elected by their constituents back home, everyone who has a voting card—to come and offer any idea that they had to improve upon the underlying bill.

I don't take issue with much of what my friend from California said about many of the good things in this bill. There are many good things in this bill.

But what I love about the Appropriations Committee, Mr. Speaker, different from the Rules Committee, is they come to the House year after year and say we have done an amazing job working together in a bipartisan way in the Appropriations Committee, but the other Members of the House who don't serve on that committee, if they have some expertise that they think can improve the bill, bring it on. Bring it on. Let's go down to that House floor. Let's have that festival of democracy. Let's test those ideas, and let's send the best product that we can to the President's desk.

□ 1330

My friend from California says that this is a good bill and that it should absolutely be signed by the President. She could be right. I would probably disagree with her, Mr. Speaker, but she could be right.

The fact of the matter is, the law of the land, as it exists today, won't let us implement this bill. This bill spends above those caps, the statutory spending caps passed by the Congress and signed by the President.

This bill cannot become law at these levels. If it were to, we would have an automatic sequester that brings the levels down.

That is a terrible way to govern. We have learned that lesson over the past 10 years together.

Mr. Speaker, I wish I didn't have to point to the gentleman from Kentucky and say remember the days when

everybody's voice mattered in this institution. Remember those days. That day should be today. It is not an easy pathway to get back to.

I remember when we were trying to do open rules on the Republican side. My Democratic colleagues would come to the floor and offer amendments that they knew would pass with a minority of Republican votes and a lot of Democratic votes. Then they would vote in favor of that amendment to change the bill, but they would vote against the final bill, knowing it would not be able to pass without their support.

That is a great strategy, and it has been used by both sides, if my colleagues want to be in the business of making a point. It is an awful strategy if my colleagues want to be in the business of making a difference. If Members came to this institution to govern instead of to get the next sound bite, that is a terrible path to be on.

Mr. Speaker, if Members went through those hundreds of amendments the way that the Rules Committee staff went through them over the weekend, they would see good idea after good idea after good idea that has been turned away before it could be considered on the floor of this House. I don't know whether those amendments would have passed or failed. I know some of them would have passed; I know some of them would have failed.

There was a time in this institution when we let the votes decide, when we let the membership decide.

Mr. Speaker, we have changed those rules. It is now 13 men and women who sit on the Rules Committee who decide.

I value my friend from California's suggestion that we get back to regular order, and I know it is not an easy path to follow. This bill is the most open we have had so far this year, and yet, it still denies Member after Member, on both sides of the aisle, an opportunity to have their constituents' voices heard.

Mr. Speaker, we can do better. If we speak with one voice in this body and reject this rule, we will do better. All it takes is the courage of our convictions to do that.

I hope my Members will stand with me in aspiring to do better today than we did yesterday and better still tomorrow.

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

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to remind my colleague that I also serve on the Appropriations Committee, and we had a very open and transparent process. Every subcommittee invited all Members to come before us to present their ideas or their requests to the subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee. We have also supported 95 percent of the written requests from all Members.

So to say that it was not transparent and that Members did not have an opportunity to come before and present their ideas is incorrect.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN).

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California for giving me this opportunity to speak on what I think is a very important and very good bill.

I am here to speak on H.R. 2740, which contains the fiscal year 2020 Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education; Defense; State and Foreign Operations; and Energy and Water Development funding bills.

As a new member of the Appropriations Committee this year, I am particularly proud to support this bill, which includes, among many other things, \$100 million in programming for reentry programs; \$250 million for registered apprenticeships; and \$128 million for Youth Build, a program that provides critical skills to youth in my district, which is New Jersey's 12th Congressional District.

I thank Chairwoman ROSA DELAURO for her leadership of our subcommittee. I was pleased to work with her to include language and funding that addresses maternal mortality, including various provisions to address the persistent gaps in our healthcare system that result in Black mothers being 2 to 6 times more likely to die than White moms.

I also thank her for working with me to include funding to address the suicide epidemic among our youth. This is needed urgently, as the suicide rate for children has increased 70 percent in the last decade, with a disproportionate increase among Black youth. To inform further efforts to address this epidemic, the bill requests a report from the Surgeon General on contributing factors and evidence-based interventions.

In closing, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and "yes" on the underlying bill.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER), a colleague of mine on the bipartisan Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I find myself in rule debate today because my very reasonable amendment was not made in order. The amendment was germane to the bill, written with proper offsets, and in accordance with House rules. The denial of my amendment was purely political.

I wanted to debate my amendment on its merits because the passage of my amendment would mean jobs for families in Minnesota's Eighth Congressional District.

In northern Minnesota, there are vast reserves of copper, nickel, and other precious metals, offering the opportunity for northern Minnesota to power our economy while providing high-wage union jobs and diminishing our reliance on foreign resources.

The Twin Metals project has a long and difficult regulatory review ahead because our approval processes are the

strongest in the world. Twin Metals is following the process. We require that they cross every "t" and dot every "i," and they will employ our friends and neighbors in good mining jobs of the future.

Unfortunately, politicians in Washington and the Twin Cities metro area oppose this project. They know that we have the strongest environmental reviews in the world, and they know Twin Metals will have the opportunity to succeed, so they decided to change the rules.

They included language in this spending bill creating a "study" that does nothing more than delay this project. It is changing the rules when they know a project has a great chance to be successful.

Instead of including it in the base bill, they snuck it into committee report language. Instead of making my amendment in order, they decided to reject it, all because they want to interfere with a promising project in Minnesota District Eight.

Twin Metals will offer a mine plan of operation in the coming months. In that mine plan, they will lay out how they will extract our minerals and store tailings in an environmentally sound way. They will illustrate how they plan to meet or exceed all existing standards.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, this is unacceptable. I want to debate the merits of my amendment by discussing how this will follow the rules and benefit jobs in my district. Instead, I am here to discuss the failed process and how antimining groups changed the rules to benefit their antimining ideology.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose the rule, and I urge my colleagues to do so as well.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

Ms. FRANKEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for their work on this bill.

I am very proud to support this rule for this very outstanding bill package that makes For the People investments to give every person a better chance for a better life.

Mr. Speaker, I want to touch on a few issues.

First, with this legislation, we recognize that when women succeed, America and the world succeed. We do this with many, many outstanding investments.

When women in our country and the world are educated and healthy and have economic opportunity, their communities will be more prosperous and peaceful for everyone.

We have increased investments in Head Start and childcare programs, medical research, family planning, girls' education, fighting gender-based

violence, and supporting women-owned enterprises.

Mr. Speaker, we are repealing the administration's cruel domestic and global gag and religious refusal rules that are cutting off lifesaving healthcare to so many people in our own country and around the world.

We are also making smart investments in our country's infrastructure. So important to my home State of Florida is the restoration of Florida's Everglades, to keep the drinking water clean and safe for over 8 million people.

I want to add, as a mother of a retired United States marine war veteran of many years and representative to so many honorable servicemen and -women, I recognize their selfless and brave service to our country. So I am especially pleased with the funding for the Veterans Student Success Program on college campuses that will help veterans transition to student and civilian life.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, this is an outstanding bill for the people of this country, and I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the bill package.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER), a gentleman who offered a germane amendment that was rejected.

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I want to echo the concerns of my colleague and friend, Mr. STAUBER, over the rejection of our reasonable amendment to this bill in the Rules Committee.

In their very last days, the Obama administration ordered Federal control of Minnesota land in the form of a mineral withdrawal proposal. We were told it was a step to protect the environment when, in reality, it was nothing more than Washington telling Minnesotans that they can't be responsible for their own land and resources.

Blocking exploration and potential development has devastated the region. That is exactly what this bill will continue to do today if it passes.

I introduced the MINER Act 2 years ago to restore the rights and responsibilities back to Minnesotans as stewards of our lands. The House passed our bill last year, closely followed by action from this administration to restore our rights. Yet, bureaucrats from Washington are at it again, this time including a provision in this bill to create the "study" that is yet another barrier, another delay tactic outside of the normal regulatory review process.

The amendment I offered with Mr. STAUBER would address this and simply allow the process to move forward. Let us be clear: Any proposed mine in the area would still need to go through a long and thoroughly detailed review through the National Environmental Policy Act and other regulatory processes. Leaseholders would be allowed to propose a mine plan of operation and demonstrate how they will protect the environment in the surrounding area. If that plan does not meet the high standards that our State and country require, it will be rejected.

Yet, I am disappointed by some of my Minnesota colleagues who do not have faith in the people of our great State. They don't have faith that our people would want to protect our own land while ensuring development and a better future for our children.

My colleagues don't want to entertain the potential for thousands of high-paying, labor-negotiated jobs for northern Minnesota and the surrounding region. These same men and women, these miners, are Minnesotans first.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. EMMER. These same men and women, these miners, are Minnesotans first. We are proud of our State's natural beauty, and we are experts when it comes to how to preserve it.

I believe my State is perfectly capable of abiding by the existing rules and regulations and determining the best way to use our land.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose the rule, and I urge my colleagues to do so as well.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1345

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SPANO).

Mr. SPANO. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, I was one of 169 House Members who signed a letter to President Trump urging him to reject any appropriations legislation that would undermine pro-life protections. The President agreed. He agreed that long-standing pro-life provisions should be retained and has promised to veto any bill that weakens those pro-life protections.

Unfortunately, the legislation before us not only strips pro-life provisions, but it includes language that, in fact, undermines efforts to promote life. In this bill, Democrats included provisions that would prevent the Trump administration from implementing its Title X and conscience protection rules to protect life.

The Title X Family Planning rule ensures that Federal funds do not go to facilities that perform or promote abortion as family planning. For more than 40 years, this country has operated under the policy that not one cent of taxpayer money can be used to fund abortion.

We are a Nation that deeply values religious liberty, and this rule further protects Americans' tax dollars from being forced to subsidize entities that kill unborn children.

Accordingly, I am fully supportive of Representative ROBY's amendment, that we will debate this afternoon, to strike the language that would halt this important rule and the other amendments that will restore pro-life policies to this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues to support these provisions.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, it is tiring to hear from so many * * * males on this floor talk about a woman's right to choose.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to ask my friend if she would like to change her last statement.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, if it pleases my colleague on the other side, I will withdraw my statement about sex-starved males on the floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentlewoman from California ask unanimous consent to withdraw the statement?

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I will agree to withdraw my statement regarding—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I know my colleague well, and I thoroughly enjoy working with her on the Rules Committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

Is the gentleman reserving the right—

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I am reserving the right to object.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my statement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has reserved the right to object.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from California. I do not object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the words are withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I will put it in different terms. It is tiring to be here on this floor or in committee as a woman and to continue to be counseled about what types of affordable planning, whether it is family planning, conversations that rightfully I deserve to have with my own doctor.

Choosing when women want to have a family and to avoid pregnancies before they become pregnancies, it is unfortunate that that is something that continues to be denied to American women day in and day out on this floor.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, while we have many champions of life in this institution on both sides of the aisle, none is stronger than the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), a tireless fighter for life.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the bill under consideration today reverses several—at least nine—life-affirming, pro-life policies, including conscience protection, Title X reform, the Protecting Life in Global Health Assistance, and more.

This is a pro-abortion piece of legislation on steroids. But passage won't be the last word.

Trump will veto it and we will sustain that veto.

No one, including doctors, nurses, and LPNs, Mr. Speaker, and no entity, like hospitals or health insurance plans, should ever be compelled against their will into performing, facilitating, or subsidizing abortion.

This bill eviscerates the administration's conscience protection rule. In late February, HHS promulgated the Protect Life rule to reassert portions of President Reagan's original Title X regulation to end colocation of abortion clinics with family planning clinics under Title X. It also requires financial separation. That, too, is reversed by this piece of legislation.

Among its provisions, the Protect Life rule also seeks to protect against child abuse, child molestation, sexual abuse, and human trafficking.

H.R. 2740 also guts the Protecting Life in Global Health Assistance policy, which ensures that our foreign aid holds harmless unborn children. It, again, is a Ronald Reagan policy expanded and reiterated, and it prevents taxpayer funds from going to—and this is grant money—foreign NGOs that perform or promote abortion as a method of family planning.

Mr. Speaker, the shocking number of unborn children killed in America is unconscionable—approximately 61 million dead babies since 1973—a death toll that equates to the entire population of Italy. All of this when our knowledge about unborn children and the breathtaking miracle of life before birth is unparalleled.

Mr. Speaker, anyone here, parent or grandparent, knows that the first baby pictures today are of the child in the womb, the ultrasound pictures that go up on our refrigerators, so proud of the new baby. It is not that you are going to be a parent; you are a parent during those 9 months.

Yet the pro-abortion movement, like a modern day Flat Earth Society, continues to cling to outdated, indefensible arguments cloaked in euphemism.

Even the seemingly benign word "choice" withers under scrutiny. Choice to do what? Dismember an unborn child piece by piece. Anyone who watched the movie "Unplanned" saw an ultrasound-guided abortion where the child was decimated right on the screen for all to see.

Then there is, of course, RU-486, which first starves the baby to death, and then the baby is expelled from the womb. Then there are injections of chemical poisons—all of it violence against children.

That is what the choice is all about: the choice of killing an innocent, defenseless, unborn child.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, contraception for women is not something that should be debated here.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-

ALLARD) for a unanimous consent request.

(Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the appropriations minibuses.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this Appropriations Minibus. These four Appropriations bills are an investment in the American public and provide robust funding for programs that strengthen our society.

In the SFOPS bill, I am particularly pleased with the strong investments in the Northern Triangle region to address the push factors that cause migrants to seek refuge at our southern border.

Specifically, the bill includes \$10 million dollars to address sexual and gender-based violence in the region. Sexual violence has reached crisis levels in the last several years, causing women and children to leave their home countries and seek asylum in the United States.

As vice-chair of the LHHS Subcommittee, I thank Chairwoman DELAURO and Ranking Member COLE for their leadership and commitment to the most vulnerable among us.

This FY20 "People's Bill" upholds our promise to Americans by investing in workers' needs, supporting the education of our children, and ensuring individuals have access to quality health programs.

The bill is a testament to our commitment to help people obtain good paying jobs. With increased funding for workforce training programs like Job Corps, and Apprenticeships, we are creating pathways to the middle class.

The bill also invests in the future of our country by providing robust increases to crucial education programs.

With an increase of \$1 billion in Title I and IDEA, our most vulnerable students will receive the additional resources they need to receive the quality education they deserve.

For higher education, increasing the maximum award of the Pell grant continues our fight against the rising costs of college.

The bill also makes a strong investment in our nation's public health by increasing the CDC budget by \$938 million above the 2019 enacted level.

This includes critical investments in public health infrastructure to begin modernizing data surveillance and analytics at CDC. It is also the first investment in over 20 years for gun violence prevention research.

The bill also increases funding for three of my top legislative priorities: fighting underage drinking, supporting newborn screening, and improving childbirth outcomes for women and infants in all communities.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to vote in support of this appropriations minibuses to help safeguard the health and well-being of the most vulnerable in our country, to ensure we have a strong labor force and national economy, and to ensure our country is safe and secure.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in light of the humanitarian crisis at our border and what is happening to the migrants who seek to

come here and to the people of the United States of America, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 3056, an emergency supplemental to provide critically needed funding for the humanitarian crisis at the border, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise that all time has been yielded for the purpose of debate only.

Does the gentlewoman from California yield for the purposes of this unanimous consent request?

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I will not. I will not yield for that purpose, and all time yielded is for the purpose of debate and debate only.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California does not yield; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 3056, an emergency supplemental to provide critically needed funding for the humanitarian crisis at the border, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentlewoman from California has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, due to the humanitarian crisis and border crisis, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 3056, an emergency supplemental to provide critically needed funding for the humanitarian crisis at the border, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentlewoman from California has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 3056, an emergency supplemental to provide critically needed funding for the humanitarian crisis at the border, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentlewoman from California has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds just to remind the Chamber that we tried to offer an amendment last night in committee that would have addressed this funding.

The Rules Committee rejected the consideration by the whole House of a measure that would provide what we all agree is urgently needed funding. We are seeing some of that passion here at this moment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 3056, an emergency supplemental to provide critically needed funding for the humanitarian crisis at the border, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from California has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, with record numbers of people coming across our border illegally, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 3056, an emergency supplemental to provide critically needed funding for the humanitarian crisis at the border, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from California has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO), one of my colleagues on the Rules Committee, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

□ 1400

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, as a Congresswoman from the border State of Arizona, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 3056, an emergency supplemental to provide critically needed funding for the humanitarian crisis at our southern border, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from California has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to say when we had this conversation in the Rules Committee yesterday—again, my friend from California is on the Appropriations Committee—and she said we talked about bringing forward an emergency funding bill that is more comprehensive. We are working on expediting that.

I would say to my friend, agreeing to one of these unanimous consent requests would be the absolute fastest way to expedite that if she would like to reconsider her position.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I will not yield.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of a unanimous consent re-

quest, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 3056, an emergency supplemental to provide critically needed funding for the humanitarian crisis and catastrophe now at our border, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from California has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request, I yield to my neighbor from the great State of Georgia (Mr. HICE).

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

As one who just returned from the border, and having personally seen the enormity of the crisis there, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 3056, an emergency supplemental to provide critically needed funding for the humanitarian crisis at the border, and I ask for its immediate action and consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from California has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield for the purpose of a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CLINE).

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, to save lives at the border, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 3056, an emergency supplemental to provide critically needed funding for the humanitarian crisis at the border, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from California has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 3056, an emergency supplemental to provide the critically needed funding for the humanitarian crisis at the border, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from California has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

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

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to remind my colleagues why we are here today. We are considering

a bill that provides \$7.97 billion in humanitarian assistance, a 3.1 percent pay raise for our troops, \$1.9 billion for the Job Corps, \$41.1 billion for mental health, for Alzheimer's research, HIV/AIDS, cancer research, and others.

I agree that we need to address the humanitarian situation at the border, and Democrats have been saying this for a very long time. We said so when crying toddlers were being torn apart from their mother's arms. We said so when children were being put in cages. We said so when children were being drugged. We said so when children were being sexually abused.

I visited those facilities. I saw the tragedy with my own eyes. HHS needs an influx of funds, and we cannot wait until this bill is enacted.

In the coming weeks, we will consider the administration's request for a supplemental appropriations bill. That supplemental, not the fiscal year 2020 appropriations bill, is the appropriate place to deal with this year's ORR funding. That is not just because we can't wait for the annual appropriations process to be completed; it is also because we have concerns about how ORR is managing some of those shelters.

With all the abuses that have come to light, I know that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle agree with us that we need to have more oversight, additional oversight over these facilities.

Most importantly, this amendment increases and decreases the same account. It is not an actual effect. The children deserve more than a messaging amendment. They deserve better than that.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will amend the rule to bring H.R. 3056 immediately to the floor under an open rule.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, we spent a great deal of time today talking about the humanitarian crisis on the border, and that is because, despite all of the very positive things that are in this bill that my friend from California has mentioned, what is not in this bill is one single penny to go to the border today. There is not a Member of this institution who does not know that we need that money going to the border today.

I am not talking about contentious issues like border security, though that shouldn't be a contentious issue. That should be an issue of agreement, as well. I am talking about an issue on which we are unanimous, which is taking care of those people who are in the

custody of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3056 would provide \$4.5 billion. Mr. Speaker, as a fiscal conservative, I don't say that lightly—\$4.5 billion. That is not \$4.5 billion to get us through another year, Mr. Speaker. That is not \$4.5 billion to start in October and run us through the next fiscal year. That is \$4.5 billion today to address needs that exist today, to fill shortfalls that are happening today, to solve problems that demand solutions today.

There is not one word in this bill to provide a single solution anywhere in America today. But if we defeat the previous question and amend the rule as I have suggested, we can provide those solutions today, and we can do it in a partnership way that will make America proud.

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

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire if the gentleman has any remaining speakers.

Mr. WOODALL. I would advise my friend that I do not see any speakers remaining, and when the gentlewoman has exhausted her speakers, I will be prepared to close.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership, and I thank her for the time.

This is an enormous and important step as it relates to healthcare in America. So many of us have been fighting to ensure that the preexisting conditions of Americans are protected. I am grateful that work has been done to provide \$190 billion that covers labor, health and human services, and particularly \$99 billion that deals with the question of Alzheimer's disease, HIV/AIDS, and, certainly, work on cancer research. I do want to take note of the fact that TRIO dollars have been allowed, as well.

There is also an important point that is probably prospectively going to be covered, but I do want to raise it now, and that is working with countries that are our partners or that we would hope that they would be partners in the war against terror.

As the co-chair of the Pakistan Caucus, I want to ensure—and I know State, Foreign Ops, Defense is prospectively coming—that I believe there has been much work accomplished by the new government and members of the expanded Government of Pakistan to work against terror.

I know that they have lost treasure in the war against terror, and that is the Pakistani military. So I would hope that we would find a way to ensure that Pakistan receives its foreign aid, as I believe it should, and that we provide measuring sticks or standards by which they can meet steps of accomplishment, because it is important that we create alliances that are

strong in the region because of the difficulty of the conditions in Afghanistan, the recent loss of life.

We know that Afghanistan is not at the level of security that we would like, and I would hope that we would work with countries in the region to ensure the peace and security of the region and the peace and security in Afghanistan.

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

Mr. Speaker, we are talking about two kinds of issues down here today. When I listen to my friend from California talk about all the wonderful things that are in the underlying bill, I can't tell you how much I wanted to stand up and celebrate with her that appropriations season is often that way.

Mr. Speaker, you haven't seen it in your time, but there was a time in this institution where the way we spent America's money reflected America's priorities, and it turned out—you wouldn't know it by reading the newspaper, Mr. Speaker, but it turned out those priorities didn't hinge on whether you had an R or a D behind your name. It didn't hinge on whether you came from the Deep South or the Northwest.

It turned out, when we started voting on issues one dollar at a time, we began to find that we had agreements with one another that had not yet been explored. We began to find, Mr. Speaker, that we could celebrate achievements together in ways that had not yet been explored.

Mr. Speaker, the year I came to Congress, and many of my other colleagues here came that very same year, you may remember the appropriations process hadn't been finished by the Democrats. When Republicans took over, the young freshman class of which I was a part said we need to get down there, and we need to finish that job. It was a Tuesday, Mr. Speaker. We brought up the entire Federal discretionary budget.

Now, that is a lousy way to do business. It is a lousy way to do business. We used to bring up bills one appropriations bill at a time.

There are 12 bills, Mr. Speaker. We have gotten in a bad habit of omnibus bills. As you know, what we switched to last year and what the Democratic majority is continuing this year is bringing up groups of four or five bills together.

But at that time, in the spring of 2011, Mr. Speaker, we brought them all up. We brought them all up together. And do you know what we said, Mr. Speaker, the brand-new Republican majority?

You know how it is when majorities change, Mr. Speaker. Folks have gotten their feelings hurt. They feel like they were a little wronged by the previous majority. My friend from California knows what I am talking about.

You might have expected the Republican majority to say, "We are going to

jam our priorities through, diversity of ideas be damned," but we didn't. It was Speaker John Boehner at that time, Mr. Speaker, and he said we are bringing up the entire Federal discretionary budget, and any Member, Mr. Speaker, any Member from either side of the aisle who has an idea about how to make it better, their ideas are welcome here on the floor of the House.

Oh, you want to talk about a festival of democracy, Mr. Speaker? We started on a Tuesday. We thought we were going to be done by a Thursday. We ended up going 24 hours a day, finishing in the early hours of Saturday morning.

And by "finishing," Mr. Speaker, I mean we allowed every single Member's voice in this body be heard on every single issue that their constituents sent them here to address. Every Member of this institution left tired, Mr. Speaker, but every Member of this institution left feeling like they had had a chance to represent their constituents the way the United States Constitution intended.

□ 1415

It doesn't always work that way, Mr. Speaker. I sit on the Rules Committee. We decide what amendments are made in order and what amendments aren't.

In the last Congress, when the Republicans controlled this institution, we didn't make every amendment in order. We did not make every amendment in order, Mr. Speaker.

But what we did do is we made more Democratic amendments in order than Republican amendments. We did. But because, for obvious reasons, when you are in the leadership, it is easier to push your agenda. When you have opportunity not to be in the leadership, it is harder to push your agenda. We made more Democratic amendments in order last Congress, Mr. Speaker, than Republican amendments in an effort to bring a diversity of ideas.

This Congress, Mr. Speaker, when Republicans are in the minority and the Democratic majority is writing the rules, 70 percent of all amendments that have been made in order have been Democratic amendments. Eighteen percent of the amendments have come to Republicans. Five times more amendments were given to the majority than to the minority. Again, we gave more to the minority than the majority.

I see my friends from Minnesota down here saying, "I had an amendment. It was a good idea. My constituents asked me to offer it. It is germane to the underlying bill. I just want my day on the floor to vote." That day has been denied, Mr. Speaker, for amendment after amendment after amendment after amendment. Hundreds of amendments. Good ideas, bipartisan ideas.

My friend from Illinois, Mr. SHIMKUS, had an amendment, Mr. Speaker, that required that we fund nuclear waste disposal licensing. Nuclear waste is

spread out all across this country. I don't know if it is in your district, Mr. Speaker, but I have got it right next door to me. It is stored as best we can across the Nation. We are trying to license a national repository. We have spent billions as a nation preparing for that. All he wanted was a vote on an amendment that has wide and deep bipartisan support. I think it would have won, but we will never know because the powers that be denied him even the chance to discuss it.

The question isn't, is there something good in this underlying bill? The question is, do you believe any of the rest of us have anything to add to make it better?

My friends made in order some Republican amendments. I told you that so far this year there have been five times more Democratic amendments made in order than Republican amendments. This bill today is better. It is only twice as many Democratic amendments than Republican amendments. It is still nowhere close to fair, it is still not representative, but this is where we are.

There is not one dollar, Mr. Speaker, for the humanitarian crisis on the border. The New York Times in an editorial on Sunday said, "The financial reality is that this agency is overwhelmed." Talking about the Office of Refugee Resettlement.

"So far this fiscal year, it has taken charge of nearly 41,000 unaccompanied children, a 57 percent increase over last year. The entire program could run out of funding by the end of June."

There is not one dollar in this bill for that. That is what my colleagues came to ask unanimous consent to do. That is what defeating the previous question would do.

We all agree there is a crisis at the border.

The editorial goes on for the New York Times, Mr. Speaker.

"There should be no ambivalence about the urgency of addressing the humanitarian needs. While lawmakers wring their hands and drag their feet, tens of thousands of migrant children are suffering.

"Congress needs to get serious about dealing with that suffering."

There is no bill on its way to the floor, Mr. Speaker, except for the one you heard my colleague ask Member after Member after Member for unanimous consent to bring. And you heard my colleagues on the other side of the aisle deny that. I understand. We don't usually get unanimous consent requests to prove during Rules Committee debate.

I don't fault my colleague for objecting. But if we defeat the previous question as I am proposing, Mr. Speaker, and we add an amendment to the rule, we will continue to consider the bill that my friend from California is so proud of. But we will also consider the bill that provides immediate funding to the men and women serving us on the border as they seek to address this humanitarian crisis.

It gives me no pleasure to bring it up during Rules Committee debate, Mr.

Speaker, because I don't think we disagree on this. I think we are together on this. I cannot, for the life of me, understand why the leadership on the Democratic side of the aisle is saying no and no and no and no to doing something that they know needs to be done. I do not understand it.

But I know this. Here, on Wednesday, we have got one shot to fix it: one. Not two, not three. There aren't a dozen different options. We have got one shot to fix it.

Defeat this previous question, add an amendment to the rule, and bring up this emergency funding supplemental. Do what we all know needs to be done. If it stretches from the editorial page of the New York Times to a conservative Republican from the deep south, Mr. Speaker, you know it has broad bipartisan appeal.

We get so used to saying no in this Chamber. We get so used to running each other out in politics. Let's take yes for an answer. Let's do something we all know needs to be done. Let's take a shot at doing better today than we did yesterday. Maybe we will come back and do better still tomorrow.

Defeat the previous question. Add this amendment to the bill. In the absence of that, I will have to ask that we oppose that rule, Mr. Speaker, and give us a chance to go back to the drawing board one more time.

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

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, while we may not agree on everything, I do want to thank my colleague from Georgia for his participation in this process. I hope we can agree that getting back to regular order is the right thing to do, not for Democrats and not for Republicans, but for the American people.

Congress cannot write a blank check and allow children on our southern border to continue to be abused while they are in our custody. We need transparency, we need accountability. Members of Congress need to be able to go and inspect these facilities without being denied entry.

On the issue of participation among Members of Congress through this process of appropriations, I want to state once again that ideas are absolutely welcome. However, the Appropriations Committee chairwoman cannot order Members to participate in the process. We can set up meetings and we can invite them to come and participate, and many did. They presented their ideas, they presented their requests for funding for their districts, and, guess what, 95 percent of those requests were agreed upon through a process of mitigating.

Now, if I was writing this appropriations bill myself, it would look very different. If my colleague from Georgia was writing this appropriations bill himself, it would look very different. He and I both know that. But our commitment is not to our personal agendas. Our commitment is to the rule of

law, is to democracy, and is to the American people, our constituents, who sent us here to represent them.

The underlying legislation is a strong bill that is the result of good, hard work by Members of both sides of the aisle. It is about time that the House of Representatives got back to doing the business of the people in a timely manner.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on the rule and the previous question.

The material previously referred to by Mr. WOODALL is as follows:/n

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 436/N

At the end of the resolution, add the following:/n

SEC. 5. That immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall resolve into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3056) to provide supplemental appropriations relating to border security, 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. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. Clause 2(e) of rule XXI shall not apply during consideration of the bill. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, 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 with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill./n

SEC. 6. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3056.

Mrs. TORRES of California. 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. WOODALL. 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.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR,
HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES,
AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED
AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS
ACT, 2020

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members